

CITY OF BLOOMINGTON



TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION Meeting Minutes

July 21, 2025 @ 5:30 p.m.

Commissioner:	Term:	Appointed by:
Rick Coppock	07/01/2025 - 07/01/2027	Board of Public Works
John Connell	03/25/2025 - 03/25/2027	Public Transportation Corporation (BT)
Stephen Volan	06/05/2025 - 1/31/2027	Common Council
Brian Drummy	06/05/2025 - 1/31/2027	Common Council
Matt Flaherty	1/1/2024 - 12/31/2027	Council Ex-Officio
Lesley Davis	05/20/2025 - 1/31/2027	Mayor
Mark Stosberg	06/09/2025 - 05/09/2027	Plan Commission

In-person:

City Hall, 401 N. Morton St.
Common Council
Chambers, Room #115

Virtual:

<https://bton.in/TCmeet>
Zoom Meeting ID:
635 944 1221
Passcode: COBPT

**Submit Public
Comment:**

[https://bton.in/
TCpcf](https://bton.in/TCpcf)



Meeting Minutes

A meeting of the City of Bloomington Transportation Commission was held in City Council Chambers at 401 N Morton Street in Room #115 on July 21, 2025 at 5:30 PM. A virtual room was simultaneously hosted on Zoom at the following link:

<https://bton.in/TCmeet> [Zoom Meeting ID: 635 944 1221; Passcode: COBPT]. The meeting was presented by staff member Ryan Robling.

ROLL CALL

In-person: Rick Coppock
John Connell
Stephen Volan
Brian Drummy
Mark Stosberg

Virtual: Lesley Davis

Absent: Matt Flaherty

City Staff: Ryan Robling
Iris Bull
Andrew Cibor

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

❖ Adopt a chair and vice chair for the Transportation Commission

Stosberg made a motion to elect Volan as chair. Connell seconded the motion.

The motion passed 6-0.

Volan made a motion to elect Stosberg as vice-chair. Connell seconded the motion.

The motion passed 6-0.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

❖ Approve meeting minutes from June 16, 2025

Connell made a motion to adopt meeting minutes. Stosberg seconded the motion.

Volan noted that some names may have been misspelled in the presented draft.

The motion passed 5-0-1. Coppock abstained.

REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

- ❖ **Volan made a report on the resignation of board member Barbara McKinney, noting two current vacancies on the board**
- ❖ **Cibor presented conflict of interest forms provided by the City of Bloomington Legal Department**

Staff requested that commission members review packet materials and return conflict of interest forms within 2 weeks or by the next scheduled meeting.

Davis asked if members should characterize existing relationships between the City and their employer or company as a conflict of interest, even if the member does not directly benefit. For example, the company Davis works for received a grant from a City program.

Cibor offered the opinion that such a relationship would not constitute a formal conflict of interest, but also clarified that members should describe those sorts of details on the form for the benefit of the Legal Department's review process.

Volan asked a clarifying question in response. Given the broad nature of topics that the Commission may review, and in the worst case scenario where Legal decides that the example Davis provided does constitute a conflict of interest, would direct Davis to recuse themselves from a particular decision, or would Davis recuse themselves from the Commission?

Cibor offered the opinion that Davis would only recuse themselves from a particular decision, but also clarified that it would be Legal's decision to make in either case.

Members may consult with commission staff for guidance on how to fill out the forms.

❖ **Title 15 Update & 180 Day Orders**

Cibor presented a summary of Title 15 in terms of its scope and function in municipal code. Cibor clarified the relevance of Title 15 and Title 12 to Commission activities. Cibor also briefly mentioned an on-going inquiry led by

the Legal Department to investigate whether or not Title 15 should authorize City Council to make changes to transportation infrastructure.

Cibor contextualized 180 Day Orders as a provision of authority granted by Title 15 for the City Engineer to make temporary or experimental changes to traffic regulations. Historically, 180 Day Orders have been used to direct City Council action, such that permanent changes may be formalized before the Order expires. Sometimes Orders have been extended.

In the past, Cibor presented reports on 180 Day Orders at Traffic Commission meetings. Given the 6 month delay in organizing the first Transportation Commission meeting, Cibor has a long list of Orders to report on, but in the future he expects reports of this nature to be much shorter.

Cibor recited 180 Day Orders documentation in sequence as they were presented in the packet.

Drummy asked what would happen at the end of 180 days if the Orders presented were not acted upon by City Council.

Cibor clarified that if he is unable to present these Orders to City Council before they expire, he will likely renew and extend them for another 180 days. Given the ongoing inquiry by Legal about whether or not City Council should make changes to transportation infrastructure, it is possible that inquiry will not be resolved by the time the Orders are set to expire.

Drummy asked if the inquiry was about whether or not City Council should make such decisions, or if such decisions should be made by the Engineering Department.

Cibor clarified that the inquiry is organized around an investigation of practices that may be codified by State statutes.

Volan asked about Staff's vision for how the Transportation Commission should consider 180 Day Orders. What do they think the Commission's role should be?

Cibor clarified that the presentation of Orders was an outcome of not having a functioning Commission. In the future, actions that may result in 180 Day Orders would come before the Transportation Commission in a preliminary fashion so that the Commission has an opportunity to weigh in on an Order before it is potentially issued.

Stosberg asked for confirmation that Cibor is describing the Commission as operating in an advisory capacity to the City Engineer. Cibor affirms Stosberg's understanding.

Volan asked for clarification on the possible options available to the City Engineer. One being to continue City Council's role and involvement in the administration of Title 15.

Volan provided some historical context for the question, remarking on "omni-bus" style ordinances sent to City Council by Public Works that described something like 50 or 60 changes to stop signs that had been changed by 90 Day or 180 Day Orders. He recollected that City Council perceived the ordinances, at times, to be onerous for their review, and that the decisions themselves felt trivial or administerial.

Cibor responded that the issues at hand in these presented cases or examples were different but ultimately related.

Volan asked if Staff were considering the possibility that City Council would delegate decision-making to a lesser body, such as Transportation Commission, as an alternative venue for hearing proposals related to traffic infrastructure.

Cibor clarified that while such a possibility as Volan describes exists, he is mindful that the inquiry in question is a legal one and that he cannot speculate how the outcome of the inquiry will be.

Volan asked if there was an attorney assigned to support the Transportation Commission. Cibor clarified that Aleksandrina Pratt is assigned to review Title 15 changes and that she could attend a future commission meeting upon request.

Volan asked if Cibor was planning to bring 180 Day Orders to future Transportation Commission meetings for member review before the Orders expire. Cibor clarified that he does not plan to bring the Orders forward to future meetings in part because they are currently in place, and several of them have received significant outside input. The Engineering Department's preference is to avoid repetitive changing of traffic infrastructure.

Volan asked for clarification about whether or not City Council approved the 180 Day Orders. Cibor clarified that it is not clear yet whether approving the Orders is their decision to make. To date, the Orders have not been taken to City Council.

Volan asked if future Orders will be brought before the Commission before they are implemented. Cibor clarified that it would be likely, and that other items on the evening's agenda may become 180 Day Orders in the future. Cibor also acknowledged that the situation on 7th St. involving stop signs was unique and that, depending on how the legal inquiry resolves, he may bring that specific Order back as an item for a future commission meeting.

❖ **N Walnut Street & Blue Ridge**

Cibor provided a status update on a traffic investigation that was prompted by the now-disbanded Traffic Commission. The status update was warranted

because it was for an item that was reviewed during the last Traffic Commission meeting, the minutes of which were never approved and archived.

The item in question was a traffic inquiry brought by residents of the Blue Ridge neighborhood. With the support of a petition and signatures from other neighborhood residents, representatives from the Blue Ridge neighborhood expressed concerns around roadway speeding, neighborhood access via turn lanes, and vehicular crashes and near-misses related therein. Traffic Commission members encouraged staff to follow up and investigate strategies for remediating the stated concerns.

Cibor reported that during investigations, staff identified a need for the resurfacing of N Walnut St. from the Bypass to Old 37. Staff took the opportunity to incorporate safety improvements into a project necessary for the road's ongoing maintenance.

Cibor described several improvements. In response to resident's requests, a passing lane was eliminated in favor of a new dedicated left turn lane for neighborhood access.

Staff have been in contact with neighborhood residents about the changes. After construction, Engineering will continue to conduct traffic investigations in the area to evaluate the impact of the changes. Cibor also remarked that over the course of discussions with residents, the topic of white lines along the road and their use arose. Engineering was asked if white lines that delineate the road's shoulder—that may be used by bikes, for example—may be used for passing or turning. When there is a white solid line, Cibor clarified, vehicles are not permitted to use the road shoulder for passing other cars. However, the white line may be crossed to access driveways or to turn into an intersection.

Volan acknowledged that Cibor's report was intended to share knowledge. Volan also asked if members should expect to approve a project like this in the future. Cibor clarified in the affirmative that the Commission should be kept up to date on staff progress before a project moves to implementation. Robling clarified moving forward this would be referred to as a Transportation Inquiry, as opposed to a Traffic Inquiry.

Volan reviewed Commission rules for public comment.

James Ferguson was acknowledged for public comment in-person. Ferguson clarified that the petition garnered 117 signatures and included local businesses near the neighborhood. Ferguson acknowledged the Engineering department for their participation in the project. Ferguson raised 3 concerns that were not addressed by the final project plan. First, a traffic signal was not installed. Second, a dedicated right-turn lane into the neighborhood that would share space

with an existing bike lane (when driving north) was not installed. Third, the left-turn lane that was installed to accommodate traffic driving south into the neighborhood was not designed to also support left-turns into the nearby chiropractic center. Ferguson requested additional attention to remediate concerns related to these decisions.

Chris Sturbaum was acknowledged for public comment online. Sturbaum raised questions about the advisory capacity of the Commission, noting language involving the word “approve” in Ordinance 2025-04.

Carole Canfield was acknowledged for public comment online. Canfield expressed concern as a Bluefield resident that there is not a safe way to exit the neighborhood to drive south on N Walnut St. Canfield expressed concern that reducing traffic to a single lane will exacerbate traffic congestion on Game Days.

Paul Rousseau was acknowledged for public comment online. Rousseau expressed concern for the prevalence of speeding on local roads. Rousseau expressed concern that the City has come to rely upon engineering solutions for a behavioral issue. Rousseau expressed the belief that someone should do more to enforce speed limits.

David Hoff was acknowledged for public comment in-person. As a former member of Traffic Commission, Hoff recalled that plans were often brought to meetings as final products, and that members seldom felt empowered to make substantive changes or suggestions to plans. Hoff reiterated Sturbaum’s question about the Transportation Commissions’s authority to issue approvals. Hoff recalled that the issue was discussed during the December City Council meeting, and that the ability to issue approvals would have necessitated a change to municipal code. Hoff expressed hope that the Transportation Commission would be involved in planning phases earlier in the development process.

Coppock directed a question to Cibor. Would the Engineering department continue to monitor the Blue Ridge intersection and evaluate the need for a traffic signal in the future? Cibor responded in the affirmative, stating that the Engineering Department relies on data collected before and after implemented changes to evaluate the efficacy of the Department’s decisions. Cibor clarified the qualifying criteria for installing traffic signals.

❖ **Bird’s New e-scooter/e-bike License Application**

Jeffery Jackson provided a personal career summary and a description of the Transportation Demand Manager role for the City of Bloomington. Jackson clarified that while the Board of Public Works will ultimately make decisions related to the e-Scooter and e-Bike licensing program, staff in the Economic and Sustainability Department believe the Commission should be kept apprised of the program and other activities or staff proposals that may affect it. For

example, Staff has been discussing the possibility of amending [Ordinance 19-09](#) to allow for the competitive selection of e-Scooter operators through a Request For Proposal (RFP) process.

Drummy directed a question to Jackson about vendors ability to geofence sidewalks to prevent the misuse of devices in unpermitted areas. Jackson replied that geofencing is employed to some degree for corrals in the downtown area, but that more information could be solicited from the vendors to determine the extent to which geofencing could be employed.

Stosberg interjected into the discussion as an expert on geofencing technology. Stosberg clarified that there are technical challenges that make it difficult for the geofencing technology to be sufficiently precise for the digital enforcement of device use. Jackson further clarified that companies rely on the mobile apps to communicate restrictions on device use (i.e., no use on sidewalks).

Volan asks for clarification on how many e-Scooter/e-Bike companies can operate in Bloomington. Jackson clarified that multiple operators have worked concurrently in the City before, but that the feedback they received from those operators was that the economic market was not sufficiently large enough to accommodate vendor competition. One vendor in particular indicated that they would reapply for a license to operate in Bloomington if the City transitioned to an RFP process.

Volan asked for clarification on the perceived benefit of an RFP process. Jackson identified that reducing the number of operating vendors would improve the efficacy of the uReport system for staff as a way of tracking issues with e-Scooters and e-Bikes. Jackson also characterized the current system as a passive deterrent for operators who don't want to be one of a multiple operating in the city.

Jackson reported that discussions to change municipal code began last year, and the current goal for ESD is to finalize a decision on changes by July 2026, when Bird's license expires.

Volan asked for clarification that proposed changes to Ordinance 19-09 will come before the Transportation Commission in the future. Jackson affirmed that commitment. Jackson also clarified that the Transportation Management Plan is due for an update and that the current draft is likely to generate several transportation-related policy changes. As such, Jackson would prefer the Transportation Commission review and provide input on those proposals.

CASES (PETITIONS, RESOLUTIONS, ETC.)

❖ **Resolution to Propose a Revised Set of Rules and Call Them “Bylaws”**

❖ **Amendment 1 to Resolution TC-R-25-01: Article IV(B)(3) - Case Numbers**

Volan commented no objection to the proposed amendment, characterizing the amendment as one that simplifies language in the proposed Bylaws.

Stosberg called for votes on the adoption of Amendment 1.

The amendment passed 6-0.

❖ **Amendment 2 to Resolution TC-R-25-01: Article VI(B) - Time Limit on Presentations (Planning Sessions)**

Robling expressed concern on behalf of Staff that imposing time limits on a type of presentation that has not occurred yet will have a negative impact on Staff performance by prioritizing the speed of a presentation over the quality its content.

❖ **Amendment 2a to Resolution TC-R-25-01: Article VI(B) - Time Limit on Presentations (Planning Sessions)**

Volan expressed a lack of familiarity with the presentation mode as described and with the function of steering committees as a State requirement for major transportation projects. Robling clarified that Federal granting programs typically require such steering committees, but that this convention also follows from the professional practice of Urban Planning. Volan commented that the proposed mode appears to directly align with the way committee meetings are discussed in Robert’s Rules of Order.

Robling expressed Staff preference for a change to the overall meeting time instead of a change to the presentation time, given the expectation that Planning Sessions will be structured as conversations.

Though it was not formally acknowledged as such, Volan expressed a desire to withdraw the proposed amendment to Amendment 2 for discussion at a later date.

No action was taken on Amendment 2a (pgs 101-102 of Meeting Packet).

Stosberg commented on the experience of learning more about meeting formats since the initial proposal set forth in Amendment 2. As the author of Amendment 2, Stosberg called for the withdrawal of the proposal.

No action was taken on Amendment 2.

❖ **Amendment 3 to Resolution TC-R-25-01: Article VII (B) - Time Limits**

Robling reiterated a general concern on behalf of Staff over the implementation of time limits without a context-specific precedent. Citing existing limits on the length of meetings, Robling expressed that additional time limitations put upon Staff may needlessly compromise the communication process with Commissioners.

Drummy expressed a preference for making a rule when a rule seems to become necessary.

Citing experiences as a City Council member, Volan expressed a preference for anticipating the need for a rule based on past experiences of public meetings. Volan observed that when elected officials have the discretion to continue a meeting, they always prefer to do so instead of ending it and scheduling additional meetings. Volan cited agreement with Staff over the adoption of a hard limit on the duration of meetings. Volan cited the proposed limitation on Staff time as a demonstration of respect for members of the public, who are similarly limited in their speech. Volan expressed a preference for having rules to suspend than having no rules in place at all.

Coppock expressed general agreement with Volan's comments.

Drummy asked for clarification on whether or not the 3 minute limit would apply to public comment during the discussion of an Amendment or Resolution.

Volan affirmed that the 3 minute rule would apply.

Drummy asked for clarification on whether or not the limit applies when someone starts talking, and/or whether or not there is a 2 instance limit on the opportunities to speak.

Volan acknowledged that the system can be confusing. Volan clarified that members of the public get 1 opportunity to speak for 3 minutes. After public comment is heard, and after a petitioner has responded to questions, Commissioners get the privilege of speaking 2 times. Volan cited Robert's Rules as the adopted source for this rule.

Stosberg called for votes on the adoption of Amendment 3.

The amendment failed 2-3-1. Drummy and Stosberg voted yes. Davis abstained.

❖ **Amendment 4 to Resolution TC-R-25-01: Article VII (C) - Staff Recognition**

As was discussed for Amendment 3, Robling cited the same concern for time limits on behalf of Staff.

Volan expressed sympathy for Staff response. Volan clarified explicit steps involved in the proposed rules for hearing cases.

Drummy requested clarification on how the rules permit the extension of a speaker's allocated time. Volan emphasized existing rule language that enables the Chair to make such decisions at their discretion. Volan suggested workshopping additional language to meet the expressed needs of Staff while preserving Commissioner's ability to reign in the length of meetings. Volan observed that a "no" vote on the amendment would not necessarily signal a desire to retire the discussion at hand altogether.

Stosberg called for votes on the adoption of Amendment 4.

The amendment failed 0-6.

❖ **Amendment 5 to Resolution TC-R-25-01: Article VII (D) - Posting of Meeting Rules**

Robling observed Staff's preference for rules for public comment to be read in advance of each public comment period, but Robling also cited Staff's recognition that the rules as originally presented could be abridged for the sake of brevity. Robling observed that Staff prefer that the decision to read the rules for public comment not be at the discretion of the Chair.

Connell requested clarification on whether or not the rules would be read once during a meeting or multiple times. Robling clarified that the intent is to read the rules before each session of public comment (i.e., such as when people are lining up at a podium to speak), so potentially the rules would be read multiple times during a meeting.

Stosberg requested clarification on whether or not the expectation would be, for example, to read the rules during each public comment period that occurs for each amendment item. Robling clarified that yes, as written the rules would unintentionally provision the reading of rules as described. However, Robling observed that Staff would be willing to amend this rule in the future to clarify that the reading of rules occur before each case on the agenda.

Volan expressed no objection to the amendment but also noted that the rules as written are clunky.

Drummy expressed concern that reading the rules as provisioned will waste time.

Volan asked Staff for clarification on the revision of “may” to “shall” in the reading of the rules for public comment. Robling clarified Staff’s intent to necessitate the reading of the rules, citing prior experiences when would Commissioners always exercise discretion to avoid repeating the rules during a meeting.

Coppock observed that it would be reasonable for members of the public to join a meeting after the first instance of reading the rules, and that provisioning a short reminder of the rules would be mutually beneficial for everyone.

Connell asked about an alternative system whereby the Chair would remind commenters of the rules when a person was speaking improperly. Volan replied that such a system could create a situation whereby individuals feel singled out by the Chair. Volan noted that provisioning the reading before each case would create a situation whereby no one could reasonably feel targeted by act of observing the rules.

Stosberg called for votes on the adoption of Amendment 5.

The amendment passed 5-1. Drummy voted no.

❖ **Amendment 6 to Resolution TC-R-25-01: Inserts new “ArticleIII(D) - Packet”**

Volan commented on the origin of the amendment language around the construction of packet materials, expressing frustration with the issuance of multiple packets by City Council whenever additions or edits are made to a packet in advance of a meeting.

On behalf of Staff, Robling expressed concurrence with Volan, citing that the proposed method of updating the Packet file online without creating multiple versions is also the preferred filing method for the Board of Zoning and Appeals and Plan Commission. Anecdotally, Staff have not received negative feedback about this system as practiced for those boards and commissions. However, Staff have received or observed negative reactions to the method of creating multiple packets as practiced by City Council and the Board of Public Works.

Bull interjected to add commentary on the process of assembling packets, noting that the process of making packets screen-reader accessible often requires multiple reviews of the document. Bull argued that there is a public benefit to

permitting frequent updates of packet materials before the meeting for that packet actually occurs, and that such a practice may be complimented by the creation of an appendix or other such documentation for materials presented at the meeting. Bull also expressed concern that codifying some details related to how the packet is assembled may unintentionally burden staff in the future.

Volan expressed a willingness to strike the last two sentences of the amendment for Staff's benefit. Volan also expressed concern for ensuring appropriate procedures are followed in the creation and maintenance of public documents. Volan expressed concern that making changes to packets—because they are a public record—may open someone up to accusations of hiding information. Volan asked for Bull's perspective on this concern.

Bull clarified that existing documentation procedures by the City ensure that all Transportation Commission materials are preserved in triplicate. Bull stated that materials posted to Onboard are not representative of documentation held for the commission, and that it would be easy to respond to a public records request for previous versions of a Commission packet.

As amendment author, Volan asked to formally strike the last two sentences from the proposed amendment.

Drummy asked for clarification from Bull on Staff's position of the revised amendment.

Bull affirmed that striking the last two sentences does contribute towards Staff's goals for Commission activities. Bull also clarified that a larger concern remains unaddressed by adopting the amendment; principally, the codification of staff activities. Bull stated that there may be legitimate reasons for publishing a packet a little later than expected, and they observed that there are no enforcement mechanisms in place to uphold the rule itself. Bull commented on the possibility that they will be replaced by someone in the future someday who has a different capacity for meeting the Commission's stated needs.

Volan observed that in the event a packet was not released according to the Commission's adopted rules, a meeting may be cancelled on account of insufficient notice.

Robling observed that striking the last two sentences of the amendment may not be of consequence because the second case on the agenda for the evening is specific to adopting a schedule that includes a packet submission deadline.

Stosberg called for votes on the adoption of Amendment 6.

The amendment failed 2-4. Volan and Davis voted yes.

❖ **Amendment 7 to Resolution TC-R-25-01: Renames and adds to “IV (C) Presentation of Cases”**

Robling expressed support for the amendment on behalf of Staff.

Volan expressed support for Staff, noting that the amendment intends to protect Staff from accusations of inappropriate conduct by members of the public.

Stosberg called for votes on the adoption of Amendment 7.

The amendment passed 6-0.

Volan made a motion to adopt TC-R-25-01 as amended. Drummy seconded the motion.

Volan summarized the Resolution. Robling summarized Staff response included in the packet.

Connell asked for clarification on the proposed change to limits on time for Staff and Commissioners. Robling clarified.

Following the discussion and adoption of amendments, Volan noted that more revisions to the rules are likely to come forth in future meetings.

The motion passed 6-0.

❖ **TC-R-25-02: Resolution to adopt the proposed 2025 Meeting & Deadlines Schedule**

Bull presented the proposed schedule.

Volan called for votes on the adoption of Resolution TC-R-25-02.

The resolution passed 6-0.

❖ **TC-R-25-03: Resolution to adopt the proposed findings and forward to the Common Council a positive recommendation for an installation of an all-way stop at the intersection of E 13th St and N Indiana Ave**

Mike Stewart, Transportation Engineering Analyst, presented a staff report on behalf of the Engineering Department.

Coppock asked about sight distance problems for a stop sign while driving North on Indiana St. Stewart stated that Staff do not anticipate sight distance problems, even while accounting for the overpass that crosses the road. However, Staff have planned to install “Stop Ahead” signs in advance of the intersection between 12th and 13th St. out of an abundance of caution.

Volan asked if there are any plans to narrow the intersection in the future. Stewart denied any knowledge of projects anticipated or planned for the intersection. Stewart also clarified that there are plans to install a crosswalk across Indiana at some point after the installation of the stop signs.

Volan asked if bump outs and neck downs are reserved for opportunistic infrastructure improvements, or if those would be considered as a means of slowing down traffic at this intersection. Stewart clarified that the project was not proposed with the intention of slowing traffic down. Stewart also observed that the existing infrastructure at this intersection is uniquely challenging for someone hoping to implement other traffic calming measures.

Drummy asked a clarifying question about the procedure of implementing an all-way stop, asking if the proposed change is an example of something that may have been achieved with a 180 Day Order earlier this year. Stewart clarified in response that the Department values consistency; Engineering doesn’t want to install a stop sign and then remove a stop sign, as that sort of behavior can contribute to the creation of a disaster. Stewart clarified that a 180 Day Order would not be used if it was believed the stop signs would eventually be removed.

Volan called for votes on the adoption of Resolution TC-R-25-03.

The resolution passed 6-0.

- ❖ **TC-R-25-04: Resolution to adopt the proposed findings and forward to the Common Council a positive recommendation for an installation of an all-way stop at the intersection of N Woodlawn Ave. and E 13th St.**

Stewart presented a staff report on behalf of the Engineering Department.

Drummy asked if the crash count at the intersection warranted the installation of an all-way stop. Stewart affirmed that it did. Drummy asked if the crash count was weighted against traffic volumes. Stewart reported that the evaluative criteria was a total number of crashes. Stewart clarified that the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) provides guidance by way of priority factors for implementing all-way stops, but that the manual does not prescribe or dictate rules for the installation of stop signs.

Stosberg observed that the procedural language related to approval incorporated into the resolution seemed inconsistent with the language that would be appropriate for an advisory group. Volan responded with an observation that all other commission bodies are advisory in nature. Volan noted that the advisory status of the commission does not diminish the significance of its activities.

Robling affirmed Volan's observation, further noting that the language under discussion was not as specific as the language described in the packet materials. Volan clarified the adoption procedure, noting that someone needed to make a motion to adopt Staff findings.

Stosberg made a motion to adopt meeting minutes. Connell seconded the motion.

Volan called for votes on the adoption of Resolution TC-R-25-04.

The resolution passed 6-0.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Jim Ferguson was acknowledged for public comment. Ferguson asked Commissioners to review and consider two proposed turn lanes to control traffic in and out of the Blue Ridge neighborhood. Ferguson expressed concern that the planned traffic control improvements will be insufficient to address safety concerns that residents have repeatedly raised.

STAFF PROPOSALS

Cibor was acknowledged for a description of upcoming topics and issues that commission members should expect to hear more about in the coming months.

Robling was acknowledged for a description of upcoming Safety Week events.

Volan acknowledged interest in Ferguson's request for an inquiry into the situation at Blue Ridge neighborhood. Volan requested clarification from Staff that the subject as described would be an appropriate topic for a transportation inquiry. Robling confirmed that the subject would be appropriate; however, the inquiry has already been conducted by Staff in this situation. Volan replied that the public comment provided by Ferguson suggests the matter warrant additional attention given that the final meeting minutes for Traffic Commission were never approved. Volan observed that Transportation Commission could serve as a forum for publishing those minutes. Volan also observed that the situation may be an opportunity for the Transportation Commission to practice conducting an inquiry. Cibor observed in response that questions were raised

about the Blue Ridge situation, but not in a way for Staff to respond. Cibor also expressed concern that there are other items which have not received any public attention that deserve Commission attention.

Volan requested that City Council move expeditiously to fill the newly-vacant member seat.

Volan requested a master list of all corridor studies planned and ongoing within the City from Staff.

Volan observed the possibility of discussing the format of standing staff reports from specific roles in the City, wherein staff would expect to perform semi-regular updates on various activities.

Volan expressed concern that construction related to the Convention Center was improperly diverting pedestrian traffic. Cibor acknowledged that the Engineering Department was aware of the inconsistencies between permitted traffic control plans and implemented traffic control plans. Stewart affirmed that Staff and contractors were working closely to properly implement a pedestrian diversion, noting that the current disruption was due to the need to construct new infrastructure to accommodate the traffic control plan.

MEETING ADJOURNED.