

**CITY OF WATERLOO  
COMPLETE STREETS ADVISORY SUBCOMMITTEE**

**FRIDAY, MAY 2, 2014**

**MINUTES**

The May 2, 2014 meeting of the City of Waterloo Complete Streets Advisory Subcommittee was called to order at 10:00 a.m. by Kevin Blanshan.

Meeting Attendees:	Wayne Castle	City of Waterloo
	Aric Schroeder	City of Waterloo
	Felicia Cass	Healthy Cedar Valley Coalition
	Will Frost	ReNew Waterloo CDC
	Pat Morrissey	Waterloo City Council and Cedar Valley Bicycle Collective
	Kevin Blanshan	INRCOG
	Kyle Durant	INRCOG
	Codie Leseman	INRCOG
	Brian Schoon	INRCOG

The meeting began with an open discussion regarding the Complete Streets Advisory Committee's ("Committee") function. The discussion started by focusing on the Committee's direction as determined by the City Council. Cass stated that the Committee could function like the Planning and Zoning Board and give recommendations to the City Council. The group reviewed Section 5.3 of the City of Waterloo Complete Streets Advisory Committee Administrative Rules. The section states that the final decision of the Committee on any matter shall be in the form of a recommendation to the City Engineer and Community Planning & Development Director who will then be responsible for submitting a formal recommendation to the Mayor and City Council for consideration, which is to include a copy of the original recommendation. If a formal recommendation is not submitted to the Mayor and City Council for consideration after 30 days of receiving the Committee's recommendation, then the Committee shall send its recommendation directly to the Mayor and City Council.

The group then discussed the implications of this rule. Cass suggested convening a work session in the event of a disagreement between the Committee and the City Engineer or Community Planning & Development Director on a specific project. This work session would include all three entities as well as City Council members, and would focus on developing a consensus-based decision for the project's design. Cass added that the Committee needs to be aware of the 30-day deadline after a recommendation has been submitted. Schoon added that the Committee could add any recommendations directly to the meeting minutes, which could later be submitted to the City Council if necessary. Morrissey noted that he could bring any Committee recommendations straight to the Council. Frost stated that having an established process can help when dealing with sensitive topics.

Cass noted that projects can change over time and asked how the Committee can monitor this. Blanshan stated that the Committee could ask project sponsors to provide project updates. Schroeder asked whether the Committee would be tasked with developing a project list of its own. Cass read an excerpt of the Complete Street Policy which states that the committee is to create a vision. Cass continued, stating that sidewalk infill shouldn't be a priority for the Committee. Schroeder said that if the Committee doesn't promote sidewalk infill projects, the need might go unaddressed. Cass asked who is looking into the sidewalk gaps if the Committee isn't. Blanshan stated that the upcoming MPO Pedestrian Plan could help address this issue. Schoon added that the Committee could help enforce the Pedestrian Plan once it is completed.

Cass stated that the Committee's full function might not be realized until 2016, as the City is already working on FY 2015 projects right now. Blanshan asked what the normal construction timeline is for the City. Castle stated that the City Council approves the list of projects in late winter to early spring, construction crews survey the construction sites in the summer, and the design process typically begins in November. As such, the FY 2016 list is already relatively firm. Blanshan stated that the Committee could start looking at FY 2016 and 2017 projects to get ahead of the curve, and asked whether the City has the lists for each year available. Castle confirmed that these lists are available. Schroeder stated that sidewalk projects should be tied to road reconstruction projects, but amenities such as bike lanes and share-the-road markings could be added any time. Cass stated that the Committee shouldn't give up on the 2015 projects.

Blanshan stated that the next big project for input from the committee is the U.S. Highway 63 reconstruction. Cass asked how the group would feel about meeting once a month for status updates on the following projects: U.S. Highway 63, Kimball Avenue, and Park Avenue. Cass suggested shorter, more frequent meetings to establish communication and fair expectations between the Committee and the City. Cass asked how citizen input could best be received by the City Council. Schoon and Cass discussed whether the Committee should ask the City Council what their expectations are, or if it's better to bring the Committee's policy to the Council first.

Blanshan stated that there exists a perception that bicycling on the road is unsafe. Schroeder briefly described the U.S. Highway 63 design process and mentioned the safety issues concerning pedestrians crossing at an at-grade railroad crossing. Morrissey stated that safety should be the top priority of the group, which would also help gain support from the City Council. Cass asked if the City would be able to produce cost estimates per mile for different bicycle amenities, e.g. bike lanes, paved trails.

Cass suggested creating a PowerPoint presentation to show the Committee's intentions and process. Blanshan asked if the Committee's next steps should include bringing a draft PowerPoint presentation to the next meeting. The next meeting was scheduled for June 10<sup>th</sup> at 4:00 p.m., and the agenda is to include the following:

- Updates on U.S. Highway 63, Kimball Avenue, and Park Avenue
- Presentation and input of the Committee's PowerPoint presentation for the City Council
- Updates on Easton Avenue and Downing Avenue

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:18 a.m.

Respectfully submitted

Codie Leseman  
Acting Secretary