

# Bicycle Pedestrian Safety Commission

Monday, May 10 2021

5:30pm – 7:00pm

<https://bloomington.zoom.us/j/99958584028?pwd=VXdIYXJYbEFPVysrZ3RiU1d2bIM1dz09>

## Meeting Agenda:

1. Welcome/ Introductions
2. New Business:
  - a. Filling Vacancies: President, Vice-President
  - b. Confirm Secretary Appointment
  - c. 2021 Meeting Schedule
    - i. Monday, June 14 2021
    - ii. Monday, August 9 2021- TCGP Project Hearing
    - iii. Monday, September 13 2021 - Local Motion Grant
    - iv. Monday, October 11 2021
    - v. Monday, November 8, 2021 - TCGP 2022 Guidelines/ Evaluation Methodology
    - vi. Monday, December 13, 2021 – Continuation of November meeting
  - d. Bloomington Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Commission ([2.12.080](#)) in Code of Ordinances
  - e. Conditions to Facilitate Meaningful Work Agreements
3. Reports from Staff
  - a. Transportation Plan and Comprehensive Plan Overview- Beth Rosenbarger
4. Reports from Commission Members
5. Public Comment
6. Adjourn

## Announcements/ Actionable Items:

1. 1<sup>st</sup> Street Reconstruction Project- Thursday, May 13 from 6-7pm details can be found here: <https://bloomington.in.gov/engineering/projects/1st>
2. Monroe County residents are invited to take a [short survey](#) on transportation needs for the Bloomington MPO Coordinated Public Transit/ Human Service Transportation Plan. The survey is open through May 15.

***Auxiliary aids for people with disabilities are available upon request with adequate notice. Please call [812-349-3429](tel:812-349-3429) or e-mail [human.rights@bloomington.in.gov](mailto:human.rights@bloomington.in.gov).***

# **Bicycle Pedestrian Safety Commission**

## **Minutes – Monday, March 29, 2021 6:30pm – 7:30pm**

**Attendees:** Staff Mallory Rickbeil, Neil Kopper, Beth Rosenbarger,  
**Commissioners:** Kelly Clark, Jaclyn Ray, Zak Huneck, Sarah Waters  
**Others:** Ann Edmonds, Neil Taylor, Benjamin Bradley, Katie Yoder, Leon Gordon, Lindsay Potts, Marta Hall, Rebecca Dilger, Shawna Meyer-Neiderman.

### **Working Group Meeting**

1. Call to Order/ Attendance Four commissioners in attendance; we have a quorum.
2. Assign Notetaking Role  
Movement that Ann serve as Secretary today from Zac, and Sarah seconded  
Movement that Kelly Chair from Ann, and Zac seconded
3. Resident Led Traffic Calming- Project Selection based on Evaluation Methodology
  - a. Review of Data- Identifying information  
Mallory will be out of the office for two weeks and wants to let the applicants know the status of their projects.  
9 projects submitted applications, and all but one successfully completed the application, including three letters of support, neighborhood signatures, and a required meeting to discuss the objectives. We need to direct limited funds to the places where there is the greatest risk of injuries. Today we will be looking at the data. The deadline for data submission was March 25, 2021, but Mallory is still getting speed and traffic data.  
There are seven projects to consider; Ann asked why seven and not eight. Mallory explained that one project will become a greenway and it is unclear how we handle that with the rubric; that project has two phases.  
Kelly pointed out that one of the criteria is 85% of people driving above the speed limit; Mallory explained that the speed data is not yet available.  
Neil explained how the 85% is calculated.  
Mallory hopes to have the speed data before the May meeting. Today the commission will decide whether we want to move forward with all the projects. The May meeting is for a prioritization hearing.  
Sarah noted that Rebecca asked in the chat about a metric for pedestrian traffic and wondered about bicycle traffic. That data is unavailable because we would have to have someone counting, and with many variables it wouldn't be accurate.  
Neil Taylor asked about whether not having sidewalks is a consideration. Mallory said she doesn't yet have that information from the GIS, so BPSC decided that sidewalk data will not be a metric this year, but it may in the future.  
Kelly thought that sidewalk data is included in Walk Score. Beth said Score just measures the density of destinations. Kelly asked about other things that we discussed including in the metric, such as vehicle ownership and other demographic considerations. Mallory says that we are not yet doing that this year. Kelly asked how to get that included next year. Mallory says that some of that data could be

May 6, 2021

used from the census, but that Walk Score is proprietary data. Walk Score will be used for sidewalk projects consideration.

Zac asked how the zones were identified for the crashes and injuries. Mallory said that crash data depends on what happens within the zone, but high traffic streets like Walnut would skew the data. Neighborhood streets are included, but not high traffic streets going to the zone.

Kelly asked about Walk Score as a gauge of pedestrian usage for sidewalks, but not here. Beth Rosenbarger said that it could be done, but one needs to manually put an address in for every street to get the Walk Score and needs to be updated manually. They want to find another way of finding similar information. Perhaps using population density and car ownership. Mallory said Boston has a similar metric we may consider using. Kelly is interested in doing that.

Kelly says there is a question from Shawna in the chat. Could the speed data impact the points awarded to projects for consideration dramatically changing their rank?

Mallory said it might make a difference in priority between two projects that are close in points, but not between two projects that have very different scores.

Kelly asked how the totals were achieved. Mallory showed a spreadsheet showing the calculations. For the highest ranked project, we have speed data that adds 60 points.

Sarah asked about the census tracts demographics data. Mallory showed how she looked at census tract data.

Mallory asked what to do next. Kelly said that if we considered location data we would get bogged down. Zac said that we should stick with these objective measures.

Kelly would like to consider this compared with sidewalk projects.

Neil Kopper said that the top two projects are so far ahead that you would have to have people going over 60 mph for the other projects to move up.

Zac asked that with so many crashes maybe more is needed than speed bumps. Neil said that it could just be one intersection causing most of the crashes.

7.1 is a Greenway project and 7.2 is adjacent. There are no future project plans for the others.

Kelly asked about cost estimates for each of these projects. Mallory says the \$50,000 would fund about 10 speed cushions.

Kelly would prefer to have complete data.

Sarah said she understands Kelly's perspective, but based on the idea that the outstanding data would not change the priorities, she would be ok going ahead with the existing data. Zac said that we could eliminate at least a couple of the projects.

b. Public Comment

Katie Yoder said that she is an organizer of one of the projects and thinks it is probably lower ranking. She understands that the application is good for two years. She hopes that no one dies in the next year. She hopes that projects won't get held up. She wants to know whether this same data will be used next year. She knows there is a greenway project for her neighborhood.

May 6, 2021

Mallory says that these projects are active for another year. That could be changed in the rubric. Mallory says the idea was to have a more focused assessment of projects that are more likely to be funded.

Katie is concerned about being in a holding pattern.

Rebecca Dilger is another sponsor. She would like the cost of each project to be considered. Rebecca says that the city calculated speed data for her neighborhood, and she would like that to be considered. She thinks that several less expensive projects might be better than one expensive one.

c. Review of Data- With Identifying Information

Kelly: Is there a motion to narrow down the projects.

Zac: Isn't comfortable narrowing without complete data according to the rubric, but cost was not part of the rubric.

Kelly: do we have the leeway to consider cost, since that is not in the rubric.

Mallory: we don't have enough money for several projects.

Neil: looked at projects one and four (the two with the highest scores), and either one would use all the money. He doesn't think that we can afford multiple projects. In chat, Leon Gordon says that cost wasn't a factor and wouldn't be fair to add now.

Jaclyn is comfortable with reducing to the top two.

Kelly summarized that we get all data for the top two projects.

Jaclyn moved to eliminate all projects except number four and number one. Sarah seconded. Motion carried.

Kelly noted that we want additional data on those two projects. Notification will be sent to leaders of project one and project 4.

Jaclyn pointed out that there were questions asking whether size of the zone contributed to priority.

Mallory said yes, larger area contributed to higher score, and size may need to be considered in improving the rubric.

Next meeting: Should there be an April meeting? Jaclyn moved to cancel the April 12 meeting; Sarah seconded. Next meeting will be May 10.

Mallory will ask the Council to notify staff when they have decided whom to appoint.

Mallory will send out the location data for these projects.

4. Considerations for updates to TCGP Policy Year #2

Sidewalk data

Vehicle ownership

Other demographic data

Normalizing by size of the project zone

5. Reports from Commission Members none

6. Public Comment see above

7. Adjourn: Zac moved to adjourn, Jaclyn seconded.