

JOINT WORKGROUP TASK FORCE
CITY COUNCIL AND
RIVERFRONT IMPROVEMENT COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

Monday, June 24, 2019 at 4:00 p.m.
Davenport Police Department Community Room

I. Call to Order

With the following members present – Ald. Kyle Gripp, Ald. Marion Meginnis, Ald. J.J. Condon, Ald. Rick Dunn, Commissioners Bill Ashton, Kelli Grubbs, Dee Bruemmer, and Pat Walton, and City Staff which included: Nicole Gleason, Clay Merritt, Tom Warner, Brian Schadt, Zach Peterson, and Steve Ahrens. Members of the public included: Commissioner Karl Rhomberg, a citizen, reporters with KWQC-TV6, WHBF-TV, and Bill Lukitsch with the QC Times.

Public Works Director Gleason opened the meeting by again briefly highlighting the purpose of this joint workgroup meeting. Ahrens entertained a motion to approve the minutes from the June 17 meeting. Grubbs moved to approve the minutes. Meginnis seconded the motion and it carried.

II. Canadian Pacific Crossings

The Mayor contacted Canadian Pacific to inquire about its interest in lowering the tracks. CP has no interest in lowering the tracks. CP is interested in working with the City on a holistic approach.

Gleason walked through the June 21, 2019 responses received from Canadian Pacific regarding the dozen questions that the Joint Workgroup requested staff to ask. With discussion occurring, they are as follows:

1. Our legal department is working with the State of Iowa to finalize an approved Memo of Understanding between CP, Davenport and the State in regards to an extension and timeline of restoration that is mutually agreed to. I am hoping to have more information on that yet this week.
Response: Understood.
2. The City of Davenport has asked Canadian Pacific to proceed beyond 30% design on Marquette.
Response: Agreed, we are proceeding with design of Marquette based on 30% design.
3. The City of Davenport has requested Canadian Pacific to consider an alternate entrance to the ballpark at Warren St. and turns Gaines St. to a pedestrian crossing. Verbal agreement for consideration was given and CP requested City to consider eliminating an alternate crossing in exchange for this. Can CP please confirm the reasons for a limited number of rail crossings for me to share with the joint committee? CP has an internal

safety policy that does not allow the creation of a new crossing without the elimination of an existing crossing.

Response: CP has an ongoing system-wide safety initiative to close at-grade railroad crossings. This is in alignment with the FRA (Federal Railroad Administration) who set a goal in 1991 to close 25% of the 280,000 crossings in the US. This goal was established to improve public safety. The primary guidance established by the FRA was to consolidate crossings particularly where redundant crossings exist. Davenport is already a location where redundant crossings exist and the addition of a crossing would go against safety initiatives established by the FRA and CP.

Our internal policy is that we do not allow new public crossings, as they increase the potential for grade crossing incidents, which increases safety risk for both the traveling public and train crews. CP would allow a new public crossing with the elimination and/or consolidation of an existing public crossings. This is key to ensure we continue to drive towards reducing the overall number of crossings and improving public safety.

4. New information: The City of Davenport does not like the planned restoration of River Heritage Park. Our landscape architect is working on an alternate proposal.

Response: We will stand by.

5. New information: The City of Davenport is working with the Army Corps of Engineers for a less invasive crossing at Perry St. We will be providing an alternate proposal.

Response: We will stand by.

6. The City has requested CP to consider raising the entire bike path along the length of the track raise that disturbed the bike path. CP has indicated this can be considered as part of the HDR design plans to determine a cost delta.

Response: We can have HDR include this in the design and provide an estimated cost for the additional bike path construction. You mentioned the City would be willing to cost share on this improvement, is this still the case?

7. New Request: The City of Davenport would like to request that CP/HDR/RDG (RDG was the landscape architect on the latest iteration of the Riverfront design plan) work on a small change order to create a rendering of how the newly raised track/bike path can be incorporated to the design that was just created. Tens of thousands was spent on this design by our downtown partners and this consideration was not included, because it was unknown.

Response: Would like to understand the scope and cost of this rendering prior to committing. Please provide an estimate from RDG based on your expectations, or have RDG schedule a quick call with myself and a representative from the City so we can discuss the undertaking.

8. New Request: What are the fencing requirements to raise the bike path? The City of Davenport would like the least obtrusive fencing possible and we would like to work on what height/design would meet both of our needs. We realize some of these fence requirements were outlined in 1990, but are interested if these requirements have been updated since that time.

Response: Our intention would be to replace the fence in kind but would consider alternatives as long as it provides an adequate barrier to prevent pedestrians from trespassing on the tracks.

9. Thus far, there have not been objections to the crossing plans at Ripley, Harrison or Main, however, if we will be required to eliminate a crossing as part of #3 above, we still need to make that determination. Our landscape architect is also working to help ease transitions at these crossings and will be sending comments soon.

Response: We will stand by.

10. Brady Crossing – our landscape architect will be supplying notes as to concerns of entry to the newly constructed multi-use space adjacent to this crossing.

Response: We will stand by.

11. New Request – There is parking lot damage and asphalt debris in the area where equipment was used to raise tracks. Could you please have local crew inspect this area and submit a repair plan for any damage related to rail crossings?

Response: Can you be more specific to the locations of the damage, or is there someone at the City that CP could meet on site to look at the areas of concern?

12. New Request – Are you willing to share survey data and CAD data, so we can make the feedback of our landscape architect more meaningful?

Response: Yes, I will have HDR package the CAD file.

Additional discussion included:

1. Verify whether or not the plan includes elevating the recreational trail to new track grade
2. Inquire about a bid related to the viaduct situation; City staff not aware of moving forward on this
3. In general, what other options were examined by CP for each crossing?
4. Marquette – permission given to CP to proceed beyond 30%
5. River Heritage Park – Zach is working on a counter proposal
6. Gaines St. – at this point a crossing would have to be eliminated to add this one; preference is to not eliminate any crossing
7. Other crossings – no further direction given – need to make a determination on #4 above to proceed.

III. New Business

- A. The Workgroup will plan to meet next on Monday, July 1 at 4:00 p.m. again in the DPD Community Room.

IV. Adjourn – The meeting was adjourned at 5:20 p.m.