

APPENDIX C
DRT NOTES – AUGUST TO NOVEMBER, 2013 (6 MEETINGS)

APPENDIX C-1
DRT DISCUSSION NOTES
8-28-2013

A. ATTENDANCE

Citizens: Patrick & Carolyn Boyle, Lewis Derr, Sandra Frank, Lisa Kerrigan, John & Michelle Kirkbride, Martin Jarrett, Jack Patrick, Sue Postal, Ken Schumaker, Mary Weil, Sara Haynes was not present

Staff: S. Bartlett, D. Dysard, J. Crandall & R. Myers, G. Stookey, D. Garvin not present

B. ADDITIONS/CORRECTIONS TO 8-8-2013 PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES

1. Add Denny Garvin to the DRT staff
2. Curbs should be labeled granite/sandstone in statement “Can Granite/Sandstone curbs be reused?”

C. CLARIFICATIONS/SUGGESTIONS

During the meeting, a number of items were address as follows:

1. Staff explained an elevated walkway and/or intersection
2. Budget not short on funding, based on FY16 construction (July 2015 to 2016). Budget has 5' wide walks, not 6'. amenities/streetscape is \$ 70,000.00
3. City has policy on salvage of sandstone sidewalks if owner Wants them for other use or to give to OWEA
4. Old West End Association (OWEA) also has a site for storing same
5. Field survey normally goes 15'+/- beyond the end of radius for side streets
6. All existing drive approaches are planned to be replaced as part of project

D. Notes

1. John Crandall reported on information gathering progress which is Attached.
2. With time becoming a problem, John Crandall moved to the next item on the agenda which was the thoughts of lower speed – provide for bikes & pedestrians and traffic/speed control at Glenwood. During

this limited discussion, the importance of the historic environment of the neighborhood was emphasized in several ways including, “the feel” of Bancroft St. through the Village of Ottawa Hills and the aesthetic look at Tuttle Interchange along I-275 in the Columbus area. Dave Dysard explained the landscaped interchanges are funded by the private sector rather than O.D.O.T. or City.

3. Next, continuing with a time constraint, Stephanie Bartlett reviewed the existing typical cross sections for Bancroft Street which are 66’ of R/W east of Collingwood and 80’ of R/W west of Collingwood (same as shown at public meeting on August 8). On the easel, Stephanie did several sketches as shown on Exhibit I.
4. There was also discussion of different design features and the need for a statement of the purpose of the project and what we are attempting to accomplish with the different design elements. The notes on the purpose of the project from this discussion are shown as Exhibit II.
5. As the meeting began to wrap up, the group focused on the need to take a recommendation back to the next neighborhood public meeting in regard to the Glenwood off Ramp intersection and the Gateway issue due to the timing of the O.D.O.T. project. While it already seems too late, the feeling was to give it a shot. Therefore, the staff was asked to bring back to the DRT some draft recommendations for the gateway along with some alternative cross sections or drawings for presentation at the next neighborhood meeting.
6. A meeting was set for the DRT for September 11, 2013 at Mansion View at 5:30 PM and for the next neighborhood public meeting on September 26, 2013 at 6:00 PM.
7. During the meeting, potential outside funding assistance for different project elements was discussed at various times. Some of the sources discussed were as follows:
 1. OWEA has some funding for streetscape type elements
 2. The Arts Commission and the Art Museum are potential sources/partners for streetscape and art installations
 3. It was the feeling of the group that Toledo Edison needs to put something back in the neighborhood
 4. St. Vincent Hospital has assisted neighborhood groups in the area

E. ATTACHMENTS TO THESE NOTES

1. Agenda
2. Update on information gathering
3. Exhibit I – Suggested typicals
4. Exhibit II – Notes on Purpose of the project from Easel
5. Street lighting option

APPENDIX C- 2

DRT DISCUSSION NOTES 9-11-13

A. ATTENDANCE

Lewis Derr, Lisa Kerrigan, Martin Jarret, Tammy Michalak, David Neuendorff, Sue Postal, Ken Schumacher, R. Mary Weil

Staff: Engr. Services - S Bartlett, D. Dysard, D. Stephens; Trans. - D. Lechlak; TARTA - Rick Bush; Consultants - J. Crandall, R. Meyers;

Not Present: Boyles, Sandra Frank, Kirkbrides, Jack Patrick, Haynes, D.Garvin

B. ADDITIONS/CORRECTIONS TO 8-28-2013 DRT NOTES:

No comments were received.

C. CLARIFICATIONS/SUGGESTIONS DURING MEETING:

- 1) Need a way to measure parking need.
- 2) Show buildings and label within 10' of R/W
- 3) Re-route Edison off Bancroft ? only at expense of others (assessment – project) Bury lines, high expense – even to provide conduit for future is high cost (OWE has met with Meg Adams).
- 4) Parking needs of Seventh Day Adventist Church?

D. NOTES

- 1) The meeting opened with a discussion of design principals from the last DRT meeting. Martin Jarret presented a summary for review attached as Exhibit 1. Dave Dysard led a discussion of these items and the group reached consensus on the revised design principals for this project as shown on Exhibit 2.
- 2) The next item for the meeting was presentation by the staff of three alternatives for the 80' R/W section (Glenwood to Collingwood) and two alternatives for the 66' R/W section (Collingwood to Ashland). A summary of the discussion on each of these alternatives is attached as Exhibit 3 (taken from the easel sheets). There were no decisions made and all alternatives will be taken to the next neighborhood public meeting.
- 3) Next, the staff reported back to the DRT on the Bancroft/Glenwood/I-75 off ramp intersection. A very preliminary sketch of a roundabout was shown for discussion (see exhibit 4). There was a strong preference shown for this with some R/W concerns. Additional construction funding of at least \$350,000.00 (very rough conceptual estimate) would be needed, but City thinks this could be found through the safety program, but it would require additional City match dollars. Stephanie Bartlett also presented a taper revision alternative for Bancroft within

the project limits. Also discussed was a plan presented by Ken Schumaker which the City will review (see Exhibit 5). The City was asked to also look at an urban compact design and to expand the taper alternate to the West.

- 4) With a time constraint, the staff requested to get input on the format for the next neighborhood meeting on September 26, 2013. (See Exhibit 6).
- 5) The meeting wrapped up about 7:30 PM and the next DRT meeting was set for 5:30 PM on October 9, 2013 at the Mansion View Inn.
- 6) Because of time constraints, there are two items attached to these DRT notes that were not presented at the meeting, but are included to keep everyone up to date. The first is an update on information gathering (see attached) and a recommendation from staff to not consider an off pavement multi-use trail (Exhibit 7).

E. ATTACHMENTS TO THESE NOTES:

- 1) Agenda
- 2) Update on information gathering
- 3) Exhibit 1 (proposed design principals)
- 4) Exhibit 2 (consensus revisions of design principals)
- 5) Exhibit 3 (alternative discussion summary)
- 6) Exhibit 4 Glenwood roundabout (City – very preliminary)
- 7) Exhibit 5 Schumacher roundabout suggestion
- 8) Exhibit 6 Next neighborhood meeting on September 26, 2013
- 9) Exhibit 7 Staff recommendation (not consider off pavement multi-use trail)

APPENDIX C-3

DRT DISCUSSION NOTES

October 9, 2013

A. Attendance / Agenda (see Attachment A)

Citizens: Lisa Kerrigan, John Kirkbride, Martin Jarrett, Tammy Michalak, David Neuendorff, Jack Patrick, Sue Postal, Ken Schumaker

Staff: S. Bartlett, D. Dysard, J. Crandall, R. Meyers and Doug Stephens

Other: Randy Swope (Toledo Edison) and Tom Gibbons (TLCPC)

B. Notes for the 9/11/13 DRT meeting were sent out to everyone before the meeting. There were no corrections or comments from the team. Dysard said to let him know of any changes by Friday, 10/11/13. He apologized for the City's computer system being down and resulting lack of a project web site. Dave also noted that notes for the neighborhood portion of public meeting on 9/26/13 were distributed. These notes include the comments from the displays.

C. Next Dave introduced Randy Swope of Toledo Edison to discuss potential project ideas and issues. He discussed the potential of overhead facilities being placed underground in future. An order of magnitude of cost for this project would be \$1,000,000 for six conduits (4 T.E. / 2 others) and manholes. Edison would desire a 12' easement. All this cost for future would be by others not Edison. He stated that service is presently in conduits in the Bancroft Street bridge over I-75, but that the new bridge will be overhead wires per ODOT.

In regard to underground street lighting, that would be at additional cost and the type of fixtures were reviewed along with the poles. Mr. Swope said that the standard fiberglass poles are not strong enough for banners, flowers, etc. and that would be an additional cost. Street lighting cost is a front foot assessment handled by Scott Bishop with City of Toledo. It might be possible to use a combination of overhead street lights with pole lights, but wasn't sure of city policy.

In regard to moving the main three phase overhead service from Bancroft Street to Virginia, Randy said he would develop some conceptual costs for the group for the additional construction cost but that he must maintain three phase service on Bancroft for Ann Manor and any other major users. Virginia doesn't currently have three phase and that would have an impact on trees and properties along Virginia to accept this larger service.

The group requested the following additional conceptual cost from Randy for construction to do the following:

- 1) Provide conduits today for future underground placement of lines on Bancroft between new I-75 bridge and Ashland (provide only conduit and manholes now).
 - 2) Provide stronger posts for combination street lighting (overhead and post mounted) with post mounted wires fed from underground.
 - 3) Shift main service from Bancroft to Virginia across the neighborhood (Mr. Swope wanted to confirm in the field if that was even possible).
- D. The next item was to confirm consensus on the principles of design which was approved (Attachment C). There was discussion on need for some street parking at Ann Manor. Ken Schumaker volunteered to contact Ann Manor and provide a summary of parking needs. John Crandall will provide assistance if needed. In regard to parking, the discussion then turned to the need for additional parking at Seventh Day Adventist Church. An adjacent parcel 74' x 200' will be coming available because of back property taxes and there was discussion to meet with Land Bank and church officials to see if church would pursue it for parking. It was determined by those present that this item was desirable, but well beyond the scope of the project.

Next the staff recommendation to not consider a 10' off pavement multi-use trail (Exhibit 7 of prior meeting notes) from the August 28, 2013 DRT meeting was discussed and it was agreed that the off pavement trail should be dropped from further consideration.

- E. The next discussion centered on what was heard at the neighborhood meeting and open house along with the Minutes and summary of the post-it notes on the alternate displays ON September 26, 2013. After a lengthy consideration, there was agreement that the neighborhood expressed many concerns with Alternate C (median) and seemed to favor Alternate B (bike lanes) expressing the importance of both bikes and parking to a sustainable neighborhood. In the end, it seemed that the Design Review Team was together on the following:
- DRT seemed to favor Alternate A (parking)
 - Evaluate 2 lanes (28') with Alternate A, B and C
 - Neighborhood favored Alternate B and disliked Alternate C
 - Two lanes (28') share the road – would require bump ins at locations to accommodate parking, bikes in share the road lanes, would accommodate buses, slows traffic
 - 10' multi-use trail is out
 - Wide tree lawn is very important
 - Maplewood and Bancroft are to stay connected
 - Still right-of-way concerns and funding issues for roundabout (tapers are still an option – even a median should be considered between Glenwood and Robinwood – Is there a compact urban roundabout design?)

F. Minutes of the 106 portion of the neighborhood meeting on September 26 had been prepared, but were not typed yet but will be distributed next week. Stephanie Bartlett reported that she had walked the site and only 8% of the walks are sandstone. She also passed out a summary sheet of the encroachments between sidewalk and right-of-way. With limited time, there was a quick review of what staff heard at the 106 meeting on September 26, 2013 and there seemed to be agreement on the following:

- Keep walks at 6' in width and in same location as much as possible (save sandstone for reuse) – adds \$45,000
- 10' tree lawn very important – don't like no tree lawn – could there be a minimum width?
- No objection to a rumble strip for bike lane (4 to 6 inches wide)
- One issue came up to be reviewed with traffic engineering is need for designated crosswalks (brick?) with no signal? Between Glenwood and Collingwood (at Parkwood, Scottwood, Robinwood?)

G. As the meeting approached 7:30 pm, Dave Dysard passed out a suggested decision matrix for each member to take home and bring to next meeting. The DRT felt it was early to compare the Glenwood Gateway options and G-1 and G-2 were dropped from the matrix. (note: Alternative A-B from Ken Schumaker was added after the meeting for consideration.)

H. The DRT also scheduled the following meetings:

-DRT	Wed., Oct. 16	5:30 pm	Mansion View	Decide on Pref. Alt.
-DRT	Wed., Oct. 30	5:30 pm	Mansion View	Decide on Pref Alt.
-Neighborhood & 106	Wed., Nov. 20	6:00 pm	C'ngwood Pres.	Pref. Alt.

Attachments:

- A) Agenda 10-9-13 meeting
- B) Project Design Principles (10-9-13)
- C) Enroachments
- D) Proposed matrix

APPENDIX C-4

DRT DISCUSSION NOTES October 16, 2013

Agenda (see Attachment)

Attendance

Citizens: Lewis Derr, Sandra Frank, Lisa Kerrigan, John Kirkbride, Martin Jarret, David Neuendorff, Tammy Michalak, Ken Schumaker
Staff: D. Dysard, J. Crandall
Other: Steve Atkinson, T.A.R.T.A.

Notes:

Notes from the 10/9/13 DRT meeting were sent out to everyone before the meeting and there were no corrections or comments from the team. Dysard said to let him know by Friday (10/18/13) of any corrections. Dysard continued that the project web site has been delayed and the 106 Minutes are still to be sent out.

Dysard then reviewed the alternates under consideration between Collingwood and Glenwood for this evening as follows:

Alt. A

36' wide pavement with 8' parking on N. + 2-14' lanes (share the road)

Alt. B

36' wide pavement with 2-5' bike lanes + 2-13' lanes (limited parking)

Alt. C

40' wide pavement with 12' median and 2-14' lanes (share the road / no parking and bus bays (previously dropped from further consideration)

Alt. D (suggested at public meeting)

28' wide pavement (limited parking / share the road)

Alt. A/B (suggestion by Ken Schumaker – see attachment)

32' to 40' wide pavement with 2 11' lanes (limited parking / bike lanes and share the road)

Dysard stated that the subject of gateway options for Glenwood would be for the next DRT meeting on October 30, 2013.

Next, the team reviewed the four remaining alternatives with the criteria developed by the DRT at the last meeting and the explanations made by Jack Patrick. Prior to ranking, the team agreed Alternate A (parking on north) seemed to be best fit for Collingwood to Ashland with a minimum tree lawn on the south side. (None exists at present.) It was

also decided to not give a weight to the criteria at this time. Dave Dysard and John Crandall documented the ranking process with the following summary of results:

<u>CRITERIA</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>A/B</u>
1. Establish gateway	3	4	--	4	4
2. Slow vehicle speed	3	3	--	4	4
3. Walk ability	1	1	--	1	1
4. Reinforce historic char.	3	2	--	4	3
5. Items for detail design	*	*	--	*	*
6. Commons / bike access	3	4	--	3	4
7. Encourage city-wide bike sys.	3	5	--	3	5
8. Buses/transit	3	3	--	3	3
9. Tree lawns	3	2	--	5	4
10. Short/long term parking	4	3	--	3	3
11. Allow utility burial	4	3	--	5	4
12. Budget considerations	*	*	--	*	*
13. Neighborhood consensus	*	*	--	*	*
	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>		<u>35</u>	<u>35</u>

Notes:

- Alt. C was deleted from further consideration by neighborhood, DRT and 106 parties
- (*) These items not ranked at this time

After the ranking by the team, Dave continued the discussion about Alt. D and Alt. A/B or different combinations by blocks. For example different elements of the different options could be selected for each block such as:

Glenwood to Robinwood	Alt. B	Alt. C	Alt. B
Robinwood to Scottwood	Alt. B	Alt. A/B	Alt. B
Scottwood to Parkwood	Alt. A	Alt. A/B	Alt. B
Parkwood to Collingwood	Alt. A	Alt. A/B	Alt. B
Collingwood to Ashland	Alt. A	Alt. A	Alt. A

Remember there are left turns at Collingwood.

There didn't seem to be much interest in applying various alternates to the different blocks and the discussion shifted to reaching a consensus decision between Alternate D (28' pavement and Alternate A/B (32' to 40' pavement). The group was unable to reach consensus, but clearly most preferred A/B. John Crandall reminded the DRT that the neighborhood has not seen Alternate D or A/B. At this point of the meeting, the team requested that the City prepare displays for alternatives D and A/B for the next DRT meeting.

During the meeting, a number of issues and clarifications came up and are listed as follows:

- A) Dysard suggested the following language for our alternatives: bump outs move curb into pavement (to shorten pedestrian crossing) and bump ins move curb into the tree lawn for parking bays or bus bays.
- B) Citizen members requested City lower speed from 35 mph to 25 mph.
- C) It was requested that alternate displays show the x-walk distance for intersections.
- D) City confirmed that all intersections for the project can have designated crosswalks at intersections with or without a signal. There seems to be a preference for stamped bricks similar to those around Huntington Arena in the downtown.
- E) The off-street parking at Seventh Day Adventist Church came up again at the meeting. The City was clear this is beyond the scope of the Bancroft Street project. The neighborhood can pursue it, but the City through this project is not a participant, nor is the DRT.

As the meeting time approached 7:30 p.m., the information gathering update was tabled until next meeting and Dave Dysard reminded everyone the next DRT meeting would be held on Wednesday, October 30, 2013 at 5:30 p.m. (Mansion View). The next neighborhood meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, November 20, 2013.

Attachments:

- Agenda
- Decision matrix
- Alternate D (Michalak)
- Alternate A/B (Schumaker)

APPENDIX C-5

DRT DISCUSSION NOTES OCTOBER 30, 2013

Dave Dysard reviewed the Agenda for the meeting and the intended outcomes for the meeting which is attached. The attendance list is also attached which consisted of 4 City staff (Dysard, Stephens, Bartlett, Lechlak) – 2 consultants (Crandall, Meyers) – representatives from TARTA (Atkinson) and TLCPC (Maguire), and 10 residents. The 10 residents were: Tammy Michalak, David and Leslie Neuendorff, Sue Postal, Ken Schumaker, John Kirkbride, Jack Patrick, Toni Moore, Martin Jarret and Mary Weil. Some minor corrections were made to the Draft Discussion Notes for the 10-16-13 DRT meeting. The group was given to Friday (11-1-13) to provide any additional comments.

Dysard continued that the main goal of the evening was to see if a consensus decision could be made on the Glenwood Gateway. The options still under consideration are short taper, roundabout and longer taper to the west of I-75 bridge. In regard to funding, the City feels all require additional dollars, but feels it can be obtained by adding Ohio Public Work Commission (O.P.W.C.) funding to the federal project and obtaining preliminary approval of the concept by O.D.O.T. which has an adjacent interchange/bridge deck project at this location.

Dave then discussed his email of October 28 in regard to the previous criteria used to evaluate typical sections at the October 16 meeting. This was followed up by a discussion led by Stephanie Bartlett and Dysard of the remaining three (3) alternatives for the Glenwood Gateway. All require additional funding from OPWC which has an application due in about two weeks. The most expensive is the roundabout at about \$700,000 to \$800,000. However, OPWC has a severe penalty if an application is approved and then dropped. Therefore, this could be high risk for the City. A summary of this discussion is as follows:

- 1) Use same criteria with addition of three items (intersection confusion, R/W takes and maintenance of Gateway). At this time cost and neighborhood preference are not included. All can be funded with O.P.W.C.
- 2) Alternate G-1 (short taper) sketch available, but could be longer across bridge – can accommodate bikes.
- 3) Alternate G-2 (roundabout) sketch available – two R/W takes [estimated at 200 SF or .46 acre ea.] 125' +/- diameter – can accommodate bikes.
- 4) Alternate G-3 (longer taper) no sketch, but City says it will work and moves lane merge further west of neighborhood (between I-75 bridge and Monroe Street) – can accommodate bikes.

Dave Dyard and John Crandall documented the ranking process with the following summary of results:

<u>CRITERIA</u>	<u>G-1</u> (short transition)	<u>G-2</u> (roundabout)	<u>G-3</u> (long transition)
1. Establish Gateway	3	3	3
2. Slow vehicle speed	3	5	4
3. Walk ability	3	4	3
4. Reinforce historic character	3	2	4
5. Items for detail design	N/A	N/A	N/A
6. Commons / bike access	N/A	N/A	N/A
7. Encourage city-wide bike sys.	3	3	3
8. Buses / transit	N/A	N/A	N/A
9. Tree lawns	2	4	3
10. Short/long term parking	N/A	N/A	N/A
11. Allow utility burial	N/A	N/A	N/A
12. Budget considerations	*	*	*
13. Neighborhood consensus	*	*	*
A. Reduce inter. confusion	3	5	3
B. R/W takes	3	1	3
C. Gateway maint.	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>
	26	28	29

Notes:

- (*) These items not ranked at this time.
- ABC apply to Gateway only and result in 9-8-9.

During the evaluation process, Dysard pressed the team hard for a preference between the longer transition (G-3) and the roundabout (G-2), but a consensus decision was not possible. The team understands the ability of the roundabout (G-2) to improve the safety of intersection, slow speeds, and provide landscape/planting opportunities, but there are also strong concerns with how G-2 fits the neighborhood, the right of way takes and ability to maintain neighborhood historic character.

During the meeting, several other observations were made as follows:

- 1) Team okay with criteria and equal weights
- 2) October 16 rankings acceptable for typical section [A/B or D consensus]
- 3) Parking important Scottwood to Ashland [remember left turns at Collingwood]
- 4) Accident information now available for team (post to web site?)

- 5) TARTA route #22 – doing survey may go from 4 stops to 2 – UT and Franklin Park service – open to appropriate shelters for OWE and Real Time kiosks
- 6) Strong support for 6' wide sidewalks even with additional cost
- 7) Minimum tree lawn of 6' width with maximum of 10' to 11'
- 8) Minimum pavement of 32' F/F curb 5' – 11' – 11' – 5' [may not apply on all blocks].

The last item of business was to set an additional DRT before the next neighborhood meeting scheduled for November 20, 2013. A date of Wednesday (November 13th) at 5:30 p.m. was agreed to at Mansion View. Adjournment was about 8 p.m.

Attachments:

Proposed Agenda

APPENDIX C-6

DRT DISCUSSION NOTES NOVEMBER 13, 2013

Dave Dysard reviewed the Agenda for the meeting. The purpose was to reach consensus on a recommendation from the DRT to the neighborhood for presentation at the November 20 public meeting and prepare for the meeting. Attendance consisted of 4 City staff (Dysard, Stephens, Bartlett, Lechlak) – 1 consultant (Meyers, Crandall out sick) – representative from TLCPC (Maguire), and 12 residents (Lisa Kerrigan, Tammy Michalak, David and Leslie Neuendorff, Sue Postal, Ken Schumaker, John Kirkbride, Jack Patrick, Toni Moore, Martin Jarret, Lewis Derr and Mary Weil). The group was asked to provide any comments on the 10-30-13 notes by Friday (11-15-13).

Dysard began discussion with a review of a staff meeting called to outline how best to help the group reach consensus. It was agreed that there was not a clear result of last meeting and the choice between roundabout or taper on the west end was not made. It was decided that staff would “have a go at” trying to outline what might be a consensus recommendation that the team could react to. The draft recommendation included extending the project west to Monroe Street to allow narrowing pavement west of the I-75 bridge, reconfiguring the bridge to include wider sidewalk area on the south to reinforce the narrower pavement cross section, realigning the ramp for eastbound turns to become part of the Glenwood intersection, adding bike lanes throughout, and adding protected parking (with bump outs) from midblock between Robinwood and Scottwood to east of Parkwood and from east of Collingwood to west of Ashland.

There were questions and discussion of the various elements of this recommendation and overall there was consensus around this recommendation. All agreed it was a compromise but seemed to address the major concerns voiced by different team members while providing for both traffic safety and neighborhood concerns. Individual members of the team were polled and all agreed that this was the consensus recommendation of the team.

It was also agreed that there are still many detail items to discuss. There was much discussion of intersection treatments with varying perspectives on the safety and effectiveness of traffic lights, four way stops or just marked crossings for both pedestrians and vehicles. Traffic lights are not “warranted” under the eight criteria listed in Ohio Revised Code but are “grandfathered” at Scottwood and Parkwood and can be maintained but only at 100% City cost – no federal participation). Dennis said that conduit will be placed underground regardless so we have options in the future. Also, there was a “negative offset” of the turn lanes at Collingwood (they don’t line up directly across from each other) that Stephanie will attempt to straighten out if it can be done with minimal impact to the general agreed upon arrangement and dimensions. Tree location and species remain a concern as well as use of recycled materials at corners or crossings.

All of these elements will be decided during detail design and are not addressed at this stage in plan development.

Discussion turned to the public meeting. Jack and Ken agreed to help with presenting at the meeting. We agreed to do slides (power point type) of the plan to show everyone plus have three hard copies of the recommended plan on boards for people to look at in more detail, ask questions individually with staff and DRT neighborhood members, and record questions/comments on post-it notes (or index cards). It was suggested that Dave convene the meeting and John or Dave can briefly review agenda and format for the meeting (highlighting to make sure comments are recorded on notes) and explain where we are in the design process. Then Jack can present the design principles that we agreed upon and a general review of the team process to evaluate alternatives, and the general cross section. Ken can then review the proposed configuration in more detail block by block. Dave can conclude the presentation portion of the meeting with next steps and next meetings and adjourn to the three displays for questions and comments.

We discussed coordination with Section 106 Consulting Parties and the need for a separate meeting. It was agreed that the 106 meeting should be held after the public meeting. It was felt that we could do this on the same night so the public meeting is to conclude by 7:15 and there will be a section 106 coordination meeting scheduled from 7:30-8:00 pm.

We agreed on the need for another public meeting in spring 2014.

The last item of business was to set the next DRT meeting. A date of Wednesday January 22, 2014 at 5:30 p.m. at Mansion View was agreed to. Adjournment was about 7 p.m.

Attachments:

- Proposed Agenda 11-13-2013

ATTACHMENT:

BANCROFT STREET DESIGN REVIEW TEAM

November 13, 2013

Mansion View Inn

PROPOSED AGENDA

- 5:30 p.m. Review discussion notes of October 30 meeting (Dysard)
- 5:35 p.m. Review discussion notes of staff meeting October 31, 2013 (Dysard)
- 5:45 p.m. Review / discuss / modify, as needed, the possible consensus recommendation that was developed (Bartlett / Lechlak)
- Monroe to Lawrence
 - Lawrence to Glenwood
 - Glenwood to Collingwood
 - Collingwood to Ashland
- 6:15 p.m. Reaction / confirm consensus (Dysard)
- 6:25 p.m. Presenting the recommendation to the neighborhood public meeting?
Materials, presenters, displays (Dysard)
- 6:45 p.m. Section 106 Coordination – meeting same night (like last time) OK?
Meeting day before, earlier that evening? (Dysard)
- 6:55 p.m. Next steps / next DRT meeting? (Dysard)
- 7:10 p.m. Roundtable for comments and adjournment