

SPRINGFIELD CITY HALL * LIBRARY MEETING ROOM * 225 FIFTH STREET * 541-726-3753

Wednesday

PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES
February 16, 2011

5:30 p.m.

STAFF PRESENT: Bill Grile, Gary Karp, Kristi Krueger, Molly Markarian, Richard Perry, Linda Pauly, and John Tamulonis

CAC MEMBERS PRESENT: Erik Bishoff, Roxi Thoren, Daniel Hill, Christine Kehoe, Eric Howard, Bill Woods, Randy Hledik, John Oldham, Steve Roth, Joan Armstead, Zack Pardo, Dave Marra, and Ken Schmidt.

PUBLIC ATTENDING: Hillary Wylie, Christian Fox, Maddie Phillips, Ben Barrett and Carole Knapel.

- **CALL TO ORDER –**

Meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m.

- **PUBLIC COMMENT –**

There was no public comment.

- **MINUTES –**

Minutes for CAC Meetings #11 (October 20, 2011) were approved without dissent.

- **2030 UPDATE –**

Planning Supervisor Linda Pauly gave a brief update regarding the Springfield 2030 Refinement Plan.

Q: Randy Hledik asked Linda if she said Area 6 & 8 under the old plan.

A: Molly responded that it is portions of 6 & 8. It's really Sub Area "A", that the CAC has looked at, and recommended moving forward to the Planning Commission as Residential Mixed-Use.

Q: Mr. Hledik asked what kind of density is being promoted.

A: Molly responded that there is no promotion of density in the Policy that's in the Springfield 203 Refinement Plan, just the minimum for the high density, which is 28 net dwelling units per acre.

- **ANNOUNCEMENT –**

The Sub-Committee of the Glenwood CAC met back in November 2010. The feedback staff received for the Draft Transportation Chapter at that time was: Need better organization, consistency, and clarity; and need to improve the balance between certainty and flexibility (specificity and detail); also, need to substantiate the policy direction.

Molly wants to emphasize that all the figures that the committee sees, either tonight on the screen or in the attached draft are temporary and as the CAC moves towards a complete plan, there will be consistent 3D cross sections and perspectives sketches, which will be done at a later point.

Molly needed to point out that the policies and implementation strategies in the chapter are guiding principles for developers to work from, and so the phrase 'contextually depicted' is used many times

when staff is referring to design and alignment. There are parameters for people to follow, but it is all very conceptual.

Finally, staff is still working with the City Attorney's Office to fine tune some of the language. Staff will continue to make revisions towards that end, in the next couple of months. Staff is also identifying what changes would require a Plan Amendment and what changes if a developer proposes it, would just be an administrative decision.

- **TRANSPORTATION CONTEXT –**

Molly spoke about several topics related to the context of the objectives, policies, and implementation strategies: Existing Conditions, Past Planning Efforts, Integration of Land Use and Transportation, Scenario Planning, Complete Streets and Pedestrian-Friendly Streets, and Green Streets.

- **TRANSPORTATION FRAMEWORK –**

Franklin Riverfront – Molly reminded the group of the Phase I boundary, Glenwood Riverfront, which is comprised of the Franklin Riverfront and the McVay Riverfront. The Franklin Riverfront is the land on either side of Franklin Boulevard up to the river. The Draft Land Use Chapter that the CAC recommended to moving forward to the Planning Commission showed the Franklin Riverfront including a Residential Mixed-Use area in Area A, a Commercial Mixed-Use area in B and an Office Mixed-Use area in C.

Franklin Boulevard – Molly mentioned that the objective for Franklin Boulevard in the Draft Transportation Chapter is very similar to the objective that was included in the Franklin Boulevard Study: Re-design and re-construct Franklin Boulevard as a multimodal transportation facility to support the redevelopment of Glenwood as envisioned in the Land Use Chapter and to provide an improved arterial connection between Springfield and Eugene. Molly pointed out that the first few policies and implementation strategies in this section are still in the City of Springfield's City Attorney's Office for review. In the end, this language will state how Franklin Boulevard is to be developed in terms of two through lanes, dedicated bus lanes, access lanes and what the maximum width for this facility would be. The images are all conceptual that Molly is presenting tonight. Molly walked the group through the recommended policies and implementation strategies for the Franklin Boulevard section.

Q: John Tamulonis asked if the center of the 'green caterpillar' at the widest part would contain all components of the multi-way boulevard.

A: Molly replied that it would be like this (pointing to a map).

Q: John Tamulonis asked about the section to the right, which is closest to the roundabout at the east end.

A: Molly replied that it would have an access lane on the north side, and just an arterial section with on-street parking on the south side. It not an arterial but it just has on-street parking.

Q: Randy Hledik asked if the eastern roundabout got shifted to the west.

A: Molly asked if Randy was talking since 2008. John Tamulonis responded that the roundabout location is conceptual because of the geometry of getting off of bridges and getting back on bridges, so the southern part might shift.

Q: Randy Hledik thought that it just nipped BRING.

- Q:** Zack Pardo wondered how the access to the neighborhood south of Franklin Blvd. would work because he did not see any cross streets.
- A:** Molly reminded the group that staff is only talking about the Phase 1 area at this time. There are some conceptual cross streets to the south (Molly pointing to a map), Glenwood Blvd, Henderson, and Mississippi.
- Q:** Zack Pardo asked if those intersections would there be stop lights.
- A:** Kristi Krueger responded that at this point staff is not sure if they will be signaled; at this point it is all conceptual. The actual analysis and design still need to take place.
- Q:** Eric Howard asked if there were any concerns with the bigger trucks, the heavy hauling trucks, the triples, maneuvering around the roundabouts. Does it create much of an issue for these triples and large trucks?
- Eric Howard is not real familiar with the Pioneer Parkway roundabout, having only used it a couple of times, and of those times, didn't see any large trucks or buses using the roundabout. He knows that during the day how much traffic is coming down Main Street and turn left to I-5, big rig traffic, which he thought would be heavier traffic load than the one on the other side of town.
- A:** Kristi Krueger responded that the City has about the same size roundabout at Pioneer Parkway and Hayden Bridge. The EmX maneuvers, and it is designed for the biggest truck legal in Oregon. If need be, they can use the truck apron that is built between the road and the center planter area, worst case scenario they can straddle the lanes if need be. Kristi added that the roundabout would be designed according to the types of vehicles that would need to use this route.
- Q:** Bill Woods asked Kristi what the diameter of the roundabout would be.
- A:** Kristi responded that it would depend on the volume of traffic. It's a hard thing to design roundabouts because they have to keep the speeds down, and be able to accommodate the large trucks, so each intersection where you design a roundabout at has a different design.
- Q:** Bill Woods asked if the same thing applies to the triple axel trailer, the visual perception of someone on a bicycle or pedestrian or someone else, is there a visual perception of signage and how far back, decrease speeds, how does that fit into handling that size of vehicle, for example a tractor trailer.
- A:** Kristi Krueger responded that the speeds going into the roundabout are reduced with the geometry, the radius that they design going into the roundabout, and the deflection that they add, and they try to do this as much as possible in order to get the biggest vehicles. So the engineers have to go back and forth in the design process to find the happy medium. The truck apron is helpful and the fact that it is not a single lane roundabout is helpful as well.
- Q:** Bill Woods asked if the roundabout in question is a two lane roundabout.
- A:** Kristi Krueger responded that yes this roundabout is a multi lane roundabout. The existing roundabout at Pioneer Parkway & Hayden Bridge has three lanes going eastbound with an exclusive right turn lane and two general travel lanes, which is the same for the south bound lanes. The northbound and westbound have two lanes.

- Q:** Joany Armstead thinks the Pioneer Parkway and Hayden Bridge roundabout is really cool because it works, everyone goes along.
- A:** Kristi Kruger added that when they analyzed that intersection at Hayden Bridge, staff wasn't sure if the roundabout would be the best choice, and so staff analyzed a traffic signal and a roundabout at the same time, and looked at queue lengths. The queue lengths and the right-of-way that were needed to do a signal was outrageous, the City would have had to take many more homes, many more lanes would have had to go in and then the queue lengths were extremely long compared to a roundabout.
- Q:** Steve Roth asked, as far as the location at McVay, is that roundabout far enough away from the bridge to prevent bridge backups or will you have to move it more to the west?
- A:** Kristi Krueger replied that now it's responding to the signals on the east side of the bridge in Springfield.
- Q:** Bill Woods is wondering if the traffic engineer has figured this out. Is the roundabout going to be where it is depicted on the map or will there be some adjustments?
- A:** Kristi Krueger responded that there will be adjustments. Where it shows now is conceptual; staff doesn't even know how many lanes will be needed, it may be less or it might need more, a different mix, different deflections where the bridges are located. The information the committee has is just conceptual. Once the materials are analyzed, then staff will have more of an idea of what will be built.
- Q:** Bill Woods asked if they could move the roundabout 20 yards one way or the other, except towards the bridge, but could move the opposite direction.
- A:** Kristi Krueger commented that no one knows because staff hasn't even started design work.
- Q:** Roxi Thoren expressed her hesitation and worries about the studies she has seen, which are primarily vehicular safety which is definitely improved and vehicular pedestrian safety and she worries about bicycle safety when talking about roundabouts, when there is continual traffic.
- A:** Kristi Kruger responded that there are two choices as a bike, you can get into the middle of the lane that you need to be in and act as a vehicle or you can use ramps that lead the bicyclist onto the sidewalks. The bike lane does end so you either have to merge into traffic or go up onto the sidewalks, either way is legal. She added that Traffic just installed RRFB's, which are for pedestrians. If someone doesn't feel safe traveling as traffic in the roundabout then they would at least have another possibility.
- Q:** Bill Woods asked if there have been any studies done in regards to bicycle traffic and accidents in relation to pedestrian accidents compared to bicycle accidents in roundabouts.
- A:** Kristi Krueger responded that there have been studies comparing a roundabout v. the signalized intersection, and there is a huge reduction in accidents for bicyclists, pedestrians and in all traffic, in roundabouts compared to signals.
- Q:** Zack Pardo asked if the pedestrian crossing is going to be the same as the ones at Pioneer Parkway.

It seems to Zack it will be really unsafe for someone to stop in the middle of a roundabout. He believes that the pedestrian crossing should have been a little farther back from the roundabout.

A: Kristi Kruger explained that there is a benefit to having crossings on the exit of the roundabout further outside the roundabout, so this is something that will be looked at when designing the new roundabouts. The entry locations are good, but staff will analyze this roundabout and look at the new data more, pushing the crossings out more.

Q: Randy Hledik would second Kristi's comments. As he was driving to the meeting tonight going south bound and did get caught with a pedestrian, he stopped but was waiting for the car behind him to not stop and rear-end him.

Dave Marra commented that it's not real safe, when the lights start going then drivers will be more likely to stop, but stopping in the middle of the roundabout is not a good thing either.

Q: John Oldham said Molly mentioned a series of requirements, such as two through lanes in each direction. Dedicated bus lanes in each direction. Molly corrected John that they are not necessarily dedicated lanes in each direction, they are dedicated and they can support bi-directional, for instance there are portions of Franklin Blvd. which have one.

John Oldham asked Molly about parking, as well as a local access lane and part of the hybrid concept was for portions of Franklin Boulevard, we would want all of those elements, and other portions of Franklin Boulevard we wouldn't have all the elements. How are those written when there are requirements, are those requirements for certain areas, or minimum requirements?

A: Molly responded that the proposed policy, "Use a blend of multi-Way boulevard concepts as conceptually depicted in figures 2 and 3, where appropriate, to allow for flexibility in planning design and construction as funding becomes available." Molly pointed out a drawing and added that the drawing is one of the concept drawings.

Q: John Oldham added that the language says that the "Minimum requirements don't conflict with the idea of a hybrid design."

A: Molly added that when staff gets to the final figures, there would probably be an aerial type concept image. Currently we only have a full multi-way boulevard concept cross section, but there would be three (3) conceptual cross sections in the final document.

Q: John Oldham commented that as far as everyone along Franklin Boulevard is concerned, different areas are going to develop differently, that was the idea behind the hybrid design for Franklin Boulevard to have the appropriate design in the appropriate area.

John Tamulonis agreed and added that especially if funding is available for various amounts. The City might not be able to build the full boulevard, but funding to help with some of it.

Q: Audience member does not know if the concepts are far enough along, but the other diagrams show a riverfront path closer to the river for pedestrian and bikes. He was curious if the plan had been digitized yet and where one might circle around to go back over the bridge on a bicycle or on foot.

A: Molly responded that the group would get to this question more towards the end when discussing the Riverfront Multi Use Path. There are a couple of streets, the northern extension of Glenwood Boulevard, and the northern extension of McVay Highway would connect people to the riverfront path.

Kristi Kruger added that this would be east of the roundabout where you would travel over the Springfield Bridges.

Molly added that there is also a conceptual bicycle-pedestrian bridge to downtown, so when this is built, citizens could completely avoid the Springfield Bridges.

Molly asked the CAC to take a few minutes and note their level of support for the Franklin Boulevard policies and implementation strategies.

Franklin Riverfront Local Street Network – Molly mentioned that the objective of the local street network in the Franklin Riverfront is to develop a grid block pattern of streets to support redevelopment, multi modal circulation, disperse traffic, facilitate walking and biking, orient development to a public realm, and enable clear & direct physical / visual routes to riverfront. Molly walked the group through the recommended policies and implementation strategies for the Franklin Riverfront Local Street Network section.

Q: Ken Schmidt asked if the east west streets would be controlled with stop lights, stop signs, or yield signs.

A: Kristi Krueger responded that it depended on the volume, but there are different things that trigger different traffic control devices. Typically, stop signs would be used.

Molly added that there is implementation strategy that talks about traffic calming devices.

John Tamulonis reminded Molly that Zack Pardo had a question earlier about connections to the other neighborhoods. The diagram before the group now shows dashed lines, for Glenwood Boulevard, Henderson, and another at Lexington and Mississippi off the access lanes.

Q: John Tamulonis asked Molly where the lower right hand picture was located.

A: Molly responded that the picture is from Corvallis, Oregon on the riverfront. Corvallis closes the street off when they are having a gathering like the Farmers Market.

Q: Zack Pardo was wondering, he has noticed from a previous slide where they have lawn and then a strip just north of the bike path, Zack wondered if this was the riparian vegetation zone.

A: Molly responded that the area Zack is talking about is the Riparian Setback. The path can meander but it general has to meet the water quality standards, which generally mean on the outside of the 75' riparian setback.

Q: Zack asked if this was from the bike path to the riverbank.

A: Molly responded that any kind of a multi use path that is in the greenway like this, needs to be on the outer edge of the Riparian setback, which is 75'.

Q: Zack asked about street parking.

A: Molly responded that the Glenwood CAC asked that the vehicle not be the predominant mode of transportation on this specific street. The CAC also asked for narrower streets, so there is no parking on the river side that achieves a narrower street, which reduces the prevalence of the vehicle on the street.

Molly added that the parking would be on the opposite side of the street in parking bays. The way the strategy was written that, it responds to the conflicts of being on the river side of the street.

Q: Ken Schmidt thinks there is some merit to this plan, because if you have sidewalk cafés you do not want to deal with the cars. Is there a provision for having a standard for alleyways within these blocks that actually allow delivery to happen, especially for this use v. street side? He believes there is a method to do this v. how do you load on the street portion but keeping it behind the building as much as possible.

A: Molly responded that the existing Specific Area Plan called for alleyways. The new proposal looks more at the east west service streets as providing that access; that your access to the inter-block development sites would happen off of there, but alleys are something we can look at as well.

Q: Steve Roth asked if within the grid design are there provisions or flexibility to allow for a development that might need to combine two (2) blocks to be able to do what the new plan is asking.

A: Molly responded that this is why the implementation strategy is about providing either through streets or access ways every 220' to 350'.

Molly asked the CAC to take a few minutes like before and note their level of support for the Franklin Riverfront Local Street Network policies and implementation strategies. Molly also asked the CAC to be sure and put their name on the comment sheets.

Q: Steve Roth asked if park blocks could be moved.

A: Molly responded that they are conceptual and what is said in terms of the implementation strategy is that there will be two (2).

McVay Highway – Molly reminded the group that the land use recommendation the CAC forwarded was for Employment Mixed-Use though the whole McVay Riverfront. Staff recognized that there is a lot of uncertainty around the particular planning needs of future development in this area. There is also a very shallow land depth, so staff is recommending some guiding principles in terms of the policies and implementation strategies, but it is a lot more flexible and open ended. Molly guided the group through the recommended objective, policies, and implementation strategies for this section.

Q: Randy Hledik commented that there is an implementation strategy that says, “Design the upgraded streets to the maximum minimum necessary width does not exceed such and such.”

A: Molly agreed, and responded, that the City Attorney’s office is still reviewing this part of the plan, that is why the language is not correct. Molly added that most likely there will be a number at the end, but basically saying, “It won’t exceed two (2) northbound and two (2) southbound travel lanes, dedicated by Bus Rapid Transit or other transit facilities or landscape median and continuous and safe bike facility and sidewalks.

Molly asked the CAC to take a few minutes like before and note their level of support for the McVay Highway policies and implementation strategies. Molly also asked the CAC to be sure and put their name on the comment sheets.

McVay Riverfront Local Street Network – Molly mentioned that the objective is to develop a street network similar functionally to street grid that support mixed-use development, enhance multi-modal circulation, disperse traffic, facilitate walking and biking, orients development to a public realm and enable clear & direct physical/visual routes to riverfront. Molly walked the group through the recommended policies and implementation strategies for this section.

- Q:** Roxi Thoren asked if there will only be the three (3) access points to McVay or is staff envisioning more access points?
- A:** Molly replied that there would only be street access points at the three (3) intersections. There could be shared driveways in between there to provide east west connections.
- Q:** Ken Schmidt asked if those driveways would be limited in size.
- A:** Molly replied that yes there would be limited, there will be also be spacing requirements the City has.

Molly asked the CAC to take a few minutes like before and note their level of support for the McVay Riverfront Local Street Network policies and implementation strategies. Molly also asked the CAC to be sure and put their name on the comment sheets.

Riverfront Multi-Use Path – Molly said that this section is applicable to both the Franklin Riverfront and the McVay Riverfront. She added that in the Transportation Chapter the objectives, policies and limitation strategies are just related to the path itself, any direction about a linear park would a part of it in the Open Space Chapter. This section of the chapter basically focuses on access to and movement along the path itself. The recommended objective is to strengthen the physical and visual connections to the river and support recreation and commuter options. In terms of the location and alignment, there is a strategy about considering a future river crossing. These are conceptual river crossings staff does not know when they will be established, but needs to be considered as the path is developed. Molly walked the group through the recommended policies and implementation strategies for this section.

- Q:** Audience member asked if there would be any consideration for athletic equipment along paths, or a small skate park.
- A:** Molly replied that this subject would be covered in the Open Space Chapter where it talks about the Linear Park portion.
- Q:** Joany Armstead wants to know if there is a possibility that the Riverfront Path could go in before development of buildings.
- A:** Molly replied that it is possible. It comes down to money and the negotiation on easements. The easement negotiation happens during the Annexation process, or at the site plan process. It just really depends on money and people.
- Q:** Zack Pardo asked what meandering is.
- A:** Molly answered that it means that it weaves to take advantage of site opportunities.
- Q:** Dave Marra asked about the 75' for the riparian zone, he wants to know if there was a visual range, 75' to 150'.

A: Molly answered that it could meander within the 75', but it needs to generally be on the outer side of the 75'.

Q: John Oldham asked if there is a rule as to what percentage of the path can meander in close to the outside of the 75'.

A: Molly answered that his question is really a water quality question. It has to do with the riparian restoration. Linda Pauly commented that sometimes there are existing trees and such that owners want to preserve.

Molly asked the CAC to take a few minutes like before and note their level of support for the Riverfront Multi-Use Path policies and implementation strategies. Molly also asked the CAC to be sure and put their name on the comment sheets.

- **NEXT STEPS –**

The next major step for the CAC group is the Open Space Chapter, that staff is currently working on. Staff thinks that in late March they should have a copy ready for the Sub Committee to review, and then it will be distributed to the full CAC. Next meeting will be April 20, 2011 when the CAC will be reviewing the Open Space Chapter.

Molly asked the CAC if there was anyone who has been on the Sub Committee and the CAC, if they would like to step in or step out, with none, the meeting was adjourned.

- **ADJOURN**

Meeting adjourned at 8:07

(Recorded by Molly Markarian and Transcribed by Brenda Jones)