Bicycle Pedestrian Safety Commission

Agenda - Monday, October 12, 5:30 - 7:00pm

Zoom Link: https://bloomington.zoom.us/j/96070073036?pwd=V3JXV3ZsOEtQcVVYWW1BbFM5MHVBUT09

Meeting Agenda:

- 1. Call to Order/ Attendance
- 2. Approval of Minutes September 2020
- 3. Old Business
- 4. New Business
 - a. Site Selection for Traffic Calming Rubric
- 5. Reports from Staff
- 6. Reports from Commission Members
 - a. Sidewalk Equity Mapping Mark Stosberg
- 7. Public Comment
- 8. Adjourn

Announcements/ Actionable Items:

- 1. TCGP/ Comprehensive Plan Tracking @ City Council
 - a. Wednesday, October 21, 2020
 - b. 6:30pm
 - c. For more information/zoom link
- 2. November BPSC Meeting
 - a. Monday, November 9, 2020
 - b. 5:30pm
- 3. November TCGP Work Session (Provided the TCGP Policy Passes)
 - a. Monday, November 16, 2020
 - b. 5:30pm-7:30pm

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

City of Bloomington, Indiana Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Commission

Minutes for Sep. 28th, 2020 meeting

1. Attendance

City Staff: Mallory Rickbeil, Sara Gomez, Neil Kopper, Beth Rosenbarger, Desiree King Commissioners: Mark Stosberg, Paul Ash, Jaclyn Ray, Ann Edmonds, Ian Yarbrough, Kelly Clark, Jim Rosenbarger,

Public: Ron Brown, Davey's Phone, Casey Green, John Kennedy, B Square Beacon, Jim Shelton

2. Approval of minutes: approved and seconded

3. Old Business

4. New Business

- a. Title 12 Updates –Sara Gomez
- -Use of the right of way during excavation; the City is suggesting these changes:
 - -Walk Around Requirements: to ensure public safety
 - -Violation fees
 - -Creating fee schedule in Title 12
 - -Enforcement and Penalties: consistent procedures in place
- -Mark: what can the BPSC do to help?
- -Sara: any questions or thumbs up for this
- -Mark: walk around problems do come up in our meetings, looks like the proposal would improve this problem
- -Ann: is this for City or do others dig in the right of way?
- -Sara: intent for everybody to do their best to meet these standards eg: capital projects don't have to apply for this, but in general the majority of things would fall under this
- -Ann: Rogers Rd. up the hill has no walk-around, is that legitimate?
- -Neil: it is a federally funded City project, had non-accessible sidewalk so technicality made it not have to make a walk-around and it wasn't very feasible
- -Kelly: if they are in violation of this new policy, who do they report to?
- -Sara: for a violation a notice would be sent to the property owner and the contractor, typically a warning is sent first, then notice of violation letter sent with a fine
- -Kelly: how do citizens report violations?
- -Sara: call City or file a U-Report
- b. Traffic Calming and Greenways Program Mallory Rickbeil
- -Do we want a presentation or just a discussion about the policy?
- -Presentation by Mallory Rickbeil
- -Year and a half to re-do this policy and working with two neighborhoods who were navigating the current process, given her lots of perspective on traffic calming

- -Traffic calming devices: speed cushions and bump-outs (effective and cost efficient)
- -Why? Streets poorly designed in the 1950s; speeds are way faster, no sidewalks, no curbs, further setback houses, and speed limit enforcement not great
- -Current policy has very high barriers: time, privilege, trust; not measurable; few installed, no process for evaluating after installation
- -New policy has 1) resident-led and 2) staff-led processes; annual cycle for resident-led; both are data driven; transparent;
- -Why staff-led? To work on projects included in Transportation Plan and risk situations that can't wait 'till residents organize to do it
- -Resident-led flow chart: green dots included BPSC feedback
- -Staff-led flow chart: more streamlined
- -Internal concerns covered
- -Paul: likes the staff-led aspect, agrees wealthier nabes get more amenities; interested to see how to go about removal / adaptation eg: Allen and Rogers island needs changing
- -Ann: do we look at this rubric every year?
- -Mallory: yes, in order to be flexible
- -Ann: greenways, those will be City-led, will there be an effort to involve users who don't live in that neighborhood?
- -Mallory: yes, absolutely
- -Beth: maybe need a set of things we do every time to let users know, maybe a website?, join an email list to send updates, annual press release?
- -Jim: worked on first program, engineering dept. so different, really happy with this version, worth looking at which nabes get the funds; may also need a couple examples to work through to make comparisons and quantify how we would select projects based on a set of objective scores
- -Mallory: yes, at next meeting and at a work session
- -Beth: objective criteria lives outside the policy but is there and transparent
- -Mark: costs for traffic calming v. sidewalk
- -Mallory: sidewalks 2-3 one-block projects with \$50k annually; could do \$3k per speed-bump (Beth in chat: sidewalks cost \$1 million a mile)
- -Mark: seems easier to get a sidewalk than a traffic-calming project doesn't make sense if it is a fraction of the cost so makes sense to make this process easier
- -Mallory: funding is also another issue
- -Mark: highlight the benefit to the City, we can get a lot further a lot faster through traffic calming vs. building sidewalks; merging commissions in the future, this solidifies BPSC?
- -Mallory: put in *traffic related commission* so that can be changed
- -Kelly: timeline?
- -Mallory: hoping to get it approved in next few weeks
- -Jim: new T. Plan will help get this through council
- -Mark: are there highlights from the T. Plan we should further call out?
- -Beth: staff can't lead greenways because it's not in code currently
- -Mallory: ask for approval
- -Jim: clarification
- -Mallory: adjustments to rubric in November
- -Mark: call for approval of policy with future adjustments pending
- -Beth: roll call vote Ann yes; Kelly: yes, Mark yes, Jim yes, Paul yes, Ian yes, Jaclyn yes

5. Reports from Staff

- -Beth: new director is Scott Robinson of Planning and Transportation Dept.
- -Beth: Cascades pilot got extension to June 2021

6. Reports from Commission Members

- -Ann: Maxwell Lane problems with the Binford school, went to Traffic Commish, same presentation, the commish suggested City get a second set of data; may have been better to get together with the Traffic Commish to see presentation together
- -Jaclyn: also attended and agree with Ann
- -Mark: could coordinate on zoom when the same presentation is required
- -Mark: will present sidewalk report project to next meeting

7. Public Comment:

- 1) -Ron: Knightsridge Rd 3 mi section popular with cyclists, Italian race in Breaking Away, ½ mi long rugged shoulder to get there, he advocated to pave the shoulder, they paved it this summer, it's very nice to ride on and there is a rumble strip
- -Jim rode it yesterday, really nice
- -Mark: county rd.?
- -Ron: MPO district
- 2) -John Kennedy: happy about the traffic calming program update;
- -growth of multi-use paths: not clear who has the right-of-way at intersections, how do cars know when to yield? May need an education program to show all users how to navigate,
- -Mallory: Flaherty wants to look at all the B-line intersections to demonstrate who has the right-of-way there, she hopes we can learn from that and apply to other multi-use paths; until the cyclist or ped is in the street, the car has the right-of-way, but must yield to car when still on the multi-use paths, need to prioritize vulnerable users,
- -John: safety of the multi-use path users, cyclist going much faster, as car approaches neither has a reason to stop
- -Mallory: need to design them to have few curb cuts
- -Beth: it is unclear, signs can be safer, sometimes not
- -Jim: raised cross walks
- -Beth: if signalized, can't do raised,
- -Jaclyn: I also share this concern, could provide a list of locations
- -Ann: is this a side path vs. multi-use path problem?
- -Beth: multi-use paths along streets, B-line is a multi-use trail
- -Mark: would it have been better to put public comment first
- -John: no, he enjoyed the meeting

Mark: reached the end of agenda so adjourned!

8. Adjourn