

**MEETING MINUTES**  
*Bloomington Common Council*  
*Sidewalk Committee*

**Clerk/Council Library, Suite 110**  
**Bloomington City Hall, 401 North Morton Street, Bloomington, Indiana**  
**May 14, 2018**

The meeting was called to order at 12:04 p.m.

Committee Members present: Dorothy Granger, Dave Rollo, Jim Sims, Chris Sturbaum  
Members Absent: None

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

1. Attendance and Agenda Summation

Sherman summarized the agenda. He reviewed the committee's previous discussions and provisional allocations, which included \$81,000 for the Moores Pike Crossing at Clarizz project, \$63,000 for the S. Walnut Street project, \$153,000 for the Mitchell Street project, and \$15,000 for the S. Maxwell Street project.

2. Continued Discussion of Sidewalk Priorities and Allocations

Sherman asked for a review of the Moores Pike Crossing at Clarizz project and what the \$81,000 that had been provisionally allocated to the project would buy. Cibor said there were a few design options for the project. One option included adding a crosswalk and rapid flashing beacon. Rollo asked if a pedestrian island was an option. Cibor said that was one of the design options but he thought it would be more cost effective to narrow the crossing so that the pedestrian island would be unnecessary. Granger pointed out that the provisional allocation of \$81,000 would leave a \$14,000 shortfall for the project. Cibor thought that if the costs came in as estimated, he would be able to find funds to cover the shortfall through the Alternate Transportation and Greenways funding. Sherman asked which design option would be used if the committee funded the project. Cibor thought the project would consist of an enhanced crossing for pedestrians. Aten pointed out that there was no official design yet. He said the design phase would show which design alternative was best.

Sherman asked for an update on the S. Maxwell Street project. Aten said he had prepared an updated estimate excluding two parcels at the southern end of the project. He said the updated project would cost \$13,000 to design and \$64,000 to construct. Rollo asked what the cost would be to the developer of a nearby planned unit development for the remaining stretch of sidewalk. Aten said he had not looked at that estimate, but he assumed it would be more than the difference between the original estimate and the revised estimate. He said it might cost roughly \$30,000.

Granger asked if the estimate for the S. Walnut Street project was still accurate. Cibor said that was the most recent information available.

Sturbaum addressed possible projects along Graham Drive. He said there would be temporary traffic calming installed, whether Graham Drive remained a two-way street or was converted to a one-way street. Sturbaum noted there would be additional signage costs if it were converted to a one-way street. He said he had walked the neighborhood with residents interested in the one-way option. He thought it was a perfect opportunity to try an experiment that would turn the street into a greenway. He said it was an easy and inexpensive way to try something as the neighborhood was developing. He noted there was another neighborhood meeting coming up.

Granger suggested lowering the amount provisionally allocated to the S. Maxwell Street project to \$13,000. She asked if contributing \$2,000 to Graham Drive traffic calming would help. Cibor said any funding, regardless of which design approach was taken, would be helpful. Rollo asked if there were speed counts for the street. Cibor said there had been counts collected and more would be collected during and after the traffic-calming project. He said speeds were higher than desired.

Sims was concerned that only a few residents were driving the idea of a one-way street. He wanted to make sure that the entire neighborhood was represented and there was neighborhood support for any solution. Sturbaum said that was the purpose for the upcoming neighborhood meeting. Rollo also pointed out that traffic calming projects had a process that included getting neighborhood feedback. Cibor said the city was trying to engage the neighborhood through a variety of methods to get as much feedback as possible.

Granger moved and it was seconded to take \$2,000 provisionally allocated for design of the S. Maxwell Street project design and move it to traffic calming on Graham Drive. The motion was approved by voice vote.

### 3. Traffic-Calming

Sherman asked if the committee wanted to address any other traffic calming projects. Rollo said he thought there were two types of traffic calming projects. One type of project aimed to reduce speeds through the use of speed tables or other methods. Another type aimed to create connectivity between existing sidewalks and pedestrian pathways. Rollo said he preferred to not fund speed tables throughout the city. He only wanted to fund traffic calming projects that had some connection to pedestrians. Rollo asked if there were other funding sources for projects that did not have some connection to pedestrians. Cibor said yes. Sherman asked if the projects on the traffic calming list met Rollo's criteria. Cibor noted that the crosswalks on Kinser Pike would be installed. He said the improvement project at The Stands Drive and Rogers Road would be completed through other funding sources. Sturbaum asked if Graham Drive should be added to the list of traffic calming projects. Sherman said it was already on the list of sidewalk projects and having it on both lists would be confusing.

### 4. Schedule Future Meetings

Granger asked for a report from staff before the committee met in the fall. The committee and staff discussed when to schedule the next meeting. Granger moved and it was seconded to meet on November 13, 2018 at 12 noon. The motion was approved by voice vote. Sherman noted that the committee would report to the full Council on May 30, 2018 at the council meeting.

Cibor asked if the committee could review its overage policy to give staff the flexibility to proceed with the projects that the committee had prioritized. Sherman described the overage policy as it existed. Aten explained that bids for projects could come in higher or lower than estimates. He said that any bid within 25% of the estimated price was considered a good bid, but the committee's overage policy meant the city could not proceed with some of those good bids before coming back to the committee. Aten suggested that the committee review the policy every year based on the projects it had selected. He recommended amending the policy from 10% to 25% and from \$20,000 to \$45,000. He said he would still consult with the committee chair for any changes, regardless of whether the chair had to approve the price.

Rollo moved and it was seconded to amend the committee's overage policy from 10% to 25% and from \$20,000 to \$45,000 and to include a provision that such decisions made by the committee chair be made in consultation with other committee members. The motion was approved by voice vote.

### 5. Minutes

Rollo moved and it was seconded to approve minutes from March 12, 2018 and April 12, 2018 as corrected. The motion was approved by voice vote. Rollo moved and it was seconded to authorize the committee chair to correct and approve the minutes of future meetings after being circulated to other committee members and staff. The motion was approved by voice vote.

### 6. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 12:52 p.m.