

City of Montgomery
Law and Safety Committee of City Council Meeting
February 5, 2024

Present

Brian Riblet, City Manager
John Crowell, Chief of Police
Paul Wright, Fire Chief
Greg Vonden Benken, Asst. Police Chief
Ben Shapiro, Asst. Fire Chief
Mike Rogers, Asst. Public Works Director
Jay Korros, CT Consultants
Connie Gaylor, Clerk of Council

Committee Members Present

Sasha Naiman, Chair
Ken Suer
Craig Margolis

The Law and Safety Committee of Council convened its meeting for February 5, 2024 at 3:30 p.m. with Mrs. Naiman presiding.

Terwilligers Run No Parking Discussion

Mr. Riblet provided history related to the Terwilligers Run No Parking discussion as previous meetings regarding this issue were held at the Public Works Committee. He explained that staff received several complaints in late summer of 2023 regarding the unsafe conditions of motorists having to travel left of center on the roadway to pass parked vehicles in areas of very limited visibility due to site distance issues. Mr. Riblet explained that Mr. Heitkamp, Public Works Director and Jay Korros, Traffic Engineer for the City from CT Consultants conducted analysis based on the permitted guidelines. He stated that they found that No Parking signs were needed. He explained that communications were provided to residents impacted by the new restriction and the result of that was the concern of where those homeowners' guests or contractors could park. Mr. Riblet explained that at the November 2023 Public Works Committee meeting most of the homeowners were in attendance to express their frustration with the signs and to request consideration be given to the placement of them. The result of that meeting was that staff would continue to monitor the parking situation as well as the speed of the motorists on the roadway to look for opportunities to reduce the impact of the restriction. Mr. Riblet explained that in consideration of the width of the roadway and the topography of the street that the No Parking restriction should have been in place years ago but was not. He explained that now that the safety issue has been recognized and studied, the signs could not be immediately removed as it becomes a liability issue. Mr. Riblet added that due to a change in meeting times for the last Public Works Committee meeting (because of interviews held at the Government Affairs Committee meeting) there was confusion, and the residents were not able to attend. An offer was extended to the residents to discuss at this meeting rather than waiting for a Public Works Committee meeting to be held.

Mrs. Naiman asked for clarification on the guidelines for the requirement of No Parking signs. She asked if this was a State statute, ODOT regulation, or a general guideline.

Jay Korros replied that ODOT established a Location Design Manual that all traffic engineers and communities follow regarding roadway requirements and site distance. He explained that the guideline states that an object that is 2' above ground must be seen by a vehicle and the vehicle must be able to stop within 155' to avoid a head on collision.

54 He stated that he and Mr. Heitkamp walked sections of the road and identified the areas
55 where the site and stopping distance did not meet the guidelines.

56
57 Ms. Naiman asked if the guidelines were considered a best practice, standard, or
58 requirement.

59
60 Mr. Korros replied that the guidelines are considered standard in the design of new roads.
61 He stated that the data has been vetted thoroughly by ODOT before becoming the
62 standard.

63
64 Mrs. Naiman asked how many houses are within the restricted area.

65
66 Mr. Korros replied he thought there were 8-10 homes.

67
68 Mr. Margolis about if the height difference of the roadway was the issue.

69
70 Mr. Korros replied yes, the hills create the problem not the curves.

71
72 Mr. Margolis asked if the documentation of the analysis was conducted by City staff.

73
74 Mr. Korros replied that it was as he and Mr. Heitkamp conducted the analysis and
75 prepared the reports.

76
77 Mr. Margolis asked if the streets were wider, would it mitigate the problem.

78
79 Mr. Korros replied that it would allow for on street parking as a motorist would not have
80 to cross left of center to pass the parked vehicle.

81
82 Mr. Margolis asked if the main concern was from homeowners with younger kids.

83
84 Mr. Riblet stated that there were several calls and did not know if the callers were all
85 residents but that really was not a factor as it is a safety issue for anyone travelling on
86 the roads.

87
88 Mr. Suer stated that while he was familiar with the area and the neighborhood and that is
89 one of the hilliest areas in Montgomery. He stated there are other streets in Montgomery
90 that also have no parking sections. He explained that he understands it is a dilemma for
91 residents however he drove it and sees the potential danger, especially at night.

92
93 **Guests**

94
95 Cheryl Bernstein, 8975 Canyon Ridge Lane-Ms. Bernstein stated that she has lived in her
96 home many years and there has never been an accident. She stated that she felt making
97 no parking the entire length of the road was massive. She explained that she could see
98 restricting parking on a portion of the hill but not the entire street. She stated that the
99 process upset her. She stated there has never been a problem if people go slowly. She
100 suggested widening the road or to have one side as no parking rather than both. She
101 stated that she does not feel that it is needed or is fair. She stated she feels victimized by
102 the City.

103

104 Sandy Nunn, 11251 Terwilligers Run Drive-Ms. Nunn stated that she 100% supported one
105 side of the road with no parking but feels limiting it to both sides is extreme. She stated
106 that speed is a factor as she feels motorists go the same speed as they do on portions of
107 Montgomery Road. She stated she felt appropriately placed speed bumps would slow
108 motorists down. She added that Terwilligers Run Drive is also used as a cut through for
109 many people coming to and from Symmes Township. She added that the Sycamore and
110 Loveland school buses travel to fast on the road.

111

112 Greg Price, 11247 Terwilligers Run Drive-Mr. Price stated that while his house has legal
113 parking allowed in front of it, he understands the concerns of his neighbors as many are
114 remodeling their homes or have lawn maintenance crews that have nowhere to park. He
115 stated that the private drives off of Terwilligers Run Drive (Canyon Ridge Lane and
116 Legendary Pass) are not cul-de-sacs so there is no where to turn around and the access
117 back onto Terwilligers Run Drive is dangerous.

118

119 Tracy O'Neill, 8968 Canyon Ridge Lane-Ms. O'Neill explained that while she lives on the
120 private drive that she understands both sides of the issue. She stated that any place
121 where it would be safe to have one-side parking, she would support.

122

123 Rene Sandler, 11250 Terwilligers Run-Ms. Sandler stated that she is having major
124 renovations done on her home and can only accommodate two vehicles in her driveway.
125 She explained that overflow parking cannot be on Old Creek Trail due to fire hydrants.
126 She added that Old Creek is also narrow so if safety vehicles need to go down it, they
127 would not be able to pass anyone parked on the street. She stated that she could support
128 one side of the Terwilligers Run being no parking.

129

130 Paula Jarnicki, 8957 Old Legend Court-Ms. Jarnicki stated that she is probably one of the
131 longest standing residents in the subdivision and stated that speed along with the school
132 buses are the real issues creating safety concerns.

133

134 Chief Crowell explained that a speed trailer was placed at the intersection of Terwilligers
135 Run and Terwilligers Valley from November 16 to November 29. He explained that data
136 reflected that 3,600 vehicles traveled the road during that time frame. He stated that
137 85% travelled at 27 mph or lower.

138

139 Ms. Bernstein stated that the speeds were low due to the speed trailer being placed at a
140 stop sign. She suggested they place it in another area and compare the data.

141

142 Mrs. Naiman confirmed that the main concerns were speeding and parking with the
143 residents in attendance.

144 Chief Crowell explained that the police department is not in the citation business, nor do
145 they want to issue them, but the data supports taking enforcement action. He stated that
146 the data corresponds with the study.

147

148 Ms. Bernstein added that while she understands not allowing parking in front of her home
149 that she does not agree with restricting the whole street.

150

151 Mrs. Naiman explained that there are a lot of factors and standards that go into the
152 decision for the no parking restriction. She stated that the City has to consider all of the
153 factors as well as what was in our control to change.

154
155 Mr. Riblet stated that if the City can find an opportunity to make adjustments, then staff
156 will do that. He stated that we are not in the business to issue citations but to keep people
157 safe.

158
159 **Safety Center Renovation Update**
160

161 Mr. Riblet provided an update on the design of the Safety Center renovation. He explained
162 that with the transition of the Fire Department going from part-time to full-time created
163 a situation where there is no longer adequate bunk room space to accommodate our men
164 and women firefighters. He explained that a placeholder was included in the 2024 Budget
165 to include the immediate renovations of the second story of the Safety Center. He
166 displayed architectural drawings of the new bunk space, restrooms and common area of
167 the Fire Department as well as conceptual drawings for a long term construction at the
168 Safety Center. Mr. Riblet stated that is agreed upon by the Committee that MSA would
169 proceed with preparing construction documents for a bid process. He stated that
170 construction would not begin until after the pool closes in September.

171
172 Staff discussed the Master Plan of flipping the police and fire departments for the long
173 term planning of the Safety Center with the Committee.

174
175 Mr. Suer stated that he felt Phase 1 looked good.

176
177 Mr. Margolis stated he was surprised the anticipated cost was as low as it was.

178
179 Mr. Riblet stated that he anticipates the scope and fee for Phase I to be between \$50,000-
180 \$55,000.

181
182 Mrs. Naiman stated that the renovations look good and agrees that the price is
183 reasonable.

184
185 Mr. Suer stated that he agrees with the transition of the Mayors Court space into
186 something more beneficial to the staff. He acknowledged that the Mayors Court was
187 something that would require more conversation.

188
189 Mr. Riblet agreed that the space was not conducive to the Mayors Court needs and felt
190 that moving it to City Hall was a better space. He added that he felt having a broader
191 discussion about Mayors Court is warranted.

192
193 The Committee directed staff to move forward with MSA to prepare construction
194 documents and a bid process.

195
196 **Minutes**
197

198 Mr. Suer made a motion to approve the minutes of the July 7, 2022 meeting. Mr. Margolis
199 seconded. The Committee unanimously approved the minutes.

200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210

Adjournment

Mr. Suer made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Margolis seconded. The Committee unanimously agreed.

The Law and Safety Committee meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.



Chair of Law and Safety Committee of City Council