

Bisbee Shared Use Path, Stakeholder Meeting No. 4**June 2, 2021**

1:30 PM – 2:30 PM

Via teleconference/MS Teams

AttendeesDonna Lewandowski, dlewandowski@azdot.govBill Harmon, bharmon@azdot.govSteve Anderson, steve.anderson@pima.govJesus Haro, jharo@bisbeeaz.govSteve Pauken, spauken@bisbeeaz.govChristine McLachlan, CMcLachlan@cochise.az.govMeggen Connolley, bisbeebikeways@gmail.comJay Gomes, jomes@azdot.gov**Consultant Team**Brent Crowther, brent.crowther@kimley-horn.comRebeca Field, rebeca.field@kimley-horn.comKristen Faltz, kristen.faltz@kimley-horn.comOlivia Neeley, Olivia.neeley@kimley-horn.com**Meeting Notes**

The following summarizes discussion from the Bisbee Shared Use Path Stakeholder / TAC Meeting No. 4 that was held June 2, 2021.

Brent Crowther shared the final report concepts, public input, and recommendations. Discussions associated are summarized below.

Discussion on Recommendations

Brent shared the final design concepts as well as the recommendation provided by Kimley-Horn. He informed that it is recommended to move forward with Concept B as well as presented cost saving alternatives to the Concept. He opened the discussion regarding the recommendation.

Meggen Connolley inquired what ADOT thought of the second box culvert idea.

- Bill Harmon shared that ADOT can work with that idea, but it is an expensive option. He shared what the bigger challenge would be is that if the primary funding is through SEAGO, you are competing with other agencies, the people that make the decision are the elected offices. They will perform a mental benefit cost ratio. They will ask if they spend 2 million dollars on a culvert in Bisbee or if they spend that money in another community. He mentioned that the TAC can make recommendations to the city that then will make recommendations to the elected officials. It would be difficult to talk officials into spending that much money.

Bill asked if there is enough room for vehicle traffic if the sidewalk is widened as well.

- Brent Crowther shared that it looks as though the curb to curb width is 26-28' so may be able to have 11' lanes there but there is probably room to add 2-3' to that.
 - Meggen shared that this sounds like a good alternative.

- Brent mentioned that it would not function as a two-way path.
- Meggen mentioned that the sidewalk can be 6' until it meets up with the mine.
- Steve inquired if this is a desirable concept.
 - Bill shared that we should consider what our alternatives are. In urban areas, making lane widths on a street 11' from larger lane widths may induce a little more traffic calming and slow people down. In an urban setting where you have to share space, some measure of traffic calming might help people alleviate anxiety as they go back and forth from sidewalk to the shared use path.
 - Christine McLaughlin shared that Bill's suggestion is a great way to save money, take the money that would be saved and put it towards what the public is really wanting, like landscaping.
 - Jay informed that as far as traffic calming, since it is not a main through street, 11' lanes can definitely be done here but would have to consider drainage but it is a good way to gain more feet for the sidewalk or shared-use path there.
- Rebeca Field confirmed that the existing asphalt width in this location is 24' and the sidewalk is 4'. Based on these existing conditions, it was determined that there can be 2 10'5" lanes to allow the sidewalk to widen. Rebeca shared that it does look like the roadway narrows down more at the bridge. This may require 10' travel lanes.
 - It was mentioned that these lane widths may be too difficult for delivery trucks and other large trucks.
 - Bill shared he would be hesitant to go less than 11'. If you have any kind of traffic that would use it on a regular basis especially, there needs to be some wiggle room for vehicles to get through. The pathway would need to be from the Mine to Erie St but signs for a shared sidewalk may need to be present from the Mine to Old Bisbee.
 - Jay Gomes agreed that 10.5' lane widths would be the absolute minimum but 11' would be better.

Jay shared that he noticed the addition of turning movements in Concept A. it would make the intersection more awkward. He inquired if the idea of a roundabout has been looked into.

- Brent shared it would be a great place for a roundabout. He mentioned that part of the objective is to make this project affordable and a roundabout would bring up the cost significantly to maintain existing pavement as much as we can to keep the cost down.

Brent informed that another alternative could be to do a crossing at the highway. This would allow more space on the northside but then would be moving people to cross the highway and investing in infrastructure. He feels it would be better to leave them on the same side throughout the entire pathway.

Brent inquired what the TAC members think needs to be done to demonstrate support moving forward.

- Jesus Haro shared that he does not think there needs to be a final recommendation, as long as both concepts will work the decisionmakers can choose between the two.
- Steve R shared that the narrower the options are, the more likely things are going to get done. He feels that concept B and Concept B1 (phased) is the best. If you are lucky enough to construct the entire path in one, that would be great but if not, something will get build until we have the rest of the money to phase the rest.
- Donna Lewandowski shared that stopping at the mine for the phases would be a good point but also share with the community that this a phase 1 and it is important to share that the next phase is planned.
- Bill mentioned that we should mention that we have deliberated and studied this situation with members of the community and we can feel good about making a strong recommendation that it be done in phases, from Erie St to the mine and then from the mine tour to Old Bisbee.

- It was determined that Concept B will be recommended with the option to phase depending on funding availability.

Meggen inquired regarding landscaping options for incorporating green infrastructure. She shared a raised median or curbing including green infrastructure. Meggen shared she thought of this was because during monsoon season the highway gets flooded. She is concerned about the median causing issues and drainage.

- Donna shared that this idea does cost more but is interesting. She shared that there may be a sperate grant for environmental that this can be funded through.
- Bill informed that if the City is willing to bury the costs of maintaining the landscaping it would be a good idea, As long as we don't place the feature that would represent a collision hazard for bicycles, vehicles, and pedestrians- we do not want to block vision or cause major debris.
- Steve mentioned that he likes the general concept but want to emphasize we only get rain for 2 months a year so anything will need to be weeds. He also does not think that the City would be against this but need to be careful of what plans we put in there.
- Brent shared that the median would be depressed rather than concrete capped and plants would go in there but if you cannot irrigate it, it would need to be desert grasses, etc.
- Steve Pauken advised that this can be added as a recommendation in the final report and can include it as a design alternative.

Summary of Next Steps

- Kimley-Horn to update Final Report based on comments received.