AGENDA
BLOOMINGTON TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
TUESDAY, APRIL 17, 2018 4:00 P.M.
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, CITY HALL
109 EAST OLIVE STREET
BLOOMINGTON, ILLINOIS

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ROLL CALL

3. PUBLIC COMMENT
A public comment period not to exceed thirty (30) minutes will be held during each Board and Commission meeting, as well as all regularly scheduled City Council meetings, Committee of the Whole meetings, meetings of committees and/or task forces (hereinafter "committees") created by the City Council, work sessions, and special meetings of the City Council. Nothing herein shall prohibit the combination of meetings, at which only one public comment period will be allowed.

Anyone desiring to address the Board, Commission, Committee or City Council, as applicable, must complete a public comment card at least five (5) minutes before the start time of the meeting. Public comment cards shall be made available at the location of the meeting by City staff at least 15 minutes prior to the start time of the meeting. The person must include their name, and any other desired contact information, although said person shall not be required to publicly state their address information. If more than five individuals desire to make a public comment, the order of speakers shall be by random draw. If an individual is not able to speak due to the time limitation and said individual still desires to address the individuals at a future meeting of the same type, said individual shall be entitled to speak first at the next meeting of the same type. (Ordinance No. 2015-46))

4. MINUTES: Review and approve the minutes of the March 20, 2018 regular meeting of the Bloomington Transportation Commission.

5. REGULAR AGENDA
A. None

6. OLD BUSINESS
A. Commissioner Question Follow-up: Status of Alley between Taylor and Olive
B. Commissioner Question Follow-up: Implementing Parking Restrictions at Bus Stops

7. NEW BUSINESS
A. Information: March Citizen Comments/Complaints Summary
B. Information: Potential Jefferson Street Modifications (Center to Main)

8. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

9. ADJOURNMENT

For further information contact:
Philip Allyn, City Traffic Engineer
Department of Public Works
Government Center
115 E. Washington Street, Bloomington, IL 61701
Phone: (309) 434-2225 ; Fax: (309) 434-2201; E-mail: traffic@cityblm.org

MINUTES
BLOOMINGTON TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
TUESDAY, MARCH 20, 2018 4:00 P.M.
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, CITY HALL
109 EAST OLIVE STREET
BLOOMINGTON, ILLINOIS

MEMBERS PRESENT: Ms. Angela Ballantini, Ms. Maureen (Reenie) Bradley, Ms. Katherine Browne, Mr. Michael Gorman, Ms. Kelly Rumley

MEMBERS ABSENT: Ms. Jill Blair, Ms. Elizabeth Kooba

OTHERS PRESENT: Mr. George Boyle, City Attorney; Mr. Jim Karch, Director of Public Works; Mr. Kevin Kothe, City Engineer; Mr. Philip Allyn, City Traffic Engineer; and several members of the public.

1. CALL TO ORDER: Mr. Gorman called the meeting to order at 4:00 pm.

2. ROLL CALL: Mr. Allyn called the roll. With five members in attendance, a quorum was established.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT:
Mr. Justin Boyd mentioned that he mailed a Transportation and Streets form on January 11th with a concern on his street. Mr. Boyd submitted an additional form on February 20th after not receiving a response. Two weeks later, he received a call from someone after speaking with the Commission Chair Mr. Gorman and a Councilman but was not sure if that had any influence on the call or not. The person indicated the request was unlikely, but that it would be reviewed at an internal commission. Mr. Boyd thought that was this Commission and was looking forward to presenting his case here in public but did not get that opportunity. Mr. Boyd indicated it has been an additional two weeks and he has still not received resolution on his request. He had the understanding that all requests would be brought to this Commission to be openly debated and discussed and was disappointed that was not the case. He expressed concern that other people's requests may not be getting addressed.

Mr. Greg Koos indicated that he had reviewed the 5 year budgeting and the current City budget. He noticed considerable dollars shown to be allocated to projects that do not seem to fit the direction of re-investing in the central part of the City but were instead legacy projects of earlier phases of planning intended to meet growth that likely will not occur due to the massive loss of jobs experienced over the recent years including Mitsubishi, State Farm and others. Specifically of concern are the Hamilton Road project and the Fox Creek bridge project. These projects may be funded with special funds; he was reading up on the use of MFT funds and understood the difficulty in determining the best way to use available funds. He would like to see the limited funds available for transportation related funds used for transportation projects that are more in line with the current direction and see more creative uses of available MFT funds such as potentially cut deals with IDOT to fix their roads.

4. MINUTES: Reviewed and approved the minutes of the January 16, 2018 regular meeting of the Bloomington Transportation Commission. Ms. Browne motioned to approve the minutes. Ms. Ballantini seconded the motion. The motion was approved by the Transportation Commission unanimously via voice vote.

5. REGULAR AGENDA

A. **TC-2018-02 –** City Transportation Project Funding Overview Discussion and Consideration of a Recommendation to City Council regarding a Proposed Local Motor Fuel Tax Increase.

Mr. Allyn summarized information from the agenda packet relating to each current funding source available to the City to transportation project funding: Federal Funds, State Motor Fuel Tax (MFT), Local MFT, a portion of the Local Sales Tax, Tax Increment Financing (TIF) (occasionally available with location restrictions), and several other more rare types and miscellaneous grants that all have different requirements.

Mr. Kothe, City Engineer, indicated when Federal Funds are used, the project cost is typically about 30% higher than a locally funded project due to additional engineering, more stringent construction requirements, and detailed environmental reviews. For State MFT, requirements are still very stringent but not quite to the level of Federal funding. Significant time is spent getting a project approved by the State as well as additional time spent after construction is finished completing State paperwork to close out the project. As an example of the additional effort required, Mr. Kothe indicated that a recent federally funded project resulted in 13 banker's boxes full of paperwork at closeout. Upon completion, the State sends out 2-3 auditors who spend a week verifying everything is correct. With the 2008-2009 Staff reductions due to eight early retirements and two layoffs, we have been unable to finish the closeout of several State MFT projects resulting in the hiring of an outside consultant at a cost of about $90,000. This amount would have paved three streets, including curb and gutter repairs, in our local resurfacing program. This illustrates the significant additional cost that comes with these funding types. Mr. Kothe indicated we try to use the Federal and State MFT fund on projects that require this extra effort due to the complexity of the project and not on smaller projects. In the past, we have used State MFT funds for the resurfacing work, but with the increased lead-time due to IDOT reviews and approvals, we would not be able to bid projects until August, which doesn't leave enough time to complete the work before winter. With this work locally funded, we are able to bid in April with work starting in May and completed in the fall. In addition, we are able to select asphalt mixes that work better in our climate and traffic rather than using the Statewide approved mixes giving us a longer lasting product. For example, the State mix is designed to prevent rutting which is a concern on state highways with heavier truck volumes. However, it is also more brittle and cracks quicker leading to earlier failure. On our local streets, we do not need to extra hardness since we do not have the truck traffic and can instead focus on reduced cracking.

We have utilized special Federal funding on larger arterial projects such as Hamilton from Bunn to Commerce and have then used State MFT funds for the match since we had to meet the higher Federal requirements any way. We also used State MFT funds recently on the Benjamin School Trail, which allowed it to be funded, but delayed the completion by about a year. We try to be selective with which projects are funded with Federal or State MFT to be efficient and not create additional work when it is not needed.

Mr. Allyn discussed a project case study of Fairway Drive and Empire Street. After giving a short description of the project in which Fairway Drive is being resurfaced and bike lanes are being added, he indicated that the project is being locally funded as part of the local MFT resurfacing work. However, because this particular intersection is with a State road, we are still required to go through some of their processes and requirements. We submitted a traffic study showing our work would not impact their highway; they approved it, and indicated we just needed to obtain a work permit. When we applied for the permit, we suddenly were told we also needed to complete a full Intersection Design Study (IDS) requiring a higher level of design. We fortunately were able to complete this work in-house. This additional effort has already set the project back in schedule at least 2 months. Had we needed to hire a consultant to complete the IDS, the project delay would have been at least 4 months. Mr. Allyn discussed the increased design effort required due to these IDOT requirements. The entire project, which runs from Robinhood Drive to south of Washington Street is budgeted for $1.4 million. If State MFT funds had been used instead, IDS's would have been required at four of the intersections along this stretch. This would have required hiring a consultant at a cost of $80,000 to$100,000 just for the IDS work. Full construction drawings would have been required as well as one or two full time staff members being

required to be on-site during construction. Construction costs would likely increase to $1.6 million due to using State-specified materials that would likely have a shorter life. The project would have been delayed until the summer of 2019 or 2020. Mr. Allyn presented the three sheets of plans required for the locally funded Washington Street resurfacing compared to the 65 sheets of plans required for the smaller, but MFT funded Towanda Barnes & Ireland Grove project.

Ms. Ballantini indicated that she previously wrote grants and believed that the additional costs for Engineering could be included in the grant amount. Is that the case for these projects? Mr. Allyn indicated that generally, that was the case, but by doing so, you are still increasing the overall cost of the project. There is a limited amount of money available, so it makes more sense to put the extra effort into projects that require the extra effort. With the case study example, the project would have increased from $1.4 million to probably $1.8 million just with the inclusion of State MFT. Ms. Ballantini stated though that the funds are being provided by the State and Federal government from taxes that have already been received. Citizens have already paid that money in and we are just getting it back. Even though the cost is higher, and the process is longer, there is no additional increased cost to residents since there is no new tax. It's hard to accept a new tax. Mr. Karch indicated that the difference between State MFT funds and grants, which are applied for and may or may not be received, is that the State MFT funds are constantly allocated to the City in a set amount regardless. We have a set amount of funding and the goal is to allocate the types of funds in a way that gets the most work completed. The more that you have to spend on administrative costs, the less work that you are able to complete. There are not additional MFT funds that we can request to cover the additional costs. Ms. Ballantini stated she understood the level of frustration and effort that comes with grant funded work. What is the actual money we currently receive? Mr. Allyn and Mr. Karch indicated that we get in local funds 0.25% in local sales tax and $0.04/gallon in local MFT. This amounts to approximately $4.6 million a year that is dedicated to streets and sidewalks. Prior to the sales tax increase and the local MFT, street and sidewalk work funding came out of the general fund. The Council would reapportion differing amounts of general funds to various other priorities each year and there was no dedicated, consistent source of street and sidewalk funding. In order to maintain the streets, we need to be able to plan 5 years out to be able to be proactive with regard to properly planning work and knowing what money is available is important. Ms. Ballantini agreed there needed to be a dedicated source of funding. However, citizens get tired of being taxed over and over again and not seeing any results. The information provided indicated State MFT could go to resurfacing work. We need to think outside the box rather than just taxing people. Mr. Karch confirmed that resurfacing is one thing on which MFT funds can be used. Council has been trying to do more dedicating specific funds to streets. Elected officials have been hearing a lot about the condition of our streets and we are trying to offer a solution that helps. The other option is cuts. Programs could be cut, but that has been a challenge. When Staff reviewed the impact of the implementation of the local MFT, gas prices fluctuated so much due to other factors that there was no noticeable difference. Another benefit is that a Motor Fuel Tax is that it is user based. Vehicles cause the damage to the streets, so by taxing the use of the vehicles, you are putting the cost of the street on the user of the street.

Mr. Gorman mentioned that he knew other local communities take advantage of various grants to help fund projects in addition to local and state MFT. For example, Champaign and Urbana have a very strong Safe Routes to School program. We recently did the Benjamin Trail project using a Safe Routes to School grant. How can we look at other grants more effectively? Mr. Allyn indicated that we try to apply for these when we can, such as the Benjamin Trail project. One that we are currently applying for is related to the Hamilton Road from Bunn to Commerce project. Part of the drive for that project is due to the number of State Farm drivers that are traveling across on Hamilton Road and then taking Rhodes Lanes to Morrissey. The intersection of Rhodes and Morrissey has been a high crash location. There is also a very poor railroad crossing on Morrissey just north of Rhodes. In the latest IDOT crash statistics, this location was named as a 5% accident location. This makes is eligible to apply for Federal Safety funds. The project is already planned to use part of our annual allotment of Federal Surface Transportation Funds

DRAFT

(STU), so we are not adding any additional effort. If we are selected for the Safety funds grant, then we will be able to apply our regularly allotted STU funds elsewhere and we have essentially increased the amount of our total funds available.

Ms. Ballantini acknowledged the additional effort associated with utilizing Federal funds, but didn't want anyone to think that should be a reason not to use them. She reiterated that she thinks there is a big enough hit already on people and that raising the Local MFT isn't the answer. There needs to be another source of money.

Mr. Gorman mentioned that there are projects being funding in Champaign using Safe Routes to School money where the primary goal isn't just focused on the schools. A large majority of our City is within distance of a school. Why aren't we using Safe Routes grants for projects that are by schools even if the primary function isn't school related? Mr. Allyn reiterated that the Safe Routes program is a grant that needs to be applied for; they aren't guaranteed funds. It's important to have a good grant application that meets the goals of the grant program in order to secure the funds as we are competing against other communities. Mr. Kothe mentioned there are a number of federal grant programs such as the Safe Routes, TARP (Truck Access Route Program), Safety funds, etc. We look at the community to see which programs are applicable and apply for those when the opportunity is available. The Benjamin School Trail Safe Routes and the Hamilton Road/Rhodes Lane Safety Fund are examples of that. We haven't done a lot of them in the past, but we are watching for opportunities. When the high-speed rail work was being done in town, we lobbied IDOT and obtained funds to upgrade the pedestrian crossing on the north side of Washington Street. Unfortunately, we were only able to get the crossing at the high-speed rail line and not the other two tracks, which are sidings. We are still working on those with the railroad to get the remaining pedestrian crossings done, but it's taking a lot of time.

Mr. Karch mentioned that we haven't yet brought up a lot of the issues with the street resurfacing. There are grants available to do new things or special projects. There aren't many grants available for maintenance work. With the funding levels that we are currently at, it will take 66 years to resurface everything. We have done a lot of work rating streets to be able to provide a professional recommendation on priorities, but we are not at a good funding level to maintain our infrastructure. We are underpaying for what we have. That means that we need to find ways to start catching back up. If we can't, the quality of the roads will continue to get worse. We are not tied to a particular funding mechanism; we just need more money for the maintenance of our existing pavements. The Local MFT is one mechanism, but there are other ways too. We just need a consistent, sustainable funding source for the community so that there is not the perception that our community is falling apart. People care about curb appeal and having quality infrastructure. There is flexibility on how that happens. We aren't just locked in to one method.

Mr. Gorman mentioned that in the packet it says that the Local MFT increase will take the resurfacing interval from 66 years down to 44 years. He's not interested in half measures and is looking for long-term sustainability. If a pavement only lasts 25-30 years, improving it to 44 years isn't a solution. What we need to do is look at ways to reduce costs in addition to increased funding. For example, over the past couple months as the potholes have been developing, three separate residents asked him if we could switch to gravel roads because they would be safer than pothole-ridden pavement. He doesn't know that gravel roads are the answer, but what can be done to reduce the cost? Do we need curb and gutter on every street? What do we really want out of our streets?

Mr. Karch indicated that thought is not far off. Other communities such as Peoria have gone to tar and chip roads in order to try to keep up. As a country, we have generally overbuilt roads and it's hard to maintain them. Gravel roads probably are not the answer, but tar and chip is not that far from gravel. They are common on County and Township roads. We see a lot of value in that, but most residents do not. There is an expectation of what citizens what for the tax dollars that they pay. For example, we tried CRF

DRAFT

several years ago. It went a long way to keeping a pavement in better condition for a longer period. The problem was citizens hated it. We received more calls and complaints because it was dusty and oily. They all wanted regular asphalt. It's not wrong that we may need to reduce expectations, but it has been difficult in the past. Mr. Gorman stated it's the Commission's goal to help Staff set priorities for the community. It would be difficult to recommend a tax increase without a corresponding cut in service. He's not interested in voting on the tax increase today, but wants to put together a total package of cuts and increased funding that results in a sustainable model that can be recommended to Council. If pavement lasts 25-30 years, then we need to be looking for a 25-30 year schedule. Mr. Karch agreed that we all want a sustainable model where we aren't always fighting an uphill battle. Staff cares about the community, takes pride in the City, and wants things to go well.

Ms. Bradley appreciates the need for consistent dedicated funding. She also sees and hears the community with another tax right on the heels of the solid waste changes. There will be a lot of pushback. She understands it's a complicated issue and it's easier to use local funds, and we understand and appreciate that but the public isn't going to dig that deep. She agrees that we need to look outside what we are doing to try something else. We don't need to go all the way back to dirt or gravel roads, but we need to look at more affordable options that can be done with new construction. We also need to maintain what is already built and maintain the standard of what is already here. That is the puzzling thing. We need to try something else. Raising the tax will not work because the public does not understand the funding sources. They also do not realize that our worst roads are the State highways. Mr. Karch mentioned that the City recently met with State legislators and showed them video of the bad State roads. They understand that there needs to be a Capital Bill and that there are problems. Ms. Bradley asked if they could help with the red tape at IDOT. Mr. Karch indicated that they did offer to meet with Secretary Blankenhorn (head of IDOT statewide) about the relocation of the State Route off of Lee Street specifically. Ms. Bradley asked if they have any power to help with the funding in general. Mr. Karch did not think so, but did not want to speak for them. He reiterated that he understood that no one wants new taxes, but that we have to find some way to get to a sustainable point. Tar and chip is maybe part of that answer. We are also trying to expand pavement preservation to help stretch the life of a road. There are multiple parts of the answer, but we cannot get there without expanding funding.

Ms. Browne asked about the revenue charts shown in the packet on page A-5. The decrease shown from 2016 to 2017 is explained due to increased fuel efficiency, etc. Is the projected decrease from 2017 to 2018 due to the same reason? Mr. Karch indicated that we are anticipating the funding level to remain the same, but it certainly could go down again. Ms. Browne also mentioned that the chart below showing Local MFT rates for other Illinois communities indicates that with the proposed increase, Bloomington with have one of the highest rates, almost double most of the other communities. Normal specifically would be half of the Bloomington rate. Is there any concern that drivers would avoiding Bloomington and buying gas in Normal? Mr. Karch indicated that when Bloomington instituted the initial 4 cents per gallon tax, Normal did not have any Local MFT. We tried to evaluate what the impacts of the new 4-cent change and there wasn't a noticeable change. There is also a study done by IDOT in the packet that is a bit older, but it seems to show that there likely would not be much impact. The 4-cent per gallon change is small compared to the regular fluctuation in price due to other factors that drivers should not see a difference.

Mr. Gorman proposed tabling this discussion to allow Staff to come back with a range of options from giant service reductions to higher taxes to fund higher-level roads. Ms. Browne appreciated Staff's expertise and ability to provide information and professional recommendations, but a lot of this is going to hinge on public perception. If we are going to get a sustainable plan, can we get feedback from the public on what is acceptable and then have Staff evaluate options so that we can present to Council a recommendation from a list of ideas? If we are basing a decision on public opinion, we need to know what public opinion actually is. Mr. Allyn suggested having a series of Open Houses would be an option.

DRAFT

Mr. Gorman indicated that the Commission members also provide public perspective and can talk with people we know through the community. He's not sure we would get much good feedback at an open house.

Mr. Karch brought up that the way the special waste decision was approached was to determine three options: high fee and no service level change, medium fee and medium service level change, and low fee and high service level change. 8-cent MFT increase and we have all paved roads, or 4-cent increase and incorporate some tar and ship, or keep the same fees and we keep doing what we are currently doing. Our end goal is sustainable infrastructure, but we need to work out at what level it should be sustained. This higher-level analysis could be done with a smaller amount of data rather than taking lots of time to gather and analyze lots of data all the while our roads are getting worse and worse.

Ms. Bradley thought it would be good to hear from the public to keep them part of the process and have some type of PR campaign. There may be some good ideas out there that no one has thought of so far. This would also keep citizens informed of what is going on so that if a MFT increase is needed, it's not a surprise and there is a greater level of understanding. This is a big deal needs to be talked about. Mr. Gorman agreed that a big delay isn't good, but in the context of a 30-year fix, a couple month delay is worthwhile to get to the right answer. Ms. Bradly mentioned it would be good to get feedback on topics such as types of streets or if a different type of tax would be more palatable and help people see that there isn't enough income. Mr. Allyn mentioned that one other possibly that was mentioned in the packet is the current Use Tax. The City collects a tax on every new vehicle purchased by a City resident. Raising this tax might be a better option. We have been focusing on the Local MFT, but there are other options out there. The point of this was not to key in on just the Local MFT rate, but to have a larger discussion about overall funding.

Ms. Rumley asked about the Next Door ap potentially being a way to share information with people and get feedback. Mr. Allyn thought it could be useful as the process moves along.

Mr. Karch reminded that a large public outreach does take time. In this case, the streets are a big enough issue that it is worth it, but keep in mind that it is a lot of effort. Streets matter. Mr. Gorman agreed that this discussion relates to a potential major change to how we are doing things and that it warrants the Staff time. Ms. Browne asked for clarification on what the Commissions responsibilities are to connect to the community. Should we be communicating within our neighborhoods soliciting feedback? Mr. Gorman thought as long as we are not engaging with other commissioners, gathering ideas from people is OK. Mr. Boyle confirmed gathering ideas on concepts or proposals is fine. You need to be more careful with doing specific fact-finding or quasi-judicial evidence gathering and making decisions based solely on information obtained "on the record". In this case, soliciting general ideas on the tax proposal and what is the best way to fund the streets, etc. is fine and part of a commissioner's function.

Mr. Gorman summarized that Staff should come back in a month or two with some conceptual plans for what a sustainable model for our streets looks like. The Commission will review and then begin a period of public interaction followed by voting on a recommendation at the following meeting.

Ms. Rumley motioned to table this discussion for approximately two months for Staff to develop additional information. The motion was seconded by Ms. Browne. The motion was approved by the Transportation Commission unanimously via voice vote.

6. OLD BUSINESS: None

7. NEW BUSINESS: None
Ms. Rumley requested that an item for Commissioner Comment be added to the Agenda in the future to allow responses or requests to comments received during public comment.

DRAFT

Ms. Rumley also asked for a monthly report on resident requests that have been received by Staff that lays out the request and by whom, the neighborhood or street, the Staff decision and what follow-up has been provided to the resident. If the request was denied, what their appeal was and were they given an appeal process. Is there an appeal form that can mailed or emailed if the request is denied? If the Commission disagrees with a decision on a request, they can review it and bump it up to the Council if needed.

Mr. Allyn reminded everyone of the document in the binders indicating the duties of the Commission and Staff as outlined in the Ordinance establishing the Commission. The Commission generally deals with policy level decisions. For example, if a request comes in for a marked crosswalk as a specific intersection, that is a staff level decision. One of the Commissions duties though is to hear appeals of Staff decisions that the petitioner does not agree with. In notifying a petitioner of a decision, we do let them know of the Commission and that they can appeal if they desire. Ms. Rumley asked that if people are not getting responses in a timely manner, or being told their request is being denied but not why, is there an official process. She wants to see what all is being done each month in which neighborhoods. She wants it to be as clear as possible to the public that the Commission is doing what it was put here to do. When they meet with the Mayor, they were told that the Commission would be hearing all of the requests by citizens and not just appeals and they are being let down because they are not being responded to in an open and timely manner. If it is covered in a monthly report, it will be more clear.

Mr. Allyn responded that this was the first he had heard of a meeting with the Mayor and since he wasn't at it to be able to address specifically was the Commissioners were told regarding the duties of the Commission, all we can go off of is the ordinance that was passed by the Council to establish the Commission. In that ordinance, it clearly states multiple times that the Commission has oversite on Policy-level decisions, not detailed, specific matters. We have been discussing bringing a sort of summary of items with a general overview of the types of requests we get to the Commission as an FYI so that the Commissioners can gain an understanding of what Staff does and the various typical processes. We had been discussing doing this potentially quarterly rather than monthly. Unfortunately, a one-month turnaround on a lot of the requests is not realistic. Data usually needs to be collected, whether it's site gathered like traffic volumes or travel speeds, or researching past requests and current City Code or checking the programming at a traffic signal. Often coordination is required with outside agencies such as IDOT, Connect Transit, McLean County, Ameren/Cornbelt, etc. We typically don't have the ability to respond the day a complaint comes in due to either staffing or outside factors like weather preventing us obtaining traffic counts. Once the data is gathered and analyzed, and code and policies are applied, it usually has been at least 3-4 weeks. It is our practice that once we receive a complaint/request, we will call or email the person depending on what contact information they provided so that we can have a dialogue about what the issue actually is. We try to do this within a week. For example, with the gentleman who spoke during public comment, when the form submitted in February came across my desk, I had our part time technician call him the following week when he was back in the office. He obviously cannot follow-up when he is not working. We have since instituted a new tracking system to help monitor turnaround times and to make sure that requests come to both him and myself rather than just being placed on his desk when he will be off for a week.

Ms. Rumley asked how many requests we get in a month. Mr. Allyn indicated it varies quite a bit, but typically is probably 5-10 a month on average. Ms. Bradley asked if they are typically pothole type complaints or matters that are more involved. Mr. Allyn indicated the potholes go through Public Services. Engineering gets complaints such as sight distance reviews at intersections where we need to visit the site, determine if there are bushes that need trimmed or removed and if so work with Parks to get them taken care of. We get requests for handicap spots to be painted in front of people homes where we will go meet with them, verify they have a valid tag, layout the paint lines and sign location, and coordinate with the sign and paint crews. We get traffic calming requests that require traffic counts and a

DRAFT

speed study. We contact the Police to see if they are aware of speeding problems. We review accident data to the level of detail of the individual policy reports to verify that crashes can be reduced. For example, when reviewing crashes, if two were drunk drivers and one was in an icy condition, they are removed from the evaluation. If certain traffic volume and speeding thresholds specified in the traffic calming policy are met, we poll the neighborhood. This all takes time and unfortunately, we don't have a full time staff person dedicated just to this type of work. Ms. Rumley asked if requests could be forwarded to the Commission when they are received. Mr. Boyle expressed some concerns with forwarding a straight complaint form with personal information in a public body format and suggested that Staff take some time to work out the details on how the requested information can best be presented to the Commission.

Ms. Rumley stated she didn't want people to feel like they had fallen into a black hole. Mr. Allyn reiterated that it is our policy to reach out to people certainly within a week to verify we understand their request and at least let them know that we are looking in to it. On requests that take longer to process, we periodically reach back out to them to let them know that we are still working on their request.

Ms. Ballantini inquired about having a work session, as she is unsure of what the Commission's role is. She was under the impression the Commission was to be a go between with the public. It would be good to have a working relationship where the Commissioners are able to request things. Mr. Allyn indicated that he is more than willing to meet to discuss any items or questions Commissioners have. Doing so with the entire group would get more difficult with the Open Meetings Act. Mr. Gorman mentioned that he emails or talks to Mr. Allyn, Mr. Karch and Mr. Kothe regularly. Commissioners should feel free to reach out to Staff directly to ask questions. Ms. Ballantini had a good experience with previous Board work using work sessions to bounce ideas off each other and brainstorm and could get a lot accomplished. Mr. Karch mentioned that as a Public Commission, we do need to keep minutes and stick to agendas. It would be good for everyone to review the information from the binder on responsibilities and we can discuss further at the next meeting. It can be a bit simplistic to say policy-level and operating-level, but that's really what it is. Staff provides professional recommendations to Council, but Council can still say "no, let's go in a difference direction" and set policy. As a group, for example with speed humps, we can discuss if we want to be more stringent or more relaxed with the policy and Staff will implement it that way. Planning Commission is the same way. They hear larger issues, but Staff doesn't bring every single detail to them such as whether a site needs 20 parking spots or 21. Mr. Gorman reminded that we are still a new Commission and are still working out the details on our role and how we function. Planning Commission has been around a long time and has most of these things worked out.

Ms. Bradley gave the example of the Towanda Barnes project going to Council in a different version than was heard and recommended by the Transportation Commission. There was no commentary back to the Commission or an opportunity to re-vote on the change of direction. Mr. Karch indicated that was a fair criticism and we will strive to do better.

8. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 5:29 pm unanimously by voice vote; motioned by Ms. Rumley and seconded by Ms. Bradley.

Respectfully,

Philip Allyn
City Traffic Engineer

DRAFT

CITY OF BLOOMINGTON
REPORT FOR THE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
April 17, 2018

CASE NUMBER:	SUBJECT:	ORIGINATING FROM:
INFORMATION	Summary of Citizen Comments/Complaints Received in March, 2018	Philip Allyn, PE, PTOE City Traffic Engineer
REQUEST:	Item submitted as information for the Transportation Commission. Any feedback or comments are welcome.	

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval
Staff submits the following information to the Commission. Any comments or feedback is appreciated.

1. ATTACHMENTS:

a. None

2. BACKGROUND AND SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:

The following comments were received by the Engineering Department between March 1 and April 10, 2018:

1) Received request to increase parking restrictions on Lee at Chestnut due to lack of sight distance when turning from Chestnut to Lee. Called petitioner to discuss: He indicated the problem was both to north and south, and for both westbound and eastbound. Phil indicated parking currently is restricted via in-place signage: no parking on west side Lee to south all the way to Locust, no parking on east side Lee to south for ~100', no parking on east side Lee north for 80'. Parking on west side of Lee to the north is not currently restricted via signage, but City Code and State Statute restricts parking within 20' of the cross walk. We'll look into signing northwest side, but the rest needs enforcement by Police as restrictions are already in place. We'll notify the Police of the concern. He should call Police if cars are parked illegally. He indicated he has a co-worker who has similar difficulties with sight distance that he would have call me with additional information.
2) Received request from Dunraven Homeowner's Associate to restrict parking on west side of Glenbridge between Ballybunion and Dunloe. Letters were delivered to neighborhood requesting feedback on proposed parking ban on west side of street. Responses received overwhelmingly favor restricting parking. Mailed letter to residents notifying them that the parking restriction would be put in place. Engineering will evaluate over next 90-120 days and incorporate into City Code provided there are no unintended consequences that arise.

3) Received request to review restricting parking to one side of street and install traffic calming on Tanner between Park Lake and Springfield. Speed and traffic data to be gathered to evaluate request when weather and staffing allows.
4) Received complaint about people parking too close to their driveway with a submitted photo showing car approximately 4' from apron. No phone number or email was provided. Phil visited site and talked to roommate of submitter, explained ordinance prohibits parking within 3' of driveways and informed resident that if a car is parked closer than 3', they can call the police department to issue a ticket. Online submittal was closed by requester.
5) Received request to remove a No Parking sign in front of a house and an old utility pole which no longer has any lines on it along the back of the property. Reviewed request: parking restriction required to allow room for school buses and garbage trucks to turn around (house is on the end of a street without a cul-de-sac). Currently verifying owner of the pole, believed to be Ameren about its removal.
6) Received a request from an insurance company requesting traffic camera video following a hit and run a week prior. Called the agent and informed him that traffic cameras do not record any video and thus none is available. Referred him to the Police Department to obtain a copy of the police report for the crash.
7) Received a comment from a driver traveling on Veteran's Parkway between Ireland Grove and Empire. Drive indicated that they had red lights at multiple intersections within this section. Emailed a response indicating IDOT controls the coordination of the signals along Veteran's. Explained how the coordination works and gave several reasons why she may have gotten several red lights in a row.
8) Received comments relating to E. Washington Street needing to be resurfaced, bike lanes re-painted. Also commented that the right turn lane at Mercer is too narrow causing large back-ups. Responded indicating this section of Washington Street is scheduled to be resurfaced following upcoming underground sewer work, the Contractor has been contacted about repairing the markings that failed over the winter, and the lane widths will be evaluated when the street is resurfaced. The worst areas will be patched this spring to get it through until the resurfacing. Staff will verify that an intersection lane use sign placed last fall hasn't been damaged or removed.

3. STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff submits the above information to the Commission. Any comments or feedback is appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,

Philip Allyn, PE, PTOE
City Traffic Engineer