



## Other Comment Submission Summary

### Overview

Leading up to and including the second round of community engagement (10/29/19 – 4/30/20), the project team received 23 comments/correspondence<sup>1</sup> on topics related to the project from 18 individuals. These comments were submitted outside of focus and community groups and the Strategic Advisory Committee (SAC) Meeting #4 and Planning Commission Meeting #5 forums<sup>2</sup>. Six comments were submitted via the project webpage or sent to the project email address, 13 were sent via email directly to project team members, and four were made over the phone, with staff responding to comments and inquiries as they were received.

### Observations & Values

Half of the comments reiterated the safety problem on Main Street, one-third referred to transportation choices and vital community, and approximately one-quarter mentioned traffic mobility and business community.

The greatest concentration of correspondence, about three-quarters, included process-related commentary. The nature of these comments ranged from requests for messaging clarifications following project E-Updates or other project communications, to appreciation for preliminary analysis efforts, frustration with the speed or approach of the process, and inquiries regarding project deliverables, stages, and outcomes. The remaining nearly one-quarter of comments included observations of safety problems on Main Street and suggestions to increase traffic enforcement, increase lighting, or other interventions, including specific design considerations.

Three commenters sought clarification regarding the Main Street Safety Project, having received a Notice of Decision regarding the separate City of Springfield Transportation System Plan (TSP) Implementation Project. One commenter expressed that Main Street is Springfield's real opportunity

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

<sup>2</sup> One Planning Commissioner and one SAC member submitted more detailed reflections on meeting materials and discussions, and three SAC members submitted comments unrelated to meeting materials/discussions.

for future growth and redevelopment potential and thus it is extremely important for the process underway to address safety issues and not inadvertently pursue short term objectives that constrain future opportunities for redevelopment. Another commenter conveyed his desire to support the project to improve conditions for those desiring to live, work, shop, and seek services in Springfield.

While four comments from business and/or property owners related uniquely to process clarifications, two also included information about site operational needs and requests for specific design considerations and attention to how proposed safety solutions will have an impact on businesses and property owners. One property owner shared insights regarding a roundabout system that has demonstrated success for businesses in another community, and two of the business / property owners also advocated for putting the project on hold or delaying indefinitely given COVID-19 public health guidelines and related economic recovery concerns.

Refer to Appendix A for comment details.

# 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.
Sue Hartman	<i>Sue noted that she went to the City two years ago and spoke to Emma about the safety of the streets. She expressed frustration with the way information is shared with the SAC and finds readings difficult to follow and then come to a meeting to talk about it. She also feels frustrated with some of the issues she sees on the roadway that she feels the City is not addressing, or pushing to the side. She also expressed frustration with some of the perspectives shared in the SAC meetings, and is not feeling like there is adequate representation from people with disabilities or people who use transit on Main Street. Sue said that she will think about attending the next meeting but is not sure. She did say that she might want to talk with someone from the City closer to the next meeting but isn't sure.</i>
Dani Wright	Yes, please cancel [Collaborative Discussion].
Michael Koivula	<p>I've finally gotten through the Main St. document for the Nov 5th [Planning Commission] meeting. Attached are comments. I look forward to the next iteration with some specific suggestions for the various areas along the corridor:</p> <p>As a Planning Commissioner, I welcome participation in my duties to review the current documents of the Main Street Safety Project. Note the page number references are from the packet for the Planning Commission meeting of 11/5/19, PDF file, not the page numbers of the attachment to Tech Memo 13 or other. All comments and questions are preceded by the corresponding page number of that packet and brief intro statement to show where my comments are associated with the packet.</p> <p>4. Safety in the Proposed Criteria table 1: traffic cameras, for speeding, distracted driving and red light violations are an important way to demonstrably &amp; significantly improve safety. I sent an email on Nov 3 to staff providing statistics on this and believe omission of these INFRASTRUCTURE improvements is at the detriment of public safety. Compared to other solutions, medians and particularly roundabouts, the cost of these improvements would be significantly less and would cause less disruption to existing access to businesses along the corridor.</p> <p>6. Vital community, bus amenities and shelters: The bus art on new LTD stations is abysmal and the shelters do not actually shelter anyone from rain or wind. Costs for the shelters must be significant, given that the huge use of custom concrete and the fact that the majority of the iron work is custom fabrication, nothing "out of the box". The City of Portland bus shelters should serve as a better model for cost, artwork and actual sheltering, while providing visibility for public safety. We do not need to keep repeating these expensive non-functional "shelters" simply because they are the current LTD default.</p> <p>6. Continuity of pedestrian and bike improvements: I support setback sidewalk/bike lane combination (on same grade) on one side of Main, 2 way use with STOP or YEILD signs on driveways crossing these paths, in conjunction to slightly wider curbside walk on the other side of Main with greatly enhanced bike and pedestrian crossings, including actuated flashing beacons with each of the crosswalks and signals.</p> <p>6. Cost/benefit of safety focused improvements: Please see aforementioned email regarding traffic cams.</p> <p>7. Access management: any restrictions are going to be very heavy lifting with existing businesses. Perhaps costs of combining driveways with permitting and infrastructure costs could be assisted by funds in lieu of the expensive extensive use of roundabouts and medians? Access management restrictions will be difficult to implement on any but new development. Can new land use permits include covenants to participate in future access restrictions?</p>

Contact	Full comment – <i>italicized text</i> summarizes phone call or in-person communication.
	<p>13. Oregon law prohibits mid-block U turns: This would seem to be an essential variance to look for in our cooperative work with the State. It is actually safer, IMO, to U turn between major intersections. At an intersection, a U turning vehicle is subject to conflicting traffic movements by other drivers not anticipating a U turn.</p> <p>14. Freight trucks thru residential: this would be very problematic and might cause safety issues to migrate from Main St to surrounding areas. I think residents would be very opposed to this. Wondering if special turnarounds might be developed in adjacent properties? Most large commercial properties accommodate large trucks. Would access management be a good way to expand this?</p> <p>14. Discussion of roundabouts as a “cost savings” concept is pretty transparently wrong. There’s a poster outside of Public Works that talks about a cost savings over a signal of \$10,000 a year. At that rate, they could pay for themselves in 400 years or so?</p> <p>14. Roundabout design needs large diameters to make them seem safe to drive. The Franklin seems OK except for the left turn movements, there are many instances of opposing traffic not yielding, I’ve seen four or five myself, none involving crashes. The smaller double lane roundabout on Pioneer Parkway and Hayden Bridge has a much less safe feel, much less sight distance. The right of way needed for the bigger roundabouts, as well as the larger and more costly construction cost will make their use VERY VERY expensive. Use of them as a primary solution to Main St safety issues is unwise. I also have heard that pedestrians and bikes are not safe in roundabouts, either. The drivers are so concentrated on finding the opening to traverse the circle that upcoming ped and bike crossings are largely ignored. Oftentimes, cars accelerate coming out of roundabouts, too, so as to prevent being hit from behind, and the foot on the accelerator is harder to remove to brake suddenly.</p> <p>14. Roundabouts, continued. When there is little room for a decent sized roundabout that would not really nearly destroy business access and parking (eg 21<sup>st</sup> and Main), the signal system should be maintained and the roadway speed limit should be lowered. I think 28<sup>th</sup> to 21<sup>st</sup> and Main speed should be 30MPH and enforced.</p> <p>15. Medians: discussion of “mountable medians” should take place. They can accommodate emergency left turns as well as oversized vehicles, and could also reduce the “shy distance” that is needed with a vertical curb. Elimination of a gutter bar for medians can also be done in some instances, both for vertical curb and mountable curb medians, given most often the drainage is away from the median outward to the edges of the roadway. Given the tightness of the Main St cross section, I’d rather see less emphasis given to lane width, where possible and more to ped and bikeway widening and setbacks for sidewalks. Center medians along Main will receive significant resistance from existing businesses.</p> <p>16. Lane widths: should be noted that lane width on outside lanes and medians includes all surfacing beyond the actual vertical curb, including concrete gutters and catch basins or curb inlets with concrete aprons, and then all other lane edges are defined by the center of the traffic striping, so that a standard 5’ bike lane can actually be only 3’ or so wide, given half of the lane stripe on the outside and a concrete inlet or catch basin on the inside. With the edge of the road often covered in debris, leaves or trash, it is very difficult to bike in a curbside lane.</p> <p>17. Bike amenities: conventional bike lane mentions “gap between the gutter and the roadway”, I am assuming that is just the joint between the concrete and the asphalt, that’s often almost completely closed off by tacked paving or is sealed after the fact with rubberized crack sealer. Not sure what else it could be? <u>Curbside bike lanes both sides. No thanks!</u> I do, somewhat support buffered bike lanes, but think striping alone and/or with plastic delineators is not a good option. Use of RPM’s (aka turtles) could help, but I think a better way would be to use a mountable median of maybe a foot wide and 4” high, kind of a speed bump for autos. I support the idea of a separated bike/ped lane on one side with a wider curbside bike ped sidewalk on the other, with enhanced crossings (as discussed above in 2<sup>nd</sup> comment for p 6 of the packet). There is no reason for both sides to be similar, if both can be improved and that one offers superior safety to the other. I appreciate</p>

Contact	Full comment – <i>italicized text</i> summarizes phone call or in-person communication.
	<p>the traffic engineer’s discussion of safety concerns with many driveways and setback bike lanes, but still think that with bike/driver education and proper enhanced signage and “speed bumps and rumble strips” on the drive areas, we can make the road much safer for bikes and peds with much less cost and impacts to the surrounding businesses due to excessive right of way takes. Note: error on “Raised cycle track” citation for “sidewalk, as shown on figure 7” should actually call out figure 8.</p> <p>19. Mono vs bi directional bike and ped traffic. No reason that I can think of for mono direction any side of Main St, signage to direct passing protocol and share the road. If a lot of no-fault crashes happen, rethink?</p> <p>19. Shared use paths : big YES from me. Understand the danger of right hook bike run overs, but I think it’s more or just as dangerous with the curbside paths. Drivers and bikes need to be careful on a busy corridor, no method will prevent at fault crashes. More signage and speed bumps of some kind for cars and also maybe rumble strips to alert to crossing dangers.</p> <p>20. Shared use path not recommended: I very much disagree.</p> <p>20. Lighting: new LED lighting systems are too bright and glarey. I do not see them as an improvement. Research something that uses LED for cost savings but provides a milder, less glaring light. Maybe there are less transparent covers for the leds? As is, they are not an improvement.</p> <p>20’ Signals Enhanced signals, backplates, larger heads, warning systems: is there a video that shows what these systems actually look like? Or an area where they are in use?</p> <p>21. Midblock crossings: general support, but self-actuated RRFB’s can also be added for ped and bike crossings at regular signalized intersections to prevent run overs by right turning vehicles.</p> <p>21. Access management: again, a difficult program to begin when Main is so far from reasonable ODOT standards for access points per mile, at best this will be a very long and slow process. Achievement of the “successfully implemented access management program” to achieve the vaunted safety, capacity and delay improvements is a far far away goal at best.</p> <p>22. Spacing of signals favor thru movements: is this signal timing, so that a car going at the posted speed could get thru the corridor without stopping? This is really needed. Demand loops seem to prioritize the side streets to my thinking, eg. Gateway, you usually have to stop at EVERY signal.</p> <p>22. Functional areas, conflict points: seems to point toward further reduction in speed limits, costs of other methods, especially roundabouts for design, r/w acquisition, landowner opposition, eminent domain, and construction are large for the safety benefit</p> <p>23. Removing turning lanes from through traffic: RPM’s could be used to delineate many of the roadways proposed changes in a way that would allow them to be tested and determined to see if they are effective solutions, if so, the permanent solutions could be installed, if not, they could be revised easily at low cost.</p> <p>23. Raised medians: I like this solution, but I doubt that business owners will. Again, testing these through RPM installation would be wise. Mountable medians could be a solution that would help safety and still maintain consumer business, freight and emergency access.</p> <p>23. Supporting street network: No through collector or arterial on the North side. E St appears to be the best, Daisy is Ok for part on the South.</p> <p>23. Shared access and circulation systems. These would be great. See comment on p7 above. Could they be required as part of any development or redevelopment along the corridor?</p> <p>25. Alternatives. At Council session, the direction from Council was not a single solution to the corridor safety, but a multiplicity of concepts and design elements. A and D call for overuse of roundabouts. I could see one at 42<sup>nd</sup> and 28<sup>th</sup> but no more than that. I also note that most solutions call for curbside sidewalks/bike lanes. I think this is not safe and should not be the default for design.</p>

Contact	Full comment – <i>italicized text</i> summarizes phone call or in-person communication.
	<p>28. Alt A: again, I think majority of intersection should remain signalized. 28<sup>th</sup> to 21<sup>st</sup> should go on a road diet with 30 mph posted, 3 lanes wide, bus turnouts, combined wide setback sidewalks with trees and shrubs curbside. Narrower planter strip could have xeriscaped plantings with trees in wider areas. This design would extend the “downtown feel” zone from 14<sup>th</sup> to 28<sup>th</sup> on Main St (not S A) and 21<sup>st</sup> to 28<sup>th</sup> on Main. Roundabouts at 42<sup>nd</sup> and 28<sup>th</sup> along with lower speed and a road diet will help downtown lose the “car sewer” feel that steady unrelenting traffic brings now. Those needing speedier transportation can access Centennial, Marcola Rd and the Freeway via 42<sup>nd</sup>, 28<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup>.</p> <p>31. Again, single solution for the corridor isn’t the best way forward. High cost with little benefit ending up with high stress bike and ped experiences. If curbs and walks are reconstructed, there will be opportunities to redo the stormwater system along the corridor to provide control over the large amount of non-point [source] pollution from all the vehicle traffic.</p> <p>32. If there are areas that this cross section is desired, it should be revised to move the curb inward to put the bike lanes off the street grade. Combo 12’ bike and ped lanes both sides of Main would totally change the bike/ped experience from current high stress.</p> <p>34. Medians again could be rpm’s which could be easily “editable” and also could be mountable to maintain access for all. Little gain in this solution for bikes and peds vs 12’ combo lane.</p> <p>35. Again, high stress bike experience is not caused by narrow car lanes adjacent, but is because of the bikes being at the same grade as the cars and the speed limit being too high.</p> <p>35. Alt C ODOT Standard: too restrictive, big costly changes for tiny improvements to safety. No bike lane at grade of cars, 6’ bike lane is still only 4’ wide or so when the concrete gutter pan and the surrounding apron for catch basins and curb inlets are removed (no one runs their bikes over these objects willingly)</p> <p>37. Despite wording, there are still left turn conflicts at the intersections. Left from Main and left from side street still in direct opposition. With non-mountable medians, these intersections will be used more and more and there can be more anticipated crashes.</p> <p>38. Freight left turns would work better with mountable or rpm medians, where needed. Where not absolutely needed, shared access might work. Freight onto side streets merely moves safety issues from Main onto side streets. Many side streets do not have adequate turning radii for larger trucks, and parking on side streets further restricts turning areas needed by freight. Adjoining property owners will resist this concept.</p> <p>38. High stress biking, high stress ped, wider crossing areas for peds, longer signal timing needed to allow for less ambulatory peds to make it across. ODOT std isn’t working as a solution.</p> <p>39. Alt D: much higher costs due to overuse of roundabouts. Too many U turns needed, seems like an afterthought or redesign “whoopsie” rather than a design function. Cycle track seems ok, but I think combo bike/ped lanes, set back where possible with correct signage and rumble strips for bikes and cars and rpms for cars as they cross the path would be better. Single use bike/ped tracks are not needed when the amount of bike and ped traffic on the corridor is fairly light. Users can easily accommodate one another as shown on the heavily used 10’ wide off road multi-use paths throughout the area, West D Greenway path, Alton Baker Park, Riverside paths, etc. At most, one side of the street should have the cycle track treatment.</p> <p>39. Discussion of roundabout use needs to include design diameters with R/W take needs. Without these necessary data, the costs are poor estimates.</p> <p>41. 10 roundabouts is about 8 too many.</p>

Contact	Full comment – <i>italicized text</i> summarizes phone call or in-person communication.
	<p>42. Transit discussion, “requires a wider cross section around a boarding area”, does this mean wider than 96’ which is already 16’ of widening, 8 foot per side? Significant opposition to 96’ should be anticipated.</p> <p>42. Ped access across roundabouts has safety issues. See my 3rd comment about p 14 above regarding crossings for bikes and peds in roundabout zones.</p> <p>43. Safety of bikes and peds. See comments on combo bike/ped lanes. Setback lanes with signage and rumble strips for bikes and cars, rpm’s for cars is preferred.</p> <p>43. Other, widest cross section: see 1<sup>st</sup> comment above on p 42, transit discussion, significant opposition to wide cross section. ODOT approvals look to be needed for most reasonable solutions for Main St.</p> <p>Conclusions: I am very happy with the preliminary work that is done so far regarding Main St. safety. We are on a path to provide a needed safer and usable corridor for multi-modal traveling public while maintaining business health. I think these “one size fits all” solutions will not bring the needed changes without significant permanent disruption to stakeholders, both users and business. Some will also cause problems for adjacent properties and areas. Future accommodations for access management may be a long-term goal, but opposition to imposition of new access standards, designs and rights of way should be anticipated. A good design can be assembled from the various concepts and parts of these plans which will enhance the business, multi-modal traffic and natural environment along the corridor. I look forward to the next iteration of these designs and hope to see the assemblage of the concepts and designs that the City Council has called for and which I agree will best serve the needs of the community.</p>
Bill Belcher	<p>I want to wish all a very happy Thanksgiving. Attached you will find my ruminations from the Oct. 22nd meeting. I wanted to give my thoughts some time to gel, but I also got very busy and forgot that I needed to respond. I apologize for the tardiness of this reply, but hope you will find my observations enlightening and reinforcing. I really appreciate how much you, the staff and committee members are putting forth into getting this all accomplished:</p> <p>The October meeting was very successful. I was impressed with the presentations, and the presenters' demeanor being completely void of any personal bias. As follows, I will give you my opinions and insight from the meeting.</p> <p>I observed that one opinion was repeatedly vocalized regarding the impact that any new mitigation efforts may have on those conducting business along the corridor. The inference I took from that opinion was not to do anything that might affect those entities. While I can empathize with those considerations, the fact remains that "do nothing" is not an option at this juncture. A problem does exist, the State has recognized this from the accident data, and mitigation efforts are now being required for safety. It seems imminent that some impacts will occur in the final proposal, but mitigation and minimization efforts appear to be in the solutions under consideration.</p> <p>I also observed that some want to include many, if not most, of the option(s) presented. I applaud them for their concerned interest in solving the problems as identified, but also know that an all-inclusive package is likely not an option within the project parameters at this time. I would cautiously advise that the slow and steady approach, phased in over possibly an extended time frame, seems inherently to be the most prudent approach, while leaving room for possible modification alive throughout the entire process, and maintaining focus on the final desired outcome.</p> <p>There was discussion about the potential impacts that may occur from design and delineation efforts being proposed. This seems to be a reasonable query at this point in the development stage, however, those could not be identified due to the timeline, and the fact that the</p>

Contact	Full comment – <i>italicized text</i> summarizes phone call or in-person communication.
	<p>potential options to alleviate or mitigate the safety issues have just been identified. One cannot spend time and effort on analyzing the potential adverse impacts until the options for mitigation are accepted in context, unless in the planning phase, a critical issue is discovered to exist. It would do no good to analyze a myriad of "what ifs" that have no merit, as they likely may not occur if some of the design criteria are not included in the final scoping documents.</p> <p>I complement your staff on the research and supporting data they have collected. I've found the package to be not only complete in scope, but extremely well developed with adequately detailed supporting documentation which has been thoroughly vetted for accuracy and inclusion in the analysis. As for myself, I am anxious to see which portions of the available options are actually incorporated into the final proposal, and the estimated impacts, both positive and negative, they will have on the residents and users of the corridor.</p>
Sydne Wasson	What changes are proposed for Main St. from Bob Straub Pkwy to 60th Street and when?
Bonnie Baker	I was talking to a friend whose sister lives in Lacey, Washington. He is familiar with our warehouse property on Main Street. He says that the main state highway through Lacey (Sorry I do not know the highway number) is using the roundabout system with apparent success. Are you all aware of and/or familiar with this project? Thank you again for meeting with me!
Joe Bruns	<i>Joe wanted to receive an update on what's happening on Main Street and understand potential impacts to his business and property. Joe expressed that the process is going quite slowly. Joe asked if any construction would be occurring in the next 1-3 years. Joe's key interests are in the intersection design concept selection and ROW impacts at 28<sup>th</sup> and Main Street. He's concerned about being able to maneuver trailers through his site to be able to operate his truck and trailer business. Joe asked if any of the zoning had changed as part of the TSP Implementation Project and was wondering some other type of use (i.e. barbershop?) could be operated from his property if desired.</i>
Michael Koivula	<p>Good article in the Oregonian about increases in fatalities to cyclists.</p> <p>Also mentions distracted driving, SUVs and speed as causes.</p>
Jon Heacock	One question - I did not see any proposed improvements on Main St. / 42nd Street in the updates [regarding the TSP Implementation Project], so just wanted to check in and see if I missed info on future plans for intersection?
Vinje Kay	<i>Vinje was wanting to know where the bus pullout would be on Main Street. Upon receiving clarification from staff, Vinje shared that he is 80+ years old, isn't concerned with planning for several years out from now, and noted that Mitch gives him all of the notifications he receives.</i>
Evan Morris	Install lights at corner of 48th and main street. There are no lights between 42nd and 54th. This will slow down Main Street traffic and it will allow making a left hand turn onto Main Street easier and safer.
John Montgomery	<p>I have tried filling out the questionnaire for the Main Street safety improvement twice now and both times after finishing, the system would not let me send my responses, this is very frustrating. Is this how this project is going to be going forward? Everything needs to work properly all of the time, no mistakes, mis-cues from the start of this project to completion. I'm very disappointed that I took so much time, twice, only to have this happen. The following is what I received when trying to fill out and send my responses. And yes, I did fill out all questions, and information in detail.</p> <p>I emailed you weeks ago when the Main Street #1 open house questionnaire went live and mentioned how the system would not let me send my responses. Well, it's still doing the same thing and I assure you that I filled everything out in its entirety and listed many replies to my</p>

Contact	Full comment – <i>italicized text</i> summarizes phone call or in-person communication.
	answers. This is very frustrating, is this how this Main Street corridor safety project is going to be handled? Here is what happens when I try to send my responses.
Melanie Higdon	I do not drive in Main Street often but I know that lighting and street lane painting could be a factor - the Q street area intersection is so dark it is difficult to see the lanes when turning left in front of the shopping center when turning from the road next to Walgreens. I have had many people mention this issue to me and have experienced difficulty navigating that area when it is dark especially. This may be a factor in Main Street as well. Thank you for your consideration.
Gary	First, there are NEVER any police enforcing the speed limit, or cell phone usage. I work/drive on the road 12 hours a day in one of my taxis, and if I see ONE police car during the day I'm surprised. I witness 2-3 texting near crashes daily, and numerous speeding/aggressive driving issues daily. Reducing the speed limit does no good if there aren't any people enforcing it. Second, the street lights are a low light, and yellow color, and it's difficult to see anything in the rain, or inclement weather...
Jeff Sakacsi	I am a Springfield homeowner and cyclist and former Landscape Architect and former BPAC member working in career in area until horrifically struck on a bike ride after work on McKenzie View Road north of downtown. I am now without a job and career due to traumatic injuries from horrific incident caused by extremely challenging drivers! If possible I would like to volunteer and help out with making Springfield a better and safer place to live, work and ride your bike or run or walk safely and well! It needs help.
	Thank you very much and helpful to think that I could possibly help in the City with what I still think is the best and the ultimate modes of transportation in very challenging places! I can no longer work for a living like I did previously due to traumatized injuries caused by super badly challenged and terribly influenced driving on my previously scenic bike ride from work! I very much would like to help out and improve folks wanting to live, work and shop in Springfield or come here for services while I am still here! Thank you very much.
Joe Tokatly	Given the state of emergency we are experiencing regarding the Covid-19 crises, I would urge you to table for now, or at least extend the deadline for the online open house for the Main Street Safety Project until further notice.
Dani Wright	I believe this should be tabled and addressed at a later date once the impacts of Covid-19 have been addressed, six months to a year from now Or however long it takes. 100's of businesses are shut down on Main St., every household is affected. How can you expect businesses or residents to even think about this project when their livelihood is in jeopardy, when they do not even know if they will be able to pay the bills, let alone open their doors ever again. The landscape of Main as well as our entire country is affected.
Bidhya Kunwar	<i>Bidhya said that she is closing on a market property at 58<sup>th</sup> and Main on June 1<sup>st</sup> and came to know of the Main Street Safety Project through the purchase process. In response to staff clarifications she said that she would like to participate in the Online Open House and would appreciate a link. She asked about how the City would deal with construction impacts to businesses.</i>
George Grier	After completing the online survey for the Main Street Safety Project, I wanted to provide some additional comments. These are attached. Thanks very much for your work on this project and considering my comments: Thank you for the opportunity to participate in the online survey regarding options the City is considering to create a safer corridor along Main Street. Please consider these additional comments. Over the last forty years I have participated in many land use decisions and visioning processes for our community. As a Lane County Planning Commissioner, a member of the Boundary Commission, a founding partner of the McKenzie Watershed Council, and presently as a member of the Lane Area Commission on Transportation (Lane ACT) I've had an opportunity to be a part of how our community has grown. I've been a

Contact	Full comment – <i>italicized text</i> summarizes phone call or in-person communication.
	<p>stakeholder in many of Springfield’s planning efforts: the Commercial and Industrial Buildable Lands Inventory and Economic Opportunities Analysis, the Main Street Visioning Project, Springfield’s Transportation System Plan, and its System Development Charge Analysis. In 2008, I obtained a grant from Lane County Farm Bureau for University of Oregon Professor Mark Gillem’s Landscape Architecture class to perform an analysis and conduct public workshops on the potential redevelopment of East Main Street.</p> <p>Springfield’s growth has brought it to the practical edge of meaningful Urban Growth Boundary expansions. Physical and geographic limitations, along with the potentially unrecoverable costs to extend urban services to new areas, are serious constraints that Springfield should consider as it looks toward future growth.</p> <p>Main Street is Springfield’s real opportunity for future growth and redevelopment potential for the community. It is extremely important that the process underway to address safety issues along the Main Street corridor recognize this potential and not inadvertently pursue short term objectives that constrain future opportunities for redevelopment. There are several ways this might happen within the options that are now being publicly vetted in the online survey. The survey asks folks to provide input on multiple choices. However, some of these choices could easily create constraints or even eliminate redevelopment options along sections of the corridor.</p> <p>For example, Main Street has high potential for transit-oriented redevelopment, helping Springfield not only address its higher density residential needs but also incubate thriving economic clusters to serve the area’s needs. Right of way is critical to the design and success of a transit-oriented corridor. There are several alternatives in the proposed safety corridor solutions that could significantly reduce or re-locate right of way within the corridor that could negatively impact future transit options. For example, the width and location of landscaping and median strips could reduce or force realignment of the right of way at critical nodes.</p> <p>Safety along Main Street is a critical component of Springfield’s future. I appreciate the effort to improve safety features of the corridor. While I have travelled Main Street for over 50 years, the biggest improvements I have noticed in safety is what has happened in the downtown area. Here renewed development has brought more pedestrians and a calming of traffic. Ultimately, there is no substitute for drivers becoming more vigilant and driving more slowly. While many of the options presented in the survey might have benefits, the real change will come when the corridor becomes more densely inhabited and developed. We need to keep our eye on that ball during this process. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.</p>
Mike Eyster	I just read “Our Main Street” online. Can you tell me if this is the most recent information on the Main Street Safety Project? If not, can you refer me to the most recent publication available? Also, can you tell me the date the “Our Main Street” document was created?