

Committee for Safe Bicycle and Pedestrian Transport Meeting

Thursday, September 4th, 2025 8:00am

Attendees: Carrie Schloss, John Wahl, Chris Bell, Dennis Galicki, Misha Alexander, Chief Rizzo, Rich Washington, Rich Bistriz

Agenda:

Here is the agenda:

1. Continue discussing the proposed trails
2. How to address Council's concern
3. The next steps
4. Setting a timeline
5. Determining a new meeting date and time

First we listed the concerns we heard from council as the following

- Is 5ft wide enough? That would mean it would be *designed* for pedestrian use only. 11ft would be multi-use but be more expensive (so would not get as far), and would not fit within the ROW (so easements would be needed)
- ADA accessibility - what are the requirements? How much additional cost would that be?
- What about flooding issues with additional paved trail
- Safety concerns since the segment proposed has 3 crossings on Bell instead of staying all on one side?
- Concerned that phase1 plan from engineer is not detailed enough (2ft topography)
- What is the need for construction easements and cost - how much will this expand the cost of the work?

Councilmembers Bell and Galicki agreed that that covered the concerns raised by council at the joint meeting working session.

The following are information and ideas to address councils concerns:

Council concerns

1. Is 5ft wide enough? That would mean it would be *designed* for pedestrian use only. 11ft would be multi-use but be more expensive (so would not get as far), and would not fit within the ROW (so easements would be needed)

-Ohio law appears to be ok based on Carrie's research of Ohio state law (see research at the end of notes)

-Local ordinance in SRV allows bikes on sidewalks (which are also pedestrian infrastructure) - Solicitor's research (shared by Chris Bell)

2. ADA accessibility - what are the requirements?

-Rich Washington (Verdantas) explained that with sidewalks you follow existing road grade and that would exempt it from the slope requirements, but you still need ADA crossings, truncated domes etc

3. What about flooding with additional paved trail?

- RW expressed that If there is existing flooding - good to know up front
- Councilmember Galicki repeated Councilmember Porter's concern that in the ROW you may have to pipe open culverts which could restrict water flow so an open ditch is a better option
- Rich Washington: Any kind of piping would be sized for drainage area so it could handle water flow - maximize pipe size so water flow would not be constricted - this would all be studied to ensure adequate - with a 5 ft path there would be a little additional runoff - but not significant
- Would a more porous surface help with that ?
 - Rich Washington: yes but would add cost and maintenance they do make permeable materials; used for a permeable walk - stone and rubber and aggregate; Significantly add cost (from \$5 per sq foot to \$30per sqft)

4. Concern about the safety of crossing the road 3 times instead of staying all on one side?

- Currently path goes into park because residents across from park requested it does not go through their ROW And switches to North because of cemetery
- What about south side all the way? Is there a way to go in front of the cemetery?
- Depends on the closest burial, Used to be a stone wall on cemetery,

- Can you relocate where the stairs are?
- Rich Washington: Looking at street view - if we got rid of the landing - continued step down a path could fit and just abut the curb, no tree lawn
- This was determined by the chief and councilmember Galicki to be the best option to appease their concerns about a continuous trail crisscrossing Bell
- If we switch to the south side in design, how will that affect cost?
 - Rich Washington: Cost is relatively the same - regardless of north or south side
 - Could be some cost to modifications to cemetery but SRV did all that work in house when they took out retraining wall so perhaps could do that to lower cost there
 - Ask NOACA - does it have to be a bid or can they just build it in house

5. Need for construction easements?

- Currently a TBD line in cost estimate so Rich can put a maximum number on those - assume 5ft all the way which is likely much more than is needed

Rich will ball park or get a range for these

Given the additional cost from potential construction easements, should we just do Phase 1 (initial) to Chagrin Lakes? And not to 306?

- Galicki said makes sense to bring it to the corner = no objection from council
- May be economy of cost - include the segment

Then we will determine where we are at in total cost with easements to figure out segment (or let council decide) and provide two options

6. Is the current plan detailed enough with 2 ft topography

- At this phase its detailed enough - its a concept - would need more detail for bids and exact cost estimates within the ROW for exactly where construction easements would be
- When will there be a detailed statement of work?
- Walks/paths are not easy projects - ROW, residences, easements,

Next steps:

Motion to approve next step

Ohio trail programs have draft language for a motion

Motion at council - initial framework for council to pass

Bring what we discussed today to Regular council meeting to show Information for concerns alleviated

What would we need included in the Motion?

Additional notes:

Grant is vague

Started talking about grant in 2017 or before, don't think council was aware what the purpose was, NAOCA was going to provide funds for paths, had the money before we had the vision

The grant doesn't specify materials or width

Merit to consider a path on one side or another

Keeping it to one side of the road would be safer

Get as much length as we can get

People will use whole path walking

As is people are walking and its not safe

How do you pay for on going cost - maintenance is taken over by the village - in 20 years you may have to do an overlay - doesn't get salt - cost will get flipped to SR village

What about plowing?

Will it be a multi-season path - right now it will be a 3 season path - get it up and running and then cross that road

What will the village need to pay?

Often overlooked is the maintenance

Councilmember Galicki: Council is not anti path its please let us know, want to spend money wisely,

Research:

Part One:

The following is information from Rich Washington *in Italics* in response to emailed questions:

1. Map detail (2ft topography): in projects like this, in order to get cost estimates, put out bids, put out scoping docs, do you usually do more detailed design than you did for the Phase 1 segment?

Due to the tight right of way we would need to update the survey of the right of way, existing conditions and topography, the 2' contours gave me a general idea what the grades are for the master plan. Yes for bidding we would do more detailed documents to prepare construction documents. It also depends on whether this will need to follow ODOT standards because ODOT has their own set of standards, but neither ODOT or NOACA have been able to answer that. Construction drawings need this information to be accurate for layout and grading and any drainage structures.

2. How much budget do you have left to work with and how much would it take to draw and alternative scenario on the north side of the park in response to council's concern that the path crosses bell to many times? *I have a couple days of time left in our budget, so limited time.*

3. Construction easements: Can you explain what those are, why they would be needed, if you've ever seen those opposed, how you acquire them, and if they add any additional cost?

I have been talking with our engineers and easements can be time consuming and will add costs in the preparation and execution. The plan is for the walk to be within the right of way, but the construction easement is needed to do any grading or if contractor mobilization is needed beyond the right of way into resident's yards. If this is federal funding, which I understand NOACA funds are, then it would need to follow ODOT criteria and they have their own easement requirements. I will work up some rough order of magnitude SF costs.

4. Last - do you have any information about the ADA accessibility question - I think the question was about if the hill would not be ADA compliant and if that would be a problem or if switchbacks and additional cost would be needed. *The general rule is if the walk follows the grade of the adjacent existing road the walk is not required to be below 5% slope or have ramps, landings and handrails.*

Part two:

Here is the committees preliminary research into laws/ordinances of laws allowing/prohibiting bicycle use of pedestrian facilities (e.g. sidewalks/paths). We are waiting for final word from the solicitor

1. Ohio: from the ODOT website addressing bicycle laws in ohio

<https://www.transportation.ohio.gov/programs/active%20transportation/bike-ped-law>

Riding on Sidewalks and Paths (§ 4511.711)

Under state law, people are allowed to ride bicycles and E-bikes, if the motor is not engaged, on the sidewalk. Many local jurisdictions only allow people under a certain age to ride on the sidewalk. No jurisdiction can require bikes to be ridden on the sidewalk.

2. South Russell Ordinances

474.12 RIDING BICYCLES UPON SIDEWALKS.

(a) A person operating a bicycle shall ride upon the sidewalk rather than the roadway when sidewalks are available, except that no person shall ride a bicycle upon a sidewalk upon or along which signs have been erected by authority of Council or other duly designated local authority prohibiting such bicycle riding, or within a business district. At no time shall a person under the age of eleven years operate a bicycle on a street.