Bicycle Pedestrian Safety Commission AGENDA

## December 9, 2024, 5:30 P.M.

In-person and virtual hybrid meeting

McCloskey Room, #135

Online link:

https://bloomington.zoom.us/j/6359441221?pwd=bXRYTnNJV2xMbTRLeE00QW9XWnRjQT09

Meeting ID: 635 944 1221 Passcode: COBPT Dial in: +1 301 715 8592

# Meeting Agenda:

- 1. Attendance
- 2. Approval of Minutes November 12, 2024
- 3. New Business
  - a. Infrastructure Project Updates Engineering Department
    - i. Hopewell West Street Improvements
    - ii. E 3<sup>rd</sup> St. Protected Bike Lane Ph. 2
  - b. 2025 Resident-Led Traffic Calming Rubric
    - i. \*Item to be voted on
  - c. Local-Motion Grant Program
    - i. Applicant Presentations
      - Monroe County Public Library
      - Indiana University Student Government
      - Boys and Girls Club of Bloomington
      - My Sister's Closet of Monroe County
    - ii. \*Item to be voted on
- 4. Old Business
- 5. Reports from Commissioners
- 6. Public Comment
- 7. Adjourn

**City Hall** 

401 N. Morton Street • Bloomington, IN 47404 Phone: (812) 349-3423 - Fax: (812) 349-3535 www.bloomington.in.gov e-mail: planning@bloomington.in.gov The City is committed to providing equal access to information. However, despite our efforts, at times, portions of our board and commission packets are not accessible for some individuals. If you encounter difficulties accessing material in this packet, please contact Melissa Hirtzel at hirtzelm@bloomington.in.gov and provide your name, contact information, and a link to or description of the document or web page with which you are having problems.

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

### City Hall

401 N. Morton Street • Bloomington, IN 47404 Phone: (812) 349-3423 - Fax: (812) 349-3535 www.bloomington.in.gov e-mail: planning@bloomington.in.gov

#### Bicycle Pedestrian Safety Commission MINUTES November 12, 5:30 P.M. In-person and virtual hybrid meeting Hooker Room, #245

#### 1. Attendance

City Staff: Hank Duncan, Neil Kopper, Ryan Robling

Commissioners: Jaclyn Ray, Drew Yeager, Ann Edmonds, Rob Danzman absent: Stephanie Hatton Public who spoke: only recorded names of the public who made comments, see below

2. Approval of Minutes - September 9, 2024 Drew moves Rob seconds All in favor: aye Opposed: 0

### 3. New Business

a. S Washington St. Resident-Led Traffic Calming Hank resident-led to create slower traffic, not staff-led, 1st to Grimes has no stop-signs, is a one-way southbound and has a striped bike lane, has parking, 25 ppl turned out to public meeting, then online open comment, 4 out of 5 car drivers are speeding, past 7 yrs there were 8 crashes caused by speed, last year's project on Miller Dr. Is a close comparison 83% speeding reduced to 16% speeding Ann drop in avg daily traffic of 13% Hank margin of error and some ppl take other streets; resident feedback concerns were: speed, visibility, bike lane use Neil 7 speed humps, full width of road, small drainage at side, no gaps in middle Ann into bike lane and parking lanes? Neil correct, because it's one-way we place them 100' in advance of the intersections, so side street drivers can tell what drivers are doing, this is where most of the conflicts occur, regular spacing, also visibility of ppl pulling out of side streets where crashes were so we will restrict 2 parking spaces and also adding 2 parking spaces Drew bike lane will have the speed hump over it? Neil looked at if there should be a gap in bike lane but cars may drive into bike lane in that case to get two wheels off the hump, newer profile so they are not that jarring on a bicycle **Ann** looks like the edge of the hump is in the middle of the bike lane **Neil** talked about that some bike lanes are completely in the hump, the northern few blocks without parking beside bike lane the edge of the speed hump is tapered then goes flat in the bicycle lane Ann it is weird that the parking flips side to side is there a reason? Neil the few blocks where cars are parked on east side was to improve bike lane, further south curb bump-outs made it so we couldn't shift parking to other side Rob any alternatives? Hank the protected bike lanes currently on Lincoln in terms of traffic calming and speed control when compared both streets are the same so that is not doing much to effect actual speeds Ann there are bus stops in this section, cross walk markings at bus stops? Neil we didn't evaluate additional cross walks, worth looking at more broadly Jaciyn neg feedback? **Hank** very close to unanimous consensus landing on this option for the in-person meeting. online feedback saying 'I don't want speed humps' no other options offered, some about adding stop signs, emergency vehicle responses were: fire ok, police not the happiest but understand the needs of the residents on this street Ann transit? Hank slightly more inconvenient but understand the shared goals of safety

Public Comment: Eric Ost: resident-led, how many applications submitted in 2024? also ranking of applications? when traffic count data was collected? and what it showed? could you release data? were the residents north of 1st notified? Hank yes Eric Elm Heights NA was not contacted, did you consider other alternatives like two-way to four-way stops? where were the crashes? and release crash data? has ambulance been consulted? Hank yes, with all projects fire, police, ambulance, no response from ambulance Eric fire and police today? For this project? Hank yes today and previous discussions, they have no concerns Eric 7 speed humps how much does it slow emergency services? 100' in front of intersection to slow drivers but after the speed hump cars accelerate as they approach intersection Ann where data from? Eric visual Ann anecdotal Rob sometimes limited due to driveways **Neil** it is a factor sometimes, not in this case **Eric** could do a raised cross walk? Public transit, how many trips they take? Publish that? Finally what is estimated cost? I would want to ask these questions if I was on this commission Rob cost? Neil \$50k Ann how many crashes and where? Hank 8 speed related crashes in past 7 years, more crashes due to visibility Ann cost/benefit we really want to reduce crashes Hank fatal and severe injury crashes but not specific to resident-led rubric, we look at speed related for these projects Ann sounds like the residents really want it, 8 crashes seems significant, this is a place that has problems Colleen (zoom) I am a resident and requested this traffic-calming

measure, questions about adding additional signage on side-streets saying 'cross traffic does not stop' **Neil** did talk about that, we try to use them in a reserved manner, don't want drivers to learn to pay attn to the sign and not the intersection, you should look for an all-way plaque under the stop sign, sometimes with a crash pattern we can put those in in unique situations **Ann** any further public comment? **Hank** should I answer public questions? **Ann** seems like some data should be posted online **Hank** yes, within 300' of project includes north of 1st **Rob** most of the data related answers are appropriate online, is there a cluster of crashes? **Hank** originally these folks reached out to engineering about the Dodds intersection, engineering forwarded it to me, so Dodds is highlighted, when they reached out to neighbors the concern spanned from 1st to Grimes for residents; 7 total applicants, they were at the top, there are other valid sites but Washington did stick out

Drew motion to approve Rob seconds Ann all in favor aye; any opposed? None (passes unanimously)

### 4. Old Business none

### 5. Reports from Commissioners

**Ann** at RCA Park, MCPL wanted money to put up story boards, did suggest Olcott Park, they did it in RCA park, less affluent area, the boards are up without the stories in them, have we heard from all the other groups? **Hank** yes

Drew IU formed a transportation group, make this easier hopefully

Ann tomorrow's meeting? Rob not much notice Ryan request from council, don't know what the activity is **Drew** when would new commission start? Ryan we are asking for Jan. 1st, council will have to talk about it one more time, Nov. and Dec Ann we can write to council members **Rob** it seems like we could just talk about it, all the commissions and council members together, we need something more formal from our commission to hand to council **Drew** is anyone interested in writing a resolution from BPSC to council? **Hank** earlier this year Ryan and I drafted a letter, you reviewed it, Ann signed it **Ann** we concluded 'we do not support doing this' **Rob** it fell silent afterwards, maybe we are just waiting, seems like we could be more involved in the process **Ann** can merge parking and traffic but not bike-ped **Ryan** Parking wants to merge Traffic and BPSC **Drew** do members of the public attend all three meetings? **Eric** yes, I go to all three sometimes **Ryan** genesis is b/c we had been working on our own proposal, administration released the Novak report and we wanted to get ahead of it **Ann** so we did write a letter, no need for a resolution **Rob** I'm interested in a response and follow-up, I assumed there'd be more communication between council and commissions **Ryan** 6:30 council chambers, another meeting Nov. 20th council meeting SS4A safety action plan to be approved by council, final draft online now **Jaclyn** does it need support? **Ryan** no but attend if you are interested or have comments

6. Public Comment none

7. Adjourn 6:43

# Google Maps



Imagery ©2024 Google, Imagery ©2024 Airbus, Maxar Technologies, Map data ©2024 200 ft



SOUTH ROGERS STREET CROSS SECTION BETWEEN WEST 2<sup>ND</sup> STREET AND WEST 1<sup>ST</sup> STREET



S ROGERS STREET / W 2<sup>ND</sup> STREET INTERSECTION (NOT PART OF THIS PROEJCT – FOR REFERENCE ONLY)



PLAN VIEW OF S ROGERS STREET BETWEEN W  $2^{\rm ND}$  STREET AND W  $1^{\rm ST}$  STREET



# INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION 2024 STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS TO BE USED WITH THIS PLAN SET

	HORIZONTAL SCALE BRIDGE FILE			FILE
F	N.T.S.	N/A		
MINGTON	VERTICAL SCALE	DESI	DESIGNATION	
	N.T.S.	N/A		
NAME:	SURVEY BOOK	SH	HEET	ſS
REET BICYCLE	N/A	1	of	11
IENTS - PH. 2	CONTRACT	PROJECT #		T #
	N/A	N/A		L.



	265	
	-125+00	
	SHEET 4	S EAGLESON AVENUE
F MINGTON	HORIZONTAL SCALE	BRIDGE FILE N/A
MINGTON	VERTICAL SCALE 1"=200'	DESIGNATION N/A
NAME:	SURVEY BOOK	SHEETS
REET BICYCLE	N/A	2 of 11
1ENTS - PH. 2	CONTRACT N/A	PROJECT # N/A
	19/5	





g



FILE: PROTECTED BIKE LANE PLANS.DWG



	A CONTRACTOR OF A CONTRACTOR O	
1 million	The Party of the second	
		369 T
1. 11/2	115 11	2 8 1 8 A B
K	P	files
Karthan Martin		
1		
-	34 8 1 /	
an the stal	The fail	
i all	Part the	1
	122/	1 States and the
VI VI		
11		
	HORIZONTAL SCALE	BRIDGE FILE
F	1'=40'	N/A
MINGTON	VERTICAL SCALE	DESIGNATION
	1"=40'	N/A
NAME:	SURVEY BOOK	SHEETS
	N/A	6 of 11
REET BICYCLE	CONTRACT	PROJECT #
1ENTS - PH. 2	N/A	N/A



Ë

PI OT

CONCRETE MEDIAN

	HORIZONTAL SCALE BRIDGE FIL			FILE
F	1'=10'	N/A		
MINGTON	VERTICAL SCALE	DESI	DESIGNATION	
	1"=10'	N/A		
NAME:	SURVEY BOOK	Sł	HEET	ſS
REET BICYCLE	N/A	7	of	11
1ENTS - PH. 2	CONTRACT	PROJECT #		T #
	N/A	N/A		1

			-		
			PRODUCT INFO	ORMATION	
Product	Size	Color	Weight	Installation Orientation	Required Parts
					THREE (3) 3/8" x 7" lag
				Rounded side facing bike	bolts, THREE (3) 3/8"
TrafficLogix "Cycle Lane"				lane, vertical side facing	washers, and THREE (3)
Traffic Barriers or				vehicle traffic (bolt holes	plastic polypropylene
Approved Equal	29.5" L x 4.75" W x 4" H	Black with White Stripe	10 lbs	on bike lane side)	shields per traffic barrier
Product	Size	Color	Weight	Installation Orientation	Required Parts
Impact Recovery Systems					FOUR (4) 16mm x 3"
"MP2 Post" Black Cap					plastic sleeves, FOUR (4)
Top with Surface Mount					1/2" x 4" lag screws,
Quick Release Base Or		White with Two 3"			FOUR (4) 1-1/4" metal
Approved Equal	36" L x 2.375" Diameter	White Bands	N/A	N/A	washers





_						
Provided by Contractor						
	Lag Bolts, Wa	shers, plastic shie	lds, Hammer			
	Drill, Drill Bits	, Installation Tool	for plastic			
	shields, any o	ther equipment o	r parts			
	required for p	product installation	n per			
r	manufacture	r's recommendation	ons			
	Pro	ovided by Contract	tor			
	Delineator pr	oduct, parts, any o	other			
	equipment re	quired for produc	t installation			
		HORIZONTAL SCALE	BRIDGE FILE			
F		N.T.S.	N/A			
Ν	<b>/INGTON</b>	VERTICAL SCALE	DESIGNATION			
		N.T.S.	N/A			
N	AME:	SURVEY BOOK	SHEETS			
		N/A	8 of 11			
		CONTRACT	PROJECT #			
11	ENTS - PH. 2	N/A	N/A			
			•			



ЫΜ

7:09:07

2024

26,

ber

2

ä

Б

Distance Detween Oigns				
А	В	С		
100 feet	100 feet	100 feet		
350 feet	350 feet	350 feet		
500 feet	500 feet	500 feet		
1,000 feet	1,500 feet	2,640 feet		

peed (S)	Taper Length (L) in feet		
mph or less	$L = \frac{WS^2}{60}$		
mph or more	L= WS		

	HORIZONTAL SCALE	BRID	BRIDGE FILE	
F	N.T.S.	N.T.S. N/A		
MINGTON	VERTICAL SCALE	DESI	DESIGNATION	
	N.T.S.		N/A	
NAME:	SURVEY BOOK	SH	HEET	ſS
REET BICYCLE	N/A	9	of	11
1ENTS - PH. 2	CONTRACT	PROJECT #		T #
	N/A	N/A		



2024

ber

ģ day,

Ë

F

	HORIZONTAL SCALE BRIDGE FILI			FILE
F	N.T.S.	N/A		
MINGTON	VERTICAL SCALE	DESI	DESIGNATION	
	N.T.S.	N/A		
NAME:	SURVEY BOOK	Sł	HEET	ſS
REET BICYCLE	N/A	10	of	11
1ENTS - PH. 2	CONTRACT	PROJECT #		T #
	N/A	N/A		1



ЫΜ

7:09:03

2024

26,

ber

2

Ċ

5

Application Criteria:

**Project Scope:** Project length is subject to staff approval. Generally, proposals should be more than one block and up to about 6 blocks; this can range from about 330 feet to 2,200 feet. Staff will work with applicants during pre-application meetings and determine a logical project length based on intersections, topography, and other factors. Projects generally can be only one street; staff may allow a proposal for two or more streets.

**Road Typology:** The Resident-Led Traffic Calming Process is best suited for streets designated as Neighborhood Residential in the Transportation Plan. Neighborhood Connectors require additional approval of EMS Providers to be eligible for the Resident-Led Traffic Calming program. Staff will work with applicants during the pre-application meeting to determine the road typology, and staff will coordinate with EMS providers to determine the feasibility of traffic calming on Neighborhood Connector streets.

Performance Objective 1.1 (Equity): Census Block Groups\* that have an increased prevalence of vulnerable users. Demographic data is scored relative to all other census block groups within the City.

group	s within the City.				
1.1.1	% of households w/ children under the age of 17 + % of households w/ adults over the age of 65+	Aggregate z values for all listed		.01 x rank of observed z-values [(1-	
1.1.2	% of households w/ people with disabilities	for all listed performance		91) 1, being the lowest performing census block group, 91 being the	
1.1.3	Difference of the highest reported median income – observed median income	objectives		highest] *20 = # of points	
1.1.4	% of households w/o				
	access to a car				
				ncreased prevalence of users	
1.2.1	Highest Walk Potential Sco		1-14	points	
	hexagons which fall at least				
	boundary of the proposed				
	the <u>Bloomington 10- Minut</u>	<u>te Walk Score</u>			
	Rubric				
1.2.2	Does at least 50% of the pr			points	
	area fall on a street that is			Neighborhood Greenway that is part	
	as a Neighborhood Greenw	•		e Priority Network- 1 point	
	Transportation Plan? Is it a	,		Neighborhood Greenway that is NOT	
	is part of the Priority Network?		listed point	as part of the Priority Network – 2	
* Cent	I sus Block Groups: If a consus	block group inclu		ore than a single Census Block	
Group (CBG), the equity scoring shall reflect the percentages in proportion to the area which falls within each zone for an aggregate total to represent the entire project.					
falls w	vithin each zone for an aggre	egate total to repr	esent 1	the entire project.	
				the entire project. ole or part, outlines a border	

the border will be weighed with equal measure between the respective CBGs. Any remaining

portion of the proposed project (which falls does not serve as the border) will earn points in proportion to the number of feet of the proposed project which is entirely contained within the associated CBG.

Performance Objective 2 (Safety): Areas with an increased incidence of crashes and behaviors which are causal in injury. Speed data and crash data is scored relative to the other projects in the applicant pool.

2.1 Spee	d Data	
2.1	% of performance based on Speed/Volume Score* based on data collected within the past two years	<pre># of vehicles 1-5mph &gt; speed limit (1 point)+ # of vehicles 5-6mph &gt; speed limit (2 points)+ # of vehicles 6-10mph &gt; speed limit (3 points)+ # of vehicles 11-15mph &gt; speed limit (4 points)+ = Total Speed/Volume Score Percentile of observed data * 38 points (example, an observed value at the 40<sup>th</sup> percentile would equate to 15.2 points)</pre>
2.2 Crash	n Data	
2.2.1	# of crashes/foot within the proposed traffic calming boundary (not including intersections) within the past 7 years where speed was <b>possibly</b> a contributing factor	0 crashes = 0 points Percentile of observed data * 8 points (example, an observed value at the 30 <sup>th</sup> percentile would equate to 2.4 points [.30 x 8=2.4])
2.2.2	# of crashes/foot within the proposed traffic calming boundary (not including intersections) within the past 7 years where speed was <b>likely</b> a contributing factor	0 crashes = 0 points Percentile of observed data *20 points (example, an observed value at the 60 <sup>th</sup> percentile would equate to 12 points [.60 x 20=12])

Scoring Mechanism/ Weight (Points Possible):

1.	Equity	(18%)

- 2. Demand (16%)
- 3. Safety-Speed (38%)
- 4. Safety- Crashes (28%)

Total	100%

Timeline/ Process and Schedule:

Process Step and Description	2025 Timeline
BPSC releases Resident-Led Traffic Calming Evaluation Methodology	December, 2024
City releases Requests for 2022 Projects	January
Residents submit Letter of Intent + Previous 1 Year Applications	January - March
Pre- Application Meetings	March - April
Application Deadline	April 25
Preliminary Review of Applications	May - June
Send Notifications `	July
Project Initial Public Meeting	August
Project Final Public Meeting	September