

MINUTES

REYNOLDSBURG BOARD OF ZONING AND BUILDING APPEALS MARCH 19, 2009 6:30 P.M.

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. ROLL CALL

Members Present:	Mr. Lucas Haire Mr. Duane White Mr. Chris Long Mr. Norman Brusk Mr. Patrick Feeney
Others Present:	Mr. Aaron Domini, Planning Administrator

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 19TH MEETING

Chairman Feeney: Okay, we'll go on to Item A2, approval of the minutes. Is there any approval? I thought we had a different sheet.

Mr. Domini: Yes, I replaced page 8. There is a correction on the Motion. It was, in fact, made in the positive but it was typed in the negative, so I've corrected that. That's the sheet you have before you.

Mr. Feeney: Okay.

Mr. Domini: And that's the sheet I put in front of you to sign as well.

Mr. Feeney: Okay, good. So the minutes will stand approved with the change.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Feeney: Approval of the agenda. Any changes to the agenda? I assume--

Mr. Domini: No changes.

Mr. Feeney: No changes to the agenda.

4. SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS

Mr. Feeney: Anybody that is going to speak in front of the Board, first make sure that you sign in before you leave tonight if you haven't already. (Mr. Feeney administers the oath.)

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Feeney: Okay, we'll go to Item A5 which is public comment. Is there any other public comment other than what we have in front of the agenda? (No response.) Hearing none, we'll move to Item B, Unfinished Business.

B. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Mr. Feeney: I see there's no Unfinished Business, so we'll jump right into Item C1. If you'll read that, please, and then we'll discuss it.

C. NEW BUSINESS

1. MAJOR SITE PLAN REVIEW; ADDRESS NOT DETERMINED ON PARCEL ID 115-026610-00 (ADDRESS TO BE ISSUED BY EMH&T AT A LATER DATE); PRESENT USE, AGRICULTURAL; PROPOSED USE, NEW HIGH SCHOOL AND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL; PRESENT ZONING, S-1. CONTACT: MARK LARRIMER (MOODY NOLAN, INC.), 7547-Z.

Mr. Domini: In fact, there is an address that has been assigned to this parcel by EMH&T and the elementary school will be 8591 Summit Road and the high school is 8579 Summit Road. And, Mr. Feeney, I think rather than taking off with a – I did not do a Staff Report on this. I thought that the City engineer addressed most of the major concerns and I didn't see the need for a staff report. And I thought maybe, given the nature of the application, it might be more appropriate for the applicant to do the presentation first. And I have one minor concern I'd like to bring up later regarding the planting, a landscape plan, and I will do that later, but I would like the applicant to just kind of introduce us to the plan.

Mr. Feeney: That sounds good. Who wants to start?

Mr. Mitch Banchesfsky: Yes. Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, my name is Mitch Banchesfsky. Please call me Mitch. I'm with Schottenstein, Zox & Dunn. I'm here on behalf of the school district and the first thing I'd like to do is have our team of consultants, and I think we've brought pretty much all of them tonight. I'd like to have them stand and introduce themselves, because we're not going to have everyone do a presentation, but we wanted to have people here that could answer any questions that you might have, so let's start over here.

Mr. Brent Wilcox: I'm Brent Wilcox. I am the project manager with Moody Nolan, responsible for the complete set of documents for the architectural team.

Mr. Mark Larrimer: Mark Larrimer with Moody Nolan. I'm responsible for the civil engineering.

Mr. Ron Strussion: I'm Ron Strussion and I'm the business manager with the schools.

Mr. Tom Sisterhen: I'm Tom Sisterhen with the Smoot Construction. I'm the construction manager in charge of scheduling of the (speaking off mic)

Mr. Doug Bender: I'm Doug Bender with MS Consultants. I perform the traffic studies that _____ (speaking off mic)

Mr. Banchefsky: Brent, who's going to run this?

Mr. Wilcox: (inaudible)

Mr. Banchefsky: Yeah, you want to do that. I think we want to start off with a very brief Power Point, which I'm told you can see on your monitors in terms of, what—

Mr. Feeney: You will be answering?

Mr. Banchefsky: I will not use the pointer because you won't see that so I'll – we'll just start with a title sheet, Summit Road site. The first document was the original document we presented showing the S-curve from Mueller Road from the west to the east and the dimensions on that road access from the left neighborhood to the Summit Road connection. Next. This is a continuation. Again, you see the Mueller Road site connection of the S-drive doing from west to east, connect to Summit. The intersection, the connection where it happens is at a bus loop drive. You see the circular bus loop in the center that is both for bus and pedestrian traffic. At the south side of the site is the elementary school, 400+ students. Parking is to the south of that and there's a drop-off to the south, and I'll show you that here in a second, with all the vehicular access. The high school is to the north side of the bus loop for 1,000+ students with the potential of a Y.M.C.A. connector off the back in the future. And then to the east of the bus loop is a soccer-specific stadium. All the site amenities are located on the site – baseball and softball fields, multipurpose fields and tennis courts. And then an Ecolab in the southeast corner.

To show you the drop-off locations, the purple dash line is for a vehicular circulation. You can see that on both the north drive and the south drive. Those enter parking lots on the north side of the site and south side of the site, the vehicular – the parent/student drop-off areas would be in the heavier purple shaded area. Bus circulation is primarily in the center loop which, again, I said it's actually a combination. Bus drop-off is the orange shaded area and we're also showing the service vehicular routes, both on the north side, into a green shaded area on the north side of the high school, which is for trash, recycling and on the south side of the high school which is for band and orchestral loading. And then similar on the elementary school, there's a drop-off on the south side of the building for utilities, for trash pickup. And there is -- one thing of note, there is a cross connect north to south just on the west side of the soccer-

specific stadium, so you can get from north side of the site to the south side of the site onsite. Next. Thank you. Mark, maybe will speak just a little better.

Mr. Larrimer: This generally shows the grading and utility layout for the site. We had addressed the detention requirements. In the southwest corner in front of the elementary school, there is a dry detention area and then another one in the area just behind the soccer stadium, between the soccer stadium and the existing drainage way. The sanitary from the schools flows to the center of the site, running through where the bus loop is and out towards Summit. Water connection is near the intersection there with the bus loop and then it loops throughout the site to provide hydrants and fire protection.

Mr. Banchefsky: And that pretty much concludes what's on your Power Point, I believe. I don't think there's any other images, are there? That was the last one. Okay. That's a good one to leave up.

If I can just give you a little bit of background. In spite of what you might have heard, the District and the City have had a long working relationship. Sometimes it can be challenging, but I'd like to think that the greater good is typically achieved with our collaborative efforts. Technically, the school district does not have to have property rezoned, it's a statutory provision. What the school district has to do is work with the municipality, which we did. The City was gracious enough to agree to rezone this property, which has already happened. Now we're here for the major site plan review and that relationship has, I think, has been helpful in this situation. For example, the City has agreed typically to waive water and sewer tap fees, at least the City's portion of that. There is a T.I.E.F. agreement that is part of this or will be part of this in terms of extending some utilities and paying back developers who are putting the utilities in and I'll talk more about that later. Jim Miller asked us, or came to us, when was it? Last – third quarter of last year?

Mr. : (inaudible)

Mr. Banchefsky: November – in terms of an OPWC grant, state funding for improvement of Summit Road. My understanding -- well, let me back up. The district, the School Board was gracious enough to agree to A) recommend and support that, which was important because having the district as part of that and having the school site as part of that application provided additional scoring points for the application which brought it closer to the top. The school was then asked to contribute funding toward this and the district was agreeable to do that. And basically that would – were that to have been approved, and it wasn't, at least at this point, that would have probably alleviated all the traffic issues that we have relative to Summit Road. Unfortunately, it wasn't. That's the bad news. The good news is it's my understanding that with the stimulus money that's coming through and all the money from the federal government, the thinking now is that they're going to just pick up on those OPWC grants where they were cut off and I think that our project was very close to the top, so we're hopeful that that's get approved. And, as I said, if that does, then that's going to provide

signalized intersections, it's going to provide walking paths, it's going to provide improved -- well, you've seen Summit Road -- that will be dramatically improved. As to the site, it's 70 acres. The proposal is for a high school and an elementary school and with the potential of having a Y.M.C.A. on that site also, as you can see from your drawing.

The timeframe is critical. Originally, when this project first came forward, the goal was to open in the fall of 2010. It was a very aggressive schedule and the consultants and the district worked very hard to accomplish that. It has just recently been moved back to the fall of 2011 and we are looking to do an early bid package on this as early as April of this year to get this process moving. There is considerable amount of state funding and -- but in terms of the district's issues, A) we have serious overcrowding and B) there was a commitment made to the voters with the last levy that this was going to be done. As you know, there's a levy on for May and it's critical to the district that they follow up and do what they said they'd do in a timely manner.

There has been a discussion or a request by the City engineer to flip the site to facilitate, I guess not so much site circulation, but access onto Summit Road and we have our traffic engineer here who has provided a report to the City and we're going to have -- I'm going to have him talk about that in a minute. But I want to tell you that if it were simply a matter of flipping the site for traffic, that would involve a three, at least a three-month delay in terms of redesign, a significant amount of money and the other point is, is that although the site is flat, and we can provide you more information on that also, this is the optimal design for this site in terms of drainage and retention. This is also -- these buildings will be LEED certified which means they are very environmentally friendly so where they are oriented in terms of the sun and how that works is very important. So just flipping the site -- again, if it were only for traffic, you'd be looking at a significant amount of money and time, but there's a lot more that goes into than just that. Our traffic engineer will tell you that the traffic situation out there will not be a problem as a result of this school. In other words, the calculations in terms of the number of trips and the type of things that go into traffic impact studies indicate that this won't be a problem. No one's here to say that the road doesn't need to be improved. Summit Road is a mess, but things are in the works, as I indicated, to do that. Additionally, there's an argument that if we move -- if we flip the site, the north highway which is going to carry the bulk of the traffic, would be on the south. Arguably that traffic signal may not be warranted at that point. It's questionable whether a traffic signal is warranted there now with the school being built as it's configured.

Let's talk about Mueller Drive for a minute. As part of our purchase contract, the sellers committed to provide utilities to this site, to extend utilities; that was part of the proceeds of the sale, and there's a question as to whether they have actually donated the water and sewer easements which were to track along Mueller Drive to bring utilities to the site. The developer's counsel, Glen Dugger, says that he has done that and that those are recorded. I asked him to check on that and he wasn't able to get back to me today. I talked to the City. The City indicates that they don't have any record of that documentation and if I'm in error let me know but, in any case, there is a contractual

obligation for the seller of the property to the school to provide for those easements to extend those utilities and to pay for the extension of the utilities. That money is currently held in escrow at the title company, so that will be done without direct City expense although the City has offered, as I indicated before, to formalize a T.I.E.F. agreement which will allow the developer to be paid back for a portion of those fees.

Mueller Drive, right now the alignment doesn't match up with the main entrance, the circular entrance, as has been laid out in the easements that I referenced, the ones that we don't have. That is something that is going to have to be changed. I'm working with the property owner's counsel, Glen Dugger, to get that resolved. I am very optimistic that that will be solved. They're reluctant – his client may be reluctant to do it because they've spent money to have it surveyed and they've done other design work based on the original design, but it is critical, I believe, that Mueller match up with the school main entrance. So I think that is something that will happen, although I can't today tell you that it has been accomplished.

As I said, we'll have our traffic engineer speak to the issues raised in Jim Miller's memo, actually his email dated March 16th which are primarily traffic issues. I'm going to touch on that just a little bit now. One of the things that Jim indicates in his letter that he wants is a statement from the school district's engineer that Summit can safely convey traffic either in current or in its improved condition. What I'm here to tell you as an attorney that you'll never get an engineer or any professional that's going to make that commitment to you, because they can't. It's not their road, they don't maintain it. What they can tell you is the traffic volumes and how it works. They can tell you whether the road is substandard and I think by all accounts it is, but that is not something that the district is willing to do or that its consultants are willing to do at this point. It's just not possible. Talked about the OPWC grant. One of the reasons the school chose this site is because it is not located on an arterial. It is on a very low traffic volume road and we hope that we won't have the type of issues we have with our other schools that are located on major arterials that carry an extreme amount of traffic. So that, I mean, one of the comments staff made is, "Well, you chose this site" when we were talking about Summit Road. And we did choose it and that was one of the reasons we did was because of its location and the fact that it's a very low traffic road at this point.

Let me talk a minute about utilities. As I said, money was withheld from the closing to extend utilities. Water and sewer are available, both from the City and from the Southwest Licking Water & Sewer District. In fact, Southwest Licking is right in front of the property, of our property right now, so that would be the easiest. We would rather obtain utilities from the City for a variety of reasons, not the least of which is cost and the waiver of TAP fees that City has offered. One of the issues is, does the City sewer that is currently in the area now have sufficient capacity to handle the high school, and we know it has sufficient capacity to handle the high school because that study was done. But since then, we've added the elementary school to the site. So the question is, can that sewer handle the additional load from the elementary school. We didn't know the answer to that so late, or early November we were asked to participate in a

flow monitoring study. We agreed to do that, share the cost with the property owner that we purchased from. The City, I believe, retained the consultant EMH&T to do that. That flow metering was put in, but there was a significant delay. It wasn't put in until late January, early February and that needs time and rain events to get accurate readings. The latest information we have is that that meter will be pulled out at the end of this month. It will take a week or so to get the report back in terms of what the capacity of the sewer is. So it is our hope that we will be able to utilize the City water and sewer but, in any case, it's available. And in terms of how that would work on the site, we're going – what we'll do, and I'll let the engineers speak to this more, but what we're going to do is have a spot where it's going to connect and it'll get built to that point. So it really, from a feasibility perspective, it doesn't make any difference where it comes from really. I think with that, I'm going to have Doug Bender come talk to you more about traffic, because I think after talking to the staff and seeing what their issues are, and they really didn't have any, although I'm told that there may be one, but I'd like to have our people address your traffic concerns.

Mr. Bender: Thanks, Mitch. As Mitch mentioned, my name is Doug Bender. I'm with MS Consultants. I did prepare a draft study that has been circulated to the City for review and there were some comments that have come out of that from the City engineer. I just wanted to give you a brief summary of what we did when we prepared the study and, essentially, it goes back to the original request that came from the City, concerns that because of the high school site being proposed on the north edge of the site, the north portion of the site, that that north driveway would be the heaviest traveled driveway, have the most traffic coming out of it. The intent was to have a traffic signal serving what we're calling the bus loop or the drop-off area there, what would be the middle drive for the site. And, essentially, the concern that was brought to our attention was that the signal made backup traffic that, when the high school lets out at 2:20, 2:30 in the afternoon, that traffic would queue up in the southbound direction north of the signal, back to the point where it would interfere possibly with that north driveway. So that was the intent of why we did the study, was to understand that issue. As a result, the school did hire us to do that. At the time, we weren't sure how that was going to work out and the results of the study show that plugging in a lot of what I consider worst case scenarios or worst case assumptions, very conservative assumptions for the study in terms of trip generation, how to possibly size or determine the queue length that might be caused by the traffic signal. We still show that for the 770 feet that exists between the two proposed, the middle bus loop driveway and the north driveway, that the worst case scenario it would still only be 725 feet of queue which is the stack of traffic from the traffic signal north and so it would still allow that driveway to function appropriately. And, essentially, what we've done is plugged in, because trip generation manual, that is the official thing that we use to generate traffic for a site like this and for the surrounding areas, the City engineer had suggested there's a lot of available acreage for development and things like that. So we plugged in 200 acres of single-family development. A lot of things were assumed, a growth rate on existing traffic. All of those things were plugged in and we looked at a design year for the school of year 2030, so 20 years out from opening as far as looking at how things would operate. And, again, what we found is that even with all those conservative assumptions, that the

queue, this issue that we were concerned about, does not get back and interfere with that north driveway at the operation there. So, again, initial concerns seem to be allayed based on what we have found.

There were some comments that were brought up and I'll just go through those briefly and then allow you guys to ask questions, if you have any that are more specific and hopefully these will answer a few of those though, so. Comment number two on the March 16th (I have this as a March 16th e-mail). I don't know if it was in a letter form previously, I really don't know. But what I have is, starting with number two, part A, it says the north access point serves as the primary entrance feature to the schools. When considering the volume of traffic, essentially, again mentioned the 770-foot spacing and this comment here I'm not fully understanding exactly, but it says typically intersections within 100 to 1,200 feet of a signal are prohibited. I personally don't know that that's case. I've been doing this for 16 years and I'm not aware of that. There are guidelines for driveway spacings. The Ohio Access Management Manual does have some guidelines and basically it's desirable to have quarter-mile spacing on a local collector when you're talking about signals and things like that on major driveways. I'm not sure that I would consider the north drive a major driveway. It's probably a medium volume driveway. But, essentially, it comes down to 55 mile-an-hour. It comes down to a minimum of 495-foot spacing and we have that. We exceed that easily. And so I don't think there's an issue there in terms of spacing. And, as a result of the analytical work we did, clearly the queue length does not back up to that point either, so it does not interfere with that driveway spacing. And the other thing is, this north drive is at the extent -- the furthest extent we can just because of the limits of the site. It's at the property line basically, so I wanted to point that out.

I've really never heard of an influence area being discussed with traffic signals. That's probably a misnomer on his part. Essentially, the queue length is -- the back of the queue is what you're looking at there and, again, worst case, we're not even getting to that. When you size turn lanes and when you look at the back of queue calculations, it basically comes down to assuming every single vehicle has to stop at that traffic signal. That's very unrealistic, but it's the most conservative way to do that and so that is how you're (according to ODOT) supposed to design storage length and queue length calculations, and that's what we did. To be honest, I seriously doubt that would ever happen. The things that we talk about in here with the most conservative assumptions, I really don't envision happening, because we had to use trip generation for what we call the P and Peak, when everybody's driving home from work. We plugged in traffic that's generated at that hour in our two to four hour -- I'm sorry, 2 P.M. to 4 P.M. window, just so we had some volumes to plug in there, because you don't typically generate single-family and assign it during those hours. And so we've got some pretty heavy traffic volume assumptions plugged into this and my vision of this, as was mentioned by Mitch, that this site was picked out because it's on a local collector roadway, doesn't have a lot of traffic. If you go out there now at that time there's probably almost no traffic. It has currently very low volumes based on the traffic count supplied by the City and so, essentially, when the high school's releasing between, you know, 2:30 and 3:00 or whatever that is, I don't envision there being much traffic at all out there other than the

school traffic. So I wanted to point that out. I don't see an issue with the stacking interfering with this driveway, to answer 2A. 2B is more related to pedestrian, not so much vehicular traffic. But, essentially, because the pedestrian path is being provided, a crosswalk on each of the three driveways would be adequate protection. Once the pedestrian is in a crosswalk, they're protected. That should be all that's needed there. 2C, it talks about a conflict with sight distance at the north drive for vehicles exiting and wanting to go north. So presumably it would be the westbound right turn movement. There are two lanes side-by-side, I believe that's correct, on the site plan and this happens pretty much at any driveway where your side-by-side lanes at a stop sign on a side street. The thing is, I will point out, that this area is flat and straight. Summit Road is in this area and the site is flat. So anything related to sight distance, I'm not aware of anything causing it and the fact that the right turn lane was being suggested at this location at this driveway compared to others, means traffic entering the site, that he's concerned about blocking the view, ought to be out of the way. As you know, if you've pulled up to a stop sign, you kind of ease out. If somebody's next to you, you ease it or you wait for that person to go and, at that point, you look and make sure you can go. And the fortunate thing is, the westbound right turn to go north is a very minor volume, and so the few cars that might be affected by that are just that, a few cars. And so I don't see that being a major concern either.

Those were the three comments that I saw related to traffic there and I guess at this point I can turn it back over to Mitch or whoever, to the appropriate person. If you have questions for me now, you want to do that, Mitch?

Mr. Haire: I have just a few questions for you, Mr. Bender.

Mr. Bender: Yeah.

Mr. Haire: What is the site stopping distance on a 55 m.p.h. road?

Mr. Bender: That's the 495.

Mr. Haire: 495 is what it takes—

Mr. Bender: That's what—

Mr. Haire: --for a vehicle to stop if it's traveling at that speed?

Mr. Bender: Correct.

Mr. Haire: And did you look at -- with the grant application, Summit Road is to be relocated to the north of this site. Did you look at the curve there and to see if there was adequate stopping distance from that 770 feet of stacking plus an additional 495 feet to stop?

Mr. Bender: We were not asked to look at that specifically, however the speed limit does drop and so, that's a good question. I don't know that answer.

Mr. Haire: What would be the stopping distance at 35 m.p.h.?

Mr. Bender: That I don't know. I could grab it for you real quick if you want me to and I can let you know that.

Mr. Haire: Yeah, because the speed limit would be 35, because that would be in Reynoldsburg once relocated.

Mr. Bender: Right. I'll find that for you here.

Mr. Banchefsky: It'd be less.

Mr. Bender: Yes, definitely, yes.

Mr. Haire: Yes. And the driveway to the north is 775 feet and your queue length is 7, what was it, 725?

Mr. Bender: 725.

Mr. Haire: So you could fit maybe an adequate, maybe two cars, three cars in addition to that if it were backed up all the to the driveway before they would be in another lane if they pulled out?

Mr. Bender: Correct. And, again, please understand that one of the other conservative assumptions that's plugged into this is that everybody leaving that high school parking lot leaves within 20 minutes and we projected that volume out for an hour straight, okay. And that's how we came to this ultimately conservative number. And so I honestly don't think that condition will ever exist, but we're showing that you could still pull out and get into the queue if needed, if that was your desire. The nice thing about this whole situation is that if traffic is backed up and blocks the driveway, you're sitting on-site which is an okay thing. I mean, it's a safe situation where you're sitting in a parking lot waiting to exit for when traffic clears enough for you to pull out. So it is a safe condition even if this backup does occur, which I really do not envision occurring.

Mr. Haire: How many parking spaces are on the north side of the site for the student event parking?

Mr. Bender: I heard it was in the 500 range, but I don't know that. You guys have a more recent count?

Mr. : I think on the whole site wasn't it—

Mr. : _____entire baseball diamond parking spots (speaking off mic)

Mr. Banchefsky: The entire site, but that includes back in the – by the field areas and the elementary school, all of that _____, that's the whole site (speaking off mic)

Mr. Haire: So it'd be safe to say that more than half is on the high school site?

Mr. Banchefsky: I'd say it's way more than half.

Mr. Haire: So 700 maybe?

Mr. Banchefsky: Yeah.

Mr. Haire: 700+?

Mr. Bender: To answer your earlier question, Lucas, the 35 m.p.h. is 250 feet.

Mr. Haire: How many students is the high school designed to hold?

Mr. Banchefsky: 1,038.

Mr. Bender: In relation to what you just pointed out, I will say that when we plugged 1,038 students into our trip generation, the manual that – it's kind of the accepted standard for doing trip generation calculations. It only kicked out about 300 trips, trip ends that would be generated by the high school during its peak departure hour. When we did the calculation to actually go worst case, we plugged in -- we assumed 400 people exiting the site. In reality, according to trip generation, there would only be 200, so we doubled the amount of people that would be leaving. Based on trip generation we try to take a very conservative assumption there as well. So it's loaded up with conservative assumptions. I know if it gets reported while it's going to be 725-foot queue out here, that's almost not going to happen. I'm 95% sure it would never happen.

Mr. White: Did your assumption include the future residents that may occupy the spaces on the – in that area on the Mueller Road area?

Mr. Bender: Yes. Things that were added into these assumptions and, as I mentioned, we agreed -- the City engineer and I talked about a background traffic growth rate of 3% a year that was added in. We did 200 acres of single-family residential that was plugged in as well, as well as then the -- I believe it's a Y.M.C.A. that's still being proposed on this site. That site traffic was added into this. All those things were added in and included in the peak departure hour.

Mr. White: In going to this queue that you were referring to, the students we have, I think you said—

Mr. Bender: 1,038.

Mr. White: --700 parking spots?

Mr. Bender: Oh, parking spots? Okay.

Mr. White: And you add that to the additional residents that may occupy that area at any point in time, would you have the appropriate amount of vehicles that would fit in that queue or would there be more?

Mr. Bender: We have those plugged into the queue, so we've plugged in everything, yeah. The site traffic coming out adds into the traffic driving the street that are not related to the school site and so, yes, we have that in there as well. Those folks are in the southbound thru-movement as well, and, let me point out one thing. I don't know if I've ever mentioned it. When we initially looked at it and just sized it originally-- What did we come up with? Well, I can't find it real quick but, again, based on conditions that we originally assumed, the queue is expected to be much less than this. Again, we then did a second evaluation where we conservatively plugged in every possible thing we could think of to make it worst case and that's where we got the 725, so that's not an expected condition.

Mr. Brusk: How many – what percentage of the students drive to school, as based on what you have experienced on the current high school?

Mr. Banchevsky: Well, you know, Norm, that about half of those are freshmen and sophomores who don't have licenses, so, you know, about – say you're looking at half of that, so you're looking at 519 kids who are possibly driving. And, out of that, probably even if you took 70% of that, I mean, you're still talking about 350 cars. We know that the site _____ there's no parking along the street. We purposely made the parking more for special events, for off-street parking so that there is not any congestion out on _____ (speaking off mic).

Mr. Brusk: Okay. At our current high school, how many parking spaces do we have, and I know there's not enough, but how many are there?

Mr. Banchevsky: I think there is – I think the last time I counted—

Mr. Brusk: And how many students?

Mr. Banchevsky: --there were 725 and that's counting all the way back to the shed where nobody else will park and we've got 2,000 -- 2,100 students over there.

Mr. Brusk: Again, give me those numbers again.

Mr. Banchefsky: We have about 725 parking spaces total and we have about 2,000 -- 2,100 students.

Mr. Brusk: Okay.

Mr. Banchefsky: So you can see—

Mr. Feeney: Do we know what – once Summit Road gets rebuilt, which we'll make an assumption that's going to happen, which I'm pretty sure it will, but do we know what it's going to look like? Is it going to be a two-lane highway, three-lane highway?

Mr. Bender: I believe it's supposed to be a three-lane roadway with a center left-turn lane for that section that's rebuilt and then a—

Mr. Feeney: Curbs and sidewalks?

Mr. Bender: Yes.

Mr. Feeney: All the way?

Mr. Banchefsky: Yeah. In fact, you know there are three jurisdictions there. You've got Etna, you've got Southwest Licking and you've got the City of Reynoldsburg, and you know, that's part of the thing that the grant had to get all the departments

_____.

Mr. Haire: Yeah. This area would be a three-lane road section if funded and there's no – I mean, we submitted a grant application that was not, did not score high enough to be funded before. There's no guarantee that it will be funded in the future or anything, so we need to anticipate everything we consider here that this is going to be built on a two-lane road in it's current condition.

Mr. Bender: The number I was looking for earlier was what the queue length would be on a normal, what we expect it to be, everyday kind of condition, it was 275 feet and that's, again, that still has thru-traffic in it from future multi – or single-family and traffic, background traffic roads and things like that. So 275 is what we think it is. That leaves almost 500 feet there.

Mr. White: Directing your attention to page four of your report, first paragraph, second sentence. It says the results indicate that the bus loop intersection is not predicted to meet minimum volume requirements that Warrant 1 or 3 within – with 2003 full build traffic volumes. What do you mean by that?

Mr. Bender: It means that Warrant 1 and Warrant 3 are based on vehicular volume, both – one is an eight-hour volume warrant. So for eight hours out of a given day you have to meet certain thresholds and, if you do, then the traffic signal is

warranted. Warrant 3 is called a four-hour volume warrant and, again, not as typical to use Warrant 3, but if you meet it for four hours you can possibly justify a traffic signal at that location. We've shown that just based on predicted or projected traffic that it would not meet those based on an assumption of how much traffic would be there in those eight hours or four hours. So we're suggesting that that traffic signal may need to be warranted possibly on future pedestrian traffic. There's a school crossing warrant, Warrant 6, I believe it is that I mentioned. I forget which one it is, but we're not going to meet it on necessarily vehicular volume, at least as we're projecting it right now.

Mr. : It means that they don't require a traffic light at all.

Mr. Bender: Yeah. It may not ever warrant a traffic signal unless you really want one and the Mueller Drive connection causes kids to want to cross at that location and you designate that as a school crossing and you start having enough pedestrians that meet the requirements for that particular warrant. Signal warrants are required. You have to meet one legally in order to put up a traffic signal. Otherwise if somebody gets in a wreck stopping for a red light, if they've got a good lawyer that knows the law, they're going to sue you for that issue. So you have to legally meet one of those warrants before you can put in a traffic signal. It's not to say illegal signals aren't out there but—

Mr. : I didn't sign in and I didn't get sworn in, but if you want to swear me in again I'll sign your paper.

Mr. Feeney: Let me swear you in just so we have it official. (Mr. Feeney administers the oath.)

Mr. : Just to put it in perspective a little bit, we tried to get a traffic signal on Waggoner Road, and you all know what the traffic volume is on Waggoner. It didn't warrant the Franklin County Engineer to put a traffic light in. Now, we're talking about a country road that has very little traffic that peaks triple the amount of traffic that normally travels that road. And that even tripling it and projecting it out in the year 2030, still does not warrant a traffic light.

Mr. Bender: Let me correct you there. We did not do that for the signal warrant. That was looking at the queue—

Mr. : For the queue.

Mr. Bender: --for the queue issue. But on everyday traffic, when we looked at that, that does not show currently – again, these are projections. We'll have to wait and see what kind of traffic actually shows up and when it might become an issue. That's when you do a signal warrant study. These are projected numbers and taking an early look at it, it does not look like it would be warranted.

Mr. Brusk: When leaving the parking lot at the end of the school day, two things – one is that do the high school and the elementary schools let out roughly the same time? Okay, that—

Mr. Bender: They're about an hour apart.

Mr. Brusk: Okay. The second is, do most of the cars leaving turn left—

Mr. Bender: One of the things—

Mr. Brusk: --and that was taken into account, that most turn left?

Mr. Bender: Yes, one of the things that was looked at initially at our kickoff meeting was what we call directional distribution, which way are the cars going. And we, Jim Miller and I agreed that 85% to the south made sense, just because it goes down and hits Main Street and takes you back into Reynoldsburg proper. That's a number that we were comfortable with and that is what we used. So 85% are turning left out of the site from that driveway. So it is -- you know, it's possible that it's a little different than that and maybe it's not quite this bad but, again, I think that's a fairly conservative number to use.

Mr. Haire: On this site did you take into consideration that the school's considering doing away with busing and what impact that would have on drivers and parent drop-offs, especially in a location like this that's so isolated?

Mr. : I think that's why – it doesn't matter what I think. I know that's why we purposely put the bus lane in the middle of the site which serves both the elementary and the high school which can stack 20 some buses, 28 buses and ____.

Mr. Haire: But if there's no busing, then would that even be necessary, if there's no busing?

Mr. : Well, my point is, Luke, is that we also then designed, and you see them when the traffic flows, the parent drop-off is not even in that center lane but in the north drive and in the south drive by the elementary school. We did that purposely so the kids don't have to cross where the buses go.

Mr. Bender: To answer your question, no, we didn't look at that. And essentially, we plugged in information that Ron gave us as far as number of buses to be a fair estimate of what kind of traffic's using that loop. It's probably a little low because we've got all of our traffic for the high school up here in this north drive. In reality, some of that traffic is actually parents dropping their kids off and so they might be using that loop rather than coming all the way up to this north drive. If I were a parent, that makes sense, I'd probably use that. It's set up for that. And, again, to be conservative in case an issue like this comes up, we've doubled the traffic, we've assumed peak hour volumes, I'm sorry, that 4:00 to 6:00 drive home kind of traffic from these single family

homes, from the Y.M.C.A., all that traffic has been plugged into a two to four hour window and when, in reality, if you go out there two to four, you know, at 2:30 whenever it is, there's just not that kind of traffic out there, but we've loaded it in just to see how bad could it possibly get out here. So we've got some worst case stuff plugged in here in case bussing goes away or something like that were to happen. We think we're in real good shape out here. We don't think it's going to be a traffic issue.

Mr. Haire: Was there consideration given to having the student parking on the north have an option for two ways to exit the site?

Mr. : There is.

Mr. Haire: There's an access gate across the back. Will that gate be open or is that gate necessary? Can that be open to allow them to – for southbound traffic to go to the southern exit point and then exit the site that way?

Mr. : Yes.

Mr. Bender: I think—

Mr. Haire: Will that be the case? Is that – or that will remain closed?

Mr. : We're doing that to regulate traffic through the site. We don't want cars really driving through that site _____ (speaking off mic)

Mr. Haire: Could you state your name? We have people transcribe and just speak into the microphone. Thank you.

Mr. : The original _____, yeah, was to – there was a concern about mixing populations, high school and elementary school populations, so there was a request to have a controlled access gate at both sides of that. The schools would have the complete control over those. There is a potential for crossover traffic if they were opened, but it was more of a separation of populations just for safety and security of the children. It is also for after-hour events, too, that you could have the crossover.

Mr. Haire: I think there's legitimate safety concerns for the children on putting that much traffic out of that north entrance, so that's why – I mean, it's balancing those, too, I think from our perspective we need to look at that, which would be an easy solution to—

Mr. : Right.

Mr. Haire: --to not alter your site plans, but still allow for access at two separate points.

Mr. Bender: That's the nice thing about this site layout is that it has that flexibility. Obviously it's not desirable to run your high school traffic past the elementary school, but if you do end up with a condition up here at the north where it's becoming a safety issue, you have that flexibility. And I think that gets at the concern of traffic can exit down here at the other drive and not conflict with the signal and that flexibility is available and provided by the site plan, and that's the nice thing about it.

Mr. Brusk: I assume though that when the – if the future Y.M.C.A. is built there, that the coming and going would not conflict with school hours for the most part. Is that predicted in--

Mr. Bender: I'm sure there's some site traffic tied to a Y.M.C.A. at 2:30 in the afternoon.

Mr. Brusk: But not a major problem?

Mr. Bender: I would agree it's much lower. I think common sense suggests that. But we plugged in 4:00 to 6:00 p.m., everybody on their way home stops at the gym kind of traffic, is what we plugged in and that's in there as a conservative analysis as well. That's what I'm saying. Everything's been kind of ramped up to be conservative to see just what it would do and that's kind of the ultimate analysis that we did.

Mr. Long: When you did your study, was there consideration of 16-year-old, 17-year-old drivers, brand new drivers that, you know? I mean, this is what the majority of them are going to be.

Mr. Bender: I deal with numbers, so I understand your point is that maybe there's more of a safety concern. The nice thing about it, again, the road's straight, it's flat, the site's flat. Unless the landscape architect wants to put a tree out there to block your view, I don't really see why there's such an issue here. And the nice thing is there's not a lot of inbound traffic. What we've assigned here as a northbound right at this driveway is probably people coming and doing the loop to pick somebody up. It's probably not getting all the way up there. So I really don't see there being a lot of traffic prohibiting the view or anything like that that's been pointed out in the memo. I just don't see that being such a concern.

Mr. Long: I had another question kind of traffic-related, I guess. This site's been reviewed by the fire department to take a look at the access and the trucks and whatever else they need?

Mr. Larrimer: I did sit down with John Singleton and go over the site plan and I actually left a set of plans with him for his review. He was generally okay with the site layout. We discussed some specific building access items which he didn't have any real problems with, just pointed out where he might want some vehicular grass

pavers or something of that nature, but the overall circulation or anything was not an issue for him.

Mr. Long: Okay.

Mr. Feeney: Does that have something to do with that access drive that they have total access around it? Was that added for that?

Mr. Larrimer: Yes, that was the discussion, was that it tied in with the open area calculation of the building, that if you calculated out an open area he would require that type of access.

Mr. Long: And have reviewed it with the police department?

Mr. Larrimer: I have not set down with the police department.

Mr. Long: You know, I know the access and egress into the site like this is all on the west side, so you don't have any way of getting to it from the north, east or south, so everything's got to come out-- just a comment.

Mr. Larrimer: Okay.

Mr. Long: Be worth looking at.

Mr. White: I have a question. I just wonder, in your study did you make a determination of how many buses could fit into the bus loop itself?

Mr. Bender: I was not involved in looking at that issue, so we had numbers of buses given to us by the school district folks and that is what we plugged in for volume on that particular driveway.

Mr. White: Is there any chance that we have backup of buses?

Mr. Strussion: The buses – we've taken what we used at the current high school with 2,100 students in there and a much smaller loop than this. We have to stack buses three-deep and then what happens is there's enough space in that loop to stack 22 or 28 buses and all the buses stop. All the kids get on the bus. No bus moves till all the kids are on the bus. This is in the high school. When the last bus is loaded, they radio to each other that they're going to go and then they all exit at the same time.

Mr. White: Okay. Did I understand some comment – maybe I'm asking now, that parents be allowed to utilize this area as well for drop-off purposes?

Mr. Strussion: Well, that's not the intended drop-off, but there are parking spaces along there, but that would not interfere with the bus drop-offs. The bus drop-

offs are located specifically in those areas, just as we have at the current high school. The drop-off is in the east parking lot right next to Blacklick Woods.

Mr. White: Right.

Mr. Strussion: The parents go down there, down by the cafeteria and--

Mr. White: Yeah, but you have much more parking area here so that, you know, the buses could go in the front of the building or to the side towards the Blacklick area, and even the parking lot out there, I guess, you know.

Mr. Strussion: This site at this mall is really deceiving, and I wish we'd have brought one of those 3-D pictures. Because when you look at the site with the buildings located on it, it's a big site. It's huge. I mean, you've got a, what is that, a half a mile from the west to the east side? You've got a half a mile.

Mr. : (Off mic - inaudible)

Mr. Strussion: The School Facilities Commission for thousands of students would only require about 35 acres maybe.

Mr. White: My only concern was just the possibility of being so many buses that you would have to back out into this two-lane road here and block the road itself.

Mr. : I think the nice thing is that this bus loop is designed for the buses, and parents will learn that they can't get in there to drop a kid off or pick—

Mr. White: They won't go in there.

Mr. : There's already a designed drop-off and pick-up spot at both locations on the outside of the schools away from the center loop. It's on the north side of the high school and the south side of the elementary. So my guess is that's where the parents are going to be encouraged to do that if they do want to use the bus loop and they can get in and out of there okay, they'll do that. But once they realize it's backed up with buses, you know, at 2:15 picking up the high school kids, I'm not going to bother messing with that. They'll work it out.

Mr. Strussion: If you watch the high school now, that's exactly what happens. And, you know, the first time they go in there and they get stuck because the buses will not move till everybody's loaded. They do it once and they don't do it the second time.

Mr. White: Yeah, I've experienced that, too.

Mr. Haire: Could we just make sure that everyone speaks on the microphone, please?

Mr. : Let me just add to that. The approximate length of the high school, east to west is about 600 feet of buses of 40-foot distance, so I mean, you can tell that this area is extremely large and the backup's going to be-- I mean, there's ample supply.

Mr. Haire: I had a quick question about the utilities for Mr. Banchefsky. You had mentioned that the seller is contractually obligated to provide access to utilities or easements for utilities?

Mr. Banchefsky: Easements to where the utility is located and, additionally, to fund the cost of extending utilities.

Mr. Long: And this is the document the City said that they cannot find?

Mr. Banchefsky: No, no, this is the real estate contract. The property owner's counsel indicates that they have conveyed -- they have provided the City with easements based on the alignment of Mueller Drive, because you obviously want to put these utilities in the right-of-way of the proposed road. The City indicates that they don't have that, that they can't find it or they don't have it, or they never received it. I'm not sure which. Glen Dugger was going to check with the Recorder's Office to see, because he's of the opinion that they were provided to the City and recorded. So I don't have an answer to that. If it hasn't been provided, it most certainly will be, assuming that's the route we go with the utilities. If we utilize the City water and sewer that will happen. Now, that having been said, if the alignment of Mueller Drive changes and it looks like it will, it needs to, those easements are going to have to be revised to reflect that.

Mr. Haire: Which, to the best of my knowledge they've not been recorded. I know they've not been through City Council to be accepted by the City, so I imagine that they've not been recorded with the County Recorder's Office.

Mr. White: Which raises a question I have, is that if you are not completely decided on using the City of Reynoldsburg's water and sewer system and you might use Pataskala's, would that have some bearing upon the use of those easements?

Mr. Banchefsky: You wouldn't need them.

Mr. White: So, if you use City of Reynoldsburg's water and sewer system, you would not need them, is that what you're saying?

Mr. Banchefsky: No, if we use the City's we would need—

Mr. White: City of Reynoldsburg?

Mr. Banchefsky: Yes. I don't think we'd -- we wouldn't need them where they were originally designed. Again, because Mueller's needs to move to accommodate so that it matches up with the entrance to the high school. But, again, irrespective of which

entity provides the water and sewer to the high school, that doesn't impact on the design of the high school site, of the school site.

Mr. Haire: Has there been discussions held with the Service Director or anyone at the City in regards to using an outside utility provider to provide utilities within the City?

Mr. Banchefsky: We've talked with Southwest Licking.

Mr. Haire: Right, but the City typically requires you to use the City's utilities if you're within the City of Reynoldsburg. I don't know that we—

Mr. Banchefsky: And we would—

Mr. Haire: --doing business—

Mr. Banchefsky: We absolutely would—

Mr. : I mean, that's our desire.

Mr. Banchefsky: If the capacity's there and we don't know if the capacity is there until the study that we commissioned last year which, unfortunately, isn't done yet, comes back. It'll tell us whether there's sufficient sewer capacity in that line to certain— Again, as I said, we know that there is for the high school. The addition was the elementary school component, which I don't believe would add significantly to that. That's what the study is designed to tell us.

Mr. Haire: And in a letter that was written by – signed by Mr. Dack on November 25th in regards to the rezoning, "I've been asked to waive the requirements for traffic impact, utility impact and drainage impact study. These studies are currently taking place and will be completed prior to final site plan approvals by the City of Reynoldsburg in early 2009." And so what you're telling me is that these studies have not been completed and you're trying to obtain site plan approval. Is that correct?

Mr. Banchefsky: That's right, but it's through no fault of the district that we don't have that sewer analysis. I mean, we agreed to it when we were asked. We put the money in when we were asked and it just – EMH&T took much longer than expected before this went into the ground. And the bottom line is we have a target date to have this high school and elementary school facility built and we – the time is running out.

Mr. Haire: It just seems like there's a lot of unanswered questions in the items that this Board's being asked to consider with this site plan. We have utility questions, we have traffic questions and I know a lot of those have attempted to be addressed tonight. Unfortunately, the City Engineer could not be here. I know that the City Engineer has asked an outside engineering consultant through you this traffic study. We just received this traffic study on March 12th, so seven days ago the City received this traffic study.

You know, that's – it's probably not adequate time for – to completely review the ramifications for what this says, so we did ask an outside consultant to look at that and they have not gotten back the results of that outside consultant that is reviewing that that is an expert in traffic engineering. So it's well within the rights of this Board -- we have 60 days to make a decision on any plan that's set before us and I would recommend that until we get some of these questions answered that we hold this plan until next month and hopefully get some answers to these questions.

Mr. Long: I am in agreement with that. There's just too many questions at this point and I would hate to be the one that would approve the site plan and not be able to serve with sewer, water and such.

Mr. Banchevsky: To be clear, we can serve it. If we go Southwest Licking, as I said, it's right in our front yard. It's in the right-of-way right in front of the school site, so there's no question but that it can be served.

Mr. Haire: But does the City allow an outside utility provider to provide utilities to a customer in the City. Has that been discussed?

Mr. Banchevsky: As I said, that's only a backup if the City does not have capacity.

Mr. Long: No, sir. I believe what Mr. Haire is bringing up here is the fact that it will require councilmatic action in order to be able to allow you to do that within the City limits. And if Council denies you that right, isn't that the direction you're going, Lucas?

Mr. Haire: I'm not sure if it requires that or not. I don't know the answer.

Mr. Long: _____ don't know _____.

Mr. Banchevsky: But if Council denies us that right, the only reason we would ask for that is if the City couldn't provide it. So I can't see Council could reasonably deny it.

Mr. Long: I understand that and that's one of the questions. The flow study is still being done on the sewer if the sewer is utilized from the City of Reynoldsburg.

Mr. Banchevsky: Correct.

Mr. Long: And if it's determined that that City sewer will not handle, what are our options? And one of our options is to possibly pull sewer and water from another municipality. We don't know if that's permitted. We don't know if it would require councilmatic action in order to approve it and if it's not, then what's the cost going to be to rebuild the sewer system to be able to handle not the one school that was originally under the T.I.E.F. agreement, but now two.

Mr. Banchefsky: I can tell you that. We looked at that and it is prohibitively expensive and involves the extension of a major sanitary trunk sewer across multiple properties probably with eminent domain and that is a huge undertaking, very costly. So, even to me, that's not viable. At some point as that area develops it may be warranted, but—

Mr. Haire: But contractually the seller is required to provide that to you, correct? If that were needed to take place, the seller of the land that you bought the land from is contractually obligated to build that sewer for you.

Mr. Banchefsky: No.

Mr. _____: No, not the trunk sewer, no. To extend from the terminus which—

Mr. Haire: So they're not contractually obligated to provide utilities. They're contractually obligated for what reason.

Mr. Banchefsky: They're contractually obligated to extend utilities from the existing terminus point which is – I don't think it shows up on this map—

Mr. Haire: To the south, the southeast corner of the subdivision that's there.

Mr. Banchefsky: Right.

Mr. _____: The sewer's on the south— (speaking off mic)

Mr. Banchefsky: And the cost of that trunk sewer would far surpass what the value of the land we purchased from them is that—

Mr. Haire: It was \$2 million or so.

Mr. Banchefsky: So my point is, the sewer's available. The water is available.

Mr. White: What I understand, at least my understanding of what is being discussed here is that you'd like to have some firm commitment as to the sewer in other contractual arrangements that you have before we decide upon the site plan. And, if I understood you correctly, you're basically saying that this easement would be able to facilitate the sewer services from the City of Pataskala? Where would it come from?

Mr. Banchefsky: The easement is to get City of Reynoldsburg water and sewer to our site.

Mr. White: Okay, what – the alternative?

Mr. Banchefsky: The alternative is to use the Southwest Licking water and sewer district. Their pipes are literally right in front of our site. That, from a connection standpoint, that's by far the easier way to go.

Mr. White: Now, if I understand, the Board's asking – the Board itself – is it our understanding that the City prefer that water be supplied or the sewer system be serviced by City of Reynoldsburg?

Mr. Haire: I don't know if that's the case or not. My concern was, are they legally allowed to use a utility provider that is not the City of Reynoldsburg being incorporated within the City of Reynoldsburg. And I don't know the answer to that question. I was asking if that's been investigated at this point with the Service Director or the water and sewer Superintendent for the City. Has that been discussed at all? And I don't know the answer.

Mr. Banchefsky: I don't either, but in talking with Jim Miller, the discussions were, if not from the City of Reynoldsburg then from Southwest Licking which is, as I said, right at our front door.

Mr. Long: And Southwest Licking has the capacity?

Mr. Banchefsky: We have talked to them. They would love to have us as customers. Our preference, as I said, would be to stay with the City for water and sewer. So if it's available, that's what we'll be using.

Mr. Long: But Southwest Licking does have it? I understand that they'd love to have you as a customer but do they have the current capacity right there to handle that?

Mr. : Yeah

Mr. Long: Okay.

Mr. : (speaking off mic)

Mr. Long: Water and sewer? Okay.

Mr. Haire: State your name, please.

Mr. Larrimer: Oh, Mark Larrimer. Don Rector, I had a conversation with him where he stated that they had extended that line with the capacity to serve the site and they have somewhat tried to claim this area as a portion of their service area with that extension in mind. And then I spoke later to Ohio E.P.A. who stated that really the connection point, they haven't ruled on a service area and it could go to either Reynoldsburg, because it's within the corporate limits of Reynoldsburg. I'm not necessarily an expert on those topics of utility service areas so I can't speak

authoritatively to any of that, any of which way it goes, but that's the statement that was made by the Southwest Licking Sewer District.

Mr. Banchevsky: An alternative I might present would be to approve the site plan with conditions that we would bring this back. Again, our goal is to try to keep this moving. I don't think anybody wants to stop the school from being there. It's going to be there, but time is of the essence.

Mr. Long: The only concern that I would have with doing that is that Mr. Miller has already expressed a concern for safety on the current condition of Summit Road. You've stated there that there is no way that the school district is going to have their legal staff issue a – I wouldn't call it a guarantee – that in its current condition and its improved condition that it would be able to handle the traffic safely. And if Mr. Miller is looking at the – even if the grant does come through, as you've mentioned with the stimulus funds, which even there it's not guaranteed.

Mr. Banchevsky: Oh, I agree.

Mr. Long: We're still talking 2011 before Summit Road improvements are completed, so we have a year based upon your projection as to the schools opening and then the roads being completed or improved, widened, a full year there. That concerns me, because I share the same concerns on the condition with Summit Road and the additional traffic.

Mr. Banchevsky: And just to clarify that the box that the district is in. This has to be – these buildings have to be in place August of 2011 in order to allow for everything that has to go on to get it up and running for that school year. If it isn't in by then or shortly thereafter, then it's back another year before it can be used, because we don't have the luxury of being able to make the switchover mid-school year.

Mr. Long: Yeah. That's another plus for year-round school.

Mr. : We support that 100%. (speaking off mic)

Mr. Long: There you go.

Mr. Haire: And you're not showing any of the improvements that were recommended in this plan. I don't see any in all the plans I've looked -- I have four different copies of plans over here, I think, and I haven't seen the turn lane that was recommended in the traffic study shown on any of these plans. Is there a reason that was omitted?

Mr. Banchevsky: Well, our hope was that it would be part of the OPWC grant and that would include that turn lane. If that were to be the only issue, I think the district would agree – I mean, we all understand that that turn lane needs to be in. We're

hopeful that it will be part of a larger improvement; but, absent that, that's something the district would probably do.

Mr. Haire: Personally, I'm not comfortable with the conditional approval based on the amount of conditions that would need to be in there, and then because I don't know what those conditions need to be with the questions that are here. So I would recommend that the Board table this until next month to give adequate time to answer the outstanding issues.

Mr. Bender: If I may-- Doug Bender again with MS. To kind of answer your question, Luke. Just like you claim that this thing was just dated the 12th and you guys are just getting a chance to look at it. The recommendations for a turn lane were just given to the school on the 12th as well, that a turn lane would be involved, and so there's an intention for that lane to be there. It's a matter of how does it get worked out, whether it's taken care of through the grant application, which Jim has indicated that there's some intention to provide a right turn lane somewhere along this corridor at one of these driveways and, so that's presumption. Yes, we'd like that to work out but also how long does it need to be? Right now we're showing it at 55 just because we don't see the speed limit dropped down now, but is there a way to reduce the impact and make it a 125-foot turn lane instead of 345 feet? So, there's some discussion that's intending to happen, so we're not trying to omit anything from the site plan. It's fairly new information as well for--

Mr. Haire: And that – you said that was just received by the schools on March 12th?

Mr. Bender: Right.

Mr. Haire: And how long did that study take?

Mr. Bender: Couple of months.

Mr. Haire: Couple of months? So, in December when we originally met and asked you to do the traffic study, it's taken since then to accomplish that – three, four months to accomplish that traffic study?

Mr. Bender: Well, to get the study done, yes. But, again, the study was just published, draft, March 12th. So I think the intent is for a turn lane to be there at one of the driveways. It seems most likely based on the warrants that it be at the north drive.

Mr. Brusk: Wasn't the study supposed to take into account whether the road was improved or, in the alternative, why that wasn't improved? Is that how that study was done?

Mr. Bender: I don't believe so, but I'll let the experts speak on that.

Mr. Brusk: I mean, it was known that it might not be, right, at the time you did the study?

Mr. Bender: Right. Again, Doug Bender with MS. The intent of the study was to look at this issue of the interaction with the signal to the north driveway and so this issue of whether the road was widened to three lanes or whether it remained in its existing condition was not necessarily the focus of the study. We understood that to be the possibility, but, again, we looked at turn lane warrants and things like that. We were not focused on whether it had a left turn lane or not. Frankly, the volumes from the north were, because we only assigned 15% to and from the north, the southbound left turn issue was not really an issue at any one of these driveways and so they did not warrant turn lanes that way. But it wasn't the main focus of this study, no.

Mr. Brusk: But the study was not done both ways?

Mr. Bender: _____ irrespective _____.

Mr. Brusk: Knowing that you did the study based on what condition of Summit Road, I guess is my question.

Mr. Bender: Again, this was a numerical analysis. It was not focused on how many lanes are out there now or in what year they show up. It was based on what kind of volume was going to be there and what it would do to backup traffic if a signal were placed at the bus loop. It was that kind of a focus.

Mr. Long: Does an improved road create more traffic?

Mr. Bender: No.

Mr. Long: I would think that road that was two lanes as opposed to a road that was three lanes with a left turn lane would actually handle more traffic.

Mr. Bender: _____.

Mr. Long: I understand what—

Mr. Bender: Yeah, the third lane—

Mr. Long: --Mr. Brusk is asking.

Mr. Bender: I guess we looked at it with the traffic all in one lane and essentially, if the left turn lane is provided, it takes a very small amount of traffic out of that queue lane, but not much. It really doesn't change the results effectively.

Mr. Long: Okay.

Mr. Bender: So, it's kind of irrespective of that.

Mr. Strussion: You know when -- that concern was never raised by Jim Miller about -- when we talked about the traffic on the road. The only concern that he talked about was that turn from the north drive. That was the -- the road is the road is the road. We don't build roads. We have to go with whatever roads are provided here. I mean, that was never asked for us to study, what the condition of the road was. That's -- we don't--

Mr. Brusk: I guess my problem is that the concept of having a right turn lane in the event that the road wasn't improved was never taken into account, and it should have been.

Mr. Strussion: It was--

Mr. Brusk: Is it? I mean, it's not on the site plan, which is confusing the heck out of me.

Mr. Strussion: Okay. And to answer your question--

Mr. Brusk: That's not the traffic study, now, that's just the site plan itself.

Mr. Bender: Yeah. And, again, Doug Bender with MS. To answer your question, part of the study was to look at if there were turn lanes warranted where were they and how long did they need to be. So, yes, it looked at the need for turn lanes. Whether that's going to be provided through a grant, whether that's provided if the grant never happens or if it's never widened to three lanes, those issues hadn't been worked out. It really wasn't discussed as to who's paying for it or anything like that. It was mentioned that the grant had gone in. They were hopeful that they would get it, but it's a possibility it would not. And so we understood that. But, again, as Ron has pointed out, that wasn't the focus of the study. The study was to determine would the signal create a problem getting in and out of that north drive, so that was the focus of our analytical work as well as turn lane warrants.

Mr. Brusk: Yeah, that is -- again, it's not -- that's not the part that I'm concerned with.

Mr. Bender: Right. I guess what I'm saying is--

Mr. Brusk: It's the site plan itself. Do we have a turn lane involved in there? You're saying that it's been taken into account, but it's not on the site Plan.

Mr. Bender: Are you talking about the right turn lane?

Mr. Brusk: The right turn lane.

Mr. Bender: Okay. And, again, that's kind of coming out of – it's a result of this study now saying that if you are going to provide a right turn lane, which when Jim put the grant together, his intention was he accounted for some cost for a right turn lane. He just threw it out and in his mind at either the bus loop or the south drive. What we are now finding, the reason we did the turn lane warrants and look at it in this report was to find out where should it go. Does it have a particular place where it's needed? That's just now coming out, so that's why it's not been shown previously. I guess that's what I was trying to point out. I mean you guys are just now getting it as well, but so are these guys.

Mr. Feeney: So what you're saying is that there – if the road stays as it is today, it stays that way 10 years. You're going to install turn lanes, is that correct, based on your study you just had?

Mr. Bender: Assuming that there's no grant or—

Mr. Feeney: Assuming there's no grant.

Mr. Bender: Yeah. I think the school would recognize that that is needed to serve the site and the school _____.

Mr. Feeney: And I think that's Norm's concern is that you're not showing that.

Mr. Brusk: We don't know that that's the case. _____

Mr. Feeney: So we're approving it without.

Mr. Bender: Right. So that's one of the things that you'd want to see when we come back, to see that on the plan?

Mr. Feeney: Yes. Oh, sure. Absolutely.

Mr. Bender: I think at that point, I think the school, if they're bearing the burden of that cost, is going to ask again, just as it was intended with the grant that the speed limit be dropped to 35, that does save a lot of length and cost to the school district for providing that turn lane.

Mr. Feeney: And you can show us as at 55 what it's going to look like and at 35 what it's going to look like.

Mr. White: I think one of my concerns is, again going back to the water supply and the sewer. I mean, again, the site plan is supposed to have a preliminary – a plan together for that kind of service and you're really not sure as to whether – where the source is going to come from. I think that needs to be firmed up a little bit to identify on your site plan where the sewer and the water system service is going to come from. At this point, you're telling me you don't really know.

Mr. Bender: Right. I mean, we can show you wherever it comes from, where it will end up on the site. We know where that will be on our site but in terms—

Mr. : (speaking off mic)

Mr. Larrimer: Yes, that's what—

Mr. : (speaking off mic)

Mr. Larrimer: That is what is shown. The site plan shows to the termination point on the site and we will extend the -- or we can show the alternate extensions if that is something that's desired.

Mr. Feeney: Do we have any additional questions, comments to discuss?

Mr. Banchefsky: I would just like to make clear in terms of what the Board is looking for when we come back. I have down showing the turn lane adjacent to our site or on our site and the water and sewer routings or directional options, determine where that's coming from.

Mr. Brusk: Right. One of the things we need to know is if Reynoldsburg wasn't and you want, you know, that wasn't to capacity, do we have a legal right to -- or do you have a legal right to hook into the Southwest Licking. That's the issue we don't have, which means we can't, at this point, approve or disprove a site plan when we don't know the law on it.

Mr. Banchefsky: I will talk with your City attorney and make sure we're on the same page with that.

Mr. Long: I would also like to hear the comments from the fire department. I know that they are waiting on that and also the police department, too, if there's some comments after they take a look at it. And I, no, I don't know that they have to but—

Mr. Banchefsky: We'll provide you with the documentation—

Mr. Long: That'd be great.

Mr. Banchefsky: --from both departments.

Mr. White: I have one other question and maybe it's in a different area. And that, just the drainage itself -- how -- it was my understanding that the drainage would go to the center of the site. How would that drainage flow?

Mr. Larrimer: Are you talking about storm or a sanitary drain?

Mr. White: Storm.

Mr. Larrimer: Storm drainage?

Mr. White: Yes.

Mr. Larrimer: Storm drainage, actually the site drainage – the site has a drainage break running between -- there is the existing drainageway that runs behind the stadium there and the overall site slopes just to the west of the stadium. It slopes towards that drainageway and then going further west it starts sloping back towards Summit Road. The low point of the overall site is in that southwest corner on the Summit Road side and then there's an alternative low point on the drainageway where it hits the south property line. The drainage routing right now takes – it maintains the current drainage flow path; therefore, about three-quarters of the area west of the drainageway go towards Summit Road and about a quarter of that comes back towards that existing drainageway. You can kind of follow the storm routing on the plan from the parking lot to the north of the high school running to the west and then south to where it will empty into a dried detention pond and then the detention pond release goes into the ditch on the side of Summit Road.

Mr. White: So you're basically saying, if I understand you correctly, the drainage is going to kind of flow ultimately to the south side of the – well, the south end of Summit Road in the plot, basically in that south corner?

Mr. Larrimer: Yeah, to the southwest—

Mr. White: Southwest corner.

Mr. Larrimer: --corner of the lot for the three-quarters of it that flows in that direction now.

Mr. White: Now, is that going to be – I mean, is there something to accommodate that much drainage at this point?

Mr. Larrimer: I've had this discussion with Jim Miller previously. The Summit Road ditch empties into a small drain in what appears to be farm tile. There's a broken section there which is not a particularly great outlet. The Summit Road project, if funded, would provide a more desirable storm sewer connection point. However, the discussed alternative with Jim was that you would have to cross the drainage area, which is something that is typically not done in engineering practice, to avoid future flooding concerns to anybody downstream of that drainage area, because you're connecting flow into it that was not previously going that way. Therefore, the accepted practice is to keep the flow going where it's going now and to provide detention controls to limit its outlet to the pre-development level.

Mr. Haire: And so what you're telling us, is the road ditch adequate or it is not adequate to handle the storm water that you're proposing on the site or will it – it's not adequate, but it will be restricted enough that it'll be pre-development levels.

Mr. Larrimer: It will be at the pre-development level based on the drainage calculations. Therefore, whatever issues that are occurring in that ditch now will not be solved by our development, but they should not be worsened by our development.

Mr. Sisterhen: Tom Sisterhen, with the construction manager. This project, as mentioned earlier, is a green project. It's required to be LEED Silver. One of those requirements is that the water that leaves this site does not exceed what is leaving that site now as farmland. So, what is designed is bio-swales and retention ponds and swales that keep the water on site and I'll let Mark confirm that, but that is the way the design has been done, to achieve a point that is required for that LEED design. So, as built and grass or farmland with corn on it, it's the same amount of water or less leaving in the future.

Mr. Larrimer: I would qualify that statement in quantity versus rate. It is the same rate of water leaving, but anytime you place impervious surface over a previously pervious surface, you do get an increase in overall quantity of runoff that is unavoidable with any kind of development. But the detention controls the rate to the pre-development rate, so it's not flowing out any faster than it was before.

Mr. White: I guess I have a difficult time understanding how the retention rate will be the same as the pre-existing rate when you've indicated that the impervious surfaces that cause a higher volume.

Mr. Larrimer: What happens with a detention pond is you have an outlet that is sized to restrict the flow out of that pond. So when you have a heavier rain occurring where the water is running off the site, it gets into the pond and then can't leave the pond and, therefore, it backs up there and leaves at a slow rate over a long period of time rather than running off in one torrent that you would get off of just a straight asphalt surface.

Mr. White: So this would actually drain into a pond, is that what you're saying?

Mr. Larrimer: It's – well, it's a dry basin. If it rained hard it would become a pond and then it would slowly empty out over time. It serves two functions, it's combined. There's some extended detention to meet the water quality requirements designed in the bottom of it which would be detained for a 48-hour period and then the actual quantity control would drain faster than that based on just the peak of your storm and then it would attenuate it out.

Mr. White: I realize – one more question. I don't want to belabor this, but I realize this is a rural area, but when that drainage causes a swell, would it affect any of the residents in that area?

Mr. Larrimer: The purpose of providing the detention is to mitigate the effects downstream of runoff from the site. That's why if -- were you to allow the runoff to come off, you know, if you developed and didn't provide detention, then you'd have a greater rate of runoff coming off and it could cause downstream flooding. Therefore, you design in the detention controls to mitigate that runoff rate.

Mr. White: Have those been designed for that purpose?

Mr. Larrimer: Yes.

Mr. White: Okay.

Mr. Haire: The last issue that we have not covered is the landscaping issue that Aaron mentioned at the beginning. 1180.11 of our code requires that for every 10 parking spaces the applicant shall provide not less than 200 square foot of interior landscaped parking lot areas with one tree and four shrubs located in each. And there are no shrubs located in any of the island areas, so you either need to request a variance from that standard or include those.

Mr. Banchefsky: Those bio-swales where the parking lots are, are going to contain plants natural so that the water and the landscaping -- it's going to be a natural landscaping.

Mr. Haire: Okay.

Mr. Banchefsky: Well, there is going to be landscaping obviously.

Mr. Haire: We just haven't seen -- I mean, they showed a few trees on the plans that we got but they didn't show anything else. It just says bio-swales, so if we can see what those -- what a typical would look like. I mean, you don't have to provide every detail but what a typical would look like.

Mr. : We can commit to meeting the requirements you're stating. So the shrubs and trees can be added to what _____. But to back up, what Ron's saying is there are certain natural species that may substitute for shrub species and I think those would have to be submitted as evidence that we're meeting your demands.

Mr. Haire: Yeah. And that's fine, because we've not seen a typical of what one of those bio-swales would look like so we didn't -- no plants material was shown.

Mr. Banchefsky: Any other items that you'd like us to provide?

Mr. White: I have one maybe other area. Normally when I see these major site plans, we do see some indication of lighting and I don't see any on your site plan at all. Do you have any kind of layout for lighting in the parking lot in the areas?

Mr. Wilcox: Brent Wilcox, Moody Nolan. Yes, we have fully developed plans that we can submit that show full light layouts for the entire site.

Mr. White: Okay. I'd like to see that then.

Mr. Feeney: Is there any other item the Board would like to see? (No response.) Do you have a comfortable list—

Mr. Banchefsky: Yes. What we were debating was whether we were going to ask the Board's indulgence for a special meeting, but given the schedule that we've received in terms of the flow monitoring, I'm not sure that that would be productive. I think we have a list of what you're looking for and we'll work with--

Mr. : (speaking off mic)

Mr. Haire: We need a minimum of two weeks' notice to hold a special meeting because we have to post it for public notice.

Mr. Long: Do you feel that you will have the results of the flow test by one month?

Mr. Banchefsky: EMH&T said that they were going to pull it at the end of the month and that it would take them about a week.

Mr. Long: Okay.

Mr. Banchefsky: So, I'm—

Mr. Long: So that should give it to you then?

Mr. Banchefsky: Yeah.

Mr. Long: All right. Super.

Mr. Feeney: So we'll make a motion. I'll make a motion that we table this until our next meeting in April.

Mr. Long: I'll second.

Mr. Feeney: Hear the roll, please.

(Mr. Domini called the roll. Mr. White voted "yes." Mr. Long voted "yes." Mr. Brusk voted "yes." Mr. Feeney voted "yes." Mr. Haire voted "yes.")

Mr. Banchefsky: Thank you.

Mr. Feeney: Thank you very much. See you next month.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

E. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at _____ o'clock, p.m.

Patrick Feeney, Chair

Aaron Domini, Planning Administrator