

MEETING MINUTES
Bloomington Common Council
Sidewalk Committee

Clerk/Council Library, Suite 110
Bloomington City Hall, 401 North Morton Street, Bloomington, Indiana
May 2, 2018

The meeting was called to order at 12:02 p.m.

Committee Members present: Dorothy Granger, Dave Rollo, Jim Sims, Chris Sturbaum (arrived at 12:32pm)

Members Absent: None

Staff present: Scott Robinson (Assistant Director, Planning and Transportation), Steve Cotter (Natural Resources Manager), Roy Aten (Senior Project Manager), Andrew Cibor (Transportation and Traffic Engineer), Jane Fleig (Utilities Engineer), Dan Sherman (Council Attorney/Administrator), Stephen Lucas (Chief Deputy Clerk),

1. Attendance and Agenda Summation

Sherman summarized the agenda.

2. Evaluation of Old and New Proposed Projects

Cibor provided cost estimates for projects requested by the committee at its previous meeting. He first reviewed the potential project along Graham Drive. He emphasized the cost estimate was very rough due to the significant size of the project along with the many possible design variables. He said design costs could be \$175,000 and construction costs could be \$900,000. He said the cost to acquire the necessary right-of-way would depend on whether the city turned the road into a one-way street. Aten explained that some of the high cost was due to storm sewer work that would need to be completed.

Granger asked if the project would cost less if Graham Drive were turned into a one-way street. Aten said yes. Granger asked if it flooded along the street. Fleig said she was not aware of any flooding.

Rollo asked if the sidewalk would be constructed on only one side of the street. Aten said yes, in order to keep costs lower. Robinson pointed out that the estimate was put together assuming the sidewalk would be located on the north side of Graham Drive, despite the fact that Bloomington Transit stops were located on the south side of the road. Cibor said bus routes might be altered anyway if the street were turned into a one-way street. Aten explained there were a number of variables yet to be determined that would impact the cost, which was why it was such a rough estimate. He said that the project could be constructed in phases, which might reduce cost. He said that phasing might become difficult if the road were converted to a one-way street.

Rollo asked if there were any other funding sources that could help with the project. Cibor said Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds could be another potential funding source, but there was no guarantee that funding would be available. Rollo asked whether Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) funds might be available. Cibor said those funds might be available in the future but he believed that MPO funding had been programmed out for the next four years.

Sherman asked about the potential pedestrian usage for the project. Cibor said it was a bus corridor. He believed there was some pedestrian usage already and thought a sidewalk would increase such usage. Robinson said that there was a church and the site of a future park nearby. Rollo pointed out that there were portions of sidewalk built on Coolidge Drive, just one block north of Graham Drive. Sims asked how switching Graham Drive to a one-way street would impact the area and its traffic flow. Cibor said he was assuming that traffic on such a one-way street would be east-bound traffic. He said such a switch could impact Bloomington Transit's routes. He said some of the neighbors had expressed concerns about only being able to get out of the neighborhood in one direction. Sims asked what the neighborhood preferred. Cibor said the neighborhood had expressed a desire to have an improved level of comfort while walking on the street. He said there had not been a strong push to make Graham Drive a one-way street and that traffic-calming devices might be more appropriate.

Cibor next reviewed the proposed project on East 10th Street from Deckard Drive to Russell Road. Cibor said the project would be a continuation of another project currently under construction. He estimated the project would cost \$20,000 for design and \$100,000 for construction. He noted that there had been a significant investment in sidewalks in the nearby neighborhood. He thought the project might be a bit of a duplication.

Rollo asked if there was a utility easement where the project would be located. Aten said there was Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) right-of-way, so INDOT would need to issue a permit to the city for any work. Rollo asked if the design for the project included a grass buffer. Aten said yes. Aten also said there were some berms in the way and that some retaining walls would be required.

Cibor next reviewed the proposed project on 3rd Street from Walker Street to the Dillon apartment complex. He estimated construction would cost \$40,000 and said the design could be completed either by the planning and transportation department (Planning) or as part of a nearby project on Adams Street. He said the big question was whether the city already had sufficient right-of-way to build the sidewalk. He said there would need to be some research completed to figure out if additional right-of-way would be needed.

Granger asked when the Adams Street project would be completed. Cibor said it was in design development, with a goal of bidding it out by the end of 2018 and having it constructed in 2019.

Rollo asked whether the \$40,000 construction estimate included the cost of acquiring right-of-way. Cibor said it did not. Aten said the cost of acquiring right-of-way might triple the cost of the project. Rollo noted that the property in question already had a paved service adjacent to the road. Aten explained that the paved area was considered parking. Sherman suggested looking into whether the property owner had complied with code regarding sidewalk installation requirements in the past. Rollo asked if the owner could be compelled to install sidewalks. Aten said he would have to have the legal department research it.

Cibor next reviewed the proposed project along South Maxwell Street from Short Street to Miller Drive. Cibor noted that the estimates were for a sidewalk on the west side of the road to connect missing pieces. He estimated design would cost \$15,000 and construction would cost \$80,000. He said the project would not need additional storm features.

Rollo asked for the status of a nearby planned unit development (PUD). Cibor said the PUD was in front of the Plan Commission. Rollo asked if the developer of the PUD could be required to help with the installation of the sidewalks. Cibor said that was a possibility. Granger asked whether there would be any additional right-of-way needed. Aten thought the project could fit into existing right-of-way but said there would need to be a survey. He said the estimate provided did not include the cost for any additional right-of-way that might be needed. Granger asked for a cost estimate assuming the PUD developer could help by extending the existing sidewalk to the north.

Sherman directed the committee's attention to the project on South Mitchell Street and the possible contributions from the utilities department for stormwater improvements. He reminded the committee that the stormwater component of the project was estimated to cost \$45,000 but that utilities only had \$10,000 budgeted toward the project. Fleig said she had consulted with department director Vic Kelson and utilities was comfortable with paying for all stormwater improvements for the project.

Granger wondered if neighbors were set on installing a sidewalk on Graham Drive or if filling in gaps in the sidewalk on Coolidge Drive would appease people.

Sturbaum asked for an estimate of the cost if Graham Drive were converted to a one-way street. Cibor said the rough estimate was \$900,000 for construction. Sturbaum asked if there would be any savings if the sidewalk were built within existing right-of-way. He thought it might not take as much grading and excavation. Cibor said that was a possibility. He said engineering cost estimate was \$175,000, which would be refined as the project progressed. Sturbaum asked why there would be an engineering cost if the sidewalk were built using existing roadway. Cibor said there would need to be a lot of research regarding impacts to driveways, drainage, and stormwater. He said curbs would need to be installed and the length of the project would be almost 2,000 feet. He reiterated they were rough estimates.

Sturbaum asked about the possibility of painting a bicycle lane and using bollards on the existing roadway. Cibor said that would be a different project than the one he quoted. Sturbaum said it might bring the project price from impossible to affordable. Cibor said Sturbaum's idea was different than what he had considered. He said there would be parking impacts that would need to be considered. Sims asked what sort of resident input had been gathered on the matter, other than one neighborhood meeting that had been held. Sturbaum said there was work still to be done to get more feedback from nearby residents. Rollo clarified that painting a bicycle lane with bollards would require that the street become one-way. Sims asked how that would impact Bloomington Transit. Sturbaum said the buses only went in one direction along the street. He said one reason to address the area was to make it safer for people waiting for the bus. Rollo suggested talking to Transit about putting in a shelter at the stops along Graham Drive. Sturbaum recognized there were more discussions that needed to happen before the project could take shape, but he wanted to make sure it was a possibility the committee was considering. He asked for an estimate for the bicycle lane/bollard idea. Rollo thought the neighbors might not like losing parking. Sturbaum thought they would still be able to park on the road.

Granger suggested that the committee fund the projects on South Mitchell Street and South Maxwell Street. She also asked for an estimate of the cost to install a bicycle path and bollards on Graham Drive as suggested by Sturbaum.

Sturbaum asked whether the temporary traffic calming devices that were to be installed on Graham Drive would be paid for by Planning. Cibor said there were plans to install speed cushions on Graham Drive. He said that different temporary devices could come from either Planning or the Public Works department. He cautioned that city staff had other ongoing traffic projects that could impact their availability.

Rollo clarified that Granger was proposing to fund the South Mitchell Street project for \$153,000 and the South Maxwell Street project. Sherman asked how much funding Granger was proposing for the South Maxwell Street project. Granger said she wanted a new estimate for the project under the assumption that the PUD developer would be able to contribute to the sidewalk work. She suggested provisionally allocating \$75,000 for the project. Sims asked if the design cost of the project would also go down. Cibor said the design cost could be reduced a little. He noted it would be difficult to get the project both designed and constructed in 2018. He said that was true for any project that was not already designed. Granger asked how much the Walnut Street and Mitchell Street projects would cost. Sherman said they would cost \$216,000 total. Robinson suggested removing the construction cost for the Maxwell Street project from the provisional allocations, leaving \$15,000 for the design cost of the project. Sherman noted doing so would bring the total preliminary allocations to \$231,000. Granger asked to add \$20,000 for the design of the Moores Pike Crossing at Clarizz project.

3. Traffic-Calming

Granger asked how much the committee normally spent on traffic calming. Sherman said it depended, but typically \$15,000 to \$25,000.

Sturbaum wondered whether the committee should set aside funds for the potential traffic calming that might take place on Graham Drive if the neighborhood decided to ask that the road be turned into a one-way street. Cibor said that was a tough question to answer. He said Planning already had plans to place speed humps on Graham Drive. He thought that turning the street into a one-way street needed more vetting with the neighborhood before committing funds. Robinson said staff had considered a temporary one-way street in another location, but it had become cost-prohibitive. Sturbaum said he would be willing to spend some money to see if the problem on Graham Drive could be solved for less than the \$900,000 it would take to install sidewalks all along the road. Rollo said that Sturbaum's suggestion was intriguing but he thought the committee should not spend funds on signage. He thought more research and conversation was required before allocating any money for the project. Sturbaum said it was a good opportunity to make a big impact with a relatively small amount of money. Granger thought that the issue was more complicated and that there was more work to be done.

Granger asked how much traffic calming would cost at College Mall Road and Covenanter Drive. Cibor said the Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Commission had been looking at that intersection as a result of a recent accident. He said there was not an easy or obvious traffic-calming solution that could be implemented that would have prevented the accident. Rollo asked if it would be premature to allocate money to traffic calming at that location. Cibor said there were things that could be explored to ensure the intersection was as safe as possible, such as refreshing the crosswalk paint or updating the signal technology. He said there were not obvious physical improvements that would help the area.

Granger asked whether crosswalks on Kinser Pike would be helpful. Sherman asked staff to comment about whether traffic calming improvements might tie into other work being done in the area. Cibor said that there would be pavement markings installed as part of the work the city was already doing near Kinser Pike and Colonial Crest Apartments. Sherman asked if there were similar plans at the Kinser Pike and Gourley Pike intersection. Cibor said he was not aware of any similar plans at that location. Granger said she would like to see a painted crosswalk at the bus stop near Gourley Pike. Cibor said he could follow up with the committee to confirm the city's plans for the area.

Sherman asked whether the committee or staff wanted to address West Allen Street between Strong Drive and Adams Street. Cibor said the city had received some concerns from residents about speeds on Allen Street. He said speeds were high on the street and there were some bus stops and limited sidewalks in the area. He said it was a challenging corridor with real concerns and no easy, obvious solutions. He thought it could use some more attention. Rollo asked if speed tables would be appropriate. Cibor said those were an option. Granger asked if there were sidewalks along the street. Cibor said there were some. Sherman asked if he should add the location to the traffic calming list. Granger said yes.

Granger noted there had been \$251,000 provisionally allocated. Rollo suggested allocating \$81,000 to the design and construction of the Moores Pike Crossing at Clarizz project and looking to alternate funding sources to pay for the balance of the cost. Cibor said that was a possibility and that the project could potentially be designed and constructed in 2018. Aten noted that the estimate for the project reflected the price of one of four potential designs of the project.

Sherman asked if there was any additional information that would help the committee make its decisions. Granger asked for a better estimate for the project on South Maxwell Street. She also wondered if Cibor would be able to find another funding source to help pay for the Moores Pike Crossing at Clarizz project. Cibor said he would look into it. Cibor also asked if the committee could prioritize the projects it chose in case funding fell through or costs were higher than expected. Aten echoed that sentiment and also asked whether any extra funds available, perhaps due to lower-than-expected costs, could be applied to the Moores Pike Crossing at Clarizz project. Granger said that would work. Granger also asked for more information about the possible solutions for Graham Drive. She thought that would entail more conversations with the neighborhood.

Sturbaum asked if committee members were committed to funding the projects on Mitchell Street and Walnut Street. All committee members agreed they were. The committee suggested that staff could proceed with those projects.

4. Schedule Future Meetings

The committee scheduled its next meeting for May 14, 2018 at 12 noon.

5. Minutes

There were no minutes approved at the meeting.

6. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 1:30 p.m.