

# **SUMMARY REPORT DEVELOPMENT OF PREFERRED CONCEPTUAL ALTERNATIVE FOR BANCROFT STREET PROJECT BETWEEN MONROE STREET AND ASHLAND AVENUE**

## **Project Background**

Bancroft Street in the City of Toledo between Ashland Avenue and Glenwood Avenue is in a state of disrepair and currently has a pavement condition rating of 46 on a 100 point scale. Generally, any street with a score of less than 70 is considered deficient and in need of total reconstruction. An application for federal participation in a project to replace the street was successful and construction has been scheduled for state fiscal year 2016 (July 2015 to July 2016).

The project is located in the Old West End Historic District. Due to the sensitive nature of street reconstruction in the historic district the City of Toledo engaged in a very robust neighborhood involvement effort to develop consensus with community representatives on the concept for design of the project. This report summarizes these efforts that resulted in a consensus recommendation made by a Design Review Team (DRT) consisting of neighborhood leaders, city staff and consultants. On November 20, 2013 this consensus was reviewed at a neighborhood public meeting and supported with no opposition voiced. The City is proceeding with detailed design plans building upon the consensus preferred conceptual alternative.

## **Generalized Design Process Outline**

This report documents the Preliminary Engineering - Conceptual Design work and public outreach that took place from August to November 2013. Figure 1 presents a brief outline of the design process that was developed. It presents an overview of the overall design process and highlights the decisions made as part of the process through November 2013 in the Conceptual Design phase. It also lists the guiding design principles (Figure 1: Column 1 - "Draft Design Principles") for the project developed cooperatively with neighbors during this process (see below for more information on developing the design principles).

## **Project Limits**

The initial project was a federal aid project to reconstruct Bancroft between Glenwood and Ashland Avenues. During the conceptual design process the project was extended to Monroe Street on the west due to input from the DRT. Ohio Public Works Commission (OPWC) funding was applied for and received to allow expansion of the project to Monroe Street.

## **Process Summary**

The formal involvement process began with a neighborhood public meeting held on August 8, 2013. City staff presented the Project Development Schedule and Preliminary Data Sheet for Bancroft Street between Glenwood and Ashland Avenues, the Toledo

**Figure 1: Bancroft Street, Glenwood to Ashland  
Generalized Design Process Outline (September 2013)**

<b>Preliminary Engineering</b>		<b>Detailed Design</b>
<b>Conceptual Design (August to December 2013)</b>	<b>Preliminary Design (January to July 2014)</b>	<b>Final Detailed Design (July to December 2014)</b>
Outcome: Agree on Broad Concept of project – number and width of traffic lanes; bike accommodations; parking; sidewalk and tree lawn location and width; major aesthetic elements	Outcome: “Flesh out” concepts into line, grade, typical drawings, details on sidewalk location/ materials, lighting, etc.	Outcome: Final “blue prints” and package for contractor to bid and build; All specific details laid out in package.
Process: Work with Neighbors and appropriate subject area experts in the City to develop design principles and then concept of project <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Neighborhood Public Meetings</li> <li>- Section 106 Consulting Parties</li> <li>- Added Design Review Team</li> <li>- Traffic and Civil Engineering</li> </ul>	Process: City Design staff determines geometry, grades, final elements based on safety stds./budget. Review with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Neighborhood Public Mtg</li> <li>- Section 106 Cons. Parties</li> <li>- Design Review Team</li> </ul>	Process: City Design Staff complete construction drawings and bid package. Review with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Neighborhood Public Mtg</li> <li>- Section 106 Consulting Parties</li> <li>- Design Review Team</li> </ul>
Draft Design Principles: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish a gateway on Bancroft Street designating the historic district (at both ends of project) ;</li> <li>• Reduce the speed of traffic (especially eastbound);</li> <li>• Improve “walkability” by providing safe and unique pedestrian friendly sidewalks and crosswalks;</li> <li>• Reinforce the historic character of the district in selection of streetscape elements;</li> <li>• Reclaim street and sidewalk materials in the reconstructed sidewalks;</li> <li>• Integrate the streetscape and ped. network with the Commons Park;</li> <li>• Encourage and provide for safe bicyclist friendly usage along Bancroft</li> <li>• Provide facilities for transit users that are appropriate to the character of the neighborhood;</li> <li>• Add and replace dead trees and landscaping to reinforce the character of the district; and,</li> <li>• Accommodate proper parking along Bancroft Street where safe, appropriate and needed</li> </ul>	Decisions on final location and type of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All gateway elements;</li> <li>All traffic calming elements and all traffic controls;</li> <li>All sidewalk elements;</li> <li>Tree location and type;</li> <li>All sidewalk materials;</li> <li>All streetscape/landscaping lighting to be included;</li> <li>All parking locations;</li> <li>All transit stop locations/accommodations;</li> </ul>	Final Specifications for installation of all elements from Preliminary Design; Exact geometry of traffic elements and parking; Final grades and utility relocations; Final details on streetscape, sidewalk, transit stop elements and materials

“Policy for Complete Street Design” along with the Project Cost Estimate Used for the Funding Application. A list of public meetings held during development of the Preferred Alternative is included in Appendix A. The Agenda, Minutes and Hand outs for the first public meeting are posted on the City Project web site for the Bancroft Street project. The minutes are included in this report as Appendix B.

At that time, a detailed topographic survey was not available for the project, but the city did have aerials available for the existing conditions. The main purpose of the project (to rebuild the pavement) was reviewed. The pavement had a condition rating of 46 on a scale of 0 to 100. This ranks this section of street in very poor condition.

All comments received are a part of the Minutes. Some of the major items of concern or issues were as follows:

- High speed of traffic (especially eastbound)
- Historic character of the neighborhood
- Need to consider bike facilities
- Provide for improved parking (especially at Ann Manor)
- Safety concerns at intersection of Glenwood and I-75 off ramp (very confusing alignment and pavement taper here; current design is poor)
- Save trees (especially any large canopy type trees)
- Unattractive appearance of neighborhood gateway at Glenwood
- Improve bus stops
- Consider underground electric service (which is not in budget) and more attractive street lighting (a line item for aesthetic improvements is in budget).

At the close of the meeting, volunteers were obtained for the Design Review Team (DRT) and for Section 106 Historic District Consulting Parties (106 CP's). Approximately 65 people attended. Fourteen persons volunteered as 106 CP's. Twelve neighbors volunteered to participate in the DRT with four staff. The City had two consultants present to assist in developing the consensus preferred conceptual alternative.

Two DRT meetings were held on August 28, 2013 and September 11, 2013 to assist city staff with development of the draft design principles to guide the process and to assist with developing three (3) initial alternatives for presentation at the next neighborhood meeting. The design principles are overall goals for the project and no attempt was made to prioritize or weigh these principles. The notes, agenda and hand outs from the DRT meetings are available on the City Project web site and notes are included with this report as Appendix C.

At the second neighborhood meeting held on September 26, 2013 with the public, three alternate typical sections were presented as developed by the DRT:

- Alt. A. 36' (f/f curb) Parking on north side and share the road for bikes
- Alt. B. 36' (f/f curb) Separate bike lanes with limited parking in “bays”
- Alt. C. 40' (f/f curb) 12' median with share the road for bikes and no parking

No attempt was made to evaluate the alternatives at this time. The purpose of this meeting was to receive neighborhood reaction and direction to refine alternatives. Sidewalks were shown as 5' wide versus the existing 6' width. Three bike accommodations were shown. These were: share the road (vehicle/bicycle shared lane with pavement markings, signing and wider pavement (14 feet) than if just for vehicles; separate bike lanes (5' or 6' lanes next to vehicle lanes but separately striped); and, a 10' off road multi-use path for bike/pedestrian use.

Results of the meeting favored bike lanes (Alternate B) through the neighborhood with some vehicle parking where most needed. There was no support for a separate off road path. There was little support for the median design (Alternate C) because of the following:

- Required wider pavement means less tree lawn width
- Concern that it doesn't fit historic character of neighborhood
- Eliminates left turns to residential drives
- No place for legal U turns and it will encourage illegal U turns
- Concern over city maintenance of median including plantings
- Encourages mid-block pedestrian crossings
- Design could encourage higher speed depending on lane widths
- 14' tight for sharing of vehicles, bikes and buses at bus stops
- If delivery vehicle parked or accident occurs, no room for vehicles to go around
- No parking.

At this second meeting, the City also introduced the idea of a roundabout at the Glenwood and I-75 off ramp with a preliminary sketch for reaction of the public and 106 Consulting Parties. Comments received are summarized in the Minutes for this meeting (Appendix D), but comments regarding the roundabout concept were mixed (some support but also some strong opposition).

It was requested that City consider a hybrid of Concept A and B (a two lane option with bike lanes / no parking and bus bays) and a smaller roundabout (compact urban design). Approximately 30 people attended the meeting.

The last portion of the meeting held on September 26 was with the Section 106 Consulting Parties and the Minutes are available on the City Project web site and in Appendix D. There was a strong preference to preserve canopy trees and 10' tree lawn on south side of Bancroft and to keep existing 6' sidewalk width. City was encouraged to seek additional funding for project in order to provide for historic features. It was pointed out that 6' walks vs. 5' walks represented about half of the \$80,000 set aside for historic elements in the City budget. Section 106 Parties concurred that Alternate C (median) should be dropped. Participants understood that underground utilities are well beyond City budget requested, but the design should not do anything that would eliminate future installation.

Three Design Review Team (DRT) meetings were held on October 9, 16 and 30 to assist the City staff with further development of alternates, establishing ranking criteria, and to evaluate the alternatives to recommend a preferred alternative. The notes of these meetings are available on the City Project web site and in Appendix C. Again, the ranking criteria were considered equal and no attempt was made to set priorities or weigh the items by the DRT. A

recommendation from the City staff that the 10' off pavement shared use trail be eliminated from further consideration was approved (see Appendix G). Two additional typical section alternatives were developed as follows:

- Alt. D. 28' (f/f curb) Share the road for bikes and no parking
- Alt. A/B 5' bike lanes with limited parking (vary from 32' to 40' f/f curb)

The DRT did not rank Alternate C (median) because there was little support for it during the pre-screening process or at the public meeting. New alternatives Alternate D (28') and Alternate A/B (32' to 40') were ranked equal with 35 points. At this point, the ranking did not include either cost criteria or public reaction.

While Alternates D and A/B had the same points, the discussion following the ranking procedure clearly supported A/B because it provided bike facilities and parking which were considered essential to the future of the neighborhood. Ken Shumaker, a retired architect and one of the DRT members had investigated the need for parking in the area and found that at the intersection of Bancroft and Scottwood there was need for around 30 places on street (see Appendix H – Ann Manor Parking Study). Further, it was agreed that it would not be detrimental to the neighborhood if we did not have a uniform cross section for the entire project since it was a densely developed mature urban neighborhood and it was agreed that typical sections could vary between blocks. This allowed the flexibility to address the parking issue at locations where there was need.

Next, the DRT worked with the City staff to consider a number of alternatives for the Glenwood/I-75 off ramp intersection which is the west gateway to the Old West End. Three alternatives were developed. They were then ranked by the DRT using the same criteria as used for the typical sections with the addition of three new criteria as follows:

- reduce intersection confusion
- minimize right-of-way impact
- minimize cost of long term maintenance by City.

The rating of the alternatives was as follows:

Alt. G-1 Short transition west of intersection across I-75 bridge	26 points
Alt. G-2 Roundabout	28 points
Alt. G-3 Long transition west of I-75 bridge (no further than Monroe Street)	29 points

While desirable, all of these alternatives (G-1 thru G-3) require the City to extend the project limits to the west beyond Glenwood and obtain additional project funding. With a funding deadline approaching for Ohio Public Works Commission (OPWC) funding, the City pushed the DRT for a consensus decision between Alternate G-2 (roundabout) and G-3 (long transition) at the meeting on October 30, 2013. However, none could be reached.

The next day (October 31, 2013) Dave Dysard called a meeting for City staff and consultants to determine if the OPWC funding application should proceed and how the City's risk could be reduced while still keeping the Bancroft project on schedule.

It was determined to make an application for an OPWC project from Ashland to Monroe Street keeping the federal funding portion of the project between Ashland and Glenwood. City staff would prepare an exhibit for a recommended preferred alternative for the DRT to review that would best meet the following:

- Use long transition to Monroe Street – Alternate G-3 (drop roundabout)
- Use Alternate A/B with slight modifications to address discussion at last meeting to do the following:
  - o Keep south curb line and 10’ tree lawn
  - o North side would have minimum 6’ tree lawn, larger wherever possible
  - o Provide parking on north side between the blocks of Robinwood and Scottwood (half way), Scottwood to Parkwood, Parkwood to Collingwood (half way) and Collingwood to Ashland
  - o Narrow pavement between Glenwood and Robinwood (32’ f/f)
  - o Accommodate bikes with striped 5’ lanes in pavement
  - o Use 6’ sidewalks.
  - o Modify A/B to revise geometrics at Glenwood to bring ramp directly into the Bancroft/Glenwood intersection

Considering project cost, City risk and public acceptance, the City determined the following point adjustments on the approach alternates:

	G-1 (short)	G-2 (roundabout)	G-3 (long)
DRT	26	28	29
City	<u>12</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>13</u>
Total	38	36	42

A revised cost estimate was developed for the alternates and is presented in the table below.

Table: Cost Summary for Bancroft Alternatives

	Bancroft from Ashland to Glenwood				“Gateway” Bancroft from Glenwood to Monroe		
	Alt. A	Alt B	Alt D	Alt A/B	Short Transition	Roundabout	Long Transition
Construction	\$2.4 m	\$2.2 m	\$2.2 m	\$2.3 m	\$0.050 m	\$0.500	\$0.175 m
Right of way	\$0.7 m	\$0.7 m	\$0.4 m	\$0.7 m	\$0	\$0.012 m	\$0
Total	\$3.1 m	\$2.9 m	\$2.6 m	\$3.0 m	\$0.050 m	\$0.512	\$0.175 m

At the DRT meeting held on November 12, 2013, the team approved the City recommendation for the preferred alternative (Alternate A/B and approach G-3). Team members were polled as to whether this represented a consensus of the team and all agreed. Further, members of the DRT agreed to assist the City with the presentation of this preferred alternative to the public at a neighborhood meeting on November 20, 2013.

The preferred alternative was well supported at the November 20, 2013 neighborhood meeting and approved by the 106 Consulting Parties. See Minutes of the meeting on City Project web site and in Appendix E. Approximately 30 people were in attendance.

### **Preferred Alternative Recommendation**

As discussed above the alternative labeled A/B (with minor modifications) coupled with approach G-3 was recommended as the preferred alternative. City staff has successfully secured additional funding to extend the western project limit to just east of Monroe Street. This alternative was reviewed and affirmed at a public meeting and with Section 106 Consulting Parties on November 26, 2013. Therefore, the City has selected this preferred alternative for detailed design beginning January 2014.

Plan view of the preferred alternative is presented in Appendix I.