

Steering Committee Meeting #6

Monday, April 24, 2017
6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.
Downtown Fire Station Meeting Room
400 NW Harrison Blvd.
Corvallis, OR 97330



Members Present

Steve Rogers, Chair, *retired City Public Works Director*
Jim Boeder, *Planning Commission Liaison*
Barbara Bull, *City Council Liaison*
Tatiana Dierwechter, *Benton County Health Department*
Meghan Karas, *Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Board*

Juliana Recio, *Access Benton County*
Jay Thatcher, *South Corvallis Neighborhood Association*
Mark O'Brien, *Corvallis Chamber of Commerce*
Meredith Williams, *OSU Transportation Services*
Kevin Young, *Community Member At Large*

Members Absent

Nick Fowler, *Economic Development Advisory Board*
Stephan Friedt, *ACT, Linn-Benton Loop*
Sal Hernandez, *Freight Representative*
Chuck Thierheimer, *Community Member At Large*

Staff and Project Team

John Bosket, *DKS Associates*
Scott Chapman, *Nelson/Nygaard*
Mat Dolata, *DKS Associates*
April Hasson, *JLA Public Involvement*
Paul Leitman, *Nelson/Nygaard*

Mary Steckel, *City of Corvallis*
Adam Steele, *City of Corvallis*
Stacy Thomas, *JLA Public Involvement*
Drusilla van Hengel, *Nelson/Nygaard*

Members of the Public and Other Attendees

Ali Bonakdar, *CAMPO*

Welcome and Introductions

Steve Rogers, Steering Committee (SC) Chair, thanked everyone for attending the sixth Corvallis Transportation System Plan (TSP) Steering Committee meeting. Steve welcomed three new members to the SC: Kevin Young, who replaces Theresa Conley as Committee Member at Large and Jim Boeder, who replaces Jasmine Woodside as Planning Commission liaison and Barbara Bull who replaces Hal Brauner as City Council liaison. Steve then led introductions for the rest of the project team and attendees.

Steve reviewed the meeting agenda and stated that the purpose of the meeting is to provide a project status update and to get the SC's feedback on the initial set of projects. He noted that public comments would be welcomed at 7:45 p.m.

Project Status and Process Moving Forward

John Bosket from DKS Associates provided a project status update. Since the last meeting in November, the project team has developed an initial list of transportation solution projects based on a review of the following:

- Plans done since the last TSP
- Analysis from the project Tech Memos
- Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and SC comments; and
- Public comments from website, correspondence and all outreach efforts

Before further analysis and refinement of that list, the Project Management Team (PMT) would like SC input identifying gaps and items that need to be removed or added. TAC comments on the initial project list were collected at their meeting earlier in the day. Their comments were compiled and made available on display boards for the SC to use as a reference.

At the next SC meeting there will be a review and discussion on the next Tech Memo which will include a refined project list that has been evaluated for alignment with the TSP goals and criteria, as well as how the projects may impact the transportation system operation (vehicle miles traveled (VMT), percent of jobs and housing in close proximity to higher frequency transit routes, etc.). Project prioritization will also be discussed related to available funding to complete projects. . For example, within the available money to spend, which projects should end up on the financially constrained list? City standards such as street classifications and mobility standards also will be reviewed and discussed at this meeting.

Another round of public outreach in mid-late this summer will follow the next TAC and SC meetings. This will include a second round of topic-specific workgroups (auto/freight, transit, bike/ped) followed by a second open house.

The PMT originally planned to hold the next round of outreach in July, but the team is testing a revised set of land use assumptions with a lower housing and employment growth forecast that better reflects the results of the City's recently completed Economic Opportunities Analysis. This

additional work will likely impact the schedule, and the PMT will know more in the next few weeks.

Stacy Thomas from JLA Public Involvement stated that the PMT is seeking input from the SC on the initial set of projects. Because it's challenging to have a collaborative discussion on such a large set of projects, an open house-style format is being used. Four modal stations (auto/freight, bike, pedestrian, transit) are set up with a mode-specific project map, a display showing TAC input, and a flip chart for comments. SC members were directed to spend an hour visiting the mode stations and to focus comments on what should come off the list, and what is missing from the list. The SC regrouped to review the highlights and begin discussion on individual projects.

SC questions and discussion (*note that discussion and questions are summarized and are not verbatim*):

- How have financial constraints been considered up until this point? It's helpful to have a complete list that works well together but when do we talk about what we can actually afford and trade-offs?
 - *Financial constraints were discussed in an earlier Tech Memo, but are not reflected in this initial list of potential projects. John Bosket indicated that aspirational (non-financially constrained) lists are a starting place, but eventually there will need to be prioritization conversations to determine a list of projects that could reasonably be funded. Larger, more expensive aspirational projects still have value and should be left on the project list because funding opportunities and local priorities change over time. However, there may be opportunities for lower cost, interim solutions (e.g., managing demand or making the existing system more efficient) that can put on the financially constrained list for the near term. The City is not locked into the financially constrained list of projects and can change priorities as needed. These discussions will be part of future SC meetings.*
- Which set of projects will be used to run the model next time – the financially constrained, or the not financially constrained?
 - *Both will be used.*
- How will the input from the TAC on the initial project list be shared?
 - *The TAC's feedback is available on display boards at the modal stations. The projects they recommended to add are in green, and recommended removals are in red, and other suggested modifications are in black.*
 - *Steve Rogers asked the SC to focus on projects that address known issues and problems. Projects that are long-range or that are development-related should not be the primary focus of the exercise tonight.*
- What is the reference to a draft OSU master plan (*in the project list matrix to indicate the source of the project*) – is this something that has been published?
 - *No, it was nothing more than an existing conditions report from an early effort to do a draft master plan, and will be removed as a reference.*

Preliminary Project List “Open-House”

SC members spent about an hour visiting four modal stations and providing input on what projects on the initial project list should be removed, and what projects should be added or modified.

Reconvene and Discussion

Steve Rogers reconvened the group and explained that the PMT provide a highlight of the comments received (what projects should be dropped from the list, and what projects are missing). If there is no discussion on any particular comment, silence will be deemed agreement. SC discussion will be documented and whether there is agreement or a split.

Due to limited time, John Bosket relayed that members can provide additional written comments through the end of the week. The full notes recorded on flip charts during the “open house” portion of the meeting are attached to this summary.

Auto/Freight Projects

John Bosket and Mat Dolata from DKS Associates reported on the comments for Auto/Freight projects. (*Answers to questions are shown in italics.*)

Project N1: Harrison widening project (remove)

- This project is specific to adding a turn lane. It has been revisited a number of times, and there is no desire to do it, so it should probably be taken off – *except for bike lanes*. An SC member noted that there’s been major opposition in the neighborhood, which is why it hasn’t moved forward.

US 20/OR 34: large scale widening project (remove with added alternatives)

Solution ideas were provided as alternatives to this large project:

- Make sure there are signal enhancements and coordination in the corridor.
- If four lanes are put in but left turns aren’t allowed, we would need to figure out how to accommodate turning right somewhere and looping back around.
- Narrow lanes and reduce speeds.
- Use roundabouts at intersections instead of traffic signals.

SC discussion:

- Steve Rogers stated that the original widening project concept was to figure out a way to get trucks in their lane, cars in their lane, and not spend \$69 million. The only way to do that is to use the area that’s already paved, including left turn lanes. Lanes can be narrowed if traffic speeds are reduced, resulting in a gain of some green light time and everything moving a bit faster. It isn’t likely ODOT would approve this concept.
- Can access management be a part of that, i.e. a median down the middle?

- *Steve Rogers said in his proposal no left turns would be permitted; all pavement is used for traffic, and no median. The only places there are left turns today are at the intersections.*

M75: Wake Robin/Brooklane connection (remove)

- A mix of comments to remove and general warnings.
- The project wasn't intended to relieve congestion. It is a connectivity project.
- There were some earlier comments about desiring a different way to get access to and from South Corvallis, perhaps in the event of a flood. However, if there is flooding, this area will also flood.
- The old TSP included a much larger project, Kiger Island over to 53rd. The County didn't put it in their TSP, but instead decided to improve other roads.

SC discussion:

- A project that connects US 20/OR 34 to OR 99W was mentioned. That might relieve some of the pressure.
 - *Yes, there were suggested ramps eastbound to southbound, but that may be challenging due to potential impacts to Pioneer Park.*
 - *Eastbound to southbound was taken out of the last plan.*
- We are hearing about more development in south Corvallis and a desire to slow down traffic on the State facilities.
- Steve Rogers noted that it appears the improvements would travel through a park.
- The South Corvallis plan doesn't support widening south 3rd Street or moving traffic there. Would an alternative connection relieve that?
 - *Steve Rogers said he didn't think there has been a project to relieve that traffic, other than Kiger Island. The current plan includes it, and the previous County plan did, but the model doesn't include it. It would be too far south to alleviate congestion.*
 - *An SC member said there are three motor vehicle projects, fairly far south of Alexander and Goodnight, which could be alternatives paralleling 3rd Street.*

Kiger Island Drive to 53rd extension (remove)

- John Bosket asked if there was a desire to keep this project on the list.
 - An SC member asked if it costs so much because of the amount of pavement?
 - *Steve Rogers said it would be going across Mary's River and considerable wetlands.*

M4 Ponderosa Avenue (remove)

- The TAC commented that there's no need to classify it as a collector standard if it's not going to go anywhere.
- Steve Rogers noted we already have another street in that area that is a collector standard (Glenridge).

Coolidge from 29th to 23rd (modification of M30)

- Add a traffic calming measure.

M30: 29th and Grant (modification)

- Consider installing a roundabout.

N44 and M59 Circle Blvd extension (Harrison Blvd to Campus Way) – (mixed input)

- OSU is not in favor of the project. It conflicts with the how the land is currently being used. It's an active research area, and OSU needs to have open space for agriculture and veterinary programs.
- There is not agreement on whether to remove this project among the SC, since improving connectivity through Corvallis would be served by the project and some members would like to see it happen.

A21: 29th Street/Harrison Blvd. (support)

- Some support for the southbound right-hand turn project.

M32: 30th Street/Harrison Blvd. (support)

- Support for a mini-roundabout option.
- It's close to another signal; another signal could be installed, but it's tricky given it's so close to one already.

M42: Witham Hill Drive/Circle Blvd. (support)

- Support for roundabout option.
- If Washington Way through the agriculture lands is going to happen, is there a way to push more traffic to Walnut, so that it's more of a beltline?
 - *The answer is unknown because an analysis hasn't been done.*
- There is a lot of housing around Ponderosa. To facilitate going to the university, motorist wouldn't have to go through Harrison or neighborhoods, they could go around.

A44, M59, M6, M64, M77, M75, M77 and other projects that create continuous routes (lack of support)

- There was a general lack of support for a number of segments that collectively create ring roads and create continuous routes and long trips that push traffic through these areas.

SC discussion:

- These projects seem like an older style of traffic design. The design doesn't support the newer goals of the City to reduce VMT and greenhouse gas emissions, etc.
 - *Ring roads might be the end result, but the original purpose was to create connectivity. North Corvallis/Crescent Valley has a future buildout of 22,000*

people, which is why these roads are planned. This wouldn't be just some quick way through, but it would serve future residents.

N7: An east-west connection on the south side of railroad tracks (support)

- Support for/preference for N7 over A44, on the south side of the railroad tracks going through The Retreat housing development to get over to 53rd. It doesn't tie to Washington Way.
- John Bosket clarified that items labeled with "N" are the new list from the TAC.

General comments regarding projects to add

- Utilize the local connector classification that is in the current TSP for local streets.
- There should be a mechanism for bike/ped-roadway projects. If the whole road can't be built, maybe the bike/ped portions can still be worked on.

Harrison and 30th Intersection Improvements (modification)

- Include a northbound right turn lane.

Harrison and 35th/36th Streets (mix of input)

- Comments received to remove this project because it operates at a single intersection signal.

SC discussion:

- Is there right-of-way for this improvement?
 - *Adam Steele stated that there is not, but the City can buy right-of-way (ROW). When the project team went through the list initially, projects that didn't have ROW weren't removed. The City doesn't have ROW on many projects. However, it could be expensive to purchase ROW.*
- Steve Rogers stated that the two signals operate as one intersection. There would need to be an extra phase to get people around. In addition to that, it was important to the neighborhood not to trap any cars in between the two intersections. The timing has been changed and it's much better than it was 2-3 years ago. It's as good as it's going to get because it's one intersection, not two. Improvements in the plan won't make it any better.
- Motorists making left turns on Harrison around the church and certain alleys backs up traffic. Cars can sit through an entire signal while someone is trying to make a left turn. There are ways to restrict lefts, such as not allowing left turns across double lines, or putting in posts. Mat Dolata agreed that measures like these are often used in urban environments and they may help on Harrison.
- An SC member requested that the project remain on the list.

OR 99W near Garfield (mixed input)

- Requests for an east-west connection – adding access onto highway.

- Steve Rogers didn't like the idea because it will slow down freight traffic on OR 99W which is currently free flowing.

M30: Grant and 29th Improvements (address at a later time)

- There was a comment asking if the intersection needs capacity improvements or a traffic circle.

SC discussion:

- What about adding a pedestrian plaza (pedestrian project)?
 - *That project would shut off traffic along the Coolidge exit.*
- Would M30 be speaking to the intersection and all five roads coming together there?
 - *The committee agreed to address this at a later time.*

Pedestrian Projects

Paul Leitman from Nelson/Nygaard presented the comments collected on the Pedestrian projects.

35th and Campus (add)

- A request for bike/ped safety when crossing 35th.

N10 (modification)

- Improve pedestrian access at 11th and the railroad crossing. This was added by the TAC.

Grant and 36th (operational issue)

- Add marked crossings. Some of the legs of the crosswalk are marked and some aren't.

Arnold Way (modification and operational issue)

- Add pedestrian safety improvements and improve yielding compliance (Project P11).
- Mary Steckel stated that by City Council policy, traffic calming measures aren't installed on bus routes.

Split out bike/ped components of Auto/Freight multimodal projects (modification)

- Split out the pedestrian and bicycle components in order to implement each independently if there's not enough funding to accomplish the entire project.
- Steve Rogers agreed, unless it's part of a development project, then we it should be the developer's responsibility, not the City's.
- Some members agreed it would be good for independent project possibilities to be identified.

Bike/Ped access (operational/programmatic issue)

- A comment in favor of having strategies to handle freight-loading impacts on pedestrian crossings and blocking bike lanes.

Brooklane (add)

- Add sidewalks to both sides of Brooklane up to Highway 34. Only one side would be a full sidewalk, because the other side doesn't have enough space unless the roadway is shifted.

P30: Van Buren Bridge (mixed input)

- During the TAC discussion, there was a comment to remove this project and replace it with moving the bridge farther south and turn it into bike/ped bridge.
- There is a comment to keep the project that converts the Van Buren Bridge into a bike/ped bridge but also make the interim bike/ped improvements (P30) now because the likelihood of near-term bridge replacement is low and there are safety issues now.

SC discussion:

- Is the \$240k estimate a realistic price tag?
 - *Yes. Steve Rogers explained that what is needed is to widen fill on the south side of the east end of the Van Buren Bridge, put in a path, widen the lane and add in barriers, then it would be safe to ride against traffic.*
 - Three SC members stated that we should move forward with that. One suggested doing both options.

PB14: Witham Hill north of Grant (mixed input)

- Mixed comments on removing the project.
- *Steve Rogers said that right now there is no sidewalk for about 800 feet. To add the sidewalk on the other side would cost more than \$800,000 because of the slope, and the need to widen the street and bike lanes, which also might entail removing houses. An SC member noted that a pedestrian option at the intersection may help resolve some issues.*

Remove all of the trails from the Parks Master Plan as TSP projects (more discussion needed)

- Steve Rogers suggested taking all parks projects out of the TSP, because otherwise they would be funded through transportation instead of parks.
 - *The parks plan has already been adopted by City Council. The TSP only includes paved trails from the Parks Plan. For now we need to show that the plans are speaking to each other or at least hearing each other.*
- Does that obligate different groups to maintain them?
 - *That's something we need to discuss. It will also inform whether a path construction project can be funded with Systems Development Charge revenues.*
- Is it the case that it's a matter of can it show up here on a map, and go in the CIP and then it will be decided?

- *If it shows up here as a transportation project, then it's funded as a transportation project.*

There is Council interest that the TSP project is aware of and taking into consideration the projects recommended by the Parks.

Restrict pedestrian crossings mid-block along Monroe at 14th and 26th and Kings and 29th (add; mixed support)

- Requests for new projects to restrict pedestrian crossings mid-block along Monroe. An SC member asked about the concept of “festival streets.” It’s a design solution where all modes of travel are allowed, but design encourages cars to travel slowly, like on 1st Street.
- A comment suggested pedestrian access control, such as fencing or another barrier for pedestrians.
- Mary Steckel stated that she drives down the street multiple times a day, and many people channelize themselves to the crosswalks and are doing a good job.
- An SC member stated that closing Monroe to car traffic is outrageous. There was some SC agreement, while another member said Monroe is utilized by buses and this warrants a charrette or study.
- Steve Rogers said there is a design for Monroe – the PMT should take a look at it.
- Suggestion that the SC should meet with the public and hear more about potential solutions to pedestrian crossings.

SE 3rd and Alexander and Tunison and Viewmont (add)

- There was a comment for pedestrian safety improvements. There has been a history of collisions.

Bike Projects

Drusilla van Hengel, from Nelson/Nygaard presented the comments on the Bike projects.

General comments

- There was a modification to Alexander (Project B5) because we might have included the wrong project because there are already bike lanes there.
- The team needs to look at low stress bike improvements for B38 and B40.
- There was a comment about low-stress network on collector streets and the need to identify streets that are functionally designated as collectors.
 - Steve Rogers stated that there ought to be more discussion about collectors streets changing to local streets with bike lanes, or not. We also need to discuss bike boulevards. We should delay until we talk about the standards.

PB44: Bike Lanes on 45th Street (remove)

- Not needed because bike lanes are already there.

PB59 (remove)

- It already has bike lanes and is outside of the urban growth boundary.

Transit Projects

No comments were received.

Public Comment

Mary Steckel, on behalf of the City Council, asked about the SC's opinion of ride sharing services, like Uber and Lyft. Specifically, the Council is interested in how offering these services locally may impact or interface with the TSP. What are the pros and cons of the services in our community from a transportation perspective? What is their impact on congestion? Are there impacts on parking?

SC discussion:

- How is taxi service in the community currently regulated?
 - *Drivers are regulated through background checks. There is not a business license fee, but drivers do register. There are some restricted taxi parking spaces within the City.*
- Many members supported the services.
- With the number of OSU students out buying alcohol, it could make the community safer. Getting a taxi in Corvallis late at night can be very difficult.
- It might stop people from driving downtown if they know it's easier to get a ride back.
- Is there any impact to similar medium size communities?
 - *It hasn't seemed to have had a positive effect on congestion in Portland.*
- It could be a benefit for price-sensitive consumers, because Uber and Lyft tend to be half the price of other vehicle transit. Students and other populations could benefit from new emerging technologies.
- There aren't any barriers to these services coming to the community, other than size and demand. Ride sharing would benefit OSU and students in particular. Safe Ride has more demand than it can meet. It would be a good addition to CTS, as CTS is considering an increase in service.
- It would be good to address transportation from Albany to Corvallis, and Corvallis to Philomath. We are trying to encourage people to take the train to Portland. There is not enough connectivity, and it could capture regional needs as well. Mary Steckel asked how driving to/from and parking at the train station yourself is different from taking Uber. The SC member stated that it's easier for the consumer.
- There is a component of services from Transportation Network Companies (TNCs) such as Uber and Lyft that includes ridesharing, which could help with parking. Steve Rogers

added that people won't use "the car they don't have" for other trips, thereby reducing VMT and parking issues.

- Is the Council's question whether we generally support these (TNC ridesharing) services, or how do we believe the services would impact the transportation system?
 - *The Council is trying to find out if there's some compelling transportation reason not to support the services. These services don't need to move forward as part of the TSP, but in a parallel process.*
- It is clear that TNCs, such as Uber and Lyft, are thinking about coming to Corvallis. There will be safety questions about what kind of processes and regulations apply. There is a parallel conversation going on at the state level.
- The City should ensure alignment with Uber and Lyft regulations.
- One concern is equity for drivers, which is more of a Council decision. TNC ridesharing service hasn't been shown to reduce congestion, and it might actually increase it. We also need to have equity for riders with a disability.
- Another concern is that these services might price out taxis. Are we going to lose some services for taxis that provide accessibility?
 - *Dial-a-bus provides free accessible services.*

Closing

An SC member asked for all the flip chart notes to be documented. Stacy Thomas indicated they will be part of the notes, as an attachment.

A question was asked about the open streets demonstration project, and if there's anything we could learn from that.

- *Mary Steckel stated that the open streets project is on 11th from Garfield to Taylor and down Taylor to Franklin Square (15th Street). It will be closed to traffic the Sunday before the eclipse (August 20) and will be an event to encourage non-vehicle use of the street with the idea that it will show how the street could function without cars.*
- At the open street event, there may be bulb out demonstration projects. An SC member said there is funding to do a temporary bulb out on Buchanan and 11th that will become permanent.
 - *The 'permanent' project is in the planning stages at this point and no funding source has been identified, so construction is not likely in the near term.*

Steve Rogers thanked everyone for attending. Any additional ideas or comments should be emailed to Adam Steele by Friday, April 28 at adam.steele@corvallisoregon.gov.