

MINUTES OF MEETING
Main Street Governance Team
Tuesday, June 5, 2018
Library Meeting Room – Springfield City Hall
1:00 - 3:30 p.m.

Attendees:

Governance Team

Councilor Marilee Woodrow, City of Springfield
Frannie Brindle, Oregon Department of Transportation
Kate Reid, Lane Transit District
Gino Grimaldi, City of Springfield
Councilor Leonard Stoehr, City of Springfield
Steven Yett, Lane Transit District
Aurora Jackson, Lane Transit District

Project Staff

Tom Schwetz, Lane Transit District
Sasha Luftig, Lane Transit District
Brian Barnett, City of Springfield
Molly Markarian, City of Springfield
Bill Johnston, Oregon Department of Transportation
Tom Boyatt, City of Springfield
Michael Liebler, City of Springfield
Loralyn Spiro, City of Springfield
Emma Newman, City of Springfield
Jeanne Lawson, JLA Public Involvement
Shareen Springer, JLA Public Involvement
Jean Senechal-Biggs, DKS

Guests

Mike Eyster
Joe Bruns
Rob Zako, BEST
Jeff Wing
Hyunsook Kim
Tamara Pitman, Springfield Utility Board

Absent

1. Welcome and Introductions

Councilman Stoehr called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. Those present introduced themselves.

Ms. Lawson went over the meeting's agenda.

Ms. Woodrow moved to approve the minutes from the May 8, 2017 meeting.

Ms. Reid seconded the motion.

All voted to approve the minutes.

Mr. Yett abstained.

2. Springfield Main Street Safety Project Update

Ms. Biggs gave an overview of the project and its phases.

Ms. Markarian explained that the purpose of the project is to engage the community and decision makers in helping to decide the right type of median for the Main Street Corridor.

Ms. Biggs went over the project's schedule and milestones. The team is currently in the beginning kick-off and identifying community priorities. The last step is presenting a draft plan to City Council.

It was clarified that the corridor Facility Plan will be adopted as a refinement of the Springfield Transportation System Plan and by the Oregon Transportation Committee as a facility plan.

3. Project Purpose

Ms. Lawson asked the committee to look over the purpose statement and give any input.

Ms. Reid said that members of that community have suggested that LTD not be part of the Governance Team because if the team is not talking about transit it is hard to connect the project to LTD. LTD would like to know how they fit in the project, and if they don't, how can they remove themselves.

Ms. Jackson said that LTD wants to support the Team but they don't want it to seem like they are heavily influencing any decisions. Clarifying LTD's role will help with public perception.

Ms. Woodrow said that it is important to utilize LTD in the movement of goods and people in the corridor but it is not a build team. It is a team to work on safety. The focus is on safety and how to respond to what the community has asked for. Their concern is increased safety in the corridor. LTD's role is there but maybe it will take more time to define it. Personally, she would not want to see them being cut out.

Mr. Grimaldi added that bringing the Transit Study and the Main Street Safety Project together benefits the corridor's business and property owners.

Ms. Reid suggested that a transparent conversation about all the transit options would be helpful.

Ms. Lawson said that one of the modifications was how to articulate the transit piece.

No changes to the Purpose Statement were proposed.

Ms. Woodrow moved to accept the Purpose Statement.

Ms. Brindle seconded.

All voted in favor of the motion.

Ms. Lawson asked the team to consider what outcomes they would like to see from the planning phase and to write them on a piece of paper. She then asked for what was written.

Ms. Brindle said a safer corridor, a decision about infrastructure safety improvement, and a build alternative.

Mr. Stoehr said alternative routes for thru commercial traffic because of confusion navigating the traffic circles and coordinated street planning with speed enforcement.

Ms. Jackson said a clearer understanding of the integration of safety improvements and transit.

Mr. Grimaldi said a long-term vision for the corridor and for the ability for business and property owners to plan for the future.

Ms. Woodrow wrote visual aesthetics that promote safe travel and movement through the corridor, not harming or impeding business access, and including the voice of public safety in the planning phase, and making sure to involve the school district in safety education planning.

Ms. Reid wrote clear community feedback and engagement opportunities, transit alternatives that fit the Springfield community, and clear message labeling.

Ms. Lawson asked if transit mode choice should be added.

Mr. Grimaldi replied that they had started a conversation about transit alternatives and hopes that the final outcome is completing that discussion.

Ms. Lawson proposed putting that out of the planning phase transit mode choice is identified.

Ms. Reid asked if that is the right timeline for it.

Ms. Luftig replied that they had discussed integrating that early in the process and then, as the facility plan unfolds, it will define the details of how transit fits in the corridor.

Transit mode choice was added.

Ms. Lawson clarified that the issue is design concepts, as opposed to specific designs.

Mr. Yett asked if they are going to be giving the community on the corridor a directive or options. He emphasized the importance of having a dialogue.

Ms. Markarian answered that in the beginning there will be lots of options, but with input, they will be narrowed down.

Ms. Woodrow added that they will be getting feedback from the people on the corridor.

Mr. Stoehr asked if the strategic locations of the medians will be related to density of traffic, speed, and visibility in the area. What will determine the location of the medians?

Mr. Johnson responded that will be looking at all those factors. It is a robust planning study with traffic engineers, and even an economist, on board. They will be considering potential median configurations with breaks in strategic locations, out-of-direction travel, how roundabouts will allow for out-of-direction travel, other breaks in the medians, and bigger properties that are the key traffic generators. There is no intent to have a continuous median.

4. Decision-Making Structure & Partner Roles

Ms. Lawson went over and explained the Decision-Making graphic.

Ms. Markarian added that they have not defined the categories of participation for the Corridor Strategic Advisory Committee but it will reflect the input level. Members will be a variety of community members.

Ms. Lawson went over the Communication Protocols handout which she feels is important because of the team alternates.

The Team agreed with the proposed protocol edits.

Ms. Lawson asked if the Chair has been the spokesperson for the team.

Ms. Woodrow said that it has varied by situation.

Mr. Stoehr agreed that it is reasonable to say that the Chair speaks on behalf of the team unless someone else is designated.

Ms. Lawson asked if everyone agrees that if you do speak outside of the group, and within, that you are speaking in support of the process. Would the team like her to write a protocol that states that?

The Team agreed with Ms. Lawson and would like her to write that protocol.

Ms. Reid added that most information brought to the community has been through staff presentations and it is different than the consensus reached at the meetings. This has led to miscommunication over time.

Ms. Lawson suggested a protocol that says staff will keep everyone informed of communications so you will know when people will be going out to the public. Also, that you are informed of what developments there are in the project.

Ms. Brindle agrees that it would be helpful if the team was notified when information is going to be relayed outside of the team, in like a presentation. The team agreed with Ms. Brindle.

Ms. Jackson wants to make sure that by adopting the protocols that LTD doesn't lose its voice.

Ms. Lawson clarified that the protocols are just to ensure respectful communication in the process.

Ms. Woodrow moved to approve the protocols.

Ms. Brindle seconded the motion.

All approved the motion.

5. Public Involvement Overview & Discussion

Ms. Springer went over the goals and purpose of the Public Involvement Plan. It is important that there are a variety of tools to engage a variety of people and making sure that the tools match the needs, interest, and goals of the population.

Ms. Lawson clarified that they want to build on the community input and not ignore it to start from scratch. They are also using previous work that identified the target stakeholder groups.

Ms. Lawson asked the team if there are any missing conversations that are currently going on in the community.

Ms. Brindle wants to make sure that previous technical work is also included with community engagement. She also asked if there was a need for looking at funding opportunities. For example, there is money available through Safe Routes to Schools and there are schools along the corridor.

Mr. Stoehr added the possible impact the median will have on the Main Street businesses.

Mr. Johnson said that he thinks it is important to recognize, under livable communities, the importance of being able to cross the street.

Ms. Woodrow said that it is important to keep in mind that three blocks from the corridor is where the Springfield community lives.

Ms. Reid said that, from her previous work on W. 11th, what they are missing are conversations directly with business and property owners, and it would be impactful to have them.

Ms. Woodrow agreed with Ms. Reid and said that Springfield had the conversations five years ago when the transit study project started.

Ms. Brindle said that she wanted to make sure that public involvement continues throughout the whole project.

Ms. Lawson asked the team to name some key messages.

Mr. Yett said that they need continuous open and true dialog with the community. Also, letting businesses know how long the project will take and informing them of any disruptions that may occur.

Ms. Reid added that there is a real need for a reminder of context.

Mr. Stoehr suggested reminding stakeholders on the corridor that the improvements will not drive up rent or overhead costs. It could increase business though.

Ms. Woodrow said that letting the community know that they have a responsibility to also improve safety in the corridor is an important point.

6. Next Steps

Ms. Biggs went over the next steps of the project. This summer they will be doing their inventory analysis and developing a public engagement plan.

Mr. Stoehr adjourned the meeting at 3:11 p.m.

(Recorded by Jolynn Barker)