Steering Committee Meeting #5
Monday, November 14, 2016
5:30 p.m. – 7:30 p.m.
Downtown Fire Station Meeting Room
400 NW Harrison Blvd.
Corvallis, OR 97330

Members Present

Steve Rogers, Chair, *retired City Public Works Director*
Theresa Conley, *OCWCOG, Metropolitan Planning Coordinator*
Tatiana Dierwechter, *Benton County Health Department*
Sal Hernandez, *Freight Representative*
Meghan Karas, Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Board
Jay Thatcher, *South Corvallis Neighborhood Association*
Chuck Thierheimer, *Community- At- Large*
Mark O'Brien, *Corvallis Chamber of Commerce*
Meredith Williams, *OSU Transportation Services*

Members Absent

Juliana Recio, *Access Benton County*
Jasmin Woodside*, Corvallis Planning Commission*

Staff and Project Team

John Bosket, *DKS Associates*
Scott Chapman, *Nelson/Nygaard*
Mat Dolata, *DKS Associates*
Mary Steckel, *City of Corvallis*
Adam Steele, *City of Corvallis*
April Hasson, *JLA Public Involvement*
Stacy Thomas, *JLA Public Involvement*
Drusilla van Hengel*, Nelson/Nygaard*

Members of the Public and Other Attendees

David Bella
Ali Bonakdar, *CAMPO*
Sarah Bronstein, *OSU Transportation Options*
Court Smith
Penny York, *Ward 1 City Councilor*

Welcome and Introductions

Steve Rogers, Steering Committee (SC) Chair, welcomed everyone to the fifth Corvallis Transportation System Plan (TSP) Steering Committee meeting. Steve introduced Adam Steele, the new project manager for the project, as well as led introductions of the rest of the project team and attendees.

Steve reviewed the meeting agenda and stated that the purpose of the meeting is to review the project status and understand the analysis of future transportation and transit conditions. The main goals are to understand new technical information and the projections for 2040, and ensure that the SC is comfortable with the information presented.

Project Status and Schedule

John Bosket from DKS Associates reviewed the schedule and directed the committee to Tech Memos 11, 12 and 13, which include a future look at what occurs to the transportation system if growth continues and if little investment in the system is made. Following the public outreach next month, the team will start transitioning to developing and testing different solution concepts. Today's meeting is to inform the committee on what the project team is seeing, as well as to receive ideas and feedback on potential solutions.

Stacy Thomas from JLA Public Involvement thanked the SC members who attended the three mode-specific work groups held earlier in November. The Auto/Freight work group held on November 3 had about 17 participants. The Transit work group and tour and the Bike/Ped group and tour were both held on November 5 and had over a dozen attendees. All three groups generated many solution ideas that will be considered by the project team. The first project newsletter is now available and promotes the in-person Open House on November 29 and the online Open House that is live from November 29 through December 20. It was distributed at the work group meetings and will be mailed and emailed to stakeholders this week. The newsletter was translated into Spanish, and will be delivered to organizations serving the Spanish-speaking community.

The Open House will be held at the Corvallis Public Library and will be a drop-in style event showcasing an update on the project with four specific modal information stations for walking, driving, biking and transit. Each of the stations will collect the public's ideas for solutions via an iPad on the online comment map, as well as on flipcharts and printed maps. A stakeholder email providing a link to the online Open House will go out once it is live on November 29th. The list of interested parties is about 425 people.

In addition to the newsletter, stakeholder emails and the website, notification of the Open House and online Open House is included in a print advertisement that will run twice in the *Corvallis Gazette Times* and the City is expecting a supplemental article to run as well. SC members are asked to promote this to constituents, family and friends.

Future Traffic Forecast

Tech Memo 11: Future Traffic Forecast

John Bosket explained that the growth assumptions used by the team include a baseline scenario (or a no-build scenario), which assumes that all growth that is projected to take place through 2040 has occurred, but very little new transportation infrastructure has been built. Known financially constrained projects were included in the assumptions, but it was a very short list; primarily the intersection at Elks and OR 99W that the hospital plans to realign with future phases of expansion.

- The Corvallis Albany Lebanon Model (CALM) growth assumptions are consistent with the current Corvallis comprehensive plan. The Corvallis TSP has to align with the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan is scheduled for review and amendment in the near future. The project team will coordinate the TSP work with the Comprehensive Plan update team to provide information about the land use-transportation relationship and ensure the two plans are based on consistent assumptions upon completion (see third bullet below for more information).
- Tech Memos 12 and 13 are based on past projections of what growth was expected to look like in terms of housing, population and employment, which may change in the near future.
- The City Council has requested that the project team identify and test different land use scenarios building off of what was done at the regional level. We will work with the Community Development staff to test these scenarios and see how they may change transportation within Corvallis.

Mat Dolata from DKS Associates reviewed the traffic forecasts and land use assumptions in the future growth scenario. Previously, there was a Corvallis CAMPO-area travel demand model used to estimate growth in traffic volumes. The CALM model expanded the coverage area by bringing the Lebanon, Corvallis and Albany areas into a single model that better captures travel between these communities. Future estimates of housing and population were developed to be consistent with adopted population forecasts at that time. Additional data, such as employment forecasts, were extrapolated from land use growth assumptions in previous models. Land use assumptions in the future scenario were vetted by the cities, counties and MPO.

- Land use scenarios estimate a 25% population increase from 2010 to 2040 (about 14,000 people), which is consistent with the recent urbanization study. Employment assumptions in the land use scenarios show 17,226 new jobs predicted for 2040, which is significant (58% increase from 2010). The estimate differs from the urbanization study, so the team plans to examine this assumption in greater detail when other land use scenarios are tested.
- OSU main campus enrollment is assumed to reach 28,500 in 2040 (22% increase from 2015). The forecast is not coming directly from OSU since the university does not project

enrollment that far out into the future, but is the best estimate based on available information.

- The CALM model shows traffic volume increasing by 40%. There is not a big shift in mode share. There will be a small increase in auto mode share (almost 2%), based on travel diaries from the household survey.

Steering Committee questions and discussion *(note that discussion and questions are summarized and are not necessarily verbatim)*:

- Regarding the 2% increase in auto mode share, Steve Rogers noted that the estimated increased employment numbers will likely double the population, with many of these people coming from out of the area/urban growth boundary. The only way these employees can get to Corvallis reasonably is by auto. He was surprised the increase in auto mode share wasn't higher.
- Due to the number of assumptions and changing behaviors, it would be helpful to see two scenarios: a model where the auto mode share increases as shown, and one that shows an auto mode decrease.
- Does the current analysis factor in improvements and access to workforce affordable housing and how far people have to travel?
    - *There has not been any additional analysis. These are the latest projections based on projected growth.*
- Is the household survey information Corvallis-specific or statewide?
    - *It is based on the statewide average, but the campus component is more localized.*
    - Ali Bonakdar from CAMPO indicated that the statewide average included 30 samples from Corvallis and is based on similar communities such as Eugene, as they are culturally similar in mode choice.
- Why is the employment map showing negative growth around OSU?
    - *The team will look into this but there is some shuffling of employment and housing in the downtown area. It may be that housing and population growth is replacing employment growth in some cases. This growth is based on the TAZ system which defines a geographic area that may include multiple types of land uses.*
- Steve was surprised that one of the areas for population growth was bounded by 6th and Monroe Ave. and Jefferson, which is all OSU-owned and is open space. It is the primary area for new population, but it's unclear if there is any planned OSU growth there or not.
- An SC member thought the walking percentage was about 13% in Corvallis, but the estimates show it as double that. This estimate doesn't seem to match the existing numbers. It also seems like bike share should be higher.
    - *This is the mode share for residents and is based on overall daily trips. Mode shares discussed previously, where the walking percentage was much lower, reflected commuting only. One theory is that OSU generates many small walking trips.*

- Do we factor in transportation alternatives like Uber and Lyft and how that new technology would factor into our planning?
    - *The current projection doesn't, but it is something that should be considered as part of the solutions development.*

Tech Memo 12: Future Transportation Conditions & Performance

Mat Dolata explained that the team looked at land use forecasts and traffic projections to see what transportation improvement projects are needed. Analysis is based on the PM peak hour when there is the most congestion and demand. The two options for analysis are: 1) the average weekday PM peak, and 2) the standard design hour, which is the thirtieth busiest hour over the course of a year. Traffic operations are analyzed at intersections and then compared with defined mobility standards. Standards vary by jurisdiction. ODOT standards are a measure of volume to capacity and City standards are a measure of level of service.

- Eight existing intersections fail to meet mobility standards under existing conditions. In 2040, 16 intersections are predicted to fail to meet standards under design conditions. These are around Philomath Blvd., Harrison and 30th and around Van Buren Ave. with traffic backups from the single-lane Van Buren bridge.
- Predictions for 2040 show a number of additional congested intersections with higher delays, bypass congestion and multiple hours of delays. Congestion will likely be more intense and may manifest in changes to travel behavior such as traveling during off-peak periods.

Steering Committee questions and discussion:

- There are problem intersections that aren't listed. One area is Garfield Ave. as you cross Kings Blvd. There is often a backup and there are no stop signs on Kings Blvd.
- The timing appears off between the lights on Harrison Blvd. and 35th and 36th Streets.
- The intersection at 30th Street and Harrison Blvd. is bad now and will only become worse in another 22 years.
- What does it mean if an intersection isn't identified at this point in the project?
    - *There has been an ongoing conversation with City staff about why certain areas aren't being flagged. In part, it may be because specific areas weren't analyzed due to limited resources. It may also be due to the differing mobility standards. ODOT uses volume to capacity ratios to measure existing conditions, whereas the City uses level of service. There are a number of intersections that are currently meeting the level of service based on the City's measures, but these would be flagged if measured under a volume to capacity ratio. Perhaps applying a different mobility standard will better reflect user experience. It is important to hear from SC members regarding problem areas that haven't been flagged.*
- The intersection at 29th Street and Grant Ave experiences backups and a number of accidents.
- An SC member asked for clarification between the two mobility standards.

    - *The level of service mobility standard is a delay-based performance measure, which measures how many average seconds of delay are experienced. The volume to capacity standard is calculated in a totally different way and the two standards are unrelated. It is a calculated assumption for how many cars in an hour, or a peak 15-minute period, could get through an intersection. If people are avoiding a place they don't think is safe, it may not show up as an issue.*
    - A SC member provided this example: in some locations with visual issues, such as 15th Street and OR 34, people perceive that there are safety issues. In some locations, such as crossing 29th Street, it is safer than going through an uncontrolled intersection. These issues will best be documented though public and committee input.
- It is important to analyze multimodal level of service for pedestrians and bicyclists where intersections meet or exceed performance measures.
- In an urban area that is heavily signalized, congestion can come from the signals themselves. For example, if there were no signals on Kings Blvd., the SC member believes there would be no congestion there.
- Other problematic areas identified: 9th Street and Circle Blvd., particularly northbound with right turn movements; 2nd Street across the bridge and 6th Street with congestion across the bridge. In addition, the un-signaled intersection at 9th Street and Conifer Blvd. is problematic, but it doesn't show up anywhere in Tech Memo 12.
- Are the online comment map comments included in the Tech Memo?
    - *The comments are not included here, as this is more the analytical side of studying conditions. The project team does want to incorporate all comments as this goes to the public open house, and combine the needs assessment with what the team has analyzed and what people experience.*
- It would be nice to see compiled comments from the online map.
- Is there any correlation between state crash data in terms of characteristics to the level of service or the volume to capacity?
    - *Not really. This is anecdotal, but in the existing conditions report, we saw that higher frequency crashes occurred in places with higher congestion.*
- An area of concern regarding safety for vulnerable users is Four Acre Place where it intersects with Circle Blvd. There is a Safeway there. It has been identified by a local group as being unsafe for vulnerable people. It may be in part due to the right turn lane being green all of the time, even when pedestrians cross. It could be fixed by not being green all the time. Traffic would be more congested, but it may be safer.
- Jackson and 3rd Ave. is un-signalized, next to First Interstate Bank. Some lights are not coordinated and may need upgraded equipment to operate more efficiently.
- Van Buren Ave. didn't show up as a congested area, before 1st, and it is.
- Highland Dr. north of Walnut Blvd. showed up as red, but there's no signal there – it goes to the high school, park land and residential areas.
    - *Adam Steele noted that in between intersections like on Kings Blvd., and between Harrison Blvd. and 36th Street, the intersection is successful, but people are bypassing the signaled intersections, so it won't show up as a problem.*

Steve noted that, due to time, this meeting doesn't include a specific solutions discussion on the agenda. However, if members wanted to provide suggestions for solutions, they should do so. Stacy noted that solutions are being sought at the Open House.

Future Transit Conditions

Tech Memo #13: Future Transit Conditions and Performance

Scott Chapman of Nelson/Nygaard reviewed Tech Memo 13.

- The team looked at how transit will respond to population and employment growth.
- Transit flow patterns were discussed.
- The model transit mode share shows where people are using transit now and in the future.
- Traffic congestion impacts transit in a number of ways, including reliability. The project team will look at how transit will get around congestion issues in the future, with one option being the use of parallel streets where applicable.
- Kings Blvd. is a heavily used transit corridor and will have some pockets of congestion in the future.
- Existing conditions performance in the current system was weighed against the evaluation criteria in Tech Memo 6.
- The model shows less people will be served by transit in the outlying areas. However, more jobs will be located within ¼ mile of a transit stop.

Steering Committee questions and discussion:

- Is the funding modeled that will come in from new residents and possible additions and improvements?
    - *Assumptions for future funding were used that's going to constrain our solutions.*
    - *It was clarified that the question is asking if the model assumed that more residents and households would mean more revenue would be available.*
- Was a model evaluated where there is an increase in the percentage of jobs or people served by transit in a more concentrated denser part of the community vs the community as one whole?
    - *What is presented is the future scenario of no-build, plus assumptions and conditions put into the model. There were no changes to land use or zoning as a part of this analysis.*
- There is an apartment complex near the urban growth boundary near Philomath that is currently being served by transit. It costs too much to provide transit service to it; the high density development should not have been built there. It might be useful to look at how easy or hard high density areas are to get to with transit. Maybe they shouldn't be employment areas or shouldn't be high density.
    - *It's a challenge, because agencies and institutions often seek out areas on the outer edges of the community to develop.*

- Crescent Valley High School is outside the city limits (it is within the urban growth boundary) and is served by a CTS commuter service. It isn't heavily used by students based on its infrequency and hours of service.
    - *It is intended to complement the school bus service. There's also a park and ride available there.*
- It would be nice to have a high-level conversation about the role of the Linn-Benton Loop in Corvallis and where it stops, especially where there may be opportunities to improve both services.
    - *The transit demand analysis was limited to the City.*

Future Active Transportation

Dru van Hengel from Nelson/Nygaard discussed future conditions for walking and bicycling. Future analysis conditions are largely dependent on inputs to models that predict the quality of service for walking and biking which may differ from user experience. The team is not only examining modeling results in comparison to the existing conditions report, but is also examining public comments regarding walking and biking challenges.

- Dru reviewed the deficiency criteria used by the team for walking and biking.
- The coverage of bike and pedestrian facilities and mode share in Corvallis is very high and there is a high coverage of sidewalks, among the highest in the country. 90% of City arterials have sidewalks on both sides, in contrast to state owned highways, which is 36% on both sides. This shifted very little in future conditions, because only two sidewalk projects are in the committed project list.
- Regarding pedestrian conditions, the team used a multimodal level of service methodology adapted from ODOT to assess the qualitative level of service. The walking experience is determined by how high the speed limit is, the crossing distance, and the vehicle speed and volume of adjacent roadways. The higher these things are, the less pleasant the walking experience is. The team identified intersections and segments that didn't meet established thresholds. They are identified as red on the map.
- Given the future conditions of growth, the team examined what percentage of residents would have access to high quality walkways within 1/8 mile of home. High quality walkways are defined as having sidewalks on both sides of the street.
- A list of potential deficiencies were identified and the key areas are: 7th Street from E Avenue to Washington, Crystal Lake from OR 99W to Alexander; Country Club; Rivergreen Ave; Highland Dr. and 9th Street north of Conifer Blvd., West Hills Road, and future growth areas where there might not be sidewalks with development, including 53rd Street and OR 99W.
- Corvallis has a high percentage of bike lanes. The analysis doesn't differentiate the type of bike lane, but it does differentiate those with shared lane markings. In terms of bike stress, streets with bike lanes score better than those that don't, and those with higher speed limits score worse than those with lower speeds.
- Future bike conditions are similar to the existing conditions, because growth has a small impact.

- High quality bikeways are those with access to a bike lane or a low stress street where speeds are 25 MPH or less, and the daily traffic volumes are less than 1,500.
- Bike deficiencies were identified in many areas, but these areas are most in need of bike lanes: Harrison Blvd; West Hills Road; along 3rd and 4th Streets downtown; future growth areas of southwest Corvallis; north of Kings Blvd. and southeast Corvallis.
- High stress biking areas, area near schools and areas with other deficiencies are identified on the map.
- Technical analysis varies from what we are hearing from users. User input says that there will be a better experience if you focus on lowering speeds and/or lowering vehicle volumes on streets, and focus on crossings, collectors and arterials to benefit people of all ages and abilities.

Steering Committee questions and discussion:

- Can you provide examples of important destinations where a pedestrian score is better than average?
    - *They are mainly downtown, some commercial developments, social services and public buildings. Also some large employers and institutions, like the library and hospitals.*
- Intersections on Harrison Blvd. and Van Buren Ave. in the downtown area are shown as low-level stress arteries for bicyclists, but that's not what many experience, especially coming into town on Harrison Blvd. with all the cars turning right at traffic signals.
    - *This is the problem with the method – if there is a signal, there is an assumption that traffic control separates the modes.*
    - The group discussed how to account for this problem. A SC member noted that ODOT is doing a study where bicyclists at low stress intersections will be interviewed by PSU. There are ways to capture individuals experiencing stress. The current model isn't the best to reflect community experience. Can we come up with a simple survey to interview people? A handful of intersections come up repeatedly, and questions are likely to be raised by the public when they are not showing up as deficient.
- In the new areas of projected growth, do we have policies to ensure that complete streets will be built?
    - *The TSP's standards flow into the land development code. There are good standards in the current TSP that should transfer to the new one.*
    - *Looking for ways to strengthen the standards is part of the TSP project conversation.*
- For bicycle level of stress, the City may not be well suited for analyzing, anticipating and addressing possible solutions, including neighborhood greenways, protected bike lanes and buffered bike lanes. Do we have instruments that will help anticipate bike level of stress on these types of facilities?
    - *Current methodologies don't differentiate between types of bike facility, so no.*

- What about neighborhood greenways? The team should recommend that the City develops a network of neighborhood greenways and identify where high stress intersections are.
    - *The TSP process doesn't direct this.*
- A preference survey could ask if buffered bike lanes or a neighborhood greenway would be considered a low stress facility.
    - *Current methodology doesn't accommodate that, but a survey preference could.*
- The section of 9th Street between Polk Ave. and Monroe Ave. should have bike lanes. There are bike lanes on both ends, but no bike lanes or shared facilities on that section, and it's possible to do it.
- There is no reasonable bike connection between the signal on OR 34 east of the Willamette River and downtown Corvallis.
- There's only a sidewalk on one side of Witham Hill Dr. It goes to the intersection with 36th and Grant Ave., which doesn't have good pedestrian connectivity.
- Monroe Ave. on the north side of campus is stressful for *all* modes of travel.
    - *Adam asked the SC if the Monroe issue has to do with mid-block crossing and uncontrolled pedestrian use on Monroe Ave.*
        - *It was discussed at the Auto/Freight focus group - at that meeting a participant suggested a concrete median in the center of street to force pedestrians to the crosswalk, like on Madison.*
        - There are some design solutions on Monroe Ave. that could make it safer. People are concerned with bike and pedestrian conflicts.
- There's a need for a connection between the residential area around Tunison Park (and farther south) to travel to and from town as an alternative to the sidewalks along OR 99W.
- What is a shared facility marking?
    - *A "chevron marking" demonstrates to drivers that bicyclists are sharing the travel lane with vehicles. It is often accompanied with a sign. There are some on 2nd Street, Harrison Blvd., 14th north of Monroe Ave., and Madison and Monroe Ave. going through town. There are also some communities that use it when there's a gap in the network or where the design solution seems untenable for a variety of reasons.*
- "Corvallis" is often referred to in the Tech Memos, but whether this is referring to the urban growth boundary or city limits needs to be clarified and made consistent.
- What is a "designated bike route"?
    - *It is when a facility is signed "bike route" but there is no other pavement marking associated with it. In Corvallis you have a "popular bike street" designation, and that's what the team is referring when it says "designated bike route."*

Any additional ideas or comments should be emailed to Adam before Tuesday, November 22 at adam.steele@corvallisoregon.gov

Public Comment

Court Smith: I have four points:

1) Look at all the intersections and how they handle all the modes of traffic and don't separate out how they handle cars, bikes and pedestrians. For example, Satinwood and Walnut Blvd. works for autos, but not bikes. Fix the left hand turn signal and evaluate it for all modes. Monroe Ave. and 16th is bad for pedestrians, cars and bikes; Kings Blvd. and Taylor Ave. is bad for pedestrians, bikes and cars. 99W would be nice between Walnut Blvd. and Conifer Blvd. if there was a clearly designated pedestrian and bike path for travel into Corvallis.

2) Bicyclists have been active on the project's online comment map, I suggest you look at their comments.

3) Watch your general assumptions about boundaries and your general assumptions about the future. Don't take too narrow of a view. What would it take not to build? Could we have a scenario of not building certain bridges or roads? Maybe there are better options than expanding. We could solve the Van Buren problem if we could get transit from Lebanon to Corvallis. We could improve US 20 with transit from Albany to Corvallis. A better highway that goes from Highland Dr. from OR 99W to US 20 east of Walnut Blvd. is needed. This is part of why we're having accidents at Granger. Be careful about the assumptions we make and the boundaries we draw.

4) I biked the Portland greenways and I think 10th, 16th and 27th in Corvallis would make great bike greenways. A greenway is cheap and easy to do: turn the stop signs, cut the speed to 20 MPH and paint the roads. Dave and I would like to suggest a lighter transportation service like trams on the bikeways, so that people can move from their homes into the university and downtown. The other thing about Portland's bike greenways, they don't go far away from the major arteries, they go parallel, so that people who are going to buses and major destinations can get there. They're very good.

Finally, I am worried about consistent project staffing. There have been three different changes in staff leadership. Are we losing anything along the way? I don't see a lot of attention to the public input.

Sarah Bronstein, Transportation Options Coordinator at OSU: When looking at updating the TSP, one of the critical components of it is our design standards. Whether we're looking at low stress routes on neighborhood streets or using protected bike lanes on arterials, I don't know that we have those standards adopted in our current TSP. We need to have all the current tools in our tool box to perform best practices in Corvallis. There's a lot more we could do to be encouraging vulnerable users to use a mode other than their car. My job is to reduce single occupancy trips to campus, so seeing that single occupancy vehicle trips are increasing is a sign that I'm failing at my job. Moving forward, let's make some changes that encourage behavior change.

Penny York, Corvallis City Council: I want the team to know that the City Council and staff are working on street standards for legacy streets with residents throughout the City especially in my ward, Ward 1, and in Ward 8. Legacy streets were built according to County standards and weren't altered when they became part of the City. They raise touchy issues for people living on them and the Council is working on policy to address street standards and funding issues. One of the issues is access to sidewalks and bike lanes. My constituents don't want to see sidewalks and bike lanes on some rural and semi-rural streets. I'm hoping the TSP will coordinate around this policy work. Staff can keep you informed. As I look at the maps for congested intersections, streets, sidewalks and bike lanes and lack thereof, especially on highways you can see in SW, SE and NW Corvallis are bisected by highways. US 20 bisects Ward 1 and it doesn't have sidewalks. It's hard to get to the neighborhood center. A fundamental piece of our land use documents is access to services. I have constituents who have to drive a few blocks to get across Philomath Blvd. to get to Safeway because they can't safely get there. So, look at transportation resources from a sub area of Corvallis in addition to a city and regional lens. If you can do that, you can increase people being able to walk where there aren't sidewalks and find that it's difficult- especially with a stroller or a child or two.

The issue about sidewalks in neighborhood streets relates to people perceiving right-of-way as part of their property, and they want to keep their shrubs and the rural feel of the area. I've heard people feel strongly for and against sidewalks. The Council is thinking through it and wants people to have options rather than a standard, because of different conditions on different streets. There are different standards and modifications around natural features. People need to acknowledge that we have different elevation issues and street width issues.

A SC member mentioned that at Safeway, there is a large parking lot on Philomath Blvd. between the Safeway and homes and that is a barrier to access.

Closing

- Please come to the Open House on November 29th at Corvallis Public Library.
- The project team is transitioning into solutions development. The team will huddle and take a look at what next steps look like given we will be developing additional land use scenarios. We will also pull together all the solution ideas we receive.
- The Public Involvement Summary Report will be sent prior to your next meeting to review. SC members will receive a summary shortly after the first of the year once the online open house closes on December 20.
- There is going to be a summary for the latest round of outreach, which will include the three work groups. Summaries should be appendices to the Public Involvement Summary Report, which will be considered by the team.
- A SC member asked that accessibility is addressed and that ADA is a piece of the models. The team noted it isn't part of the models, but we are collecting this information. There is a map of ramps in the walking maps to show where ramps are missing and where they are deficient. We do look at sidewalk connectivity and accessibility issues. With all of our changing demographics and the growing population of older adults, we also need to look at lighting and a variety of things, not just the physical act of moving.

Action Items for Project Team:

Action	Responsibility	Estimated Completion	Date Complete
Check references to “Corvallis” in the Tech Memos and make the term consistently refer to the urban growth boundary or the city limits.	John Bosket		
Work with City Council and Community Development staff to develop and test different land use and growth scenarios.	John Bosket		
Send Tech Memo 13 to Mark O’Brien	Stacy Thomas		