

Comments received from website

We live between Indianola and the railroad tracks. The majority of the task force diagrams seem to end at Indianola.

Now I know or am 95% certain that all of these plans (mediums, plantings etc) will include us if resources permit but every time I see a diagram that ends at Indianola I have to consciously reassure myself that "they probably mean us too !".

It sure would help if I didn't have to process those worries every time the task force put up a diagram.

and while I have your attention:

Speed ! please remember our section is the one that had the overturned car in the middle of the street - presumably from excessive speed this spring. We could use one of those trailers between Indianola and the freeway.

Our section also has about 6 fender benders a week from the right turn only westbound traffic pattern at Indianola. I used to keep emergency flares on the front porch but the cost became excessive.

I am the wife of the City Engineer of Gahanna and I worked with school bureaucracies for 30 years. In my experience, if you give a bureaucracy an easy way out, that is what they will take. The "interim" solution will become the "final" solution without a doubt. It also will not solve anyone's problems.

I do not support the task force recommendation if it includes the interim solution.

Let me start by saying thank you to all of the task force members. I know you've all put a lot of hard work into this process. I think the complete street plan will be a plus for Clintonville & local businesses. Right now, many people buzz through Clintonville using N Broadway & High as a way of getting from point A to point B. The roundabout creates a focal point, for Clintonville. German Village, Worthington, Campus & the Short North all have a distinct flair, something that attracts you there. Why not Clintonville too! The roundabout adds to the small town feel which I like. My only real concern is the lack of total support by the task force for a plan, in which they say they believe is the best but, which they are also so quick to brush off as nearly impossible. To those more in favor of leaning towards the back-up plan, option 3, I would say, where would we be as a city, a state, as a country if we dared not to dream and dream big. We only fail when we do not try, my question is why are you not willing to at least try? and my last question is, do some of the members of the task force really believe the city would spend approximately \$350,000.00 on option three and turn around a few years later, rip up all or part of the project and put in a roundabout? I really would like someone, to explain to the more depressed parts of the city, why it would be worth wasting all that money in Clintonville twice when other neighborhoods are in greater need of updates and repair. Can I say Franklinton, Hilltop, Olde Town East etc.

My husband and I fully support the roundabout proposal. However we cannot support the left turn lane as an interim solution. We do not feel the turn lane would solve anything and would instead create more problems. We also feel it would become the "solution" in the eyes of the city and leave our neighborhood worse off than before intervention.

Ann and Steve Wilson
32 E N Broadway

Whatever "interim" solution is arrived at, please do not allow widening of the intersection. If a left turn lane is critically important, it can be done with the existing pavement, as outlined in Option 1 (or 2--I'm unsure which)M thank you. Dan and Karen Wander 264 E N Broadway.
Karen Wander

Dear Mike McLaughlin: I understand you are collecting votes on the North Broadway issue. Here are two votes against any widening of the intersection at High and N Broadway. -Lisa Russell and Dotte Turner

Reasons:

I thought traffic calming was the goal, not traffic expediting. Traffic moves too fast and freely on N Broadway except during rush hour where it backs up at the I-71 North entrance ramp in the AM, and on West N Broadway heading east in the PM. If we could add anything or start over with a new plan, I suggest removing the I-71 interchange. It is too close to the Weber Rd interchange and not needed. It's within walking distance of Weber Rd. Southbound 71 has its own congestion problems in the mornings. Removing a ramp might help. Traffic calming shouldn't apply to all residential streets except N Broadway. That's not fair. (Especially since the new area plan calls for ENB to be a conservation district because of the quality of architecture represented on the street. It is a treasure in Clintonville that improves everyone's property values.) Look at the massive amount of cut-through traffic ON North Broadway. Calm or reduce, not expedite, N Broadway traffic.

Orchard Lane and Milton get tons of cut-through traffic and we don't complain to the city. Those are public streets. Maintain the grid and keeps streets skinny.

Lisa Russell 75 Orchard Lane
Dotte Turner 185 East N Broadway (since 1965).

I was very impressed by last Thursday's task force presentation. The amount of research and other preparation must have been incredible! It's clear that each person on the committee is dedicated to making Clintonville an even better place to live. I must admit to being skeptical about adding a round-about at the intersection of N. High and E. N. Broadway, but this presentation for the "Complete Street Plan" converted me! I hope that we are able to make this plan come true. My one concern is the "interim solution" of widening E. N. Broadway. When money is one of the obstacles to climb, I'm not sure I understand the thinking of spending money to widen the street with the plan of tearing it all up in the grand scheme. Could we not choose to make the current westbound left lane into a turn only lane, keeping more money in the pot for the "Complete Street"? I know this has its own set of disadvantages, as do all the options, but conserving our limited resources should be a priority. Thanks again to all the task force members for a job well done!

Sincerely,
Rhonda Walkup

Dear Mike,

Like many of neighbors and over 700 Clintonville residents, most of whom DO NOT even live on East North Broadway, I vehemently and adamantly oppose the left turn lane. THis whole issue has taken on the odor of three day old dead fish. We can start with the deception that D Searcy used in trying to slip this proposal by the CAC and the community without hearings and continued with the bogus argument about cut-through traffic. As you know, there is NO cut-through traffic and that the great majority of vehicles on the roads in question have legitimate reasons (ie they live there) for being on that street. Never mind that as taxpayers, anybody has the absolute right to travel down any city street anytime. Over 90% of the merchants on High Street oppose the left turn lane or are neutral to it. So, in spite of this huge and ongoing opposition to this proposal both our own representative to the CAC , Garonski and D Searcy still insist on forcing this down our collective throats!. What is the motive here? There are two: Firstly, we (not the residents of

Clinton Heights) are being victimized here and for some reason these CAC members seem to revel in the opportunity to "stick it" to ENB residents whom they perceive are "rich" (nothing could be farther from the truth). The only other reason for pushing an unpopular proposal is because some CAC members (D Searcy) are on the "take" for considerations and \$\$ for voting this way. I suspect that this has something to do with re-development of the corner to create a Walgreen's drug store, something we REALLY NEED MORE OF HERE IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD (not).

Now, the task force has identified the round-about as a viable and effective alternative. Great, this is the only option that makes sense. Yet the task force, who developed this idea is NOT EVEN WILLING TO insist to the CAC that this plan be submitted to the city! Why for God's sake don't you do this. Lots of excuses including, "we don't know the whole story (Pachen quote, which demonstrates his complete naivety and stupidity by admitting that there is a HIDDEN agenda behind all of this mess). Another great excuse is that it is "too expensive". Says who? Clearly NOT the city since they have not even seen the proposal. Is this another part of the "hidden story"? I hope not. You will NEVER win the lottery if you don't buy tickets! Why not have the courage to kill the left turn lane initiative for all the right and ethical reasons and then submit the proposal to the city? What could be simpler, more democratic and more efficient? Of course, the only "problem" with this plan is that it does not feed the special interests of Joe Pachen, D Searcy and Chris Garonski! How pathetic that the CAC, supposedly a representative governing body for ALL of CLintonville insists on "dissing" neighborhood and Clintonville opinion. In truth, the residents of Clintonville realize only too well what this push for a left turn lane means for them: YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD IS NEXT.

Please, please forward this round-about plan to the CAC with 100% complete enthusiasm. You chaired the committee, they found an equitable solution and it is only morally correct that you support your own findings!

Regards, Steve Krakowka

Hi Mike,

I am a resident of E North Broadway and attended the task force meeting last week. Thank you for the time and effort you have all spent working on this issue, as I know it has not been an easy process. After seeing the presentation and listening to the comments I am still concerned that there not consensus. I realize that the issue effects not only our street, but our entire community and it doesn't seem as though the task force or CAC has been listening to the vast majority of the residents.

The roundabout is a great idea that, if feasible, would continue to add to the community feel. I totally disagree with having an interim solution to the issue and do not feel we need one. I think we all know that if an interim solution is reached, there will be no roundabout and no RFP. With over 700 Clintonville residents against the left turn lane, I think it is safe to say that this is not the solution the community wants. I am not saying that all these residents want the roundabout, but it is clear they do not want the left turn lane.

I heard several comments from the task force on having to wait 2-5 years for the roundabout, however I believe it will take this long for the interim solution to come into play as well. With our entire area torn up and all traffic currently being diverted to ENB, there is no possible way that any one with an ounce of common sense would put our street under construction right now. If cut through traffic is truly the reason why you are seeking a left turn lane, it would be beneficial to see what the cut through traffic is now with the amount of increased traffic we have seen over the summer. A left turn lane would keep the traffic level up and undoubtedly keep up the so called cut through traffic. No reasonable person can say that the left turn lane would not increase traffic. If safety is the reason why you seek the left turn lane, then why are you catering to those people who are breaking the law daily by turning left? Why are we catering the those people who are speeding down our street at 40+ MPH with 3 schools near by? Why can we not give tickets to those turning left and speeding rather than allowing them to do what they want in our community.

We all realize that ENB is a busy thoroughfare, however it is still our community and our street and our residents that we need to protect. We do not need to encourage more traffic to the area by allowing a left turn lane.

I am against the interim solution, against the left turn lane in its entirety and am for the keeping the street safe and green.

Thank you,

Katie Conway

224 ENB

Good evening, Mike,

As I sat in the last Task Force meeting, and previous Task Force meetings, I have had the following thoughts:

1) I do not favor ANY solution that allows the left turn lane and widening of East North Broadway Street, period. Once that's happened, I don't believe anything further will happen in terms of a roundabout or the "complete street" plan. I believe it's entirely likely that the City of Columbus would announce after some interval that the resulting increased traffic across North Broadway has created sufficient "public need" to justify widening the entire stretch of ENB between High Street and Indianola. They own the property and have the zoning necessary to accomplish that. The intersection change would establish conditions to promote this scenario.

2) Given the Mayor's posture on City finances and tax increase needs, I don't believe that the City of Columbus cares a whit about preserving our community or our street. Turning North Broadway into a commercial street would certainly satisfy those pushing a "cut through" [aka connector] between 315 and I-71. It would also produce vastly increased tax revenues for City coffers. I thought that was implicit in last Thursday's comments from those who work for and with the City, and consistent with Public Service Director Kelsey and Development Director Safford's responses during their March "dog and pony show." I have very little faith in the credibility of City officials involved with these functions. They were evasive about whether Walgreens' has a contract on the southwest corner of North Broadway and High Streets that is contingent on a left turn southbound onto High from westbound North Broadway. Directors Kelsey and Safford also said they did not believe traffic flow would increase if the City proposal were adopted, and that seems absolutely incredulous to me. The City proposal was originally described as "expediting" traffic; that's precisely what I believe is intended.

3) I do not consider that the claim of unbearable traffic volume cutting through various neighborhoods has been sufficiently proved to represent a serious concern. The density of the population in those neighborhoods, and particularly considering the proportion of rental residents, accounts for the preponderance of traffic leaving or entering during rush hour, as confirmed by our recent traffic studies and 2001 City data. I also feel the claim that cars regularly race down narrow streets with cars parked on both sides, such as Longview, Clinton Heights, and Como is exaggerated. It is possible an occasional nut might do that, but it would be like threading a needle at high speed. I am saddened and offended that some of the residents who feel persecuted by cut-through traffic on their small streets have no compassion for those of us who live on North Broadway, which has more than 16,000 cars a day when traffic conditions are NOT altered by stimulus funds-related road

construction.

4) I believe that enlarging the intersection to include a left turn lane from ENB southbound onto High Street will only increase congestion and cut through traffic on both sides of High Street, as more cars traverse the street and drivers look for alternative routes coming from both directions.

5) I feel the Task Force has been manipulated behind the scenes in favor of the original City proposal, and the position of the CAC members who instigated it. This began with the Chamber of Commerce's sudden change of policy AFTER Donna Leigh-Osborne had been designated as its representative, having been hired under the presumption of neutrality. I believe the proposal was sent to the City for review before NBSA representatives had been given a sufficient opportunity for input and comments.

6) I feel the scope of the "task" has expanded to make the Task Force's proposed concept of a "Complete Street" unwieldy and improbable. My understanding from the proceedings at CAC the night the group was appointed was that its purpose was to come up with a better solution for the North Broadway - High Street intersection issue, not completely revamp North Broadway from I-71 to 315. It would be nice to implement previous Clintonville planning recommendations, but not at the expense of losing focus on the original purpose.

In summary, this entire process has been a disappointment. We are back where we started. As more than 700 other Clintonville residents who have documented their feelings via petition, I am adamantly opposed to any action that includes the City's proposal for creating a left turn lane southbound onto High Street and widening any part of East North Broadway.

Thank you for the time you have spent chairing the Task Force and serving as a Clintonville Area Commissioner. I am sorry that those who embrace the City's proposal do not see the liability it creates not only for North Broadway Street, but for the entire Clintonville-Beechwood community.

Respectfully,
Marilyn Clark
77 E. North Broadway Street
Columbus, OH 43214

Dear Clintonville Area Commission,

I was glad to read in the Dispatch that the proposal to build a roundabout at High & N Broadway was scrapped. I hope you will find another alternative to the traffic problems at that intersection. I recently discovered a Hilliard website where you can search for traffic accidents. I typed in Britton for the location and found 8 accidents at the Davidson/Britton Parkway roundabout in July alone. I really think that the media and engineers are being remiss in not disclosing the fact that these roundabouts are causing an increase in accidents. Maybe not injury accidents, but accidents (with property damage) nonetheless.

<http://hilliardoh.policereports.us/>

Tricia Kovacs
Gahanna, Ohio

Here's my final thought on the intersection situation. If anyone agrees or disagrees, that's fine. I would like to see these things happen: 1. Install a left turn lane on ENB from west-bound to south-bound, widen ENB as needed to add the new lane, making three lanes west-bound on the east side of the intersection. 2. Align the lanes west of High street to conform with the newly added lanes east of High. 3. Synchronize the traffic light(s) to conform to the light at Indianola, Calumet and the High street lights.

Mike,

We have not met, my name is Curtis Taft and my wife and I live at 454 Walhalla Road. I'm writing to you today regarding the "Complete Street Plan" which the task force has proposed as a solution to the concerns voiced by the citizens of Clintonville. Unfortunately this proposal has been hijacked by a group of people that are not even affected by the problem, and they are, predominately, the residents of East North Broadway. This group has somehow convinced the task force that there is no cut through traffic on the side streets (false), that a left turn lane at westbound ENB and High is somehow incredibly dangerous (false), and that if said turn lane is built the city would widen ENB, from High to Indianola, to 5 lanes (as WNB already is from Kenny Road to High, which I think would be a great idea). These are simply scare tactics that have prevented the task force from addressing the real problem at hand.

So what is the problem that started all this? It is, plain and simply, the cut through traffic on the side streets around the North Broadway and High intersection, caused by the lack of a left turn lane south onto High from ENB, and a bottle neck on eastbound WNB at High due to the lack of a dedicated right turn lane. I used to live, for 13 years, at 174 West Kenworth Road, which is the intersection of Milton and Kenworth. I can say, for a fact, that there is cut through traffic that turns north from WNB onto Milton to avoid the WNB and High intersection (Kenworth was closed before High to stop this, but it did absolutely nothing). I don't need a traffic study done by the city to know this, I sat on my front porch for 13 years and saw it for myself. The cars blatantly disregard the stop signs both north and south bound, and do so at a high rate of speed, all day long. The residents at Hennepin and Brighton have a similar problem. Here is a link to their videos of their problem.... <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=r54VkmFCit4&feature=related> (Don't forget to look at the other 3 videos in the right hand column). Now that I am on Walhalla, I am affected by cut through traffic caused by the lack of a turn lane at High. I have cars that turn at Indianola to go down Walhalla, just to avoid the North Broadway and High intersection. There are some that do this at very high rates of speed. I have seen MANY (100+) cars in my 2 years here, doing 50mph+ down Walhalla, no joke.

So why now is the task force, created to solve the side street cut through traffic problem, proposing a series of four roundabouts on North Broadway and reduced speed limits as well? These roundabout and speed reduction proposals will further compound an already clogged, yet essential, east west artery. The traffic will back up even further then it currently does, and more people will avoid the intersection, cutting through our quiet side streets more then ever before. The roundabout proposal is not a traffic solution, it is a poorly veiled attempt to shut down traffic on ENB all together, in an attempt to make it into another quiet little side street. The problem is there are no alternatives for people who must travel east to west, or west to east. (The Morse/Bethel connector would have solved so many problems, and North Broadway may have much less traffic if it was built. I don't understand why that idea has not been put back on the table.)

Almost every part of the "Complete Street Plan" works against the smooth flow of traffic on North Broadway. The idea is to get from point A to point B as quickly and smoothly as possible, right? The roundabouts will essentially slow down traffic to the flow rate of a four way stop sign, four times. The sheer volume of traffic at the High street intersection will make it impossible for a roundabout to function properly, not to mention the danger posed to bicyclists and pedestrians by the lack of signals. I spoke to my brother, who is blind, about how he would manage crossing a street with no signals. His guide dog is not trained to walk out in front of traffic to make it yield, so he would have to rely, completely, on the good will and kindness of drivers to stop, two, three or four times for him to cross from island to island to island. Good will and kindness are not two words associated with 99% of the drivers I share the road with. Cut throat and selfish are terms that come to mind though. What about the multitude of cyclists we have here in Clintonville? Do you really think it's safer for them to navigate a roundabout, with so many cars jockeying for every little non-existent gap in traffic on the roundabout, then a lighted intersection or crosswalk? Drivers have too many things to look out for in this busy inner city intersection.

Making it a free for all is not the answer. Turning a major artery into a capillary is not the answer. The roundabout is not the answer to the problem that was proposed to the task force. The task force has been hijacked by a group of isolationist ENB residents whose agenda looks pretty on paper, but in reality is just a pretty picture, and not a solution to our problem. You need to talk to the people who are affected directly. Go door to door on the immediate side streets of the North

Broadway and High intersection, and talk to the people on Hennepin, on Brighton, on Milton, on Kenworth, on Oakland Park, on Clinton Heights, on Longview, on Como, on Orchard, etc, etc, etc.

Simply add a left turn lane westbound, as proposed in the "Interim" plan, and add a dedicated right turn lane eastbound. Less land has to be grabbed, less money has to be spent, less time the intersection would be under construction. Problem solved, period.

If people want a roundabout so badly, why not just reinstate the Calumet and ENB roundabout, and see how well it works. (Funnel everyone down Oakland Park for 6 months, see how they like it). Why did they remove the roundabout at Calumet anyway, does anyone know when and why it was done?

Curtis Taft
454 Walhalla Rd.