

## APPENDIX D-1

### MINUTES OF PUBLIC AND SECTION 106 CONSULTING PARTIES MEETINGS FOR THE BANCROFT STREET (GLENWOOD TO ASHLAND) PROJECT COLLINGWOOD PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH SEPTEMBER 26, 2013

David Dysard opened the meeting just after 6PM and went around the room with introductions of people from the neighborhood and the City of Toledo Design Team. Representing Toledo was: David Dysard, Dennis Lechlak, Doug Stephens, John Crandall, Stephanie Bartlett, and Dick Meyers. Kacey Smith from ODOT, District 2 was also in attendance. The total attendance was approximately 30 people with about 23 citizens.

(See attached attendance list)

Next, Mr. Dysard discussed the agenda (Exhibit 1 to these notes) and the design process (Exhibit 2). He stressed that tonight's meeting was about the broad conceptual design principals for alternatives developed by the City of Toledo staff with the members of the Design Review Team. He emphasized that the focus is the following elements of design: reduce speed of traffic; accommodate bikes; tree lawn width; reinforce historic character of neighborhood; provide for bus stops; walk ability; accommodate parking and major aesthetic elements. Other project design details will be developed later in the process of detailed design. The overall goal is to select a design concept by early December of this year, so more detailed preliminary design can follow between January and July of 2014. The overall Bancroft St. design principles as developed by the Design Review Team were then presented to the group by Mr. Dysard and after suggestion to add a provision for future burial of utilities were accepted by consensus. These design principles are shown as Exhibit 3. Finally Dave pointed out that a separate Section 106 Consulting Party Meeting would convene at 7PM to specifically address historic district issues.

Next, John Crandall reviewed the alternatives developed by the Design Review Team for the project which are summarized as follows:

Alt. A – 36' wide pavement (f/f) – Parking on north side with Share the Road for bikes.

Alt. B – 36' wide pavement (f/f) – Separate bike lanes with limited parking.

Alt. C – 40' wide pavement (f/f) – 12' median with no parking and bus pullouts.

Alternates A, B, & C can be built between Glenwood and Collingwood Blvd. where the City has 80' of right-of-way width, but only A & B can be built between Collingwood Blvd. and Ashland Ave. where the right/of/way width is 66'.

John stressed that the goal of this evening is not to pick an alternative, but to discuss each alternative, answer questions, and be sure the concepts are clear along with hearing likes, dislikes and concerns for refinement by the Design Review Team. The open discussion

that followed was mainly focused on questions of understanding for the alternatives with the City staff clarifying the proposals.

Almost all of the allotted time was used to answer general questions in regard to the process and specific questions on the alternatives. A summary is as follows:

1. The method of evaluating the alternatives has not been determined and will be the topic of the next neighborhood meeting.
2. Likewise, no attempt has been made to prioritize the design principals developed with the Design Review Team and presented at the meeting. It was pointed out that all underground utilities are not a part of the design at this time.
3. It was suggested that this project should not prevent future improvements, by others, in the corridor such as a framework for underground utilities.
4. Much discussion on Alternate C (median)
  - Any research data that this would actually slow traffic or reduce accidents?
  - Looks confusing. No left turns for driveways. Would traffic patterns be revised on adjoining streets?

During the discussion of alternatives, Dave Dysard addressed the Glenwood Gateway Traffic Calming Exhibit where the City showed a modern roundabout along with a taper approach and encouraged those present to comment during the open house portion of the meeting. In answer to a question, the alternate for a compact urban roundabout has not been developed yet. It would have a diameter of 80' to 120'. This proposal will take more time and be investigated further later in the design process. However, the Design Review Team would like to get an initial reaction from the neighborhood tonight during the open house.

Due to time constraints, it was not possible to gage the like/dislike reaction to the alternatives, but there did appear that there were many concerns with Alternate C (median). During this portion of the meeting, it was requested that City staff add encroachments to the plans and the one-way adjoining street pattern.

The neighborhood general meeting was adjourned with an open house following with four stations (3 alternates and Glenwood Gateway) manned by staff. A summary of the comments received are summarized as Exhibit 4. A separate set of minutes was prepared for the 106 Consulting Party Meeting which lasted between 7:00 and 7:45PM. The City staff and consultants stayed until 8:00PM when the open house portion of the meeting ended.

Attachments:

- A) Attendance
- B) Exhibit 1 (agenda)
- C) Exhibit 2 (design process)
- D) Exhibit 3 (design principles)
- E) Exhibit 4 (comments posted on the alternatives)

**APPENDIX D-2**  
**MINUTES OF 106 CONSULTING PARTY MEETING**  
**BANCROFT ST. (GLENWOOD TO ASHLAND)**  
**COLLINGWOOD PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH**  
**SEPTEMBER 26, 2014**

Dave Dysard called the meeting to order about 7PM and an attendance sheet was passed around for signatures. Present were: C. Kutsche, K. Schumaker, J. Patrick, D. Neuendorff, P. Radley, K. Gagen, C.J. Kuzma, M. Jarred, T. Moore, T. Effler, S. Frank, and L. Derr , along with D. Dysard, J. Crandall, and K. Smith (ODOT). Dave said that the topic of this meeting is specific to how the project affects the historic character of the neighborhood.

There was a discussion of the Secretary of Interior Standards along with the need to have the funding necessary to address the historic issues. Without funding how can these historic issues be properly addressed? The budget always is an issue on a project and sometimes additional funding can be found such as safety funding for the roundabout if it is determined to be a part of the Bancroft Street Project and an effective safety countermeasure. There could be historic features that will require additional funding from other sources, but it depends on the choices made for design. Are there still transportation enhancement funds available? No, that program was eliminated by Congress in the renewal of the Highway Act, however many of the activities previously eligible for funding under the enhancement program can qualify for a new Transportation Alternatives Program funding. The Transportation Alternatives program, however, includes many more eligible items and is funded at a greatly reduced level so funding will be extremely competitive. Our region already has those funds programmed through 2018, which is beyond this project's construction date of 2016.

The discussion then shifted to some of the design elements of the project as follows:

1. Sidewalks: Would like to preserve the existing 6' width, but cost estimate is based on 5' (City Standard).
  - Like to preserve sandstone, but don't know the cost to do so or how much can be salvaged?
  - Is there an alternate way to use concrete to get the look and finish (color additive/texture) to mimic sandstone? Don't just store, encourage reuse of sandstone especially at intersections.
2. Curbs: Similar issues as sidewalks, but feel even less is salvagable.
3. Underground Utilities: Most likely a budget buster and where would dollars come from? Invite Toledo Edison to next D.R.T. meeting. While desirable, is this an historic 106 issue? Could at least the street lighting be underground? Includes cable and telephone.
4. TREE CANNOPY LOOK \*\*: Possible on south side of Bancroft St., especially with underground street lighting, but north side requires smaller height of trees with Toledo Edison policy on trimming. \*\*

5. TREE REPLACEMENT \*\*: What is proper mix of trees and why do other cities seem to have success with plantings in smaller tree lawns? \*\*
6. TREE LAWNS \*\*: Like the look of existing 10' +/- tree lawns. Try to keep them as much as possible. \*\*

\*\* Seemed to be of high importance, but no budget for #3, underground utilities.

As the meeting continued, the discussion shifted from specific design elements to general comments, questions, and suggestions as follows:

1. Why is the funding (budget) already set for project without Section 106 input?  
There is no project without a budget of funding. The need here is to reconstruct the pavement and the City added \$ 70,000.00 to \$ 80,000.00 for neighborhood amenities which represents about 4% of construction budget.
2. Don't feel alternate C (median) fits character of neighborhood. Because of extra 2' of pavement, it makes saving trees more difficult and reduces tree lawn width. Drop it.
3. Could a rumble strip be used on alternate B to narrow look and feel to driver to slow traffic?
4. Is there any way of estimating amount of street bricks that might be present and reusing them?
5. Could a construction cost breakdown be gotten for the project so that consulting parties have a feel for the cost of different elements?

Toward the end of the meeting, Tammy Michalak submitted additional her comments which are attached to the minutes and are being shared with the consulting parties. The 106 Consulting Party Meeting concluded about 7:45PM and the attendees had the opportunity to view the four open house stations which concluded at 8PM.