

## MEETING NOTES

### Main Street-McVay Transit Study Governance Team

Thursday, May 26, 2016

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on May 23, 2016, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, the Main Street-McVay Transit Study Governance Team held a meeting on Thursday, May 26, 2016, beginning at 3:00 p.m., in the Library Meeting Room at Springfield City Hall, 225 N. 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Springfield, Oregon.

#### Present:

##### Governance Team:

Mayor Christine Lundberg, City of Springfield  
Councilor Marilee Woodrow, City of Springfield  
Frannie Brindle, Oregon Department of Transportation  
Angelynn Pierce, Lane Transit District Board of Directors  
Don Nordin, Lane Transit District Board of Directors  
Gino Grimaldi, City of Springfield (Ex Officio)  
A.J Jackson, Lane Transit District (Ex Officio)

##### Project Management Staff:

Tom Boyatt, City of Springfield  
Emma Newman, City of Springfield  
Sasha Luftig, Lane Transit District  
Tom Schwetz, Lane Transit District

##### Consultants:

Stefano Viggiano, Parsons Brinckerhoff

##### Welcome and Agenda Review

Ms. Lundberg called the meeting to order at 3:05 pm and reviewed the agenda. Those present introduced themselves and clarified for the audience who were voting members.

Ms. Lundberg asked for clarification about which businesses were contacted during the Phase 1 outreach and how Cogito Partners contacted them. She emphasized this was important because it was clear that many businesses felt they were not contacted before the council passed resolution to move forward. At that public meeting, no one had spoken in opposition. She articulated the Governance Team's role was to gather and forward recommendations to Lane Transit District (LTD) and the City Council.

Ms. Lundberg stated that the project was still in the information gathering stage. She offered to meet with business owners and emphasized the Council's primary concern was safety on Main

Street. Secondary goals were to enhance the overall accessibility to the corridor, including access to bicycle lanes, safe pedestrian areas, and transit. Ms. Lundberg stated the meeting was not a public hearing. She said the audience was welcome to attend city council meetings, which provided an opportunity for public input. Written comments were also welcomed. LTD also holds open public meetings once a month, every third Wednesday. Ms. Lundberg said that everyone who signed up at the meeting would receive notifications of upcoming meetings by email.

Ms. Woodrow moved to approve minutes from the previous Governance Team meeting and Ms. Pierce seconded the move. The motion passed unanimously (5:0).

### **Brief summary of feedback received at meetings with business and property owners fronting Main Street and South A Street**

Ms. Newman stated that 500 phone calls have been conducted in order to provide contact information, ensure public knowledge of the potential project, and offer sit-down meetings. A mailer was sent to business and property owners which included: a letter, an invitation to meet with project staff, an aerial view of the different design options, and information on becoming involved in the project. There have been over 60 in-person meetings with people on the corridor and over 20 more were scheduled. She said the timeframe had to be extended in order to ensure the team was able to meet with all interested parties. During the meetings, the team explained the project process, the focus on safety, the design options under consideration, and provided an overview of the process of Phase 2. Staff also gathered site usage information.

Ms. Lundberg asked who staffed the in-person meetings. Ms. Newman replied that there is always at least one City and LTD representative present during the meetings. Most of the meetings have included Ms. Newman, Mr. Boyatt, and Ms. Luftig.

Ms. Luftig offered a summary of the comments she has heard so far. She said the outreach had focused on those fronting the corridor, as they were to be most impacted. Everyone they met with was courteous, respectful and appreciated the outreach effort. Many expressed a strong interest in safety and transit improvements. She reported the majority were concerned about the negative impacts on businesses. Where businesses are constrained on small sites, any change could have a substantial impact on parking and circulation of customers, service and freight. Ms. Luftig stated that while the project would seek to mitigate impacts, this might not be possible in every case. She stated that part of the projects next steps include a series of design solutions meetings where project consultants, project staff and city engineers would work with specific sites to mitigate impacts. She offered examples of design solutions.

Ms. Luftig reported that many business and property owners believed the impact of implementation would be too costly for businesses. She further explained there was very little support for raised medians along the corridor. A median would include a number of left-turn pockets allowing U-turns. Most felt this would deter customers from shopping because they would have to go past the business and then make a U-turn. She also stated it is undetermined how the median would work with freight traffic.

Ms. Luftig reported that responses have been mixed with respect to pedestrian safety. She said many stated flashing beacons are working better. People were using them more frequently and drivers were becoming more accustomed to them. There were still problems with pedestrians

crossing in areas without crosswalks. Most emphasized that safety improvements needed to be balanced with impacts to businesses. Ms. Luftig reported that reactions to roundabouts have been mixed. Some individuals mentioned there would need to be additional work to ensure functionality for freight traffic; others are concerned about the impact a roundabout would cause on businesses.

Ms. Luftig said the Project Management Team had met with businesses along South A Street and there were several locations that needed attention through design solutions to accommodate the 67-foot-design option. There were some businesses along South A that could accommodate that design without significant impact to operations.

She concluded by stating that businesses were concerned about operating during construction. Many business owners had experienced loss of business during previous construction projects.

Ms. Newman called attention to the packet that was handed out during the meeting containing written public comment addressed to the Governance Team. The public comment had been received after the May 24, 2016 email update had been sent to notify people about the May 26, 2016 Governance Team meeting. She stated the Project Management Team would be compiling a comprehensive public comment report. Ms. Newman noted that there was a comment box available for public comment.

Ms. Newman explained that staff has met twice with the Springfield Utility Board (SUB). SUB had concerns about the potential impacts and changes that would be necessary for power distribution, landscaping incursion with overhead power lines, the need for water main line replacement, and the need for additional fire hydrants should a raised median be implemented. Ms. Newman said staff would continue to meet and communicate with SUB to evaluate the impacts in relation to the design concepts.

Ms. Newman stated that the next steps in their planned activities entailed: continuing to meet with property and business owners, broadening community outreach, and starting design solutions with business and property owners with Governance Team guidance.

### **Review of Project Goals and Additional Safety Information**

Ms. Newman referred the Governance Team to the handout entitled: *Main/McVay EmX Project* and reviewed the goals for the project that had been developed by the Stakeholder Advisory Committee and the Governance Team during Phase 1.

Ms. Lundberg asked Ms. Brindle about the status of the All Roads Transportation Safety (ARTS) grant. Ms. Brindle explained that the ARTS is funded through the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and would be used on roads with documented safety issues. Main Street has had multiple pedestrian fatalities and rear-end crashes. ODOT is examining the benefit of using ARTS to address safety concerns. The two ARTS grant proposals for Main Street are: improved lighting and a median. Ms. Brindle reported that these projects had not yet been funded. She expected to know more at the end of June. When Ms. Lundberg asked if there were handouts available with information about the ARTS grant, Ms. Brindle offered to put together a handout and post the information on the website.

Ms. Pierce asked if the ARTS funding was expanded to the Main Street-McVay project, or if it would be a separate project. Ms. Brindle responded it was dependent on the outcome of the transit improvements. It was possible that the transit and ARTS funds could be merged. Ms. Woodrow noted that there had been a lot of opposition to a median. She asked how people might voice concerns or get information about the ARTS project. In response, Ms. Brindle stated the project would go through a project development process. It would be a lengthy process determining the impacts and there would be an opportunity for businesses to provide input during the project design. Ms. Brindle emphasized the importance of considering the most optimal plan for safety, minimizing or eliminating pedestrian fatalities and serious injuries. If there were strong opposition, the project probably would not move forward. Mr. Nordin asked if the funding was approved, then overwhelming opposition to the median were voiced, would the funding be allocated to another project. Ms. Brindle said yes.

Ms. Lundberg asked if the median project could be broken into segments. She advocated for a block-by-block approach. Ms. Brindle responded the design would have to take truck movement into consideration as well as accessibility for emergency vehicles and businesses. She stated that a segmented approach could be done.

### **Review the Springfield City Council work session (5/16/16) and LTD Board meeting (5/18/16) discussions on the Main-McVay Transit Study update**

Ms. Newman reported that during the City Council meeting on May 16, 2016 and the LTD Board meeting on May 18, 2016, the Project Management Team provided a project update and preliminary design concepts. At the City Council meeting they heard an emphasis on safety for all users, especially for bicycle and pedestrian traffic. There was a desire to compare and analyze signalized intersections versus roundabout intersections. There was discussion to reconsider enhanced corridor treatments. Ms. Lundberg added that undeveloped lots provided opportunity for road widening without negatively impacting businesses and parking. Ms. Newman stated that further out on the corridor there are places where wider widths would be easier to accommodate, for example past 52<sup>nd</sup> Street, and near Bob Straub Highway. Ms. Pierce stated that LTD aimed to partner with the City. Ms. Lundberg said the City Council was looking for feedback from LTD about narrowing, signalized intersections, and medians.

Ms. Brindle asked if the segment breakdowns of Main Street made sense based on the feedback received in Phase 1. In response, Ms. Newman said it would be beneficial to look at the segments once the design solution stage was entered.

Mr. Nordin asked for clarification about the report on travel time between the 116-foot-design option and the 96-foot-design option. In response Ms. Luftig stated the analysis indicated the difference in travel time was minimal.

### **Discuss and provide feedback on options for moving forward**

The Governance Team continued discussion about what steps are needed to move forward.

Ms. Luftig summarized their direction:

- Remove the 116-foot-design option. Designs would not go wider than 96 ft.
- Begin a context sensitive design solutions process.
- Examine how to narrow to avoid impacts on properties, particularly building, parking, and access impacts.

- Study both signalized and roundabout intersections.
- Evaluate the median in terms of context; for example, if funding is available from ARTS then designs should be reviewed based on segments. Safety should be considered in median design.
- Continue conversations with SUB regarding concerns.
- Provide feedback about outreach done by Cogito during Phase 1 – specifically did Cogito mention the possibility of EmX.
- Continue to coordinate with ODOT throughout the project.
- Provide updates about the project through email, or other modes of communication that are best for people.
- Look at an enhanced corridor option for Main Street that includes bus turnouts.

Ms. Lundberg said the next meeting of the Main Street-McVay Transit Study Governance Team meeting was scheduled on Tuesday, June 21, at 3:00 p.m. She adjourned at 4:02 p.m.

*(Recorded by Emily Mathis)*