



## STRATEGIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE

### MEETING #4 SUMMARY

DATE: Tuesday, October 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2019, 3:30 – 6:30 pm

LOCATION: Springfield City Hall, Jesse Maine Room

### ATTENDANCE

- William Belcher **[note: Called in via phone line for first half of meeting.]**
- James Coldren
- Susan Hartman
- Staci Holt
- Dean Huber
- Richard Jones
- Marshall Loveday
- Alyssa Martin
- Garrick Mishaga
- Charles Richmond **[note: could hear and see meeting via GoTo but not reverse]**
- Joseph Tokatly
- Jeffrey Wing
- Dani Wright

### Project Staff and Consultants

- Bill Johnston, ODOT Project Manager, Transportation Planner, ODOT Region 2
- Molly Markarian, City of Springfield Project Manager, Senior Planner, City of Springfield
- John Bosket, Consultant Project Manager, DKS Associates
- Kayla Fleskes, Transportation Engineering/Planning Assistant, DKS Associates
- Allison Brown, Program Manager and Facilitator, JLA Public Involvement

### Audience / Members of the Public

- Brian Barnett, City Traffic Engineer, City of Springfield

## OVERVIEW

This was the fourth meeting of the Springfield Main Street Safety Project's Strategic Advisory Committee. The committee learned about the solution evaluation criteria (as outlined in Technical Memorandum #11), and how they were applied in the preliminary analysis and screening of safety solutions. The group also had an opportunity to discuss the initial Alternative Solutions (Technical Memorandum #13) and Preliminary Analysis and Screening results (Technical Memorandum #14) and provide input on the initial alternative solutions to help in the selection of the three refined solutions. The meeting concluded with a brief overview of the Key Principles and Access Management Methodology (Technical Memorandum #12), and an outline of next steps.

## WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS

Molly Markarian, City of Springfield, and Allison Brown, JLA Public Involvement, welcomed everyone to the meeting, and committee members and project staff introduced themselves. The team noted that John Bosket and Kayla Fleskes from DKS Associates are filling the role previously played by Jean Senechal Biggs, and that they would be present at future meetings throughout the project.

## SOLUTIONS EVALUATION CRITERIA

John and Kayla gave a presentation outlining how the evaluation criteria to measure the performance of the Alternative Solutions was developed. This included taking the values identified by the community and the advisory group and developing project goals and objectives. These goals and objectives then have corresponding criteria that the team will use to measure the performance of possible alternative solutions to address the goals for Main Street safety improvements. John also clarified the process going forward, wherein the five alternatives will be refined to three solutions (which could be a different mix of elements), to the final selection of one preferred alternative solution. The feedback from the Technical Advisory Group (TAC), the Strategic Advisory Group (SAC), community outreach (including an upcoming online open house, focus groups and local access meetings) will help to identify the key elements to put forward in the refined alternatives.

Some questions and comments from the group included (*staff responses are listed as sub-bullets*):

- Will the 'no build' be a part of the three alternatives?
  - John responded that it will not, since it does not improve safety. Instead, the no-build scenario will be a baseline for measurement, but not a solution for the project.
- Wasn't 'no build' a part of the options identified in the TSP?
  - Molly clarified that this was related to the transit study, not this safety project. Bill Belcher, SAC member, added that no-build is always used as a measurement in these kinds of studies.

## ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS

John and Kayla then presented and defined the elements that make up each alternative solution. Each alternative solution included a variation on the following elements:

- Raised medians, with varying opportunities to make left-hand turns or U-turns
- Intersection treatments, including signalized intersections or roundabouts

- Bicycle improvements, ranging from on-street bike lanes to cycle tracks with landscaped buffers
- Pedestrian improvements, with varying widths of sidewalks and landscaped buffers
- Enhanced transit improvements such as stop balancing and enhanced ground-level amenities
- Systemic safety improvements such as street lighting, enhanced pedestrian crossings, and decreased access density

John and Kayla then presented each of the alternative solutions. The alternatives in this stage include the following:

- No-Build (which serves as a baseline for measurement, but is not a viable option for improving safety on Main Street);
- Alternative Solution A – Minimize Conflicts, which is focused on reducing conflict points on the corridor;
- Alternative Solution B – Minimal Impacts, which maintains the current location of curbs on the corridor;
- Alternative Solution C – ODOT Standard, considering that Main Street is an ODOT highway;
- Alternative Solution D – Active Transportation Enhanced, which focuses on walking and biking comfortably.

The team reiterated that the alternative solutions are only examples of how various street elements could be combined. The refined alternatives would be a mix of the most popular elements, based on project stakeholder feedback. The team then walked through the corresponding elements in each cross-section, to provide an overview of what is included in each initial alternative solution.

Some questions and comments from the group included:

- The Mayor indicated at City Council that there would not be a continuous median along Main. Has that changed?
  - Kayla noted that all alternative solutions have raised median breaks, and therefore there is not a continuous median proposed along Main Street.
- Why can't cyclists go in both directions on both sides of the street in a shared used path?
  - Kayla clarified that typically, a shared use path doesn't dictate which direction people cycle in. For the purposes of this project, we want to be clear on what names we're using for different elements in this project.
- Has there been any talk of burying utilities for lighting?
  - Kayla said that right now, the project is looking at keeping utilities above ground.
- Do these alternative solutions mean that this is what all seven miles of Main Street would look like? Or will it look different depending on the business and community needs?
  - Kayla clarified that these alternative solutions show the typical cross-section for all of Main Street. However, as the project moves into further evaluation and phased implementation, we may see that the cross-section should change based on the needs of the corridor. Molly added that the project extends to 72<sup>nd</sup> Street, but all the alternative solutions show the median ending at 69<sup>th</sup>. This would potentially be the last place where you could make a U-turn on the corridor.

- Regarding Alternative C, how does the current state of Main Street not comply with the ODOT standard?
  - Kayla noted that the Springfield Main Street corridor wasn't built in the last few years, so it's not up to the current standards (which have subsequently evolved). Bike lanes and sidewalks are smaller than the current standard, which has an overall wider cross section.
- Where does the additional 10 feet of right-of-way in these cross-sections come from? Will it be coming from the businesses or properties who can't spare space?
  - John said that the project team will talk more about this, but yes, it will affect adjacent properties and that is one of the tradeoffs to discuss.
- In every alternative solution, there would only be median breaks for streets, not in front of businesses?
  - Yes, that is correct. As Kayla noted earlier, the alternative solutions show the typical cross-section for all of Main Street for the Planning Phase. However, as the project moves into further evaluation and phased implementation, we will see the cross-section change based on corridor needs.
- Would the cross-section for roundabouts stay within the indicated 96 feet, or would that also impact businesses?
  - Kayla elaborated that both roundabouts and signalized intersections would require widening, in order to accommodate U-turns. Therefore, intersections would need to be widened.
- A couple of SAC members asserted that the Governance Team did not provide guidance that up to 96' of right-of-way could be considered for infrastructure improvements.
- Would roundabouts take more space or less?
  - John noted that the team doesn't know yet. There are congestion issues at signals that may change depending on the number of median breaks, and the team is still working on the roundabout concepts.
- What will you do about the businesses that are right on the corner? The worst intersection in Thurston has a 7/11 on the corner, and yet two people have been hit there.
  - Molly noted that this is what the City Council will be weighing and looking at tradeoffs.
- What's the minimum requirement for a median?
  - Kayla clarified that 8 feet is the minimum width for a median in order to be ADA accessible.
- All of the alternative solutions have a planted median. Is there any discussion on forgetting the median and keeping it a turning lane throughout the entire corridor? Why is some form of median included in all solutions?
  - Molly noted that this would be addressed in the evaluation and the data shared with the group later in the meeting.
- Can the Lane County Tax Assessor weigh in on the impact a median would have on property values?
  - Project managers will have to determine.

- There's a lot of concern about taking additional right-of-way from the businesses. A lot of people do not want to see the City taking space from businesses.
- One SAC member expressed that it is exciting to see the alternative solutions.
- What would change for the turn from 30<sup>th</sup> onto Main Street? (Alternative Solution A bottom cross-section depicts Main onto 30<sup>th</sup>) It would be helpful to have a graphic to visualize it.
  - Project managers will have to ask engineers.
- Will 30<sup>th</sup> be considered for an enhanced crossing? There is a lot of bus stop crossing and SAC member receives requests for this a lot from clients.
  - Molly referred to the presentation slide for Systemic Safety Improvements that are not shown in cross sections but will be considered for all Alternative Solutions, including additional enhanced crossings. She also noted that stop balancing for transit is considered whenever enhanced crossings are designed.

## PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS AND SCREENING

John then walked the group through the preliminary analysis conducted on each of these solutions, to see how well they perform against the project goals. Highlights from that presentation include:

- **Safety:** Raised medians significantly improve safety, and roundabouts help to reduce crashes compared to signals.
  - Alternatives A and D performed best in safety, with Alternative D emerging as the safest option with the additional roundabouts.
- **Business Community:** Maximizing U-turn opportunities has the greatest potential to reduce the out-of-direction travel and delay for accessing businesses along Main Street. Roundabouts allow freight vehicles to make a U-turn at intersections, while freight vehicles will not be able to make those turns at signalized intersections.
- **Mobility:** Roundabouts significantly reduce overall delay, while signals have additional turn lanes to accommodate traffic growth in these alternative solutions. The team noted that a different cross-section should be considered east of Bob Straub Parkway, considering the vehicle-carrying capacity needed in that part of the corridor.
- **Transportation Choices:** Each of the alternative solutions provides slightly wider bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities, but a raised cycle track with a landscaped buffer or a buffered bike lane is needed to help reduce stress for people walking and biking. Each of the alternative solutions also considers Enhanced Corridor Transit, consistent with LTD's planned transit improvements.
- **Vital Community:** Medians provide opportunities for stormwater, landscaping and opportunities for enhanced pedestrian and bike crossings, while median breaks provide for more direct routes for motor vehicles.
- **Feasibility:** Roundabouts may be costlier than intersections and may have more right-of-way impacts. Each of the alternative solutions includes a planning level cost estimate, with Alternative D coming in as most expensive, with the widest cross section and biggest impacts on right-of-way.

Some questions and comments from the group included:

- Where did the data come from?
  - It's a statistical analysis that takes into account data from similar corridors.
- Does it take into account future growth estimates into 2040?
  - Yes, it does.
- Does it look at future modes of travel?
  - The data does assume a similar pattern of travel (primarily car-focused) to what we have now.
- Is there any analysis on the possibility of larger logging trucks moving through a roundabout versus a signal?
  - John noted that it will be easier for a larger truck to move through a roundabout rather than a signalized intersection. Generally, roundabouts outperformed signalized intersections in the analysis.
- If you look at an appraisal of any property, the first thing they look at is access, and any impact on access devalues the property. Why can't you find any data to quantify these kinds of impacts?
  - John indicated that it's important for the team to know what kinds of impacts appraisers are looking for, to help further the team's understanding of the overall impacts of each of these alternatives. That is good information to share!
- Approximately how many streets are you planning to cut off the direct through access where cars exiting off Main Street are forced to go right?
  - The team noted that they did not have the exact number available in that moment, but that it would be a significant change from the current state on Main Street.
- Is it possible to look at slowing down traffic coming down the McKenzie, with the possibility of putting in a traffic signal at the end of the corridor?
  - This project extends to 72<sup>nd</sup>, and currently there are no plans to put in a signal at that part.
- These alternative solutions don't seem to score so well in the vital community and business community goal areas. Are we looking at the right alternative solutions?
  - That's an important point, and why we want to get your feedback on how to improve these alternative solutions.
- One SAC member referred to the stretch of Main Street between 20th to 32nd as "Auto Alley" (smaller auto repair businesses located) and opined that it does not warrant pedestrian crossings or medians.
- Another SAC member stated that the inconvenience of a median does not seem any more challenging than navigating a parking maze at indoor malls.
- No roundabouts are proposed at Bob Straub intersection. Assuming this has to do with traffic volumes?
  - John responded that a roundabout is being considered there but prior to this effort ODOT had identified the need to study a possible interchange there. It's a massive intersection and needs a more focused effort looking specifically at that intersection.

- Controlling traffic makes a SAC member feel more comfortable as a driver and thus more likely to frequent the corridor. Having to travel a few blocks out of direction is not a big deal compared to the safety benefits of a median.
- Is there a budget for implementing a solution on Main Street?
  - John noted that there is currently no funding secured for design and construction, and this effort is only going to the facility planning phase (not design). Brian Barnett, City of Springfield, added that the City and ODOT recognize that this is a high crash corridor, and something needs to happen to improve safety. Medians are the way to address the safety concerns but both agencies wanted to do more than just put in a continuous median (including identifying key issues on the corridors, ways to minimize impacts, etc.).

## GROUP DISCUSSION: ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS

Allison led the group through a discussion on their preferences and concerns with each alternative solution presented. Each SAC member was asked to share what they liked about each of the alternative solutions, and the things that concerned them in each. The following table summarizes the feedback from the group on each of the alternative solutions (the addition of a check mark [✓] indicates additional agreement with a statement).

After the meeting, Molly followed up with members of the committee who were not present at the meeting, with the opportunity for them to share their thoughts and reflections on the Alternative Solutions. Their feedback is added below, in the italicized bullets and/or italicized check marks:

### Alternative A

#### Positive feedback

- Meets safety outcomes ✓✓
- Roundabouts – 58th, 69th needs roundabouts ✓
- *Roundabouts help decrease vehicle speeds*✓
- *Roundabouts – better for safety*
- Buffered bike lanes ✓✓
  - 2 foot buffer between bikes and cars is great
  - Find ways to help cue drivers if they are close to the bike lane (like rumble strips?)
- Controlled traffic flow feels safer, more appealing
- Medians good for safety
  - Plantings also look good
- *Medians better on residential segment*
- Impacts to property & changing ROW feel minimal
- *Accessible for all*

#### Cause for concern

- Roundabouts in busy intersections – not sold!
- This option has too many roundabouts
  - However, a roundabout on 69<sup>th</sup> and/or Bob Straub would be a better fit
- Medians – concern for business impacts ✓✓
  - Would like to see more left hand turn opportunities on Main Street ✓
- Medians are an inconvenience ✓
  - Commute times
  - *Emergency response (tow-trucks)*
  - Property values
  - *Train crossing*
- Expensive✓
- Street widths would negatively impact business property lines
- Putting in roundabouts (with a large footprint) would negatively impact businesses
- *Buffered bike lane not as good a buffer for bikes as Alt Sol D and concrete is ugly*

## Alternative B

### Positive feedback

- Likes more median breaks
- Combo of roundabouts and signals could work best for Main Street
- Medians at 42<sup>nd</sup>
- Cost is better
- Offers mobility access points
- Doesn't devastate businesses through roundabouts

### Cause for concern

- Likes A more
  - Does not have roundabouts ✓✓
  - U-turns less effective ✓
  - *Trucks routed to adjacent neighborhoods*
  - Should have more roundabouts to make it less inconvenient
- Medians ✓✓✓
- Doesn't improve already confusing traffic
  - Needs bike buffer ✓
  - Do we need medians at residential areas?
- Narrower bike lane
- *More median breaks is worse for safety*

## Alternative C

### Positive feedback

- Brings street up to ODOT standard

### Cause for concern

- This just feels like a deluxe version of Alternative B – is any benefit worth the cost? (All members agreed with this statement).
- More land used, with less benefit
- *More median breaks worse for safety*
- *Does not have roundabouts*
  - *U-turns less effective*
  - *Trucks routed to adjacent neighborhoods*

## Alternative D

### Positive feedback

- Feels like the 'deluxe' option
- Meets those safety outcomes ✓
- Modernizes corridor
- Could galvanize corridor's economic development
- Landscaping is great ✓✓✓✓
  - Buffered landscape could be good exchange for businesses
  - *Incredible benefit for pedestrians*
  - *Game changer for people walking and biking*
- Bike buffer/off street cycling path is good ✓
- Looks beautiful! ✓
- Hourglass median and more breaks ("islands") would be better.
- Roundabouts should only be located where there are no business impacts
- *Roundabouts will keep traffic flowing*
- *Roundabouts – better for safety*
- *Could enable being able to bike kids to daycare*

### Cause for concern

- This was the least favorite alternative for one SAC member.
- Concern on traffic volume
- Negative impact on businesses ✓✓
- Might not be feasible, practical or cost effective ✓✓✓✓
- Impact on current property ✓ – even more than Alternative A
- Mix of roundabouts and lights is better ✓
- Smaller medians would be preferable
- Bike lanes don't need to be that wide
  - Consider narrower bike lanes (less than 7')
- 28<sup>th</sup> is a major intersection and includes railroad. No median or roundabout should be there, a stoplight is preferable, and a roundabout at 42<sup>nd</sup> would have a major impact to businesses that lose land to right-of-way acquisition.



## **NEXT STEPS**

Before the meeting adjourned, John noted the Key Principles and Methodology for Access Management, and that some members may be involved in upcoming collaborative discussions with staff. The team then ran through the next steps for the group:

- There will be a second round of community engagement between November and January, focused on feedback on the alternative solutions.
- The next SAC meeting will be in the Spring, where the group will review the refined alternative solutions and analysis.

## **APPENDIX**

- SAC Slide Show (attached)