



**COMMUNITY SERVICES ADVISORY COMMISSION  
APRIL 9, 2024, 6:30 P.M.  
MINUTES**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Pryor called the April 9, 2024 Regular meeting of the Community Services Advisory Commission to order 6:30 p.m.

**ROLL CALL**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Vivek Arunachalam, Steve Dritz, Elizabeth McClain, Rex Pryor, Hong Qiu  
Jessica Tobias, Vicki Guinther

STAFF PRESENT: Ms. Goliver, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Darling, Ms. O'Callaghan, Mr. Hartmann,  
Ms. Wawszkiewicz, Ms. Willis

ALSO PRESENT: Mike Brehm, Director of Transportation Partnerships, EMH&T; and  
Karen Seidel, Communities Program Administrator, SWACO

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Mr. Pryor opened the floor to public comment for items not listed on the agenda. Seeing no members of the public who wished to speak, the floor was closed to public comment.

**REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES**

Mr. Arunachalam stated that the March 12, 2024 minutes were an abstract and not true minutes. Ms. Goliver explained that a minute-taking service generated the minutes from a recording for the previous meeting. Staff is working on moving toward meeting summaries rather than verbatim minutes. She informed the Commission that Legislative Services would be staffing the meetings moving forward and minutes will be consistent across all Advisory Committees.

Mr. Arunachalam requested that language be added to the minutes noting that they are a summary. Ms. Maxwell stated that minutes moving forward would capture more detail. A statement could be added that the minutes are not verbatim. Ms. Goliver noted that the audio recording is retained.

Ms. Tobias noted that a disclaimer is currently listed on the minutes of the March 12, 2024 meeting.

Mr. Arunachalam moved, Ms. Guinther seconded approval of the minutes from the CSAC meeting held on March 12, 2024.

Vote on the Motion: Mr. Dritz, yes; Ms. McClain, yes; Mr. Pryor, yes; Ms. Guinther, yes; Ms. Tobias, yes; Ms. Qiu, yes; Mr. Arunachalam, yes.

## **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

### **Miscellaneous:**

Ms. O'Callaghan stated that she and the Acting Law Director are visiting the four Advisory Committees to check in and to express appreciation for their work. She shared that staff has been reviewing advisory committees to ensure everyone is aware of their roles, responsibilities and scopes. As members are appointed, questions often arise regarding how work is assigned, how to make recommendations, etc. Ms. O'Callaghan expressed the importance of the Commission feeling supported and having the tools they need to operate effectively.

Mr. Hartmann provided a big picture of advisory committee roles including how they are formed and their role within the City of Dublin. The City of Dublin is founded on a Charter, which provides Council the ability to create advisory committees through legislation. The committees can then provide feedback to City Council on topics they are assigned.

Ms. O'Callaghan stated that training has been provided to staff liaisons, as these are public meetings with associated laws and requirements. That is one reason to involve the Clerk's Office in meetings moving forward as experts in public meetings. Because advisory committees are bodies of Council the desire is for consistency.

Mr. Hartmann shared the example of the City of Westerville being challenged on Ohio's open meeting law. It serves as a reminder that public bodies should not meet as a majority outside of public meetings.

Ms. O'Callaghan closed by inviting members to reach out at any time.

Mr. Pryor thanked Ms. O'Callaghan for attending and stated that Ms. Goliver is a great liaison.

### **Solid Waste Management Plan Update:**

Mr. Anderson introduced Karen Seidel, Community Programs Administrator for the Solid Waste Authority of Central Ohio (SWACO) and a Dublin resident. He explained that she would be reviewing the Solid Waste Management Plan (Plan), which was approved by City Council on March 25, 2024.

Ms. Seidel thanked the Commission for having her and as a Dublin resident, expressed her appreciation for their service. Her role with SWACO is to serve as the liaison between SWACO and communities. SWACO is a regional governmental entity created in 1988 by HB592. The Solid Waste Management Plan guides what happens with solid waste in the county for the next five years. The Plan is statutorily required and must be updated every five years. Ms. Seidel outlined the plan review and approval process. They have 92% support from local communities; some communities began the review process late. SWACO is confident that they will acquire necessary approvals to move forward with the Plan.

Ms. Seidel shared a chart illustrating what goes into the landfill. One million pounds of food waste enters the landfill every single day and one million tons goes in very year. Cardboard is the next highest volume item going into the landfill. Food waste and cardboard are recyclable materials. The Plan allocates more resources to programs that divert recyclable materials away from the landfill. 76% of the material going into the landfill has value and can be recycled. Only 24% is material that



truly needs to be in the landfill. Franklin County does a good job with its recycling program in comparison to other communities.

Mr. Dritz asked if other communities are recycling. Ms. Seidel stated that most communities have curbside recycling. In her position, she tries to recruit communities to participate in SWACO's consortium program and curbside recycling.

Ms. Seidel shared an extensive list of current programs and services offered by SWACO including landfill tours, which she highly recommends.

Ms. Qiu asked for Dublin's current recycling amount. Ms. Seidel stated that it is about 50%. The goal is to send only things to the landfill that truly belong in the landfill. The life of the landfill is approximately 40 years right now. Extending the life of the landfill will benefit the entire county.

Ms. Seidel shared areas of planned program growth. SWACO established a convenience center at the Jackson Pike center. It is a location that allows people to bring items for recycling including items outside of curbside recycling. Adding special recycling opportunities there is ongoing. A new state of the art education center is being built. The Plan shows that additional staff and resources will be dedicated to the schools. The grants program is an area of program growth. SWACO is making an effort to make curbside food scrap collection available. A central compost facility is necessary. While that is being developed, efforts are being made to work on ordinance language, how much residents would be willing to pay, etc.

Ms. Seidel reviewed the SWACO programs budget. Programs and services are funded by a "Generation Fee" of \$5.00/ton. In 2017, SWACO removed a \$7 tipping fee but retained \$1 (the Allocated Dollar). There are no changes to the \$5/ton Generation Fee and Use of the \$1/ton Allocated Dollar.

Ms. Goliver introduced Michael Darling, Operations Administrator for the City of Dublin.

Ms. Qiu asked about the percentage of actual reusable materials included in Dublin's recycling. Mr. Darling stated that Dublin's contamination rate is about 18%, which is good compared to other communities. Mr. Darling stated that everything that ends up in the recycling tote that is not contaminated is recycled into something. Materials are sorted and there is a market and buyer for those lots. Nothing other than contamination is ever sent to the landfill. Ms. Seidel added that recycling is dictated by two factors:

1. Can it be sorted? and
2. Does someone want to buy it?

Mr. Dritz asked about the \$5/ton plus the additional dollar. Ms. Seidel stated they are separate funding mechanisms.

Mr. Dritz asked about the approval schedule of the Plan. Ms. Seidel stated that SWACO is statutorily required to revisit this entire process every 5 years but the Plan forecasts out 15 years. Ms. Goliver provided the example of the City's 5-year Capital Improvement Program that is updated annually.

Ms. Qiu asked if this Plan would cause an increase in costs to residents. Ms. Seidel stated that residents would feel no difference beyond an increase in services.

Mr. Dritz asked if “Zero Waste Stadiums” are truly zero waste. Ms. Seidel stated that the Ohio Stadium takes the materials to the London Correctional facility where it is hand-sorted, so there is much less contamination. There is a spectrum of how much material can be diverted.

Ms. Qiu stated that she feels there is not enough education. People should be encouraged to reduce and reuse. Recycling is the last step. Ms. Seidel stated that much of this is about behavior change. Data shows that education alone is not enough.

Mr. Anderson encouraged the Commission to reach out to staff with any questions.

**East Bridge Street Visioning & Preliminary Engineering Study Update:**

Ms. Wawzkiewicz introduced the East Bridge Street Visioning & Preliminary Engineering Study stating that this study is looking at the future vision for East Bridge Street including all modes of transportation. She introduced Michael Brehm, Director of Transportation Partnerships with EMH&T.

Mr. Brehm stated that the study area is East Bridge Street/Dublin-Granville Road/161 with a focus on the section between Riverside Drive and Sawmill Road. East Bridge Street is still a suburban arterial roadway from the 1990s while the City’s needs and the surrounding land use are changing. The purpose of the study is to come up with a new vision for East Bridge Street in light of these changes. Mr. Brehm shared the project timeline starting in winter-spring of 2023 and moving into winter-spring 2024 with Final Recommendations planned for summer 2024. Mr. Brehm shared the goals of the study as follows:

- Improve pedestrian experience
- Imagine redevelopment
- Refine the future street grid
- Plan the Emerald Trail
- Incorporate transit & micro-mobility

Mr. Brehm stated that an early focus for the study was the pedestrian environment. They observed the pedestrian environment in the roundabout at East Bridge Street and Riverside Drive and the East Bridge Street and Dale Drive intersection and considered how to facilitate pedestrian activity across this road as it continues to transform. He shared suggested improvements to strengthen the pedestrian crossings including urban streetscape, specialty paving, rectangular rapid flashing beacon, raised crosswalks, separated curb ramps and tight curb returns.

Mr. Brehm detailed the recommendations at each intersection providing near-term improvements and longer-term suggested improvements.

Mr. Brehm addressed speed management. It is the most effective way to improve the pedestrian experience, but it is easier said than done. The City has taken steps toward changing the speed limit. Speed limits are governed by Ohio Revised Code. Dublin has passed an ordinance creating the Bridge Street Riverside Drive Business District, which will pave the way to eventually lowering the speed limit to 25 mph.



Mr. Dritz asked about variable speed limits. Mr. Brehm stated he has seen that in school zones, but he is not familiar with it being used in other situations.

Mr. Brehm spoke about development patterns. The main reason to study this is a desire for the street to react to/encourage the type of development called for in the Bridge Street District Code.

Mr. Brehm stated that planning for LinkUs has become a large part of this study. Phase 2 of LinkUs Northwest Corridor overlaps with the Bridge Street Corridor. EMH&T has been charged with considering this corridor with dedicated bus lanes. Bus rapid transit is only rapid if there are dedicated lanes. He shared renderings showing alternative plans with dedicated bus lanes.

Ms. Guinther stated that is a high volume area, and this study is suggesting it will be more of a bottleneck. Mr. Brehm stated that it requires a different way of thinking about traffic. There are currently no good east-west alternatives. The hope is that over time there could be a mode shift to bikes and buses. There are always going to be cars. Ms. Guinther stated that the renderings show apartment buildings, but people move to Dublin for the suburban feel. She asked about the community's reaction to taking away the suburban feel. Ms. Wawszkiewicz stated that people are supportive of redevelopment in the area inside 270 and the Bridge Street Corridor. Bridge Park-type development is anticipated there, and as those properties develop, it is necessary to be prepared. Traffic bottleneck already exists on Sawmill Road. Ms. Guinther asked about additional crossings over the river. Ms. Wawszkiewicz stated that an additional river crossing at John Shields Parkway is called for in the Thoroughfare Plan.

Ms. Qiu stated that Dublin City Schools is feeling the pressure of population growth. She wants to be mindful of that and make sure we are not bankrupting the schools. Ms. O'Callaghan stated that the goal of the Bridge Street development was to focus on attracting young professionals and it has been successful in doing that. There are 18 children in the most recent properties. In contrast, there are over 100 children in Jerome Grand, showing an example of a different type of multi-family development. There is a negotiated cooperative agreement with the schools that would help fund this entire area and that cooperative agreement is still in place. Ms. Guinther asked about those funds. Ms. O'Callaghan stated that the agreement was entered into between Council and the Dublin School Board. The City compensates Dublin Schools for a certain amount of years and based on a certain percentage of property tax. \$1.5 million goes to the schools. Ms. O'Callaghan added that it only applies to the Bridge Street District. Mr. Brehm stated that the building shown on the rendering is zoned office and is not intended to represent a multi-family development. There is quite a variety of zoning in the study area.

Mr. Brehm shared the next steps for the study as follows:

- Incorporate findings into Envision Dublin and the Bridge Street District (BSD) Special Area Plan
- Integrate key transportation elements into the Multimodal Thoroughfare Plan
- Refine alternatives and study recommendations
- Prepare cost opinions and concepts for phased implementation.

Mr. Dritz asked about new areas available for urbanization. Mr. Brehm stated that the impetus was that the City was hearing from developers interested in the area. Part of the goal of the study is to come up with a unified vision. There is interest in redeveloping existing uses along that corridor.

Ms. O’Callaghan stated that this is a proactive effort to help inform the review and vetting of proposed developments.

Ms. Qiu asked how much influence the City has over developers. Ms. O’Callaghan stated that we have a thorough review process as well as many Land Use plans that indicate to developers the type of development that would be in line with the community’s goals. Ms. Wawzkiewicz added that this area was rezoned and has very prescriptive zoning regulations.

**ENVISION DUBLIN UPDATE**

Mr. Arunachalam stated that the steering committee began meeting a year and a half ago. Consultants have been consolidating feedback. The process is wrapping up. There will be one more meeting.

Ms. Goliver stated the conversation this evening can feed back to Envision Dublin. CSAC is well represented in that planning endeavor.

**NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting is scheduled for May 14, 2024, at 6:30 p.m.

Mr. Dritz asked about streetscape improvements. Ms. Wawzkiewicz stated that staff has an agenda item based on input received from CSAC going before City Council April 22, 2024.

**ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business of the Commission to transact, the meeting was adjourned at 7:57 p.m.



Chair

  
Deputy Clerk of Council