

PHILOMATH TSP – Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
Meeting #2 Notes
Tuesday, June 6, 2017
3:00 PM – 4:45 PM
Philomath City Hall, 980 Applegate St., Philomath, OR 97370

Present:

Valerie Grigg Devis, ODOT
Jenna Berman, ODOT
Ed Moore, DLCD
Richard Saalsaa, Philomath Fire and Rescue
Kevin Fear, City of Philomath
Jim Minard, City of Philomath
Laurel Byer, Benton County
Ali Bonakdar, Oregon Cascades West COG
Chris Workman, City of Philomath
John Bosket, DKS Associates
Ben Chaney, DKS Associates

I. Sign-in, Introductions, Agenda Overview (meeting purpose):

The purpose of this meeting is to review and discuss Draft Technical Memorandum #9 – Transportation Solutions and Standards, and the upcoming Open House.

II. Project Orientation:

John Bosket shared the updated project schedule, which is currently in the “Evaluate” phase of the project. There are Technical and Citizen Advisory Committee meetings today, and then a second public Open House will be held on June 15th from 5:00 PM to 6:30 PM at City Hall [location later changed to Philomath City Park to coincide with the summer music series]. After those events are completed and comments have been discussed with the City, we’ll move to the Draft TSP document production with adoption hearings beginning in winter and finished by spring.

III. Draft Technical Memorandum #9 – Transportation Solutions and Standards:

Overview of changes to City transportation-related standards and management practices

DKS reviewed the major changes to the standards and management practices including roadway functional classifications, local truck routes, typical street cross sections, and requirements for access management, local street connectivity, transportation demand management, traffic impact assessment, Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), mobility standards, and neighborhood traffic management solutions.

Roadway functional classifications were adjusted to be better aligned with naming conventions used by the federal functional classification system. The biggest change to individual roads on the map involved matching classifications to intended use, including changes to 19th Street, West Hills Road, Applegate, 13th Street, Industrial Way, Pioneer Street, and College Street. The TAC discussed the changes and agreed to downgrade 19th Street south of Main Street to a Major Collector instead of Minor Arterial, to discourage freight traffic from using the street. The TAC also discussed the future road alignments, with

DKS emphasizing that exact alignments will be development-dependent and that aligning Clemens Mill Road with 26th Street maximizes the likelihood that a traffic signal will meet warrants there in the future when development occurs. Ed clarified that for the Clemens Mill Road extension beyond the urban growth boundary (UGB) to the east, even if the County adopts the road it will need an exception from DLCD because it serves urban purposes. DKS agreed to include this in the disclaimer about alignments outside the UGB.

The major changes to the Truck Routes include adding 13th Street and the future alignment for Industrial Way. The TAC asked why the truck route designation on 13th did not continue south past the UGB; DKS responded that it's the County's responsibility at that point. A side comment was asked about the recent annexation of the Rodeo Grounds, specifically if the annexation includes the adjacent road. DKS responded that it depends on the annexation language and needs to be worked out with the County, who should inform DLCD as well.

Typical street cross sections were discussed in some detail, key discussion items included:

- Planting strips of less than 5' reduce tree survival chances. The City is looking in to moving the trees outside the sidewalk, but the TAC emphasized that both the "Tree Canopy" effect and the traffic-calming effects of trees are better when they provide a buffer between the road and the sidewalk. The TAC asked why not take the space from the bike lanes, and DKS emphasized that bike lanes should be 6' minimum. The TAC agreed to mention tree health needs in the text. The City also expressed a desire to develop a visual document with a limited (~10) number of preferred trees and implementation guidance, although it is out of the scope of this project.
- The cross sections will ultimately be included in a separate standards document, not the TSP, so that changes are not subject to land use actions.
- It was mentioned that the coordination with the Downtown Streetscape Plan about minimum bike lane width is important.
- ODOT mentioned that through the couplet, there may be room to add a 2' painted buffer to the bike lanes. The TAC supported this idea. DKS commented this should not impact the freight approval.
- ODOT requested that the document include visualizations of the couplet cross sections, to give ODOT Traffic and ODOT Freight a better opportunity to comment. The TAC supported this idea. DKS recommended it only be for the portion east of Downtown since the Downtown design is still in process.
- ODOT asked what the best method would be for them to provide input to the Downtown Streetscape design working group, which has been separate from the TSP process. The City committed to getting ODOT's Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator an invite to the group's next meeting.
- The County would prefer no parking on freight routes on County streets.
- The Public Works Director should be listed as the party responsible for all exceptions to cross section designs.

The Access Management section had minimal discussion. The County indicated that their access spacing standards would not apply within the UGB.

The Local Connectivity section had limited discussion. The City clarified that maximum block length and perimeter is per-street, not cumulative, so the word "respectively" should be included in the text description. TAC asked how the City discourages cul-de-sacs; there are limitations to maximum length and requirements for a multimodal cut through.

The Transportation Demand Management section had minimal discussion. The City would like to remove or weaken the “disincentives to parking” text.

The Traffic Impact Assessment section had minimal discussion. The City would like to confirm that there is a defined TIA requirement for impact studies; they will look into this internally and get back to the team about it.

There were no comments on the ITS and Mobility Standards sections.

DKS gave an overview of the Neighborhood Traffic Management Solutions section of the memo, explaining that it is a guide and not requirements. It has gone through fire department review. The City explained that they do not have a formal process for neighborhood traffic reviews or complaints. There was some discussion about the threshold for a residential impact study, and the advantages and disadvantages to a defined threshold. The TAC agreed that the text needs to be changed to clarify that the threshold is for a single street, not the whole street network. There was also agreement that the standard should be based on the daily values not the PM peak hour, and it needs to be clear if it's moment of study or ultimate build out. DKS and the City will discuss how to incorporate this into the text.

Project list discussion, including changes and priorities.

John gave an overview of the project development process and resulting list, explaining that from the TAC we're looking for help identifying high priority projects and projects that have serious concerns or need to be changed. Although the primary funding source was identified in the memo, it does not imply a funding commitment. DKS led the discussion following the grouping in the memo, which separated Active Transportation, Safety Improvements, Connectivity and Congestion, and Transit projects.

Active Transportation Projects:

- DKS commented that the project team tried to minimize sharrow routes and parking removal, but did recommend some in limited locations.
- DKS highlighted the “Yield Roadway” interim treatment for local roads, from the FHWA Small Town and Rural Networks Multimodal Design Guide.
- The TAC recommends adding a wayfinding signage project, especially coming into town on the Hunsacker Bike Path and through sharrow routes.
- Figure 11 legend item for sidewalks needs to be fixed.
- The TAC asked why bike lanes and not shared use on Applegate outside the couplet? DKS responded that it was because of the school access use and because there are higher traffic volumes due to local circulation restrictions from the highway medians.
- The TAC suggested that SUP-6 be coordinated with the new Clemens Mill Road Extension alignment. Ed clarified that shared-use paths, if not within road ROW, still require a land use exception from DLCD.
- The TAC suggested that SUP-5 add wayfinding for westbound bikes and a bike loop so that bikes can activate the crossing treatment at the highway.
- The TAC suggested that the gap in comfortable bike access between 17th and the couplet should be addressed in the projects.
- The TAC suggested that the project list somehow reflect or emphasize a single continuous route in and out of Philomath via. the Hunsacker Bike Path.

- DKS noted that UP-8 and UP-6 are half-street improvements because they are on the border of the City and County, and that UP-6 has the incorrect functional classification in the description.
- The TAC discussed if UP-8 and UP-6 should be changed to shared-use paths. If so, it might get around the half-street problem, have a more “rural fringe” feel, and allow for bi-directional bike travel. DKS agreed to discuss this with the Citizen Advisory Committee.

Safety Improvement Projects:

- The TAC expressed support for CR-1 (17th Street Highway Crossing), and Int-1 and Int-2 (Weigh Station Relocation and Turn Lane Addition).
- The TAC discussed and expressed support for ITS-1, an interim solution for warning signs on the 9th Street low-visibility hill. The County mentioned they have had experience and success with speed feedback signs (ex. on Springhill Road), which would apply here because speed problems are generally southbound traffic in the rural to urban/residential transition zone. Philomath Fire and Rescue confirmed that the safety concern is consistent with their experience.

Connectivity and Congestion Projects:

- DKS explained that this is mostly new roads, and there is not much to discuss here as details will be highly development-dependent.
- DKS highlighted the school vehicle circulation study, based on public input.
- DKS mentioned obtaining a traffic signal warrant at 26th Street will be very dependent on how development and connectivity are implemented.
- Ed mentioned that for UP-9 it's OK to show it outside of the UGB, as you only need a DLCDC exception if it's not within existing ROW.

Transit Projects:

- DKS highlighted projects including expansion of transit service hours and days, recommendations to adjust the transit route to match new growth areas, and a marketing/outreach free-pass-day program.
- The TAC mentioned that the Council of Governments provides TDM grants for this area, which might be able to fund transit promotion programs.
- The TAC discussed if there were any informal park-and-ride facilities in the area. The impression is that there are not, and members haven't seen any naturally forming vehicle or bike to transit patterns.
- The TAC commented that there is often limited bike rack space on the transit vehicles, and this can be a limiting factor for some riders.

IV. Next Steps/Adjourn:

As noted earlier, the second Open House is on June 15th from 5:00 PM to 6:30 PM at City Hall [location later changed to Philomath City Park to coincide with the summer music series]. TAC members are encouraged to come. We'll also be meeting later tonight with the Citizen Advisory Committee to review the same material covered today. After that, we'll move to the Draft TSP document production with adoption hearings beginning in winter and finished by spring.