TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MEETING #8 SUMMARY

DATE: Monday, October 12, 2020, 9:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.

LOCATION: Virtual Meeting

ATTENDANCE

City of Springfield

☒ Brian Barnett, City Traffic Engineer
☐ Ben Gibson, Operations Supervisor
☒ Courtney Griesel, Economic Development Manager
☒ Michael Liebler, Transportation Planning Engineer
☒ Amy Linder, AIC Deputy Chief/Fire Marshal
☒ Kristi Krueger, Principal Engineer
☒ Meghan Murphy, Environmental Services Technician
☒ Emma Newman, Senior Transportation Planner
☐ Loralyn Spiro, DPW Communications Coordinator
☒ Sgt. Michael Massey, Police Department

ODOT

☒ Eric Alexander, Region 2 District 5 Assistant Manager
☒ Jenna Berman, Region 2 Active Transportation Liaison
☐ Nicole Charlson, Region 2 Transportation Safety Coordinator
☐ Carl Deaton, Region 2 Roadway Engineer
☐ Scott Nelson, Region 2 Access Management Engineer
☒ Amanda Salyer, Region 2 Traffic Investigations Engineer & ARTS Program Coordinator
☒ Katie Scott, Motor Carrier Division Mobility Operations Program Coordinator
☐ Manny Boswell, Motor Carrier Division Mobility Program Analyst
☐ Bob Stolle, Region 2 Rail Crossing Safety Section
☒ Dorothy Upton, Region 2 Traffic Engineer
☒ Kristie Gladhill, TPAU Senior Transportation Analyst

☐ Keith Blair, Region 2 Traffic Manager

DLCD

☐ Patrick Wingard, South Willamette Valley Representative

Utility Providers

☒ Dan Norland, Engineering Technician, SUB Electric
☒ Tamara Pitman, SUB Electric
☐ Sarah Follett, NW Natural
☒ Steven Wages, SUB Water

LTD

☐ Bret Smith, Transit Service Planner
☒ Kelly Clarke, Senior Transportation Planner, LCOG
☒ Jennifer Zankowski, Senior Development Planner
☒ Jeremy Card, Service Planner

Willamalane Park & Recreation District (WPRD)

☒ Eric Adams, Planning & Development Manager

School District #19 (SPS)

☒ Laughton Elliott-Deangelis, Safe Routes to Schools Coordinator
☐ Mike Schlosser, Transportation & Fleet Operations Manager

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
☐ Lacy Brown, Transportation Engineer, DKS Associates
☒ Kayla Fleskes, Transportation Engineering/Planning Assistant, DKS Associates

Audience / Members of the Public

None present

MEETING PURPOSE

- Discuss Technical Memorandum #15: Refined Alternative Solutions (TM #15)
- Provide input on the recommended solutions

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

John Bosket, DKS Associates, welcomed everyone to this eighth meeting of the TAC. He reviewed the agenda with the committee and asked members to introduce themselves.

PROJECT CONTEXT AND RECOMMENDATION OVERVIEW

John updated the TAC on project progress since the previous meeting, including committee meetings and community engagement. He noted what meetings will be happening after the TAC meeting and that the TAC is being asked to help improve draft recommendations.

John discussed that the approach for TM #15 was based on the direction from City Council for simplicity and flexibility. The request for simplicity resulted in the team presenting one set of potential solutions rather than multiple alternatives from which the best components would be selected and recombined into a preferred alternative. He noted that the flexibility is being provided through the guiding principles and cross section variations. Three main components make up the recommendation: intersection control, raised medians and street cross sections. John gave an overview of what was being recommended relative to those three groupings. The recommendation includes roundabouts at all the major intersections (prioritized into tiers), raised median openings with passenger vehicle U-turns at many unsignalized intersections, and a Balanced Width cross section with buffered bike lanes for the majority of the corridor. The Active Transportation Enhanced cross section is also recommended for portions of Main Street, which includes an off-street cycle track and has a larger right-of-way footprint. John noted that with this recommendation combining roundabouts and raised medians, there is potential for a 48% crash reduction for the entire corridor with an average of 31 seconds of out-of-direction travel time with roundabouts (compared to 53 seconds with traffic signals).

INTERSECTION CONTROL

Kayla Fleskes, DKS Associates, presented on the intersection control recommendation for Main Street. She noted the benefits of roundabouts and highlighted the recommended tiering for each of the major intersections. Dorothy Upton, ODOT, and Courtney Griesel, City of Springfield, asked about the roundabout design. John noted that these designs are conceptual only and typically show two lanes on Main Street with one or two lanes on the side streets. He noted that interim year analysis has not been done to determine when those lanes may be needed but there will be excess capacity at most intersection in the 20-year planning horizon. Brian Barnett, City of Springfield, also noted that it was undesirable to construct one lane on Main Street when the segments of Main Street are two lanes, requiring merging at the intersections. Courtney noted that communication will be important to make sure that community members understand that these are conceptual and subject to change as design progresses.

Amanda Salyer, ODOT, asked what the footprints would be for widening signalized intersections for freight vehicle U-turns. John noted that the footprints are included in Appendix B of TM #15, but that there would be impacts beyond the footprint, including impacts to signal operations to accommodate the time needed for freight vehicle U-turns and lengthened pedestrian crossing times. He noted that due to these impacts, we would not be recommending widening signalized intersections on Main Street to accommodate U-turns by trucks and would instead require trucks to reroute on the City truck routes.

Emma Newman, City of Springfield, brought up phasing of intersection improvements as it relates to ARTS and safety funding. She asked whether 48th Street should be Tier 1 or Tier 2 and, while phasing is not being included in detail with this tech memo, wanting to know what makes the most sense for investment. Dorothy Upton noted that ARTS funding is based on benefit-cost of fatal and severe injury crashes. John noted that ODOT is currently doing a more detailed benefit-cost analysis through the ARTS program but 32nd to 54th

Street is likely higher priority for implementation. Amanda noted that from preliminary ARTS work, 42nd Street is likely a high priority roundabout location.

There was general support among TAC members for roundabouts as the proposed solution, with some noting that prioritization will be important as funding will be limited, and phasing will be important to ensure consistency on the corridor.

Mike Massey, City of Springfield Police, noted that roundabouts can be problematic for emergency responders when there is a crash in the intersection and that they tend to get more bottled up than signalized intersections when yielding to first responders. There was discussion around how education will be a large piece of multilane roundabouts and making sure drivers understand how to behave after a minor crash or when encountering emergency vehicles near an intersection. Emma also noted the importance of adjacent street connectivity to provide multiple routes for emergency responders. Mike noted that some roundabouts can better accommodate emergency vehicles, such as the Glenwood roundabout, which Kristi Krueger, City of Springfield, noted has an exclusive transit lane which emergency vehicles can utilize when the approaches are otherwise blocked. Jenna Berman, ODOT, also stressed that pedestrian and bicycle safety needs to be considered at multilane roundabouts and that designs that can better control speed would be preferable. She also noted that as drivers become more used to multilane roundabouts, particularly if they are along a single corridor, they will likely become more aware of their surroundings and be better able to be aware of people walking and biking.

RAISED MEDIANS

Kayla presented the raised median framework that is being recommended, including the guiding principles for raised median design and noted the performance of this approach. John noted that the raised medians are being shown as one particular concept but that it will be subject to change as design progresses.

Dorothy asked what large traffic generators would be expected on the corridor and if there were alternate ways for them to access Main Street. Emma noted that some business parks only derive access from Main Street and may generate enough traffic to justify a break in the median.

Kayla noted that prioritization will be touched on more in the Facility Plan. Dorothy noted that two-stage left turns may be difficult at many locations and John agreed that it would only be where feasible, which likely wouldn't be much of the corridor.

John noted that research around replacing direct left turns with right turns and a U-turn show that safety is improved, and the severity of crashes can be reduced due to the changes in types of crashes. He noted that it will likely require a little bit of education as most people are not used to making U-turn movements. John also noted that emergency vehicle response times may be impacted as direct turns will be limited (although mountable curbing would be used for the raised medians to make them traversable), which is a tradeoff with the reduction in crashes that would come with reducing turning conflicts.

Emma noted that pedestrian crossing locations and transit stops should be considered but acknowledged that this would be a design detail that would go in conjunction with Lane Transit District's (LTD) stop balancing efforts.

Brian Barnett, City of Springfield, asked how medians may facilitate pedestrian crossings at locations where enhanced crossings were not installed. Dorothy noted that ODOT would need to be careful about closing crosswalk locations and limiting accessibility. Michael Liebler, City of Springfield, noted that it may be worthwhile to install some sort of barrier in the median near the Bob Straub Parkway intersection where there have been numerous higher-speed, pedestrian-related crashes. There was discussion around maintenance of this type of treatment and how existing fences do not always deter people. Brian added that the median can provide a safety enhancement with a two-stage crossing and that midblock crossings limit turning vehicle conflicts. John noted that medians are considered a pedestrian crossing treatment in NCHRP Report 562 and it would likely be better to have the median than not but there may be exceptions near higher speed areas such as Bob Straub Parkway. Michael noted that an ADA compliant crossing at every Main Street intersection would be difficult and would require closing crosswalks but Dorothy noted that instead, a break in the median at an unsigned crosswalk could be provided.

STREET CROSS SECTIONS

Kayla presented the three recommended street cross sections.

Dorothy commented that vertical elements in the bike lane may be problematic in the segment east of Bob Straub Parkway due to the Reduction Review Route. Kayla showed that the current recommendation does not include vertical delineators as a potential recommendation there. Jenna pointed out that there are a lot of elements that will require Mobility Advisory Committee (MAC) review for the freight Reduction Review Route and questioned if there could be removeable delineation, particularly between Bob Straub Parkway and 58th Street with the nearby school.

John noted that the Balanced Width cross section would not be narrower than the existing pinch point on Main Street but the Active Transportation Enhanced cross section would be. He noted that if the MAC was concerned about the narrower cross section, we would need to recommend a different cross section east of Bob Straub Parkway or widen the cross section beyond what is currently shown in that area. Jenna emphasized that we shouldn't make assumptions about how MAC may react to certain elements.

Jennifer Zankowski, LTD, asked how transit stops would be accommodated in this cross section. Kayla noted that stop locations would be determined during a future Design Phase and noted that figures from NACTO were provided in previous memos that showed how transit stops could be integrated with the cycle track. Jeremy Card, LTD, noted that bus stops would be preferred to be in-lane, not even pulling over. John stated that more examples could be provided in the Facility Plan to acknowledge that treatment would be needed for transit stops and to provide direction to a future design team.

John asked if there is enough space being shown in current cross sections to accommodate utilities, particularly if there is no expectation of undergrounding utilities, and what tools can be used for locating utilities. Brian noted that the typical footprint for the right-of-way meets the needs of utilities and added that currently there are no expectations of mandatory undergrounding of utilities, but City Council and community priorities may change as the project is implemented over time. Brian noted that there are many properties with public utility easements (PUEs) on their frontage currently and as redevelopment occurs PUEs will be required in through the development review process to provide space for utilities. He noted that as site development occurs, right-of-way could also be purchased and saved which means that utilities would end up near the sidewalk. Bill Johnston, ODOT, added that sometimes ODOT will install conduit under sidewalks in anticipation

of undergrounding utilities. John asked if more space needs to be provided in the current cross sections to accommodate utilities. Brian said that in balance of all of the competing interests for real estate, the cross sections are acceptable as shown. Tamara Pitman, SUB Electric, noted that a discontinuous PUE is not very useful. John noted that in the draft Facility Plan, there can be a larger discussion around utilities.

NEXT STEPS

- John summarized comments and discussions from the TAC meeting.
- Community engagement and committee meetings will occur from December 2020 through Spring 2021
- The next TAC meeting will be in Summer 2021 to discuss the Draft Facility Plan.

APPENDIX

- TAC Slide Show (attached)