BLOOMINGTON TRAFFIC COMMISSION AGENDA August 24, 2022 4:30 P.M. –In-person and Virtual Hybrid meeting City Hall, Council Chambers Online link: <u>https://bloomington.zoom.us/j/81707854386</u> Meeting ID: 817 0785 4386 Dial in: +1 312 626 6799, 817 0785 4386# US (Chicago)

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of Minutes July 27, 2022
- III. Communications from Commission
- IV. Public Comment*
- V. Reports from Staff
- VI. Old Business*
- VII. New Business*
 - A. TC-22-10: Adding no-parking areas to Strong Drive –*Hamid Matinkhah*, *Engineering Technician*
 - B. TC-22-11: Resolution to amend Title 12 to define "right-of-way" *Greg Alexander, Commission Member*
- VIII. Traffic Inquiries
- IX. Adjournment

Next meeting – September 28, 2022

*Action Requested/Public comment prior to any vote (limited to five minutes per speaker)

Auxiliary aids for people with disabilities are available upon request with adequate notice. Please call (812) 349-3429 or e-mail <u>human.rights@bloomington.in.gov</u>.

BLOOMINGTON TRAFFIC COMMISSION MINUTES July 27, 2022 4:30 P.M. –In-person and Virtual Hybrid meeting City Hall, Council Chambers Online link: https://bloomington.zoom.us/j/82065735347

Diline link: <u>https://bloomington.zoom.us/j/82065735347</u> Meeting ID: 820 6573 5347 Dial in: +1 312 626 6799, 820 6573 5347# US (Chicago)

I. Call to Order: 4:35pm

Members present in-person: Sarah Ryterband, Ryne Shadday, Andrew Cibor, Steven Reynolds, Greg Alexander Members present remotely: David Hoff, Freddie Love Staff present: Beth Rosenbarger, Neil Kopper, Hamid Matinkhah

II. Approval of Minutes – May 25, 2022

Move to approve minutes from May 25, 2022 with the addition of the word "in-person" after "members present: Ryterband Second: Cibor Yea: Ryterband, Shadday, Cibor, Reynods, Alexander, Hoff, Love Nay: -Approved: 7-0

III. Communications from Commission

A. Report from Director of Engineering: City Engineer, Andrew Cibor, presented about a Safe Systems approach and two fatal crashes in Bloomington in 2022. Commission members asked several questions. Cibor reported on construction projects.

IV. Public Comment* - none

V. Reports from Staff

Rosenbarger noted that in reference to the safety conversation, there are advancements that the automobile industry could be pursuing, such as lower speeds, speed governors, gps-automated speed governors, and cellphone disabling technology.

VI. Old Business* - none

VII. New Business*

A. TC-22-09: All-way stop analysis for Maxwell Lane and Sheridan Road –*Neil Kopper, PE, Senior Project Engineer*

Kopper presented for staff. Ryterband: it says in the report, that members of the neighborhood are opposed to traffic calming, do we understand what that opposition is? Are tiny traffic circles an options? Kopper: that would best be answered by residents who are here to comment. Tiny traffic circles could be an option within traffic calming.

Petitioner: Stephanie Hattan: presented.

Teresa Swift: I live in this area. The demographics of the area have shifted. We have a lot of retired people and a lot of older people. I have been crossing the street with my dogs, people start driving faster, and honk at me to speed up. People want you out of the way, and they make it clear that it is their road. With no sidewalks on the southside of the street you don't feel safe. You can't see a fast-moving vehicle. And if you're hearing impaired, you might not hear that car coming. I want to know if the crash data took into consideration crashes involving bicyclists. You just don't feel safe here. In this neighborhood, you don't expect 70 year olds to hop on bicycles. They walk. We want to take advantage of our lovely city, and that particular intersection feels very dangerous. I will comment about why residents are opposed to speed bumps. Any residents with spinal issues, speed bumps are painful for those residents.

Virginia Metzger: I live nearby. I cross that intersection with my dogs. We constantly have to run across. It is very dangerous. I think in the presentation, there was a lot of concern about the driver's attitude, that they won't see the pedestrian, that they won't stop, and whether they can stop. It concerns me with the 1% of the drivers who are going so fast, that they won't stop. If I am going to dodge a car, I would rather dodge a car rolling through a stop sign, than a car speeding through. There is a stop sign on Highland. And they qualify for an all-way stop and we don't. One more note, it's Sheridan Drive, not Sheridan Road.

Devonia Stein: I have lived at this intersection since 1973. No one has lived there as long as I have. I am elderly. I had back surgery a year ago. I'm supposed to walk daily. I try to get across the street, but cars come whipping around there, and they are there before I know what I'm doing. If you don't do something about this. We're a walking neighbood, and we need this stop sign. Thank you.

Geoffrey Bingham: I urge you to listen to the presentation. I can attest to the speeding. Flying down that hill. I hear it, I see it. I see lots of people walking. People practically run me down when I walk down the street. I hear a lot of criticism of stop signs, and no criticism of speed humps. And it doesn't make sense to me. It is expensive, really expensive. And it's our dollars paying for it. Stop signs are much cheaper. Why isn't it being done? It's a simple request. We need it.

Hunter Rackly: I live one block from the intersection of Sheridan. I have three children. There are many speeding cars through this residential area. We sit on our front porch, and watch. I invite you to come sit and watch, too. Speed data was only taken north and west of the intersection. I live east of the intersection, and I am quite sure the average and 85th percentile of speeds would be hired if they were measured east of Sheridan. I have witnessed three crashes at the intersection (of Maxwell) and Mitchell, although I don't think that's the best place to put a stop sign. Issues we've talked about is the intersection is very wide. There's no sidewalk buffer, and it scares me as a parent. If my kid is bicycling and falls, it is scary. I am open to multiple things, and I would be supportive of a stop sign at Sheridan as one option.

Jane Benjamin: I've used this corner in question here for many years. I worked at the university, and I used this intersection frequently. The hill coming over Maxwell and intersecting with Sheridan is just extremely dangerous. Thankfully, I know this as I've used it for 18 years. I would use the left lane as a safety space. I am here to support any form of slowing down the traffic. Especially where motorists are coming over the hill. They come flying over there. I was fortunate never to have been involved in an accident because I knew to be particularly aware of this dangerous area. Some people are new, and they don't know about how dangerous it is yet. Maybe an accident has not happened, but an accident will happen. Thank you.

Steve Benjamin: It doesn't make sense to me that if we install a four-way stop there, almost every driver would come to some form of a stop, maybe a rolling stop. It defies logic to think that installing a stop will make people speed up in other parts of the street. That's not my behavior. The presentation earlier was very good about the fatal accidents. Also the data presented, that there were no accidents in the last five years. In the presentation, it said we should be proactive, not wait until we have 3, 4, or 5 accidents here. Maybe this is an area where an accident is going to happen, and perhaps we have a chance to overcome that here. I went to visit recently, and as I back out of the driveway onto Maxwell, it is a game of roulette every time. I look carefully. I know there are guidelines and rubrics, but those are not laws you must follow. The two things that are the most critical, it's about the hill and it's about the intersection.

Dave Rollo: This intersection is in district four. It is unique and it deserves unique consideration. I'm an advocate for an all-way stop at Sheridan and Maxwell for safety reasons. As the data indicates in your packet, there's a lot of traffic. A primary hazard that I experience concerns southbound traffic on Sheridan; one southbound on Sheridan cannot see eastbound traffic on Maxwell. Nor can one perceive the speed. If you're stopped at that stop sign, drivers accelerate due to the possibility of cars driving eastbound that might appear. There is a crosswalk nearby, but cars are rushing toward them. It seems that a stop sign on Maxwell would do much to alleviate that problem. I'm willing to sponsor the oridnace and put it on Council's agenda. I'd appreciate commission members consideration and support.

Deborah Myerson: I concur that it is a challenging and difficult place to be a pedestrian. I would like to share the perspective of two of my sons. I have a son with an intellectual disability who has to scurry across this intersection. I am always terrified. My middle son will be a sophomore at south next year, and he walks to school most days. He told me it is difficult to cross, and luckily he can do that relatively safely. I'd love to see a four-way stop at that intersection, and I'd love to see that intersection narrowed. I realize it's a bus route, and I love that it's a bus route.

Regina Moore: I have lived here for many years. Ms. Hattan's presentation provided a good opportunity for you all to experience the space. I am sharing comments from other neighbors. First from Kerry Thompson, people speed down this street; we have witnessed crashes. Anyone under 12 needs to have an adult with them. From Mary Wintersong Philips: I am very much in favor of an all-way stop at this intersection. Visibility for cars turning east down Sheridan is very difficult. Visibility for people exiting driveways is very difficult. Over the years, I've witnessed crashes in that stretch of road. An all-way stop sign at Sheridan and Maxwell would immensely help that situation.

Chuck Livingston: I live across from this intersection. I cross this intersection daily on my morning walk. There is only one intersection nearby that comes close to having ADA accessible sidewalks. People who are handicap who have walking trouble, they are all channeled to Maxwell. The other point I want to raise is that this conversation is much like a conversation from 35 years ago. We wanted a stop sign at Maxwell and Grimes. It didn't happen until a boy was hit. There was another instance that the neighborhood asked for a stop sign. The City didn't approve it, and then a neighbor was hit. He died five months later. Then, a traffic light was installed. I hope you vote in favor of putting a stop sign at this intersection

Eric Ost: the neighborhood is asking for a stop sign in order to stop traffic. Stop signs do stop traffic. A majority of residents do not want traffic calming for reasons they have shared. I support an all-way stop. I am sharing a comment from a neighbor named Holly: this is a dangerous intersection, I wish you luck in addressing the danger. Another neighbor said this intersection does not support the pedestrian-friendly goals of Bloomington. Listening for an oncoming vehicle is not a reliable way to identify that a vehicle is coming. Turning from Sheridan onto Maxwell, I had to speed up through the turn because a car was speeding down the hill. Mr. Ost shared comments from other neighbors in support of a stop sign. Brian Hattan: I support this stop sign. If you want to wait for something to happen, something is going to happen at this intersection. If you want to wait, something is going to happen.

Natalia Galvin: I live in the Near Westside, and I live at an intersection that has a traffic circle that Ms. Ryterband cited. I support Ms. Hattan's advocacy. I have walked this intersection many times. I believe in Ms. Hattan and I believe in her and her neighborhood's lived experience. I look forward to supporting her further.

Commission member comments: Alexander: I support slowing speeds and I support geometric changes here. I do not think a stop sign achieves what you want. Ryterband: there aren't sidewalks here. The proactive thing that would work is traffic calming. We see traffic calming working in many places across the city. Change the stupid turning radius at that intersection, don't allow it to remain ridiculously big. We heard from the Council Member that he will move this forward and endorse it whether we support it or not. But I can't endorse it because it won't solve the problem. Cibor: I think this is a tough intersection. I appreciate everyone who came to share input. I support something happening here. Reynolds: it bothers me there is no enforcement. I thank you all for explaining your concerns. The detail in the presentation was wonderful. Hoff: I think we can all agree there is a problem here. I think that there is a solution on the table, but if we don't like it, we need to come up with another solution, and we haven't done that. The appeal of the idea of slowing down traffic is great, but do we have a credible alternative on the table? I don't see a credible alternative. Love: I think we could consider speed cushions, I see them around the City, and they seem to work well. A 4-way stop could work, but I think it needs to be more than just that. Shadday: I am interested to see what else is on the table.

Ryterband: I move to support the recommendations of the Engineering department in TC-22-09, to reject the 4-way stop at Sheridan and Maxwell, Alexander seconded. Yea: Love, Ryterband, Alexander, Cibor, Shadday Nay: Hoff, Reynolds Vote: 5-2

- B. TC-22-10: Adding no-parking areas to Strong Drive –*Hamid* Matinkhah, Engineering Technician: - not presented, tabled for August 24
- C. TC-22-11: Resolution to amend Title 12 to define "right-of-way" Greg Alexander, Commission Member – not presented, table for August 24
- VIII. Traffic Inquiries none

IX. Adjournment – 6:58 pm

Next meeting – August 24, 2022

**Action Requested/Public comment prior to any vote (limited to five minutes per speaker)*

Auxiliary aids for people with disabilities are available upon request with adequate notice. Please call (812) 349-3429 or e-mail <u>human.rights@bloomington.in.gov</u>.



TRAFFIC COMMISSION STAFF REPORT

Case #: TC-22-10 Date: Aug 27, 2022

FROM: Hamid Matinkhah, Engineering Technician, Engineering Department

REQUEST: Strong Drive Parking Restrictions

Location: Strong Drive south of W Allen St

Description and purpose: Engineering Department staff received requests from the public via uReport and from Catalent Biologics for on-street parking restrictions along Strong Drive. Strong Drive is a 29' to 30' wide road with a northern terminus of W Allen Street. The road is currently a 'dead end' facility but the City's Transportation Plan identifies plans for the road to continue south and provide future connectivity. The adjacent properties are occupied by Catalent and Organized Living, and the facility has significant truck activity. There is significant on-street parking on Strong Dr which can limit maneuverability especially for the large trucks and the on-street parking limits sight distance at the driveway access points. Currently on-street parking is permitted on both sides of Strong Drive except in locations that have yellow painted curb (some yellow curb exists at the southern terminus).

<u>Title 15 Changes:</u> Additions to 15.32.080 – No Parking Zones will need to be made to limit parking to one side of Strong Drive. The attached map illustrates a proposal that prohibits parking on the west side of the northern section of Strong Drive and the east side of the southern section of Strong Drive. This proposal maximizes on-street parking capacity while providing sufficient space for truck maneuverability and improved sight lines at driveway access points.

Schedule M, No Parking Zones				
Street	From	То	Side of Street	Time of Restrict.
Strong Dr	W Allen St	~1,140' south of W Allen St	West	Any Time
Strong Dr	~1,100' south of W Allen St	~2,330' south of W Allen St	East	Any Time

Recommendation:

Staff recommends that the Commission forward the Title 15 changes to Council with a positive recommendation.







On-street parking on both sides of the road

Sponsor's memo

From: Greg Alexander (July 12, 2022) For Members of the Traffic Commission

The intent of the following ordinance is to clear up ambiguity in the law that authorizes the city's Engineering Department to regulate closures within the city's right-of-way. The administration has taken the position that the B-line is not right-of-way, and therefore not subject to the regulations in Chapter 12.08 (Use of Right-of-way) within Title 12 (Streets, Sidewalks, and Storm Sewers), and therefore Parks Department can close the B-line without oversight. Due to this assessment, the citizens of Bloomington are harmed when they use nonautomobile transportation, as Parks does not have the necessary transportation engineering expertise to competently manage closures of the B-line.

It is important that all transportation facilities are managed according to appropriate engineering practices. Indiana state law requires that only engineers can perform this function. City code already provides for the Engineering Department to perform this oversight, all that is needed is for the administration to admit that the B-line is right-of-way.

The proposed ordinance simply takes the definition of "Right-of-way" from another chapter within Title 12 (Chapter 12.24, Trees and Flora) and inserts it into Chapter 12.08. It attempts to remove the ambiguity which has allowed the administration to use an alternative definition of right-of-way which excludes non-automobile transportation, by clarifying that all land which is open to the public for transportation use meets the definition of right-of-way.

It is my hope that the Traffic Commission will endorse this ordinance, which could then go before the City Council for consideration and possible adoption.

ORDINANCE

TO AMEND TITLE 12 OF BLOOMINGTON CODE, ENTITLED "STREETS, SIDEWALKS, AND STORM SEWERS" TO DEFINE "RIGHT-OF-WAY"

- WHEREAS, Many engineering decisions affecting pedestrian and bicycle transportation infrastructure, including the decision of how to design closures and detours, are currently being made by Parks staff without engineering qualifications or oversight.
- WHEREAS, The city's Engineering Department has existing legal mechanisms in place to make some of these decisions properly, but aren't using them because the administration has determined that the B-line, though transportation infrastructure, is not "right-of-way."

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COMMON COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BLOOMINGTON, MONROE COUNTY, INDIANA, THAT:

SECTION 1. Chapter 12.08 of the Bloomington Municipal Code, entitled "Use of the Right-of-way" is hereby amended to insert a new section 12.08.001 - Definitions, which shall read as follows:

Whenever in this chapter the following words are used, they shall have the meanings respectively ascribed to them in this section. When not inconsistent with the context, words used in the present tense include the future tense, words in the singular number include the plural number, and words in the plural number include the singular number. The term "shall" is always mandatory and not merely directory. Terms not defined in this section shall have the meanings customarily assigned to them.

"Right-of-way" means a strip of land reserved for, occupied, or intended to be occupied by transportation facilities, public utilities or other special public uses. Right-of-way may be held in the form of easement or fee.

SYNOPSIS

This ordinance amends Chapter 12.08 of the Bloomington Municipal Code entitled "Use of the Right-of-way" in order to provide a definition of "right-of-way." The definition provided is the same definition that already exists in Chapter 12.24 of the Bloomington Municipal Code entitled "Trees and Flora."