

**RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
SPECIAL JOINT MEETING OF COUNCIL AND
THE SAFE BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN TRANSPORT COMMITTEE
MONDAY, AUGUST 25, 2025 – 7:30 P.M.
MAYOR WILLIAM G. KOONS PRESIDING**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Bell, Berger, Canton, Cavanagh, Galicki, and Porter

OFFICIALS PRESENT: Fiscal Officer Romanowski, Police Chief Rizzo, Engineer Washington, Solicitor Matheney

VISITORS: Carrie Schloss, Hickory Hill Rd., Chagrin Falls; Suzanne Moloney, Waverly Ln.; Misha Alexander, Chillicothe Rd.; John Buda, Leaview Ln.; Mary Rensel, Chelsea Ct.

The Mayor called the Special Joint Meeting of Council and the Safe Bicycle and Pedestrian Transport Committee to order. The Mayor reminded the participants that it was a Special Meeting and therefore only items on the agenda could be discussed. Copies of the committee's survey, Village map, and timeline were distributed. The Mayor advised that his goal for the meeting was to have Council pass a motion to accept the Master Plan presented by Verdantas Engineering. Accepting the plan would acknowledge what has been presented to Council, and does not in any way obligate Council, Verdantas, or the committee to take any action. The motion would simply recognize the project presented to Council for consideration of implementation. He added that this was the plan for which the Village paid \$15,000. He continued to describe the work done for the Village by Verdantas over the past 20 years, to include the Park Master Plan.

The Fiscal Officer conducted the roll call.

The Mayor introduced the first presenter, Carrie Schloss, the co-chair of the committee, who would be presenting the committee's Phase I portion of the project and cost estimate. This would be followed by discussion. Schloss' provided a slide presentation which reviewed the committee's activities to date. She concluded that presently, Verdantas has been working on the master plan for trails as well as a very detailed design for Phase I and cost estimate. Her presentation is attached.

She further explained that the committee's priority was to connect residents to South Russell Park and children to schools while funding the project with grants, ensuring the rural character of the community through path design, and taking a phased approach. Schloss explained the media graphic presented for the park, including an added section to the proposed trail which the committee recommended so as to maximize the grant money. The Phase I path starts at Spring Dr. at Countryside Estates, crosses to the park, runs through the park, crosses back to the north side of Bell Rd. at the existing crosswalk at Alderwood Dr. and moves up Bell to Gurney Elementary School where it crosses back to the south side to connect to Sugar Bush and then continues as boardwalk to Chagrin Lakes. The path would be less than one mile and would connect more than 50% of the residents to the park, Gurney Elementary School, and to each other. Regardless of whether the path extends to Chillicothe Rd., the crossing at the intersection

would be part of the Phase I recommendation. For Phase I and crossings, the cost would be estimated at \$745,851. 80% would be covered by the Northeast Ohio Area Coordinating Agency (NOACA) grant with a 20% match for the Village. If the expanded version of Phase I were done, it would cost \$1,023,384, which would maximize the \$800,000 grant. She reiterated that the committee wanted to get as much as possible for the grant money in hand. Schloss advised she would have Engineer Washington describe the details and costs he developed for the project. She concluded that the committee wanted the work to move forward this fall and to learn from Council what barriers and concerns they had so that the committee could address them over the next couple of weeks. Ultimately, she wanted an agreement on Phase I segments. The Mayor acknowledged the committee had done a lot of work and appreciated their efforts.

Washington explained that one of the first considerations was the size of the path in terms of NOACA's design criteria and whether this would be an 11-foot multimodal path or a narrower path. There were conversations with NOACA which defers to the Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT), and the grant does not specify that it must be a multimodal trail. ODOT's recommendation was a minimum 5-foot width. Material-wise, neither ODOT nor the committee were comfortable with a gravel path, since it would require more maintenance and had potential for washouts and erosion. An asphalt surface would be preferable because it would be flexible and could be routed around various obstacles. Preservation of existing infrastructure like catch basins in the ditches would be ideal. There are places with a culvert crossing which will require a boardwalk similar in width to the path and constructed with wood or possibly Trex for longevity. Location was considered based on the neighborhoods, and how it tied in with Gurney Elementary School and the existing crosswalk at the park. The path could run along the front edge of South Russell Park, creating the potential to expand it into the park to create a loop trail. There is a conservation easement on part of this, but in talking to the Western Reserve Land Conservancy (WRLC), permission was provided to put a path through that area of the park.

Referring to the map displayed on the media screen, Washington pointed out an area near the high-tension wires that was proposed for a future path to be part of a long-term regional trail connection to some of the Geauga Park District areas. This would necessitate coordination with the power company for approval and would follow different design standards, like a shared road. Cavanagh asked if the power company had ever given such permission, and Washington said yes, but was unable to provide specific examples. Cavanagh recalled issues with the power company over youth with four wheelers using this area. Washington surmised that it would be a more frequently used road and not an off-road structure but would need to be monitored for such activity. He thought that the number of people using the trails would preclude this from happening. Washington continued to say that Chagrin Falls had been asking about the progress of the trail since they have trail connections to Solon and are thinking regionally about the trail systems.

The other trail would be from Chillicothe Rd. going east. He investigated the first segment consisting of going to the first major road but did not consider any costs. The markings on the map were potential trails for future consideration of how they could connect into the overall local and regional trail system. He described other ideas people had for locations for trails, to include paths that transitioned to roads running through less busy neighborhoods instead of on Bell Rd. into Chagrin Falls. He explained that the section from Spring Dr. to Chagrin Falls has a lot of obstacles, so they tried to pick the easier route. Starting at Spring Dr. and heading east,

Washington described a crosswalk at the west end of the park to get people into the park. The trail would run through the park by the pavilion and then it would cross back over by the parking lot to Bell Rd. at the existing crosswalk. From there, the path would involve the boardwalk over a stream crossing and wetlands. It could be constructed in such a way as to not disrupt the wetlands and would not require wetland fill permits. However, it would require oversight by the Army Corps of Engineers. The boardwalk would preserve the area and make it unnecessary to extend the culvert out into the wetland. The next section for the path would be trickier because it is wooded along the right-of-way and has a ridge. It might be necessary to obtain construction easements in this area. He added that this might happen in a number of areas along this portion, which would be necessary to determine once he gets the final topography and knows exactly what they will be working with in terms of grading. From that point, it would just go along the front yards, with the idea of keeping it at the edge of the right-of-way. The power poles are at the edge of the right-of-way, which varies. This is another item that needs to be coordinated with the final layout. Washington did not envision a straight trail. As the trail continues east, there will be a painted crosswalk across the Gurney Elementary School driveway and then a beacon crossing to the south. There are some guardrails that will need to be adjusted and a boardwalk on the south side would be needed to cross there. Washington indicated that a potential future path was identified going to the south in the lakes neighborhood.

Galicki noted that Washington said he did not have the topography and specific areas, and said it seemed like this was a 500-foot elevation view of where the planned path would be. He asked if there was anything identifying areas where the right-of-way could be used, or where it would be necessary to acquire property. On the Verdantas trail proposals, there are either no line items, or they are marked "TBD" for right-of-way acquisition, construction, and slope easement, etc. Galicki suspected there could be significant costs with obtaining those easements or acquiring property if necessary. Galicki asked if Washington had any idea of what those additional costs might be. Washington did not know, but said the idea was to stay in the right-of-way as much as possible. Galicki understood this and thought it was a great idea but was concerned about how much area this provided. At times, the right-of-way might be in a ditch. Pepper Pike, which has already gone through the sidewalk proposals, has the path/sidewalk staked. Through discussion of the proposed trail, Galicki had heard references to where the trail might run and the potential for it going through residents' yards and/or the necessity to grade their yards. He surmised this would have an impact on the actual costs. Galicki asked if it would be possible to mark where the trail would go with stakes or spray paint. This would help in identifying the impacted properties which may require easements and/or property acquisition. It seemed like those details had not been captured in the plans. Washington stated that the next step would be to look at it in more detail. The base map he used was from the improvement of Bell Rd., so it had all the aprons, power polls, catch basins, etc. He explained that the type of topography used on this map, however, shows the location of the ditches but does not contain the level of detail to show the slope, which would lead to the discussion of easements. Galicki suspected some of the ditches would have to be enclosed, and Washington thought there was potential for this, but it seemed like it would not be necessary. Even though it is not quite a mile, there is still a lot of area to cover. Pepper Pike's ditches are already closed in, and for the most part the path is going through yards. Cavanagh questioned the location of this project, and Washington said the second segment of the larger sidewalk project was on South Woodland, starting around Pine Tree Road down to Lander and then north on Lander. Galicki reiterated that the paths are going through residents' yards and not the right-of-way. Washington concurred but said he did not see stakes

identifying the location of the right-of-way, just the location of the path. Galicki recalled that there was controversy concerning this project and that it went to the voters. Washington thought it did but added that now that the first segment is in, people think it is great and are eager to have more. The existing path is on one side of the road. It is a 6-foot path and not a multimodal 10-foot path.

Galicki asked if the Village could get something in writing about the width of the proposed path. He understood there had been conversations about it, but preferred getting something in writing from the governing body, whether that was ODOT, NOACA, Ohio Revised Code, etc. that verified that the chosen width of the path was acceptable because he would hate to see the project go forward and then find out that the Village was ineligible for any grants because guidelines were not followed properly. Washington said this would be a next step, adding that NOACA would want the Village to resubmit because originally the application was submitted for an 8-foot-wide path. NOACA said the Village would need to resubmit the application for a 5-foot path. This would be the next step to make sure they sign off because ODOT said 5-foot is the minimum, but they did not say yes, that they were good with a 5-foot path. It would need more confirmation, but their interpretation of the grant was that it could go down to 5 feet, which is the minimum they would allow.

Cavanagh verified that there would be 30 feet from the center of the road, and Washington concurred. She thought that seemed like a lot of room, but Washington said this road has a narrow right-of-way. Additionally, as the road was widened, the ditch was pushed out. He further discussed issues with the road as it approaches Chillicothe where it would potentially need to push out into the properties there. As the project moves to the next step, some of these costs can be determined. Galicki said he was also concerned about the property owners and their buy-in. It is one thing to be supportive when the path isn't going through your yard, but another when your front yard is being excavated. He was aware there had been an effort to contact these residents, but it would be beneficial to know what was needed to get their buy-in. Would it be in the right-of-way, or would the Village need to acquire some of the property? Would the Village take it by eminent domain? He did not think that question had been answered for the six to eight houses that will be affected by the proposed path.

Canton shared that he felt the committee's passion for the project and appreciated the work they had done. However, he had questions he needed answered to make an intelligent decision. The Village had spent hundreds of thousands of dollars mitigating storm water runoff. His concern was with the effect of a 5-foot blacktop path running down Bell Rd. and storm water runoff. Washington said that typically, for something like this, there would not be a requirement to prepare a storm water management plan, which is determined by calculating the acreage involved. Canton was also concerned about the cost of maintaining the asphalt. Furthermore, the potential for three to five crossings that children and adults would have to negotiate concerned him. Washington said there was one existing crosswalk, and two more were being proposed. As a father of seven and grandfather to 11, Canton said he would be concerned with having 10 to 12-year olds crossing Bell Rd. at two to three points. Regarding the survey, Canton noted that 373 households or 25% were represented and asked Schloss if she was confident that it was a scientific poll. Schloss explained that it depended on who responded. The committee did its best to get the word out broadly through social media, the Village newsletter, posting flyers in the community with QR codes to take the survey. Additionally,

paper copies of the survey were available. Flyers were placed in residents' mailboxes and distributed by different Homeowners' Associations (HOAs). They did not look at the spatial bias, but the 25% response rate is pretty good. The Village put out a survey the year before and only received 8 responses. Additionally, the survey remained open for several months and continued to be publicized on social media. Canton shared the elements of a scientific poll which he found through his research. He asked if answers were received from both adults and children. Schloss stated that one response per household was requested, and separate questions were asked for the responder and then for the responder's family members.

Bell was uncertain that the cost of traffic paint was included for Alderwood and Waverly for painting the crossings. He also expressed confusion about the width of the trail. In some instances, he read that the ORC states that 5-feet is a pedestrian only path and no bikes. With some, he thought it was necessary to have 10 feet and did not know what the right answer was. Washington explained that deferring to ODOT, the 5-foot minimum path is for ADA requirements. It depends on the designation of the trail and whether it is a multimodal trail with bikes, runners, etc., which would be an 11-foot path with a center line for two-way traffic. There are different levels of bike trails depending on whether it is a side street versus Bell Rd. versus Chillicothe Road. Bell asked if the Village installed a 5-foot trail, would it be in violation of ORC if bike riders used it? Washington could not answer the question. Galicki noted that the issue was about the use of the trail based on the width. If it is 5 feet wide, it is for pedestrian traffic, and no bikes. If the plan is to have a multi-use path for bikes, etc. then it seems that it would have to be wider. Washington speculated that perhaps the law allowed children up to a certain age to ride a bike on a smaller trail. He would need to research this. Bell just did not want the public body to go down a path that would cause issues for the residents and future public bodies. Galicki reiterated that this needed to be defined because he, too, would hate to go down the path and find out the Village did not qualify for funding or the path would have to be restricted if the anticipation of the community was that they would be able to use it for bike riding, class one and two e-bikes, walking, strollers, etc. Bell wanted to make sure the Village did it right so that everyone could utilize the path with no issues in the future.

Schloss reported that she received an email from NOACA that said the 5-foot-wide path would be an acceptable project, but it would be a pedestrian only facility. It would follow the design for the pedestrian only path. However, she has seen kids in Chagrin Falls riding bikes on the sidewalks and they are still not on the road. She thought the question becomes whether Council wants an 11-foot path and can they get it through. The committee thought it would get push-back to an 11-foot path, so the idea was to get what they could to get people off the roads. They see people walking dogs, kids walking, kids on bikes, etc. The 5-foot path was proposed because the committee thought it was something that could get done which would start to get people off the road and be safer. If Council thinks more can be done, she did not want to limit it. Galicki asked if Schloss was suggesting that because children use their bikes or other motorized scooters on sidewalks that the Village ought to close its eyes and say that it will get a walking path, but it is okay if the kids use it in this way. Schloss did not know what the laws are in Chagrin Falls, but where she used to live, kids under 12 were allowed on bikes on sidewalks. Galicki suggested that the Solicitor investigate the liability issues of having a walking path where someone is injured on a bike. Bell questioned what could be done legislatively to edit the law within South Russell. He also asked if the grant had to be used in fiscal year 2026 or could it be used in 2027 or 2028. The Fiscal Officer said that according to the Engineer, NOACA is good about holding

it for two to three years. Bell explained that there were some expensive projects coming up for the Village and it would be good to know if this was a possibility. Washington said that 2028 was discussed at one point. John Buda, Leaview Ln., spoke to the Engineer who relayed that NOACA likes to see grassroots projects coming from the citizens and that when it comes to funding deadlines, they are very lenient. Once the money is approved, NOACA tries to do what they can to see it through. Galicki asked if the Engineer indicated that the Village would need to apply right away and then potentially push the project out. Buda said that the conversation was not that specific, but the Engineer said that if a request for extension were made, it was likely it would be approved. Referring to correspondence from Adam Allen, NOACA, the Mayor read, "Once this project is programmed, ODOT will schedule a scoping call that you should be included on. It will take between 9 to 18 months for it to move through the engineering design process. At this point, the earliest possible award date would be State Fiscal Year 2028, calendar year 2027." Any construction would start July 1, 2027. Bell concluded that in unscientific polling, he received 10 positive and one negative response about trails. Cavanagh thought that 25% was a good survey response. The Mayor advised it was 27%. He added that Pepper Pike consistently received 65% in response to two surveys and the issue on the ballot and said that the Village is running about 67% off the survey and thought the matter had been covered. There were 14 negative comments, 12 of which pertained to using South Russell funds for it. Whatever the Village spends, it is spending \$.20 on the dollar of the Village's money.

Porter clarified that this is once the grant money is received. The discussion involves the extension of the path all the way from Spring Dr. to Chagrin Falls. At this point, the cost of the first project would prevent the Village from using that money which would essentially be gone for the westward extension. The options then would be to get another grant, have it come out of the taxpayers' pockets, or not do it.

Berger asked Washington if the path must be ADA compliant. Washington clarified that this was in terms of the crossings, and Berger specified his question pertained to the entire project. Washington said there are places, like a regular sidewalk in a city, where the slope is greater than 5% because of existing conditions which abstain the Village from having to install ramps, landings, and handrails. It would follow those guidelines. Cavanagh clarified that it would have to be ADA compliant, and Washington said to the extent that it could be. Cavanagh questioned that if the criteria could not be met, it would be permissible to sidestep some of the rules, and Washington further explained that with some of the existing conditions it would not be possible to have it below a 5% slope. There would have to be switchbacks. Being a path, they would just need to be sure to know what that criteria would be.

The Mayor read correspondence from Neil Shop, Program Transportation Commander, District 12, ODOT. It said, "Depending on the funding requirements which seem pretty loose, you could possibly do a walking path, not designed for bikes, that would typically have a 5-foot minimum width for ADA." Berger noted that this only addresses the width of the path, but not the slope of the path in terms of making it ADA compliant for access. Washington explained that trails have different requirements than ADA accessible buildings and it would be necessary to investigate the specific requirements. Berger raised this question because ultimately every complication adds costs.

Porter advised that on Bell Rd., he had seen people with strollers with children in them, bicyclists, kids going to and from the park, and he wondered if a 5-foot path is enough. Perhaps it should be 8 feet for two-way traffic. Maybe having trails on both sides of Bell would solve this problem. Would the 8-foot path fit within the right-of-way? Washington said it would not in most places. Porter concluded that the Village is limited to 5 feet with it being limited to pedestrians, and no bikes. He supposed that joggers and people with strollers could use it, but again it would officially be a pedestrian only path. Is this something the Village would want to do? Cavanagh thought that the whole purpose was to get the cyclists off the road. Bell asked if the Village could adjust its ordinances to allow bicyclists to use the path. The Solicitor said possibly, but she did not know, adding that she was uncertain whether the Village's home rule power would allow it. Porter concluded that this was a legal question that needed to be answered. He did not want to see a path built that costs the Village money, regardless of whether it is \$200,000 or whatever it might be, and have it turn out to be not enough. If it had to be widened down the road, it would cost significant amounts of money and might involve asking residents to give up parts of their front yards. If they were not willing, the Village could pursue eminent domain to take the section, but this would seriously delay the whole process. The homeowner could decide to take it to a jury trial in Geauga County Court. An 8-foot path is not something that can be done without significant change for the homeowners along the path. To Galicki's point, it is different for people to say they are supportive until they are asked for a portion of their yard for the path and then they are not so supportive. Galicki offered that having had a childhood home taken by eminent domain, it is not necessarily a wonderful path you want to go down. Porter concurred, adding that he was not sure that anyone would win in the situation, but typically the homeowner comes out smiling broader than the Village.

The Chief stated that he had a document from ODOT which provided guidelines for shared paths. In the section that references pedestrians, which include walkers, runners, people using wheelchairs both non-motorized and motorized, people with baby strollers, people walking dogs, and others, adult upright bicycles, tricycles, bicycles pulling trailers, tandem bicycles, child bicyclists, in-line skaters, roller skaters, skateboards, kick scooter users, users of other micro mobility devices, it states that paths with widths less than 11-feet do not provide space for people to travel side by side and be passed by other users approaching from the opposite direction without increasing the potential for conflict. Failure to account for normal human social behavior in the mix of operating speeds will result in user conflicts. The Chief had concerns about the minimum width of 5 feet because according to the ODOT document, the minimum would be 11 feet. A "constrained" path is 8 feet. A 5-foot path is super constrained. The Chief loved the idea of paths for getting kids off the road, but just yesterday during the Ice Cream and Bike event, he observed an issue with the crosswalk. 90% of the people never pushed the button to turn the lights on. At one point, there were two people at opposite ends of the crosswalk looking at each other as cars approached, slowed down, and then took off. Neither of these individuals pushed the button. He realized there was some confusion. Furthermore, having three separate locations for crossing Bell Rd. was troubling and a safety concern. The Chief continued to explain his concerns about the 6% grade coming down Bell Rd. from 1080 Bell Rd. to Waverly Ln. A kid on a Huffy bike coming down that hill would probably not want to stop at the crossing at Waverly Ln. The better path for them to take would be to get back on the road where they have the right-of-way and do not have to stop for the cross street. The Chief was afraid they would leave the trail and go out into the road. He concluded that the idea of a bike path is phenomenal, and he would love to see it, but had concern about these issues.

Referring to the Chief's concerns about the crossings, Porter proposed having the bike path solely on the north side of the road rather than going across to the park, down the park, and back over. He understood that it is Village property and can be as wide as needed, considering the conservancy, but if it went straight down the north side of Bell Rd., or straight down Bell Rd. on the south side, would that not be better for the bicyclists? He recognized that the Cemetery is on the south side and there are houses at Sugar Bush, etc. but wondered if the committee considered a south side path or a continuous north side path that did not cut over twice to the park. It is fine to have crossings there to allow people to cross safely to the park, but his question was whether the committee considered the alternatives. Schloss explained that the committee considered a continuous north side path. There were two meetings held for the residents who live along the north side of Bell Rd. who would have the path going through their yards. There was one meeting for residents between Alderwood and Gurney and one for the homes directly across from the park. The people who live directly across from the park expressed support for the path because some had kids who walked their bikes to the side streets to then go for bike rides. They were excited about this but said they did not understand why the Village would put it on the north side of the street where it is necessary to cross all the driveways when there is a park that is Village property across the street. Their guidance to the committee was to move the path to the south side of the street for that section where bikes will not be crossing driveways and potentially encountering cars that are backing up. This is why the committee asked to have that segment on that side. As far as having it be continuous on the south side, she thought this was an engineering decision. Washington explained that the Cemetery is the biggest issue, and it would not be possible to put a path in that area.

Porter assumed the Village would have to take care of the asphalt path forever and ever. He continued by addressing the impact with storm water. He was very concerned with the sanitary and storm water lines that run down the road. Additionally, regarding the potential need to fill ditches, he explained that a basic engineering principle is that ditches are better than pipe when conveying storm water. The Village has spent a lot of money fixing storm water issues and will spend more to get them resolved. He did not want the bike path to negatively impact all the people to the west from the hill down. He also did not want the storm and sanitary lines disturbed. If the path fills in the ditch that runs downhill, he viewed this as a serious problem with the potential to make storm water worse or for deterioration of the path from the storm water overrunning the pipes. Washington asked if there are currently flooding issues there, and Porter responded not at the moment. However, Porter explained that residents of the west side of the Village have had major issues with storm water, especially Hazelwood and Fairview. In addition to his concern about the grade with storm water, he also was apprehensive about how people in wheelchairs would negotiate the grade from both the top and bottom of the hill. Porter concluded that these are all things that Council should consider.

The Mayor suggested wrapping up the meeting. He stated that the spandex bikers would never be on the path and would always stay on the road. He distributed a tentative timeline. As he previously stated, his goal for this meeting was to get a motion to accept what Washington had presented so far as a proposal. The Solicitor stated that the motion could not be made at this meeting because it was not noticed as such. It was noticed as a work session of Council and the committee. The Mayor stated that on Friday, August 29th at 8:30 a.m., the committee would be meeting. The next few Saturdays he hoped to have people at the Farmers' Market to answer

questions. On September 8th, the Emerald Lakes HOA President, will come to the meeting to speak about her community's feelings about a path. The Preserve of Chagrin would also come on that day. On September 22nd, Council would hear from Chagrin Lakes HOA and from Country Estates. Also on September 22nd, Council will be doing some budgeting, so on October 13th he hoped they could get some money budgeted. As he also said, the Village put in its request in October of 2025, called a Request for Programming Local Public Agency to ODOT. The first time they could dig a shovel-full would be July 1, 2027. There is plenty of time to plan and get through. The Mayor referenced the correspondence he presented and said no one has said the Village cannot do the 5-foot path and has said it looks like the Village can do it. He thought they needed to push it now to ODOT to get some final engineering and get something done. Since nothing can be done tonight, he thought they needed to keep plugging away. He thanked Washington and Schloss, noting she was a tough person and a good worker.

Cavanagh reiterated the need to get some clarity on the 5-foot versus 8-foot versus ADA details. The Mayor said that with everything that the Village has gotten in writing so far, it looks fine. Everything the Village proposes then goes to ODOT and they have heard from ODOT that it is fine. Berger wanted to be clear that the comments made by Neil Shop do not tell the Village that 5-feet is fine. Schloss stated that there was an email from the planner at NOACA that said 5 feet is an acceptable project and it would be a pedestrian path. Berger concurred that if it is a pedestrian only path. His assumption was that the committee was not interested in a pedestrian only path because the committee's name included "Safe Bicycle" in it. He assumed they wanted to be able to ride bikes on it. Schloss explained that the committee is proposing a 5-foot path because that is what fits in the right-of-way. It will definitely get pedestrian use, and potentially children on bikes, which may be an acceptable use. This will have to be investigated. Adults who feel Bell Rd. is a safe place for them to bike is a different thing. Right now, there is pedestrian use of Bell Rd. without pedestrian facilities, and they want to create what they can with the funding the Village has. Berger said he supports that with the idea that the Village gets the parameters from a legal perspective of what they can and cannot do so that they can tell constituents what is being done and that it is legal. Porter added that Council would not want to find out the hard way. The Mayor concluded that they want to find out if they can do the 5-foot or what can be done.

ADJOURNMENT: Being that there was no further business before Council Porter made a motion to adjourn at 8:42 p.m., seconded by Berger. Voice vote – ayes, all. Motion carried.

William G. Koons, Mayor

Danielle Romanowski, Fiscal Officer

Prepared by Leslie Galicki