



Other Comment Submission Summary

Overview

In between the first and second rounds of community engagement (1/3/19 – 10/22/19), the project team received 42 correspondence/comments¹ on topics related to the project from 36 individuals. These comments were outside of community group presentations and SAC Meeting #2 & #3 forums. Five comments were submitted via the project webpage, 18 were sent via email to the project email address or directly to project team members, 12 were made over the phone or by leaving voicemail messages, four were sent in letters, and three were made in person at the City of Springfield Development and Public Works counter or at offsite meetings with City staff.

Observations & Values

The greatest concentration of comments were received following the mailer that the City and ODOT sent to 650 business and property owners on the corridor in conformance with the requirements of Senate Bill 408². The nature of these 13 comments was largely to request clarification or more details regarding the information shared in the mailer and inquiries as to how the project will have an impact on their specific property. One property owner commented that the project seems very auto-focused and requested consideration of persons with disabilities. Three property owners eventually submitted written requests for formal review of the Key Principles & Methodology through a *Collaborative Discussion*. One of the three property owners ultimately declined the meeting noting that her questions had been answered through communication with staff. The other two *Collaborative Discussions* were held in November, as documented in the meeting summaries available on the project webpage.

Of the remaining inquiries, approximately one-third of the comments involved process and messaging clarifications following project E-Updates or media coverage. Another one-third related to the enhanced pedestrian crossing project under construction at that time between 66th Street and S. 67th Street on Main Street. Comments included observations of safety problems, suggestions for increased traffic enforcement (automated and motor team), requests for a

¹ In some cases, comments resulted in additional input from follow-up communication with staff, as documented in Appendix A.

² Enacted in 2013, Senate Bill 408 changed Oregon law concerning management of access onto state highways. One of the most significant changes included procedures to increase the level of involvement of property owners, local government, and other stakeholders in decisions that would affect property access during the planning, development, and design of state highway projects. Guidelines for developing Key Principles & Methodology for Access Management during the highway facility planning process are detailed in Oregon Administrative Rule 734-051-7010. The August 2019 mailer was the second of two required notices to property owners to explain and offer options for providing feedback on the draft Key Principles & Methodology that will be used in later design and construction phases to evaluate whether potential changes to individual driveways meet project goals and objectives.

permanent reduction in the posted speed limit, and other project design considerations. The final one-third of comments were comprised of:

- Five comments related to the business community, including information about business operational needs, requests for specific design considerations and attention to how proposed safety solutions will have an impact on businesses and property owners, and seeking clarification regarding the Business and Property Owner Literature Review³;
- Five comments sharing observations of safety problems on Main Street and suggesting increased traffic enforcement and other design interventions;
- One comment expressed concern that early collaborative efforts and visioning for Main Street may have gotten lost in light of subsequent infrastructure efforts, and one comment related to an area outside the project boundary.

Refer to Appendix A for comment details.

³ As part of the larger evaluation framework for assessing solutions considered for the Main Street Safety Project, the Literature Review (Tech Memo #3) summarizes potential economic impacts to businesses and commercial property owners from various kinds of possible corridor safety infrastructure solutions and is available on the project webpage.

SPRINGFIELD MAIN STREET SAFETY PROJECT

Appendix

Other Comment Submission Summary

Appendix A: Other Comment Submissions

Contact	Full comment – <i>italicized text</i> summarizes phone call or in-person communication.
Kip Amend	Your Safety Summary looks good! Seems like the project is in good hands.
Larry Orr	I have lived on 34th for 40 years. It has always been a problem at night to see where the streets are on Main Street for accessing these streets from Main Street at night. The road and the curbs blend together at night, so you might miss your street or turn at the wrong time, causing problems. The street lights don't help. I think some reflectors on the edge of the street curbs on Main Street to show where the streets are would help. They would go on the street curb and not on Main Street, so you would see them as you are approaching the street on Main Street.
Kim Boals	Are the project boundaries 30th through 71st?
Anonymous Main Street business owner	I know this is a late response to a letter sent out in November but after attending an ODOT meeting at Thurston High before any pedestrian crossings were installed I know you don't take action very quickly. I have had my business for 22 years on Main and 44 th . In that time, I could not tell you how many people have been killed between 42 nd and 54 th ! We had suggested they lower the speed limit to 35 and ODOT said because it was a main thoroughfare through Spfld they could not do that. Two years after that meeting they lowered the speed limit. Now we have pedestrian crossings. I wonder how many people from Spfld or ODOT have ever tried to use these crosswalks. When you have to warn people not to assume any of the cars are going to stop before you step out I think you are admitting there is a flaw in this. I have seen when cars in three lanes are stopped but someone decided to speed through the 4 th lane and almost hit the pedestrian walking across the street. Yellow is a traffic light that says slow down and be cautious; stop if you can safely. In the new generation that means look out for me because I am not stopping unless a car in front of them has already stopped. Red lights on the other hand say stop. Much like a stop sign. Stop-look-then go. That would save lives. Then I saw the Chief of Spfld Police say on TV that just because Salem and Portland were putting cameras in that would catch speeders, we don't need them. He said our police cars out there slow them down. At the ODOT meeting they said we didn't have enough police cars to patrol Main St. Here is where I think an investment of even two cameras set up on the pedestrian crossings at 44 th and the next one down toward 54 th St. You will find out how many people drag race in that area not to mention just speed because they get away with it. The other thing I think Spfld should check out is why on a rainy-day River Rd has lights that light the street up on a rainy night but Spfld might just as well not have any lights. You both have the same number of lights. What is the difference? Just my opinion.
Brenda Casarez	I am sitting here today hoping with my whole heart that your bidding process went well and the plan to install some pedestrian crossings between 58th and 69th is moving forward. Yesterday afternoon I witnessed a 14-year-old girl get hit by a car near 63rd and Main St trying to dash across Main. Her friend made it but she did not...I have inquired today and have learned that she should make a full recovery but it was horrifying to see. It seems that this area should be important with the schools that are nearby. Many children live on the south side of Main that go to the nearby Middle School and High School. I just am hoping that this area could get some attention so that we never have such a tragic accident again. If there is another avenue for voicing my opinion about this that you think could be helpful please let me know.
Jim Beer	<p>Is a Pedestrian Crossing in the works for Main Street at 63rd, where the heavily used bus stop is there? Also, why has the speed limit remained at 45mph east of 62nd? Does ODOT know this is a residential area?</p> <p><i>Jim asked for clarification regarding the process for installing a pedestrian crossing in the vicinity of 62nd Street, the planned pedestrian crossing at 66th, and the future planned signal at Mountaingate. Jim looks forward to the Main Street Safety Project to improve safety on Main Street.</i></p>

Contact	Full comment – <i>italicized text</i> summarizes phone call or in-person communication.
	We spoke on the phone a couple months ago regarding my petition to put a Rapid Flashing Beacon crossing near our apartment complex, McKenzie Manor Apartments at 62nd and Main. It has been well-noticed by us here at McKenzie that construction has begun on the first of those crossings, just a couple blocks east from us here. My hat is off to you, sir! You are saving lives! Thanks so much to you and your crews, citizens, and City staff who have helped this safety issue along.
Sandy Coffin	<i>Sandy shared that she recently took over as volunteer chair for the AARP Springfield Age-Friendly Initiative. She noted that she is on the project Interested Parties list and receives E-Updates, but she wanted to coordinate with the City to make sure their report does not suggest ideas that will have no traction or that are already in works. She asked about the project status. She asked to be informed when planning the next round of focus groups for the project.</i>
Jim Beer	<i>Jim inquired about the details of what was referred to as a ‘public hearing’ in media coverage of a Springfield City Club meeting where the project team was scheduled to make a presentation.</i>
Jon Heacock	Got the notice of the SAC meeting tomorrow and was hoping you could point me to the location of the two Tech Memos and summaries/key takeaways mentioned below, as I did not see them as part of the agenda packet.
Bobbie Clark	<p>I am sick about the man that was killed in front of my home on Thursday night. The speed limit on the south lane is 45 mph but in the north lane it is 35 mph it makes no sense! That victim was killed in the south lane. I realize that crossing at an unlit corner wearing dark cloths is not very smart but it's hard for me to believe that the driver wouldn't have had time to swerve or stop going 35 mph instead of 50 mph. How many more must die before we have a safe lighted crossing put in place. I have witnessed two deaths and a multitude of accidents some ending in my front yard. There is a lighted, covered bus stop in front of our house but no safe way for persons to cross main street. Loaded semi-trucks barrel down the street towards town Jake breaking because their going over the 35 mph speed limit, some blowing their horns to warn pedestrians crossing the street to/from the bus stop, knowing that they are going too fast. There is a school bus stop on the corner of 63rd & Main and many times I have held my breath hoping that none of the children will try to cross main street. In the morning between 7:00 am and 8:30 am there are at least three vehicles that fly by going way over the speed limit with their loud mufflers and booming music, I have never seen a single one ticketed. Please join me in requesting the speed limit be dropped to 35 mph going both ways starting at 58th and ending at 72nd street and petitioning the city to put in a safe crossing at 63rd and Main bus stop.</p>
	<i>Bobbie asked for more information regarding Main Street projects, and she asked to be included in the Interested Parties list.</i>
Sue Hartman	<p><i>Sue expressed continued concern that the planned pedestrian crossing at 66th is not the best form of traffic control, especially given school bus drop off and bus stop locations (she thinks a signal would be better and does not understand why this location is less deserving of a signal than the one planned for Mountaingate). Sue asked if roundabouts are still being considered for Main Street, and she asked about the Willamalane trailhead at 75th.</i></p> <p><i>Sue requested more information regarding the installation of the pedestrian crossing at 66th. Sue is passionate that a signal is needed and requested an explanation of how to stop the pedestrian crossing project. She expressed frustration that this was not a decision made within the Main Street Safety Project and that she was not aware of this project development before. She strongly disagreed with the City's decision to proceed with the pedestrian crossing project, but appreciated staff follow-up.</i></p>
Dani Wright	I have several questions related to the business part of the plan [Literature Review]. On page 20, they saw [a case study documented] 50 new businesses and 800 new jobs [after a nine-block revitalization project]. As a business that looked at 14 sites in 14 years, I know that you cannot start a restaurant or retail business in a[n] auto repair shop without a change of use affect, which includes but is not limited to an

Contact	Full comment – <i>italicized text</i> summarizes phone call or in-person communication.
	<p>environmental study. If there is oil, transmission fluid, paint, etc. You must mitigate equaling tens of thousands of dollars. I was told on several sites on Main St. to just use the SUPERFUND to clean it up. I would ask that a business survey include types of business you expect to fail with the street treatment.</p> <p>My biggest question / concern is if service stations and repair shops fail because several hundred cars a day stop using Main how will the City handle large strips of unusable land? Fuel, transmission fluid, oil etc. is an environmental nightmare.</p> <p>I appreciate your interest in small business on Main St. The reason I brought up the environmental issue was that my loan was contingent on a clean bill. My site was reviewed as part of my small business loan and passed easily. There was initial concern due to there having been a dry cleaner north of my current building back in the 40's according to history. Other sites I had looked at previously would not pass based on the history, anything with oil, cleaning fluids, etc. trigger a mandatory (expensive) cleanup. I just do not want to see Main St. to become a vacant strip. We are already looking at the empty buildings in the old Safeway building and every block down Main St.</p>
Dan Lourcing	<p>I have lived out in the Thurston area for 33 years in the same house just 3 houses off Main Street, and received your letter in November about the problem with the speeding in these areas, your letter saying about the changes on Main Street. I see the City of Springfield and ODOT have done nothing about the speeding at all, where I live the 45 mile per hour speed is like a freeway, people speeding all the time up and down Main Street and nothing has been done to slow people down and further up on Main with the 35 mile per hour speed, nothing has been done either. I drive 40 at the least when its 35 and I get passed like I am sitting still. Being 3 houses off Main at night during the night it's like a speedway on Main off and on all night. What is it going to take to do something about the speeding, more people getting killed on Main before something is done again or what? What's wrong with the police department, I hardly ever see them out here in Thurston, and further down I see them going up and down the street at times ignoring the speeders. Don't bother sending this to the police department, I have had them visit me already about one of my other letters.</p>
Dani Wright	<p>Could you send out a link (a diagram or description) to what is being labeled as the enhanced corridor in the Main-McVay Transit Study Main Street Mode Choice Memo?</p>
George Grier	<p>I'm glad to see the project still has legs. I'm a little concerned that it has been going on for so long that a lot of the early collaborative work and visioning might have gotten lost along the way. This is such an important opportunity for Springfield; it will shape its future in many ways. I'm attaching a study that the Lane County Farm Bureau collaborated on with Mark Gillem at the U of O that envisioned one potential future for the corridor. I think this is still relevant as a tool for considering what options are available. Thanks for your continued work on this.</p>
Mike Eyster	<p>Thank you for the update. I briefly reviewed the items in the links provided in the update. However, I couldn't easily identify: 1. How the new goals differ from the previous goals. 2. The Literature Review describing the economic impact of No Build. Can you point me more directly to those specific items?</p>
Christine Landry	<p><i>Christine asked questions about the temporary posted speed limit associated with the pedestrian crossing being installed at 66th.</i></p>
Anonymous Main Street resident	<p><i>Left voicemail stating that the 35mph temporary posted speed limit in the construction zone for the pedestrian crossing being installed at 66th has made a world of difference in terms of traffic passing in front of her residence and would like to advocate for the City/ODOT keeping it even after construction has been completed rather than resuming the 45mph posted speed limit in that location.</i></p>

Contact	Full comment – <i>italicized text</i> summarizes phone call or in-person communication.
Charlotte Crawford	Morning! Char Crawford here. The new crosswalk is going in right in front of our house. It has been nice to have the speed limit on Main St. during construction posted at 35. Sure there are some Idiots not abiding by the signage. But the big trucks traffic, it's a lot safer! I haven't seen patrol during the new construction. Should continue after construction from 69th-62nd. With the construction of the upcoming crosswalks it a safety issue for everyone to keep the speed at 45.
Jon Heacock	There is a lot of "general" information, can you tell me if in all of the studies is there a built-out alternate local road network (or frontage roads) to support alternative access routes? In particular, I am concerned with businesses on the east side of Main Street (for example see sketch below) [north side of Main Street between 42 nd and 48 th] for which there is no local street network to support business access modifications such as a center turn median? I am sure there are many other locations, but I am most familiar with this area. If you have studies of these cases, please direct us specifically to those studies so we do not have to weed through the mountain of information referenced in the documents. If not, what is your plan to address these concerns?
	Thanks for taking the time to respond and your guidance on this project. I know it is not easy leading this type of process and appreciate all of your understanding and communication. I have done similar work in my past and know how difficult it can be to work with all of the various interests on a project like this and appreciate all of your time given to responding to my comments. As business property owner in the area, there is just too little corridor-specific information on the direct impacts to businesses. Timing is everything, so I just want to keep responding to the information provided as timely as I can. I am asking that you do additional work to address how proposed solutions will impact businesses on this corridor. As noted in the study information, installing a median will impact businesses, regardless if access points are changed. I just do not see how businesses within the footprint that I provided (and likely many other locations) will be not severely impacted by a median.
Joe Bruns	I would like a phone number and person to talk to specifically about what is projected and how it will affect my business and property at 28th and Main.
Bonnie Mogstad	I was wondering who I could contact about possibly paying to get an apron paved in our driveway when they get ready to finish this project [pedestrian crossing] with asphalt. We are a 1/2 block from it. Also, the new street lights they installed, the one by our drive is angled back so that it shines in our house. If it was angled at a level angle I do not think it would be so bad. Just if possible to change that would be greatly appreciated.
Kevin Lee	<i>Kevin shared Rosboro operational needs. Kevin is supportive of safety improvements to Main Street. His brother was killed in a traffic collision on Main Street approximately 10 years ago. Kevin will discuss the project with senior staff and surface any concerns.</i>
	In asking around, here is a list of the issues that we would like to see be considered in the upcoming Main St. project. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Improve truck access at the intersection of So. 28th and Main Streets.</u> Large trucks, especially log trucks, have trouble turning from either direction of Main Street onto So. 28th Street. Sometimes log trucks must begin the turn, then back up in the intersection in order to complete their full swing onto So. 28th Street. That intersection also serves chip trucks and all kinds of tractor-trailer rigs. 2. <u>Retain Current Log Deck Configuration.</u> Any widening of Main Street or relocation of the sidewalk should not create safety issues that would require Rosboro to shorten or otherwise reconfigure the existing layout of log decks located along our Main Street frontage. We also need to retain our current log yard stormwater drainage swale located along the fence line on the Main Street frontage.

Contact	Full comment – <i>italicized text</i> summarizes phone call or in-person communication.
	<p>3. <u>Maintain Main Street Access to the Rosboro Office.</u> Rosboro needs to retain access from Main Street to the front and rear parking areas of the main office (OB-1) for passenger vehicles and small delivery trucks.</p> <p>4. <u>Improve truck access at the intersection of S. 21st and Main Streets.</u> Similar to the issues at So. 28th Street, chip trucks and flat-bed tractor-trailer rigs often have trouble turning from Main Street onto So. 21st or turning from So. 21st Street onto Main. The truck swing often requires both lanes of the street. Passenger vehicles in the opposing lane are sometimes forced to back up in order to allow truck access.</p> <p>5. <u>Maintain truck access from So. 23rd Street.</u> Log trucks leaving Rosboro turn onto Main Street from So. 23rd Street.</p>
Anonymous Main Street resident	The guy I spoke to at the City told me that they won't be lowering it [posted speed limit] permanently because (drumroll) they found that motorists wouldn't obey the new speed limit and that they didn't have enough police presence to enforce it. That guy should do stand-up comedy. Wow! I have been texting with people on Main St. in Thurston. One lady at City told her keeping speed down after construction is ODOT'S decision.
Brad Folsom	My wife was attending an event on A and Main, a painting place. The sidewalk is not flat due to tree roots. I'm very upset that there is no warning about the danger. I will be in contact with the mayor and I hope we can work something out about the city taking full responsibility. Pain and suffering will be a topic in the future. Rescue responded and she has been in the hospital for three hours now.
Craig Koch	<i>Craig said he owns property on Main Street, and he said that he received the recent mailer and wanted confirmation that he was understanding correctly that no driveway modifications are proposed now since he has one driveway and was told in the past that no changes would be made. He said he would re-read Attachment A of the mailer and call back with any questions.</i>
James McCarter	<i>Jim said he is on the Interested Parties list and receives E-Updates. He shared that he owns property on Main Street and he wants to stay involved throughout the process as he has gone through these types of processes elsewhere and desires to redevelop property but wants to wait to see the grand scheme before further investing. He appreciates the work we are doing trying to balance the interests and needs of all stakeholders. He is very interested in reviewing and commenting on solutions and designs when they are available.</i>
Paul Darling	<i>Paul shared that he came to the area in the 1970s and that he has owned property on Main Street since 1990. He said he is on the project's Interested Parties list and receives E-Updates. Paul found the letter confusing and containing too many generalities, and he asked for clarification regarding how the project will affect driveways. He referenced the recent Register Guard article on House Bill 2001 and asked if it applies to Springfield. Paul noted that density affects traffic and asked if we are taking that into consideration with our planning efforts on Main Street. He expressed frustration about prior planning efforts on the corridor and citywide, citing public hearings in 2000, 2010, and 2012 and communication with City staff that regarding the zoning of his property. He expressed that he planned to share his zoning frustrations with the Mayor. Paul said the City is doing a good job keeping stakeholders informed about the Main Street Safety Project.</i>
John Hammer	<i>John left a voicemail stating that he received a letter with information regarding City studies and wanted to know if what we are doing will have an effect on the property he owns on Main Street.</i>
Dani Wright	<p><i>Dani submitted a letter requesting a Collaborative Discussion.</i></p> <p>I want to meet and discuss the avenues of entry and exit to my/our business in the new thought process. What are the indicators for access to my property for semi-trucks, utility trailers and hay trucks, RV trailers, vans and coaches, gooseneck etc.? I would like to discuss potential changes to individual driveways meet the goals and objectives of the Main Street Safety Project.</p>

Contact	Full comment – <i>italicized text</i> summarizes phone call or in-person communication.
	<p><i>Dani thanked staff for calling to clarify our email exchange. Dani expressed frustration trying to understand the complexities of the information shared in the mailer and fear as a property owner that if she doesn't answer everything that she will find herself in a compromised position in the future. She said that she recognizes the legislation was in response to some real ODOT 'screw ups' in Portland and other areas, and she added that it can be scary as a business owner with the uncertainty regarding Main Street and she just wants to make sure there are no hidden messages in our mailer. Dani said that she had highlighted some of the text in the table and would take a closer look. She mentioned that in the past a design under consideration would close off all access fronting her property and direct vehicles to access to her property off 44th and she wanted to know if that design was still on the table.</i></p> <p>Could you resend me the Draft [Key Principles & Methodology]? I'm working from home today and cannot seem to pull it up?</p> <p>Thank you for the quick response. My questions specific to the Methodology are: The consistent writing of ODOT rules etc. Should there be an alternative solution if ODOT gives over the highway, as is historical proven with West 11th and Franklin. Does this solution then dissolve and become null? Meaning we start over planning Main St safety or do the same methodology apply whether or not ODOT maintains ownership of the "Highway". The second specific question; 'Consider the relationship between accesses and historical crash records and mitigate accesses where it would resolve a recurring crash pattern.' I understand there is not a pattern in crashes that they are widely spread out. Should we not spend resources to look at something that is not a problem? In the transportation section of the methodology the highlight [bullet point] only addresses issues is the ADA access and sidewalks. Should driving, biking, walking, freighting and business access be added also?</p> <p><i>Dani spoke with staff in the City Hall lobby prior to the 10/22 SAC meeting. She wished to follow up on my 10/14 email scheduling the Collaborative Discussion she had previously requested. Dani clarified that staff had answered all of her questions regarding the draft Key Principles & Methodology for Access Management in my 9/12 email, so she did not believe that a Collaborative Discussion was necessary.</i></p>
Lisa Edelberg	<p><i>Lisa said she had received the mailer and was looking for clarification regarding what was being considered for the right-of-way design at this time. She is concerned about any changes that would affect truck access to her business. Lisa expressed that her existing access is imperative for truck access and she believes that a median would prevent truck access. Lisa also asked whether right-of-way widening was still on the table and if she will be informed when safety solutions are ready for community feedback. She thanked staff for returning her call.</i></p>
Kurt Straube	<p><i>Kurt left a voicemail noting that he had received the mailer and is concerned about driveway modifications for his property on Main Street and requested more information about what is planned and how to engage with the project.</i></p>
Karen & Joel McCowan	<p>My husband and I live in Springfield, and we own and manage a duplex on Main Street. Thank you for the summary of draft key principles and methodology for this project. I note that the italicized Project Purpose begins with "solutions that will make Main Street safer for people walking...", yet I see nothing in this draft that would do this for our tenants living on the stretch of Main Street where our duplex and many, many other multifamily dwellings were sited. This project seems very auto-focused. We have had blind tenants and tenants with disabilities who have to walk half a mile in one direction and more than 1/4 mile in the other to reach a crosswalk. Please consider additional crosswalks with flashing lights for this section of Main Street.</p> <p>Wow — I appreciate the rapid response explaining the bigger picture. It sounds good. Great news about the flashing beacon crossing. I don't recall receiving anything about that. Please add me to the email list.</p>
Jim Bourne	<p><i>Jim reported receiving mailers from the City regarding the Main Street Safety Project and asked if the City plans to widen Main Street since he feels doing so would solve an access challenge he faces. Jim asked how he can go about determining his access rights.</i></p>

Contact	Full comment – <i>italicized text</i> summarizes phone call or in-person communication.
Bonnie Baker & Craig Corliss	<i>Bonnie called in response to the mailer. She said that she understands we are developing the criteria for planning purposes, and she asked for clarification regarding when the Key Principles would be applied in the future. She said that she is sure that she has issues with the criteria, and she asked for clarification regarding the formal review process.</i>
	<i>Bonnie & Craig submitted a letter requesting a Collaborative Discussion.</i>
	What is the time for getting back to you? I will be out of town next week.
	We have had a major fire [on one of our properties] which has destroyed about 1/3 of the building. We must deal with this situation. Therefore, we need more time to respond to your request for more information relating to the Key Principles and Methodology....as much time as possible given our circumstances. Thank you for your consideration.
Jesse Trenholm	Hello, I just wanted to bring attention to the crosswalk at the Main St. to Hwy. 126 west on ramp. Today I witnessed a sedan stopped for a young couple pushing a stroller in the crosswalk. A semi behind the sedan laid on his air horn in frustration of having to stop. This is a daily occurrence and there seems to be confusion between motorists and pedestrians to who has to yield, which in my opinion vehicles need to yield. A simple solution may just be a pedestrian crossing sign or a[n] illuminated sign. Perhaps another solution would be to remove the crosswalk and have pedestrians cross to the south side of Main St., over Bob Straub, and then back to the North side of Main St.
Joe Tokatly	<i>Joe submitted a letter requesting a Collaborative Discussion.</i>
Jon Heacock	<p>We received a copy of the Key Principles and Methodology for Access Management, regarding our property on Main Street. I do not wish to request a Collaborative Discussion or Dispute Review Board on the draft key principles and want to go on record that the information is not-acceptable at this time. There are not specific enough specific details for which we can understand the direction or potential impacts. As with most businesses, modifications that negatively impact our access and/or our tenants' ability to operate business on this property would be unacceptable. I would appreciate better information regarding:</p> <p>Safety -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce the number of potential conflict points within the function area of the public street intersections - can you provide information regarding the functional area for the 42nd/Main street intersection and the process you will use to "reduce" this number and address the impacts of those reductions? <p>Business Community -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider site circulation and parking affected by proposed modifications and closures - can you provide guidance on how site circulation impacts will be considered and evaluated? <p>Mobility-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Move in the direction of meeting ODOT's adopted standards for spacing of accesses along main street. - Can you provide this information and detail how this specifically applies to this corridor and specifically the area of 4270 Main street and the process you will use to "move in the direction of meeting" and address the impacts of those actions? <p>Feasibility-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that existing accesses are consistent with the properties' access rights (both deeded access rights and permit status) - Can tell us how we can get the most current access rights and permit status for 4270 Main Street?

Contact	Full comment – <i>italicized text</i> summarizes phone call or in-person communication.
	<p>Also would appreciate a response to my follow-up email sent 8/9/19 (see thread below).</p> <p>Thanks - appreciate all of the time it takes for you and staff to review and respond to our questions. One of the key issues for me is that the committee's and staff making decisions understand the potential impacts associated with the guidance being provided. The KP&M just do not provide this at this time and we are kicking the can down the road until this information is provided. We are on record that we do not agree with the KP&M being used and look forward to the process that provides more input and opportunity for property owners to be meaningfully engaged with decisions.</p>
<p>Jim Rombach</p>	<p>Sirs; I understand and agree on Springfield Main St. Safety Project...However, as one who travels throughout the State-extensively and often, the statement that Main St is consistently one of most “un-safe streets” in Oregon is a Gross Overstatement...Have you ever traveled in Portland on I5, I 205, Columbia/MLK BLVD.,I-84 coming in and out of Portland, Oregon City main roads, Wilsonville main exits/streets during am/pm, — In your locale, all of Beltline, River Road during all time close to rush hours and or try Hwy 58 - in Pleasant Hill ...they make Springfield Main St. look really good And Safe !..These were all driven recently and multi-multi issues are present daily to include High speed violations , back-ups, crossing issues ((to include multi-deaths), major merge issues, MILES of traffic back-ups , etc. There is a real case to always review any traffic areas; the issue just dramatically over-stated the Main St. situation... wrecks/serious bad driving practices are vastly more of a safety issue on mentioned street/roads than Springfield...You can state the case, without getting close to “worst in the State” category...</p> <p>Thanks for the reply and agree that “any project” can be improved and safer, with real hazards or issues; including Main St. project and other Springfield projects.... Further, agree that there may be specific points/ road sections that could have “specific issues/hazards” (street crossings, intersections, traffic lights, speeding problems, road maintenance, road signing, bike paths, bikes on sidewalks/streets , poor bike riding practices (like Portland), —just should not lump all of Springfield Main St. into one of Oregon’s worst— any , I say again , any communication that says that is suspect and lacks real credibility—that detracts from substantive and appropriate review/action. Thanks again for your reply and keep up the good work...</p>
<p>Della Webb</p>	<p>When will the new cross walk be operational, has there been a problem bringing it on line, taking way to long. Hopefully there are plans to place a cross walk closer to town where it was really needed, 2 people hit by cars there in the last year. Also additional street lights are needed from 59th to the cemetery. We drive this section daily and in the winter/rainy times it is VERY difficult to see people, especially those that just dart across the street.</p>
<p>Kevin Lee</p>	<p><i>Kevin asked City staff if they were supposed to be at something.</i></p>
<p>Hank McCormick</p>	<p><i>Hank said that he is a business owner and property owner on Main Street and has spoken with staff in the past and is inquiring to see how current plans might affect the building on the property he owns and the value of his property. Hank asked that we call him when we know how the changes may affect his property. He said that he does not get to his email much and would prefer to be called.</i></p>