AGENDA ITEMS

1. Call to Order/Agenda Review
   
2. Mayor's Communications
   
3. Communications and Hearings from Persons Before the Board
   
4. Response to the Public
   
5. Reports
   A. Special Committees of the Board
   B. Council Liaison
   C. Board Liaisons
   D. Superintendent and Staff
   
6. New Presentations

7. Administration & Communications
   A. City of Ithaca's Sexual Harassment Policy
      The City's policy was recently updated; members of the boards and committees are being
      asked to sign an acknowledgement form stating they received the new policy.

8. Buildings, Properties, Refuse & Transit

9. Highways, Streets & Sidewalks
   A. Hudson Street/Hillview Place Intersection Evaluation
      A study has been conducted regarding the traffic at this intersection, per the Board's request.
   B. South Aurora Street Sidewalk Alignment – Resolution
      A resolution is offered for consideration, per the Board's discussion in December.

10. Parking & Traffic
    A. Resolution to Grant Hardship for 304 and 304A
       Mitchell Street for the Residential Parking Permit System
       A hardship request has been submitted for an RPPS permit.

11. Creeks, Bridges & Parks

12. Water & Sewer
    A. 221 South Geneva Street Water Account Resolution
       Per the Board's discussion, a resolution is provided approving the request to remove the
       penalties for this bill.

---

If you have a disability that will require special arrangements to be made in order for you to fully participate in the meeting, please contact the City Clerk at 607-274-6570 at least 48 hours before the meeting.

The Board of Public Works meets on the second and fourth Mondays at 4:45 p.m. All meetings are voting meetings, opening with a public comment period. Meeting agendas are created from prior public input, Department operating, planning issues, and requests made to the Superintendent. The Board reserves the right to limit verbal comments to three minutes and to request written comments on lengthy or complex issues. This information may then be used to create committee agendas, with the speaker or author invited to attend.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Voting?</th>
<th>Presenter(s)</th>
<th>Time Allowed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Appeal of Water and Sewer Bills from Tiny Timbers, LLC</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Asst. Supt. Whitney</td>
<td>15 min.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please see the enclosed request for a reduction of charges for the installation of water and sewer lines.*

13. **New Business**

14. **Adjournment**

Date: January 10, 2019
Hudson Street / Hillview Place Intersection Evaluation
Evaluated by Kent Johnson, Assistant Transportation Engineer and Eric Hathaway, Transportation Engineer

Summary of issue:
One Traffic Calming Program request expressed community concern for pedestrians crossing and side street delay at the Hudson Street/Hillview Place intersection. The request suggested that converting the intersection to an all-way stop could improve the situation. Though signs are not recommended ‘traffic calming’ devices, all-way stop control could conceivably be an appropriate design at this location and, therefore, an all-way stop warrant analysis has been conducted. Additionally, evaluations were performed to evaluate the existing speed limit, the appropriate pedestrian crossing treatment and intersection geometry. The end goal of all this analysis is to address the expressed concern regarding pedestrian safety.

Existing Conditions:
Hudson Street is an ‘Urban Collector’ street on the federal-aid functional classification system and is posted with a 30 MPH speed limit; immediately south of this intersection a 15 MPH school speed limit is in effect 7AM-6PM on school days. Traffic counts from 2017 and 2018 indicate that the average daily traffic (ADT) is approximately 5,500 vehicles per day (vpd) and the 85th percentile speeds are about 24 MPH (about 20 MPH when the school speed limit is in effect). The morning peak-hour volume is about 360 vph and the afternoon peak-hour is about 530 vph. Hudson St. is served by TCAT route 11 which passes through the Hudson/Hillview intersection (both ways) 56 times per day with slightly less service on Sundays. An all-way stop is present a block (320’) northward at the Hudson/Columbia intersection.

Hillview Place is also an ‘Urban Collector’ street on the federal-aid functional classification system and is posted with a 30 MPH speed limit; a 15 MPH school speed limit is in effect 7AM-6PM on school days. Recent traffic count data is not available, but, based on a 1999 traffic count and a recent (2017) turning movement count, the traffic volume is estimated to be around 1,000-2,000 vpd. Turning movement counts indicated a typical volume of about 30-60 vehicles/hour along Hillview Place, and about 4 pedestrians/hour crossing Hudson Street. A stop sign is present at the end of Hillview Place where it meets Hudson Street.

East of the Hudson/Hillview intersection is a private driveway/street named Renzetti Place and the adjacent South Hill Recreation Way multi-use trail.
Response to Traffic Calming Request:

In response to the primary focus of the traffic calming request (safety of school children) the engineering office evaluated the entire school zone of the South Hill Elementary School and upgraded pedestrian and school speed limit signs at 25 locations throughout the school zone on Hudson Street, Aurora Street, Hillview Place and Columbia Street in May of 2018. At the intersection of Hillview Place and Hudson Street, two pedestrian warning signs were placed at the existing crosswalk as part of this effort.

This location is on a primary emergency response route (Hudson Street) as identified by the Ithaca Fire Department, so speed humps or raised crosswalks are not an acceptable treatment on Hudson Street. The slope of the roadway is also in excess of 8 percent, which is another reason that vertical speed calming measures are not appropriate here.

In the Spring of 2019, once conditions are appropriate for painting, it is recommended that an edge line be painted on the northbound Hudson Street approach to Hillview Place to visually narrow the roadway. The centerline to curb width is about 12 feet today, so an edgeline can be painted two feet off of the existing curb.

Speed Limit Analysis:
A speed limit analysis was performed using Federal Highway Administration methodologies for establishing speed limits. Based on the analysis, it is our recommendation that the speed limit be changed to the State minimum allowable speed of 25 miles per hour along the entirety of Hudson Street.

Pedestrian Crossing Treatment:
In addition to the pedestrian warning signage mentioned above, the engineering department recommends placement of an in-street pedestrian warning sign on the northbound/southbound approaches on a trial basis. The signs will only be in place during times of the years when plows are not in use, as they are not permanently affixed to the pavement. Sometimes these signs are struck by vehicles, so this can be monitored, once placed. If ICSD were willing to maintain the signs during the school year, it would likely enhance the utility of the signs.

Crossing Guards:
We contacted the individuals within the City that coordinate the school crossing guard program regarding whether a crossing guard could be posted at this location. At the present time, the city is short 4-5 crossing guards to cover the existing needs. If local residents or ICSD would like to see a crossing guard at this location, they can contact Peter Messmer, Director of Parking to discuss possibilities. It should be noted that
students do have the option of crossing the street where there is a crossing guard posted further south by Crescent Place or at the all-way stop intersection of Hudson Street/Columbia Street.

Intersection Geometry Enhancements (Sidewalk Program):

After completing the traffic calming evaluation and speed limit analysis, the engineering office began an evaluation of the existing intersection geometry, especially as it relates to pedestrian crossings. Members of the engineering office visited the site and crossed the roadway at the existing crosswalk during peak and non-peak travel times to experience the concerns expressed by local residents. Other pedestrians were observed attempting to cross the intersection to see if drivers would yield to them and if they experienced significant delay.

In general, low pedestrian delay was observed. However, this intersection is unique in that the existing crossing provides access to the South Hill Recreational Trail, so we looked at how the intersection could be changed to make pedestrians more conspicuous as they cross the intersection to enhance pedestrian safety and reduce delay by encouraging vehicle yielding.

The existing pedestrian crosswalk across the south leg of the intersection terminates into the driveway access onto Renzetti Place to the east and to a perpendicular curb ramp oriented north/south across Hillview Place. The crosswalk is oriented diagonally across the intersection, which requires a longer crossing distance than a perpendicular crosswalk. (See Visual in Attachment 1)

We believe that an improved alignment would be to move the crosswalk south to create a perpendicular crossing at the existing trail access point (see Attachment 2). This would reduce the crossing distance for pedestrians by about 11 feet, or 29 percent. There is currently a curb cut at the trail entrance that the Town of Ithaca uses to access the trail for maintenance purposes. We recommend modifying the existing trail access to make it an ADA compliant curb ramp that can also be used by the Town for trail access. A similar design was constructed recently at the Hudson Street intersection with the South Hill Recreation Trail at Coddington Road. We have confirmed with the Town Public Works Department that this concept would improve their access to the trail. A corresponding ramp would be built directly across Hudson Street.

Per Highway Capacity Manual methodologies, the reduced crossing time would be expected to decrease pedestrian delay by 10 seconds per pedestrian. If the crossing is moved further south, placing a stop sign on the northbound approach would be more
difficult, as the sign would be spaced farther away from the intersection than is typical and could lead to confusion.

A second enhancement that could be constructed at the intersection is to create an ADA compliant crossing on the north leg of the intersection, where there are currently no crosswalks or curb ramps. Establishment of a crossing here would provide more options for pedestrians crossing the intersection and make the intersection more visible for vehicles approaching from the north. There is an opportunity to create a bulbout at the northwest corner of the intersection, as parking is restricted at this location already. This could serve to shorten the pedestrian crossing distance, encourage low speeds and encourage side street traffic to pull up even further when approaching the intersection for maximum visibility.

The most appropriate way to accomplish these two enhanced crossings would be through the City Sidewalk Program, as the crossings are primarily pedestrian enhancements, not traffic calming. Residents have also mentioned concerns about the sidewalk alignment in the vicinity of this intersection, so the sidewalk program could evaluate one design that would maximize the separation of the sidewalk and tie into the intersection improvements. The traffic calming program could partner by contributing funds towards the bulbout, if determined feasible. I would encourage the residents to request this site be included in the sidewalk program construction schedule.

**Stop Sign Warrant:**

A stop sign warrant was conducted at this intersection per standard Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) procedures and is included in Attachment 3. When warranted, all-way stop intersections can be an effective way of assigning right-of-way at intersections. However, we want to encourage the Board of Public Works and the local residents to read the article included in Attachment 4 describing the dangers of installing all-way stop intersections and traffic signals where they do not meet MUTCD warrants. The article can also be found at this link (https://nyc.streetsblog.org/2011/04/26/to-get-safer-streets-traffic-lights-and-stop-signs-arent-the-answer/).

The following quote is from the article and is in reference to using stop signs as a traffic calming measure:

Reid Ewing, a professor at the University of Utah, literally wrote the book on traffic calming — the Institute of Transportation Engineers’ *Traffic Calming: State of the Practice*. “They’re good for traffic control,” said Ewing of stop signs and traffic lights. “They’re not so good for traffic calming.” In other words, they
help make traffic flow in a more orderly fashion, but not necessarily in a safer one.

“We kind of panned stop signs as a traffic calming measure,” continued Ewing. “They don’t do a lot for speeding, because there’s a tendency for drivers to make up for the lost time.” That can lead to increased speeds midblock.

This idea is corroborated by the experience of one local resident who wrote to us about the intersection. This individual noted that drivers approaching the intersection from the south during school hours appear to be trying to make up for lost time when they are stopped by the crossing guard at the intersection of Crescent/Hudson. By adding another stop sign at Hillview Place, a potential outcome is to increase drivers desire to make up lost time mid-block. Making drivers stop two times in 320 feet (Columbia, Hillview) and potentially three times within 800 feet (Columbia, Hillview and Crescent) could result in more dangerous and aggravated driving midblock, near the school, and a tendency to disrespect the stop signs or crossing guards.

The MUTCD warrant study showed that an all-way stop condition is not warranted at this intersection. The primary reasons that an all-way stop sign is not warranted is because the number of pedestrians and vehicles crossing Hudson Street are much lower than the number of vehicles traveling through on Hudson Street. The manual traffic counts conducted at the intersection observed a ratio of roughly between 6:1 and 10:1 of main street to side street traffic. When traffic demand is this imbalanced, all-way stop conditions are generally an inefficient means of assigning right-of-way at intersections, which is a primary purpose of stop signs.

There is not a history of crashes that appear to be correctable by installation of an all-way stop condition. Angle crashes are a common type of crash that can be improved by installation of a stop sign; however, none have been recorded in the 10 year period from 2008-2017. For this reason, engineering principles would not suggest that installation of an all-way stop would provide a traffic calming effect or improve safety.

There is good reason to believe that crash rates would increase by conversion of the intersection to all-way stop. A synthesis of research on installation of stop signs has concluded that unwarranted stop signs can decrease pedestrian safety, especially for small children. This phenomenon is attributed to pedestrians anticipating that vehicles will stop, but drivers have gotten used to running the “unnecessary” stop sign.
Fuel Consumption and Noise Considerations:

We conducted a software simulation of the intersection representing the weekday afternoon peak travel time. The simulation showed an increase in 1.4 gallons of fuel consumption during this time period under an all-way stop condition compared to a two-way stop condition. This increase is likely related to the increased fuel demand required for over 500 vehicles per hour to stop and accelerate on Hudson Street. Considering that the afternoon peak hour makes up about 10 percent of the daily traffic on Hudson Street, the amount of increased fuel usage on a weekday is estimated at 14 gallons, or 3,600 gallons per year on weekdays alone. This is an important environmental consideration of adding stop conditions.

In addition to increased fuel usage and emissions, stop signs would be expected to increase noise levels at the intersection due to increased vehicle braking and acceleration.

Street Lighting Considerations:

Street lighting can have a significant effect on visibility of pedestrians crossing an intersection. Our experience crossing the intersection during the afternoon peak time in December was that vehicle yielding decreased as conditions became dark around 5 PM. It is recommended that pedestrian lighting be evaluated as part of the intersection redesign effort through the sidewalk program.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the above factors and considerations, and numerous site visits, the following modifications are suggested in the vicinity of the Hudson/Hillview intersection:

- Change speed limit from 30 mph to 25 mph during non-school hours (traffic calming program)
- Stripe an edge line on the northbound approach to the intersection to visually narrow the approach (traffic calming program)
- Place in-street pedestrian crossing sign on approach to intersection (traffic calming program)
- Modify street markings north of the intersection to provide more efficient parking and enhance sight distance (work order)
- Relocate existing crosswalk to align with the entrance to the South Hill Recreation Trail. Construct two new curb ramps (Sidewalk Program)
- Design and construct curb ramps (bulb on northwest corner) and crosswalk on the north leg of the intersection. (Sidewalk Program)
- Further analysis of pedestrian lighting needs at this location, perhaps in coordination with the pedestrian redesign (sidewalk program)
Attachment 1: Existing Intersection Geometry
Attachment 2: Conceptual Intersection Geometry Changes
Attachment 3: All-Way Stop Warrant Analysis

The Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) provides support, guidance and options when considering the installation of all-way stop control at an intersection. The following criteria were considered in this study.

A. Where traffic control signals are justified, the multi-way stop is an interim measure that can be installed quickly to control traffic while arrangements are being made for the installation of the traffic control signal.

The City of Ithaca is not considering the installation of a traffic signal at this location; this criteria does not apply.

B. Five or more reported crashes in a 12-month period that are susceptible to correction by a multi-way stop installation. Such crashes include right-turn and left-turn collisions as well as right-angle collisions.

A search was conducted via NYSDOT’s ALIS (Accident Location Information System) database for all reported collisions in the Hudson/Hillview intersection vicinity over the past three years (March 2015 – March 2018). The ALIS database contained the following three crashes:

6/29/15 – A vehicle rear-ended another vehicle on the Hillview Place stop sign approach to the Hudson/Hillview intersection. No injuries.

7/31/16 – A vehicle traveling along Hudson St. collided with a utility pole. No injuries.

9/9/16 – A vehicle traveling along Hudson St. collided with an animal. No injuries.

None of these crashes fit the typical characteristics of a crash that would be prevented by installation of an all-way stop condition. A concern with adding an all-way stop condition is that it could result in an increase in rear-end crashes, such as the one listed above on the stop-sign controlled Hillview approach to Hudson Street.

C. Minimum volumes:
   1. The vehicular volume entering the intersection from the major street approaches (total of both approaches) averages at least 300 vehicles per hour for any 8 hours of an average day; and
Yes, typically, the volumes along Hudson St. meet this threshold. Weekday volumes from 7 AM to 6 PM generally range from 250 to over 550.

2. The combined vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle volume entering the intersection from the minor street approaches (total of both approaches) averages at least 200 units per hour for the same 8 hours, with an average delay to minor-street vehicular traffic of at least 30 seconds per vehicle during the highest hour; but

No, this threshold is not met for the minor approach during any observed hour. The combined pedestrian and vehicle volumes are between approximately 30-70 per hour during the six hours observed. The calculated peak hour (5-6 PM) average delay for Hillview Place is under 13 seconds/vehicle.

3. If the 85th-percentile approach speed of the major-street traffic exceeds 40 mph, the minimum vehicular volume warrants are 70 percent of the values provided in Items 1 and 2.

No, this threshold is not met. Measured 85th percentile speeds were 24 miles per hour.

D. Where no single criterion is satisfied, but where Criteria B, C.1, and C.2 are all satisfied to 80 percent of the minimum values. Criterion C.3 is excluded from this condition.

No, this threshold is not met.

Other considerations noted in the MUTCD:

A. Need to control left-turn conflicts.

This is not a concern at this location.

B. Need to control vehicle/pedestrian conflicts near locations that generate high pedestrian volumes.

The turning movement counts conducted counted at total of 22 pedestrians crossing Hudson St. over a 6 hour period (which averages about 4 people every hour). For comparison purposes, a recent all-way stop warrant at the intersection of Cayuga Street and Cascadilla Street observed 72 pedestrians crossing Cayuga Street in a single hour.
C. Locations where a road user, after stopping, cannot see conflicting traffic and is not able to reasonably negotiate the intersection unless conflicting cross traffic is also required to stop.

Currently, Hillview Place traffic must come to a stop at Hudson Street. On-Street parking is present along the west side of Hudson Street, south of the intersection. On-street parking reduces sight distance, however, it also typically has a traffic calming effect. The majority of cars observed on the Hillview approach pull well into the crosswalk before proceeding into the intersection. This makes their vehicle visible to northbound and southbound vehicles on Hudson Street that can react and slow or stop, if needed, when the side street vehicle enters Hudson Street. Southbound vehicles are traveling up an 8 percent grade, which reduces their required stopping distance to under 143 feet based on the measured 85th percentile speed of 24 miles per hour.

The on-street parking is restricted for approximately 55 feet south of the intersection, which is well over the typical 20 feet restriction. Sight distance south of the intersection extends well beyond the required stopping sight distance requirements, as there is no on-street parking and trees are adequately spaced. If sight distance were not adequate for vehicles exiting Hillview Place, a trend of angle crashes would be expected, however, none were reported in the 10 year period between 2008 and 2017.

Overall, the sightlines for Hillview Place appear standard for the urban environment and adequate for road users to reasonably negotiate the intersection. One sight distance enhancement is proposed, in addition to the reduced speed limit. A site visit confirmed the “no parking” sign located in front of 416 Hudson Place can be moved approximately 5-10 feet south (away from the intersection) without losing any passenger car parking capacity.

D. An intersection of two residential neighborhood collector (through) streets of similar design and operating characteristics where multiway stop control would improve traffic operational characteristics of the intersection.

This scenario does not apply to the intersection in question.
Attachment 4: Article Regarding All-Way Stops and Traffic Signals As Traffic Calming Devices
To Get Safer Streets, Traffic Lights and Stop Signs Aren’t the Answer

- By Noah Kazis
- Apr 26, 2011
- 27

The addition of pedestrian refuge islands and bike lanes narrowed Brooklyn's Vanderbilt Avenue, slowing down speeding traffic and improving safety through changes to street geometry.

When faced with the question of how to fix a dangerous street, the first instinct of many New Yorkers is to call for the most familiar symbols of regulating cars: the stop sign and the traffic light. Nothing, they think, could more effectively force dangerous drivers to stop speeding through their neighborhood than these familiar red symbols. Just this month a community group in Manhattan Beach, Brooklyn asked the city to remove a bike lane and zebra stripes from Oriental Boulevard — measures that have a real traffic-calming effect — and add a new traffic signal where the road intersects with Falmouth Street. But stop signs and traffic signals are usually ineffective, even counterproductive, if the goal is to make streets safer.

Sometimes, the demand for traffic control devices is driven by good intentions, as when City Council Member Karen Koslowitz urged the city last year to stop treating Queens Boulevard “like it's a highway” and instead make it a “pedestrian-crossing street.” Koslowitz was calling for a new traffic light at the intersection of Queens Boulevard and 80th Road.
Residents of Manhattan Beach know they have a speeding problem, but some mistakenly think that replacing this bike lane with new traffic signals will solve it. Photo: #http://www.qaptainqwerty.com/2010/03/manhattan-beach-re-visited.html#QaptainQwerty#

Other times, it’s part of an attack on more effective traffic calming measures. During Dov Hikind’s epic tirade against NYC DOT at a Brooklyn Community Board 12 hearing last December, the assembly member contrasted the construction of pedestrian refuges on Fort Hamilton Parkway with his long campaign to get a traffic light installed elsewhere in his district. “You know, because you live there, you know how dangerous that corner is. I had a situation on East 4th and M, where people died, and the Department of Transportation turned down the traffic device four times,” said Hikind. Eventually he prevailed and a traffic light was installed at the location.

These fights — which local politicians apparently relish — can last years. Together, Peter Vallone Sr. and Jr. fought for a traffic signal at 21st Street and 30th Drive in Astoria for 41 years before a light was installed in 2008. Requests for stop signs or traffic lights are so common that the City Council recently passed a law requiring DOT to explain to community boards and Council members why it rejects them.

Each case is different, but in the aggregate, the reason traffic control devices aren’t installed more frequently is quite simple: They tend to make streets less safe, not more.

Reid Ewing, a professor at the University of Utah, literally wrote the book on traffic calming — the Institute of Transportation Engineers’ Traffic Calming: State of the Practice. “They’re good for traffic control,” said Ewing of stop signs and traffic lights. “They’re not so good for traffic calming.” In other words, they help make traffic flow in a more orderly fashion, but not necessarily in a safer one.

“We kind of panned stop signs as a traffic calming measure,” continued Ewing. “They don’t do a lot for speeding, because there’s a tendency for drivers to make up for the lost time.” That can lead to increased speeds midblock. Ewing did say that with enough stop signs, drivers will avoid a street altogether, reducing the number of cars but not the danger of each one.
This Queens Boulevard intersection, circa 2001, has plenty of traffic signals, but that doesn't mean it was safe. Signal retiming helped some, but a major change to the street geometry would do more. Photo:

##http://www.angelfire.com/ny4/expwy/qb/phqbgrand.htm## Jeff Saltzman ##

Sam Schwartz, the former New York City Traffic Commissioner, explained another problem with using stop signs as traffic calming devices. Schwartz said that if a stop sign doesn’t seem to belong in a location, some drivers will ignore it. “It may result in people crossing thinking they’re fully protected, when some driver thinks a stop sign doesn’t belong there and drives right through,” he said. “Putting the wrong traffic control device in can be a mistake, sometimes a fatal mistake.”

Similar problems arise if you install a traffic light where it doesn’t belong. “You’ll find the side street speeds actually increase,” said Schwartz. “When cars see the green light, they may floor it.”

Schwartz recalled a study he worked on while at DOT. A number of traffic signals that did not meet federal guidelines had been installed when local residents demanded them. “Statistically, crashes went up when traffic signals were introduced as a result of political pressure rather than the warrant,” said Schwartz. According to that report’s executive summary, crashes rose by 65 percent where unwarranted signals were installed.

In limited situations, however, retiming the signals at existing traffic lights can improve traffic safety. “Traffic signals can be timed in those few cases where you have the right spacing for a slow progression,” explained Ewing, who cautioned that “you have to have very special conditions where the signals are spaced just right.”

Schwartz pointed to Queens Boulevard, where he said signal retiming has helped pedestrians make it across the so-called Boulevard of Death. “It can work,” he said. Even on Queens Boulevard, though, Schwartz said a change to the design of the street’s geometry would have been preferable. Signal retiming also carries drawbacks like potentially increased traffic congestion and more rear-end crashes, said Schwartz.
Neckdowns, like this jumbo-sized one at the corner of Smith and Bergen, narrow pedestrian crossing distances, force drivers to turn more carefully, and send visual cues to slow down, providing real traffic calming and safety benefits. Photo: ##http://www.streetsblog.org/2009/08/28/now-thats-what-i-call-a-neckdown##

Ben Fried

NYC DOT posts similar reasoning on the FAQ section of its website. “In some areas where speeding is a problem, residents believe that a traffic signal is needed to address the speeding problem. In fact, traffic signals sometimes result in greater speeds as drivers accelerate to try to get through the signal before it turns red.” With regards to stop signs, DOT writes, “Studies made in many parts of the country show that there is a high incidence of intentional violations where stop signs are installed as ‘nuisances’ or ‘speed breakers.’ While speed is reduced in the immediate vicinity of the ‘nuisance’ stop signs, speeds are actually higher between intersections than they would have been if those signs had not been installed.”

Instead of stop signs and traffic signals, street safety advocates suggest physically altering the street to slow down traffic. “Because traffic signals and stop signs are not self-enforcing — they don’t come with a physical component that requires drivers to slow down — they can easily be ignored by drivers, especially if there isn’t visible enforcement by the police,” said Transportation Alternatives safety campaign director Lindsey Ganson. “Traffic can be calmed and pedestrian safety improved with other treatments, like speed humps or curb extensions, that are physically self-enforcing, treatments that force drivers to regulate their traveling speed.”

Acknowledging that many concerned citizens will nevertheless request stop signs or traffic signals, Ganson said that “when communities request safety improvements from the DOT it is most important to emphasize the problem and the overall need for safety improvements rather than request a specific solution.”
9B. **South Aurora Street Sidewalk Alignment – Resolution**

WHEREAS, the City of Ithaca Common Council passed a resolution on November 7, 2018 allocating up to $386,583 of NYS administered Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) for the South Aurora St. Sidewalk Extension; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Public Works completed the Environmental Review for this project on May 15, 2018 which resulted in findings that the project will result in no significant impact on the environment and issuance of no negative declaration; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Public Works discussed the South Aurora St. Project at the December 18, 2018 and the Engineering staff recommendations were presented to proceed with new sidewalk construction on the east side of the street in 2019; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Public Works approves that a continuous sidewalk be constructed along the east side of South Aurora Street, and if funds are available, also the west side; under the supervision and direction of the Superintendent of Public Works.
10A. **Resolution to Grant Hardship for 304 and 304A Mitchell Street for the Residential Parking Permit System**

WHEREAS, the Board of Public Works (BPW) has promulgated regulations, adopted June 9, 2004, for implementation of the Residential Parking Permit System (RPPS), which was established by Common Council on May 6, 1998 after an act of the New York State Legislature, and

WHEREAS, in accordance with Section 260-4 of the City Code and in accordance with the BPW regulations, the BPW may grant hardship requests, and

WHEREAS, 304 Mitchell Street is on a street within the residential Parking Permit Zone without on-street parking and is within the R-1 zoning designation; therefore allowing up to two permits per single family dwelling, now, therefore be it

**RESOLVED,** That the Board of Public Works hereby grants the residents of 304 and 304A Mitchell Street to purchase permits for the Residential Parking Permit Systems, in accordance with the above-mentioned regulations.
Hi Tim,

Can you please take a look at the attached draft Resolution for 304 Mitchell Street, together with the RPP map of the area, and there is a previous example of a Hardship RPP approved for 326 Mitchell. I wanted to have this resolution included for discussion at the BPW meeting tomorrow. Mike asked that you take a look at it. His concern is that we need to have a strong basis for these "hardship" resolutions so that they don't become abused by the students/residents.

Mitchell has no parking. Delaware Street has parking and the residential parking permits apply there. I drafted the hardship resolution for the following reasons:

1. The house is on a corner (Mitchell and Delawar)
2. They abide by trash collection for Delaware Street.
3. The have to shovel sidewalks on Delaware Street.
4. House has one door facing Mitchell street, and the door of one of the apartments faces Delaware Street.
5. A House at 326 Mitchell has already been granted a hardship RPP.

What do you think about RPP eligibility for this house?

Pete
12A. **221 South Geneva Street Water Account Resolution**

WHEREAS, the Owner of the property and water account at 221 South Geneva Street requests that the penalty be removed from the water bill dated 9/20/18, due 10/22/18, and

WHEREAS, the Owner states that the New York State Homes and Community Renewal Office in New York City signed the payment authorization on 10/15/18 and the signed authorization was mailed and received by McGraw House via mail after business hours on 10/22/18. The bill was paid in person 10/23/18, one (1) day late, and

WHEREAS, McGraw House is a non-profit community service with a good record of timely payment of their water and sewer bills, and

WHEREAS, their payment was one (1) day late, most likely because of processing time in another layer of Government administration, now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the 5% penalty of $935.34 is to be removed from their account for this one particular occurrence.
Kathy Servoss

From: Michael Thorne
Sent: Wednesday, January 02, 2019 2:54 PM
To: Aaron Lavine; Joseph Murtagh; Svante Myrick; Erik Whitney; Kathy Servoss
Cc: JoAnn Cornish; Dan Cogan
Subject: RE: From Buzz

Yes,

He should contact Kathy Servoss and send her information that can be discussed at the next BPW meeting. He should send the information to Kathy by next Tuesday, January 8th.

Michael Thorne, P.E.
Superintendent of Public Works
City of Ithaca
108 E. Green Street
Ithaca, NY 14850
607-274-6527

From: Aaron Lavine
Sent: Monday, December 31, 2018 2:58 PM
To: Joseph Murtagh; Svante Myrick; Michael Thorne; Erik Whitney
Cc: JoAnn Cornish; Dan Cogan
Subject: RE: From Buzz

Thanks Seph. Right, his recourse is to appeal to BPW. Mike probably knows best, but I assume that he should contact Kathy Servoss to file an appeal and get it placed on the agenda?

Aaron (Ari) O. Lavine
City Attorney, City of Ithaca
108 E. Green St.
Ithaca, NY 14850
Tel: (607) 274-6504
Fax: (607) 274-6507

This e-mail contains information that may be privileged and confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete this e-mail and notify us immediately by reply email, or at (607) 274-6504.

-----Original Message-----
From: Joseph Murtagh
Sent: Tuesday, December 11, 2018 11:23 AM
To: Aaron Lavine <ALavine@cityofithaca.org>; Svante Myrick <mayormyrick@cityofithaca.org>; Michael Thorne <MThorne@cityofithaca.org>; Erik Whitney <EWhitney@cityofithaca.org>
Cc: JoAnn Cornish <JCornish@cityofithaca.org>; Dan Cogan <DCogan@cityofithaca.org>
Subject: RE: From Buzz
Ari - sorry just noticed that you said you didn't receive the bills. I've attached them.

What are next steps? Go to BPW? Who is reaching out to Buzz?

Thanks,

Seph

Seph Murtagh, Common Council
City of Ithaca, Second Ward
585-703-2582

From: Aaron Lavine
Sent: Thursday, December 06, 2018 5:08 PM
To: Svante Myrick; Joseph Murtagh; Michael Thorne; Erik Whitney
Cc: JoAnn Cornish; Dan Cogan
Subject: RE: From Buzz

Sounds right to me that this would appeal to BPW, though I need to see the bills that we issued in order to be sure. (I didn't receive the attachments to this chain.) Thanks.

Aaron (Ari) O. Lavine
City Attorney, City of Ithaca

108 E. Green St.
Ithaca, NY 14850
Tel: (607) 274-6504
Fax: (607) 274-6507

This e-mail contains information that may be privileged and confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete this e-mail and notify us immediately by reply email, or at (607) 274-6504.

-----Original Message-----
From: Svante Myrick
Sent: Thursday, December 06, 2018 11:58 AM
To: Joseph Murtagh <JMurtagh@cityofithaca.org>; Michael Thorne <MThorne@cityofithaca.org>; Erik Whitney <EWhitney@cityofithaca.org>
Cc: JoAnn Cornish <JCornish@cityofithaca.org>; Dan Cogan <DCogan@cityofithaca.org>; Aaron Lavine <ALavine@cityofithaca.org>
Subject: RE: From Buzz

Yeah I believe the proper body to hear the appeal is the BPW - though Council can always step in and overrule the board. Copying Ari here so he can double check my amateur lawyering.

Svante Myrick
Mayor, City of Ithaca

108 East Green Street
Ithaca, NY 14850
607-274-6501

“A community is democratic only when the humblest and weakest person can enjoy the highest civil, economic, and social rights that the biggest and most powerful possess.”

Philip Randolph (African-American labor and civil rights leader, 1889-1979)

From: Joseph Murtagh
Sent: Thursday, December 06, 2018 11:36 AM
To: Michael Thorne; Erik Whitney
Cc: JoAnn Cornish; Dan Cogan; Svante Myrick
Subject: FW: From Buzz

Hi all,

I'm sending this email to get a conversation going, and to seek guidance on how to deal with Buzz's immediate problem. I recently participated in a housing panel, and Buzz brought the attached bills to my attention.

He recently built three homes on West Hill, and according to him, was unaware that he would be charged for utility hookups. The attached bills came as a major surprise to him, and he doesn't want to pass along the bills to the homeowners because it would be big burden on them. From a planning perspective, we are trying to encourage more owner occupied housing in the city, and we've discussed ways of easing these costs on developers, or at the very least, smoothing out our process so that the cost of utility hookups can be bundled into the sale of the home.

In terms of Buzz's immediate problem - what to do about these bills - I wasn't really sure how to respond, and JoAnn suggested I send this email. Where does this go? Can he appeal to BPW or Council?

Thanks,

Seph

Seph Murtagh, Common Council
City of Ithaca, Second Ward
585-703-2582

Hi Seth,
I was a pleasure be on the panel with you last night. Thanks for your time and interest in addressing our current housing issues.

About the other thing we spoke of last night. Here are the bills I mentioned. I'd appreciate any advice or assistance you might be able to lend.

Thanks,

Buzz
Hi Buzz,

I'm sorry for the length of time it's taken for me to get back to you on this. The venue to appeal these bills is the Board of Public Works. You should send the information to Kathy Servoss (copied here) by Tuesday, January 8th to get on the agenda for the next meeting.

Let me know if you have any questions, or if you'd like me to help out in any way. As you know, I have big concerns about these costs are impacting development of owner-occupied housing the city.

Thanks,

Seph

Seph Murtagh, Common Council
City of Ithaca, Second Ward
585-703-2582

Hi Seth,

I was a pleasure be on the panel with you last night. Thanks for your time and interest in addressing our current housing issues.

About the other thing we spoke of last night. Here are the bills I mentioned. I'd appreciate any advice or assistance you might be able to lend.

Thanks,

Buzz
Hi Kathy,

I got your name from Seph Murtagh as the person to contact to appeal invoices from the DPW for water and sewer hookups. I was hoping I could get on the agenda for the next Board meeting.

I’ve attached the invoices in question. Please let me know when and where I should plan on attending.

Thanks for your help on this.

Buzz Dolph
CITY OF ITHACA
108 E GREEN STREET
ITHACA NY 14850

Bill to:
TINY TIMBER, LLC
44 QUARRY RD
ITHACA NY 14850

Water & Sewer Division
General Billing Information
(607) 274-6580
Information specific to bill
(607) 274-6596

Property:

Invoice From: Water & Sewer Division
Invoice Ref. STMT19021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry Date</th>
<th>Item Category</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04/05/2018</td>
<td>LABOR (WATER)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$2,804.66</td>
<td>$2,804.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/05/2018</td>
<td>EQUIPMENT(WATER)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$243.00</td>
<td>$243.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/05/2018</td>
<td>MATERIAL (WATER)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$173.34</td>
<td>$173.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/05/2018</td>
<td>OTHER (WATER)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$109.30</td>
<td>$109.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/05/2018</td>
<td>LABOR (SEWER)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$2,804.67</td>
<td>$2,804.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/05/2018</td>
<td>EQUIPMENT (SEWER)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$243.00</td>
<td>$243.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/05/2018</td>
<td>MATERIAL (SEWER)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$351.23</td>
<td>$351.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/05/2018</td>
<td>OTHER (SEWER)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$109.30</td>
<td>$109.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total: $6,838.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Description: 926 HECTOR ST - INSTALL 3/4" WATER AND 4" SEWER SERVICES 4/3 - 4/5/18 - SEE ATTACHED STATEMENT FOR BREAKDOWN OF CHARGES

BILLS NOT PAID WITHIN 30 DAYS ACCRUE A LATE PAYMENT PENALTY AT THE RATE OF TWELVE PERCENT PER ANNUM OR $3.00 PER MONTH, WHICHEVER IS GREATER, PURSUANT TO CITY CODE. DELINQUENT BILLS REMAINING UNPAID ON DECEMBER 1ST MAY BE ADDED TO THE NEXT YEAR'S CITY TAX BILLING, AND COLLECTED AS A PART THEREOF.

Return this portion with your payment

Make check payable to:
CITY OF ITHACA
CHAMBERLAIN'S OFFICE
108 E GREEN STREET
ITHACA NY 14850

TINY TIMBER, LLC
44 QUARRY RD
ITHACA NY 14850

Invoice Date : 10/26/2018
Invoice # : 00025432

Please Pay on or before 11/26/2018

Amount Paid

$6,838.50

INV00025432

0000000000000025432000000000004000000010000068385003
Bill to:
TINY TIMBER, LLC
44 QUARRY RD
ITHACA NY 14850

Property:

Invoice From: Water & Sewer Division
Invoice Ref. STMT# 19022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry Date</th>
<th>Item Category</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04/11/2018</td>
<td>LABOR (WATER)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$2,769.58</td>
<td>$2,769.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/11/2018</td>
<td>EQUIPMENT(WATER)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$425.25</td>
<td>$425.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/11/2018</td>
<td>MATERIAL (WATER)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$178.37</td>
<td>$178.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/11/2018</td>
<td>OTHER (WATER)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$229.50</td>
<td>$229.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/11/2018</td>
<td>LABOR (SEWER)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$2,769.59</td>
<td>$2,769.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/11/2018</td>
<td>EQUIPMENT (SEWER)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$425.25</td>
<td>$425.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/11/2018</td>
<td>MATERIAL (SEWER)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$517.80</td>
<td>$517.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/11/2018</td>
<td>OTHER (SEWER)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$229.50</td>
<td>$229.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total: $7,544.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Description: 930 HECTOR ST 4/3, 4/9 - 4/11/18 - SEE ATTACHED STATEMENT FOR BREAKDOWN OF CHARGES

BILLS NOT PAID WITHIN 30 DAYS ACCRUE A LATE PAYMENT PENALTY AT THE RATE OF TWELVE PERCENT PER ANNUM OR $3.00 PER MONTH, WHICHER IS GREATER, PURSUANT TO CITY CODE. DELINQUENT BILLS REMAINING UNPAID ON DECEMBER 1ST MAY BE ADDED TO THE NEXT YEAR'S CITY TAX BILLING, AND COLLECTED AS A PART THEREOF.

Return this portion with your payment

Invoice Date: 10/26/2018
Invoice #: 00025433

Please Pay on or before 11/26/2018
Amount Paid

INV00025433

0000000000000254330000000000040000001000000754484004
Bill to:
TINY TIMBER, LLC
44 QUARRY RD
ITHACA NY 14850

Property:

Invoice From: Water & Sewer Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry Date</th>
<th>Item Category</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04/13/2018</td>
<td>LABOR (WATER)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$2,867.25</td>
<td>$2,867.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/13/2018</td>
<td>EQUIPMENT (WATER)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$354.37</td>
<td>$354.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/13/2018</td>
<td>MATERIAL (WATER)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$210.02</td>
<td>$210.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/13/2018</td>
<td>OTHER (WATER)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$273.25</td>
<td>$273.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/13/2018</td>
<td>LABOR (SEWER)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$2,867.25</td>
<td>$2,867.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/13/2018</td>
<td>EQUIPMENT (SEWER)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$354.38</td>
<td>$354.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/13/2018</td>
<td>MATERIAL (SEWER)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$354.75</td>
<td>$354.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/13/2018</td>
<td>OTHER (SEWER)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$273.25</td>
<td>$273.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,554.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Invoice Ref. STMT# 19023

Additional Description: 936 HECTOR ST - INSTALL 3/4" WATER AND 4" SEWER SERVICES 4/12 + 4/13/18 - SEE ATTACHED STATEMENT FOR BREAKDOWN OF CHARGES

BILLS NOT PAID WITHIN 30 DAYS ACCRUE A LATE PAYMENT PENALTY AT THE RATE OF TWELVE PERCENT PER ANNUNUM OR $3.00 PER MONTH, WHICHEVER IS GREATER, PURSUANT TO CITY CODE. DELINQUENT BILLS REMAINING UNPAID ON DECEMBER 1ST MAY BE ADDED TO THE NEXT YEAR'S CITY TAX BILLING, AND COLLECTED AS A PART THEREOF.

Return this portion with your payment

Make check payable to:
CITY OF ITHACA
CHAMBERLAIN'S OFFICE
108 E GREEN STREET
ITHACA NY 14850

TINY TIMBER, LLC
44 QUARRY RD
ITHACA NY 14850

Invoice Date: 10/26/2018
Invoice #: 00025436

Please Pay on or before 11/26/2018
$7,554.52

Amount Paid

INV00025436

000000000000000025436000000000000000001000000755452007