

## Steering Committee Meeting

Wednesday, April 20, 2016  
5:00 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.  
Madison Avenue Meeting Room  
500 SW Madison Ave., Corvallis OR 97339



---

### Members Present

Steve Rogers, Chair, *retired City Public Works Director*  
Hal Brauner, *City Council Liaison (non-voting)*  
Theresa Conley, *OCWCOG, Metropolitan Planning Coordinator*  
Meghan Karas, *Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Board*  
Mark O'Brien, *Corvallis Chamber of Commerce*

Juliana Recio, *Access Benton County*  
Jay Thatcher, *South Corvallis Neighborhood Association*  
Meredith Williams, *OSU Transportation Services*  
Tatiana Dierwechter, *Benton County Health Department*

### Staff and Project Team

Robyn Bassett, *City of Corvallis*  
Kevin Young, *City of Corvallis*  
John Bosket, *DKS Associates*

Scott Chapman, *Nelson/Nygaard*  
Stacy Thomas, *JLA Public Involvement*  
Jessica Pickul, *JLA Public Involvement*

### Members of the Public and Other Attendees

Jim Mitchell  
Court Smith

Mary Steckel, *City of Corvallis*  
Frannie Brindle, *ODOT*

## Welcome and Introductions

---

Steve Rogers, Steering Committee (SC) Chair, welcomed everyone to the third Corvallis Transportation System Plan (TSP) SC meeting. He reviewed the meeting agenda and led committee introductions.

Two Steering Committee members are no longer able to participate. Jeff Barricks retired from Safeway. The project team plans to find a new freight representative, however Mark O'Brien can advise on this in the interim. Roger Lizut moved from Corvallis and is no longer able to serve on the Planning Commission.

### Project Update

John Bosket told the SC that the project team is currently conducting an internal review of the existing conditions analysis and future forecasts for the TSP and TDP.

John then reviewed the project schedule and informed the committee on what will occur over the next year. At the next SC meeting, the committee will review the existing conditions analysis and future forecasts. That information will be shared with the public at workshops and a public open house. Outreach will begin in early fall in order to include college faculty and students. Following those meetings, the team will start developing draft solutions.

The project team hosted several public outreach opportunities this winter with the intention of seeking additional feedback on the goals and objectives, as well as transportation needs at OSU, LBCC Corvallis, and the Sustainability Town Hall. A comment map was also relaunched on the project website, and a [summary](#) of the feedback collected is posted there as well.

John reminded everyone that the project Goals and Objectives were approved by City Council and are available in [Tech Memo # 4/5](#). The team worked with the TAC to develop evaluation criteria based on the Goals and Objectives.

A steering committee member asked if the Goals and Objectives had changed since the last SC review. John confirmed that no changes were made.

### Local and Regional Planning Efforts

Kevin Young provided an update on some of the local and regional planning efforts that are occurring concurrently with the TSP and TDP. At present, the City of Corvallis is working on the Urbanization Report, which is an update to the Buildable Lands Inventory. This report considers population growth trends and forecasts land needs for residential, commercial and industrial uses through 2036. It is anticipated to be completed in June.

Imagine Corvallis 2040, also known as the Vision Plan, is underway. This effort is an update to the Vision 2020 Plan. The Vision Plan will include an action plan and ways to track progress and metrics. Community feedback has already been considered in this process and Kevin

encouraged SC members and meeting attendees to get involved. The Vision Plan is currently in the data collection phase and will be moving into six community-developed focus areas. A draft plan will be ready for review by the public in June and the final plan is scheduled to be completed by the end of 2016. Kevin added that the plan will consider what the City can do and what they can do in partnership with other community organizations.

Both of these City planning efforts will be considered with the next Comp Plan update, which will occur in 2017.

SC question: Will sports be considered in Imagine Corvallis 2040? Kevin responded that it would make sense for it to be considered in the plan's Create/Celebrate focus area.

Robyn let the SC know that the Corvallis Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (CAMPO) is hosting two Scenario Planning Workshops for the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) in May. She encouraged everyone to attend. Steve added that improving connections to Corvallis from outside communities will be discussed at the workshops and with the overall CAMPO RTP. The workshops will be interactive and illustrate tradeoffs for solutions.

SC question: Can special accommodations language be added to the CAMPO workshop brochure? Yes.

John walked the group through the timeline for these related planning efforts.

### **Public Involvement Update**

Stacy Thomas provided an update on the project's public involvement activities. The most recent public survey was launched summer 2015. Since OSU and LBCC were not in session, the project team reached out to students in February. Many students talked about the lack of parking near campus and connectivity issues between campuses. In addition, many maintenance issues were brought up such as lack of lighting and transit facility locations and improvements.

Stacy mentioned that the project team is planning to survey middle and high school students about identifying barriers to biking, walking, taking transit or the school bus to school. Elementary schools have already been surveyed by the school district about this topic and the team will consider that data. Scott Chapman added that it will be helpful to know if the barriers relate to locations of schools, access, or safety. The survey will be launched in the next month.

This fall, a public open house, an online survey and topic specific workshops will be held with the intention of gathering public feedback on the draft Existing Conditions and Future Needs. The topic specific workshops will drill down on different modes and will be interactive. The team will hold another SC before the public events. The SC was asked to share information about the events with their constituents once they are announced.

SC question: Can transit be a workshop topic without overlapping with TDP efforts? Scott responded that it would be a good topic for one of the workshops.

Steve asked when the second round of public open houses and workshops will occur. John said it will be about 9 months between the two rounds of public events.

### **Project Evaluation Criteria (Tech Memo #6)**

John explained that the team reviewed the SC and City Council approved Goals and Objectives with the TAC, and worked with them to draft evaluation criteria. The evaluation criteria will initially be used during the planning process to benchmark how the current transportation system performs. Later, they will be used to inform the selection and prioritization of alternative investments and policies packages for the TSP and TDP. This will be done by helping to determine how likely the alternative packages are to support the goal areas and achieve the stated objectives. As the TSP and TDP are being finalized, the team will also recommend a set of performance measures, some of which may be derived from the evaluation criteria. The City can use these measures over time to monitor transportation system performance and progress toward achieving the TSP and TDP goals and objectives as each plan's recommendations are implemented. John clarified that the table in Tech Memo #6 includes what the team is considering. The appendix shows what was considered but taken off the table.

SC question: Does it make sense to have some similarities between the evaluation criteria and the performance measures, so there is a base line? John said that, ideally, there would be similarities. However, some types of evaluation criteria work well for plan development but aren't practical for ongoing performance monitoring and vice versa. For example vehicle miles traveled is a useful evaluation criterion, and we can use the regional travel demand model to estimate changes between alternative packages. However, there is no practical way to measure it every year for performance monitoring.

While there are many project objectives and the team wants the evaluation criteria to be comprehensive, it also needs to be manageable. There isn't an evaluation criterion for each objective.

SC question: Is it possible to count trips as a criterion for walking or cycling? Steve explained that as a part of this project the team won't actually be counting trips. Once the TSP is approved and solutions are in place, then a count could be done as a performance measure. The member clarified that it will be important to get a baseline. Also, it would be helpful to have more information on mode split. John explained that the team will obtain current mode split information from the American Community Survey, which the City can also use to track change every year.

SC question: Can the team provide an example of how the evaluation criteria could be used in managing the investments in the system? Scott responded that the overall benefit to the system (when considering the goals and objectives) needs to outweigh the costs or investments in the

alternatives or solutions. The idea is that the results from the investment will result in improved travel behavior and change based on the baseline.

John reviewed key themes that were raised by the TAC. One idea that was shared in relation to Goal 2 was that rather than focus on quantity (for example, the number of bike lanes), it is more important to focus on quality (the types of facilities).

SC question: Why do the evaluation criteria for bike facilities focus on arterials and collectors rather than on neighborhood streets, where new riders may be more comfortable riding? John explained that the TSP will consider solutions involving all street types. Arterials and collectors are generally the focus of a needs analysis because local streets are typically bike-friendly as they are without need for further improvement. However, solutions for the system as a whole often involve local streets.

John reminded the group that the Goals and Objectives and evaluation criteria can be adjusted as needed as we move forward. Steve reinforced this by asking the SC to let the team know if the evaluation criteria are missing something or don't make sense. Steve shared his own suggestion that rather than measuring by miles, percentages may work better.

Another key theme from the meeting with the TAC is that the team's intent is not to change land use, but to consider how land use impacts transportation choices. That information will be shared with the Comp Plan team. While transportation and land use are strongly related, it is the Comp Plan amendment team that must decide whether land use changes are appropriate.

SC questions and discussion:

- Do the evaluation criteria consider how additional affordable housing can reduce travel distances? John responded that the TAC discussed this, but it was not included because it is the Comp Plan amendment effort that must determine if that is appropriate. The TSP team wants to acknowledge this issue and will inform the Comp Plan amendment process.
- An SC member suggested including language about the costs of the projects and the importance of being good stewards of financial resources. John explained that the objectives don't directly address these ideas. Therefore, they aren't directly addressed in the evaluation criteria.
- Did ADA compliance get dropped from the criteria? Scott explained that ADA compliance is a requirement, so it will always be addressed. The member clarified by adding that they meant that we should choose projects that make options more ADA-friendly.
- A SC member asked a question regarding the evaluation criteria for Goal 3 - why was 30 or more transit vehicles per day selected as a measurement? It seems like a high bar. Scott responded that the number is not unreasonable. It considers a combination of frequency and span of service, and today two routes meet that target.

- The group had a discussion around what is meant by the term “vulnerable users.” John said that it came up in discussions about needs for school children, but it could also relate to lower income community members, or those with physical disabilities. Members requested that the term be defined. It was also important to members that the TSP serves areas equitably.

### **TSP Existing Conditions**

John provided an update on Tech Memos #7 and 8 addressing existing conditions. The memos are being internally reviewed and will be available for SC review soon. The findings from the existing conditions are important since this information will lay the ground work for solutions. The SC’s feedback on what is included in the memo will be important and a key component of the next SC meeting.

When working on the existing conditions, the team tried to understand where people want to go – to shop, to work, to school – and reviewed census data. John and Scott reviewed highlights of the draft Tech Memos #7 and 8. (*View the highlights in the [SC #3 presentation.](#)*)

SC questions:

- How do you factor in other services, like OSU service? Scott responded that the team is documenting parallel services, and coordinating transit services will be considered.
- Corvallis Parks and Recreation is trying to balance the high use of local trails and resources with the need for increased parking near the sites. Is there a way to consider that with these plans? There are opportunities to address this need.
- There are under served citizens with no sidewalks and lack of transit service. Will these be considered? Scott explained that if there isn’t the population density to support new transit service in an area, there may still be alternative solutions like service during peak hours.

### **Public Comment**

Jim Mitchell asked how the team would like to get feedback from the public on the Tech Memos. Comments can be emailed to Robyn at [robyn.bassett@corvallisoregon.gov](mailto:robyn.bassett@corvallisoregon.gov). This feedback can also be provided at the upcoming public open houses and workshops.

Jim also asked if the condition of the facilities is factored into the solutions considerations. He felt that the team could consider a rating system for the existing facilities in the existing conditions. Lastly, regarding transit, there are sections that have two routes that overlap and may have more than 30 trips in a day, like by the hospital, which should be considered in the evaluation criteria.

Court Smith raised other factors that make more sense to the traveler like convenience, cost, and travel time vs. miles, which is what the existing conditions currently considers. It would be more effective to think in terms of trips rather than distance. There was a group discussion

about how a single trip may include several modes. The team agreed that this is a good point, and the team will think creatively about how best to capture this data and ensure it can be measured.

### **Round Table Discussion**

Steve opened up the floor to SC members to discuss any ideas or issues that the team should consider:

- Downtown parking is not going to get better, particularly with the hotel being developed. It is quite difficult to park there, especially during peak times. *Team response: The TSP is not going to address parking because it is an operational issue (you will likely want the flexibility to modify a parking strategy, which is difficult to do if adopted as part of the TSP), but the TSP can acknowledge it.*
- Shipping and receiving is important to downtown businesses and needs to be considered. Alleys don't work and the trucks are too big. This is particularly challenging on 9<sup>th</sup> Street.
- There are many opportunities for the transportation system.
- Accessibility is not just a physical issue but also programmatic. For example, there is an opportunity for transit drivers to be trained to always use announcements, because they really help those that need them. *Team response: We can note systematic issues and programmatic solutions to address your concerns.*
- An announcement was made about the Corvallis Ride in Silence event. The event brings silent awareness to the presence of people on the road and honors those that have been injured or killed.
- The bike share (in development) should be incorporated into the existing conditions, because it could reduce downtown car trips.
- What will be the financing for the TSP and TDP solutions and how do we set the priorities? We can't do it all. We need to ask ourselves if funding for the TSP projects should continue the current trends or change behavior.
- With transit, where do you get the best bang for your buck? How do we make headway on the existing routes? Is it by increasing service?
- It would be helpful to know the existing conditions of available financing. *Team response: A funding memo will be released soon and will be sent to the SC.*
- Why aren't we allowing UBER or Lyft in Corvallis? *Hal responded that there is no city policy against this.*

### **Next Steps and Closing**

The next Steering Committee will be held at the end of June. Steve and Stacy closed the meeting by reviewing the next steps and actions the SC should take before the next meeting.

- Members should review the Tech Memos and bring their feedback to the next meeting.
- SC members are encouraged to attend a CAMPO RTP scenario workshop in May. If interested in volunteering as a table facilitator, email Carole Richardson, [plangineering@comcast.net](mailto:plangineering@comcast.net).
- The team will send the results from the middle and high school survey.