

ROADS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

February 23, 2011

MEMBERS PRESENT: Kent Fleming, John Anderson, Jeff Paschall, D.W. Northey, Mark Callahan
MEMBERS ABSENT: Sean Barrett, Jim Wilcox
STAFF & OTHER PRESENT: Marsha Miller, Bill Morgan, Celia Barry, Mike Russell, Shashi Bajracharya, Christy Mosier.

Fleming called the meeting to order at 5:45 p.m.

- I. PUBLIC COMMENT – None.
- II. GROUP INTRODUCTIONS/WELCOME NEW MEMBERS D.W. Northey & Mark Callahan
Fleming introduced D.W. Northey and Mark Callahan as newly appointed members to the committee. Committee and staff did introductions. Callahan said he was appointed by Sid Leiken and shared his background has primarily been in the Information Technology industry. Northey stated he was appointed by Jay Bozievich and is a retired Utility Contractor.
- III. BRIEFING FOR TONIGHT’S AGENDA
Fleming explained we have postponed the Cognitive Map item until next meeting when we have a full committee. Fleming stated we will stay in this room for our regular meeting items and will transition to the room next door for the Public Hearing. Fleming added that the purpose of the public hearing is to take record of what people have to say, with minimal comments or discussion with committee and that next month we will deliberate the comments received.
- IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – January 26, 2011
Motion: Anderson moved to approve the minutes as written; Paschal seconded. All present voted in favor.
- V. FOLLOW UP: BOB STRAUB PARKWAY PEDESTRIAN SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS – Bill Morgan
Morgan said Barnett is here to represent the partner in this project. Morgan summarized the long history and background of Bob Straub Parkway. Morgan explained it was originally a metro loop system similar to Beltline. Morgan explained ODOT was involved and was the purchaser of the wide corridor section. It became an issue of “who is going to champion this project”. Morgan explained when the County took this on, we went through the standard process of fitting it into the Capital Improvement Program, and a lengthy Design Concept was created and moved through the approval process through multiple public hearings and received a lot of public testimony. Morgan explained a lot of the public testimony was from the residents on Mt. Vernon Cemetery Road wanting to get traffic off of local roads and onto a collector arterial that would connect Jasper Highway to Highway 126. This was well before constraints on greenhouse gas and development were major planning considerations. The project was developed and went through with a 3-2 vote from the Board in 2001 with the focus on getting traffic from one point to the other. Looking back on the project, Morgan explained in addition to there being new developments after the project was completed, the lessons learned include the current trend is to be more cognizant of pedestrian movements and people getting from one neighborhood to another. If we were to do this over in today’s setting, the discussions would probably have included more conversations from community members saying they want more things considered such as roundabouts and narrower lanes.

About a year ago, city residents began approaching Springfield in wanting the city to provide alternatives for safer pedestrian crossings. Springfield came up with 17 alternatives. Morgan

explained because it's more involved than just painting a stripe on the road or putting up a sign, we began looking into the issues at hand to understand the dynamics out there. Staff and the RAC agreed to find out what the average/85th percentile speed is. Once we learned through study that the average speed is 53MPH in the 45MPH zone, with a 100' crossing, staff became very concerned. Staff have analyzed and heavily researched the 17 options, including looking at what's working in similar environments and what the success rates are with each option. Research included looking up ODOT traffic manuals, outreach to people in Arizona who have experience with these systems, research through literature and outreach to OSU professors. Morgan stated they came up with 3 options from the 17 alternatives. The three selected options include a Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon (RRFB) system, a Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon (PHB) system, or an option of doing nothing. Morgan summarized the differences, similarities, success rates, and costs for options for one and two. Morgan cited examples in Eugene and Springfield of both options and said staff collectively recommends option two, the PHB system.

With regard to option one, Morgan explained it was determined that the crossing point of 100' is too far for someone to attempt in one crossing but this area doesn't have enough room for a half-way island point to break the distance up. Consequently, staff determined the crossing will need to be pushed further north by 500'. Morgan explained costs with a lot being influenced by sidewalk installations. Morgan summarized the negative considerations of option one including that it's very difficult to change human behavior, which is what option one attempts to do with yellow flashers. Staff would not feel good about spending a significant \$100,000 on an improvement and still have a death occur due to the higher human behavior risk factor with option one.

Morgan explained more on option two (PHB System) and key advantages are a higher rate of people obeying due to the right light indicator and it being a very active system. While this option hasn't been installed in a lot of places, the feedback is that it would work well in this high speed setting. Morgan said this system is not designed with a median where the pedestrian would rest while crossing; however, the crossing would be calibrated to provide average crossing time – of about 25-30 seconds for this distance. This is the same system installed on Gateway. Morgan said they would also want to see continental ladder-style cross walks for better visibility rather than two parallel lines. Morgan summarized cost ranges from \$100,000 to \$150,000. Morgan added an additional benefit of option two is that if this intersection ever warrants traffic signal installation, the poles used for this device are the same poles to be used for a traffic signal in the future. Morgan explained that there would only need to be some basic modifications made and two more poles added to complete a signal in the future.

Anderson asked if this signal might confuse people. Anderson has noticed people pulling out the apartment complex on Gateway as the lights are flashing have made the pedestrian rush across the road. Barnett responded that this is the downside of this option; however, this problem has not been reported as an issue in Arizona where the studies have been conducted. General discussion ensued.

Morgan said Barnett and Chastain also identified that most traffic are taking a right, heading to Springfield, and therefore the crossing should be put on the south side where there is not as much traffic. Morgan said staff suggests that the RAC recommend this item be placed in the CIP, under Projects for Development. Morgan explained having a project on this list allow staff to mobilize and do preliminary work including determining the budget and seek funding opportunities. Morgan said they do not have a recommendation to fund it out of this CIP because it's estimated at \$150,000 and it would mean a project would have to come off of the list in order to accommodate it. Morgan added that, doing the preliminary work helps prevent us from discretionary immunity. Miller added that by adding this to the list, if future funding comes open for another project on the list, it frees up funding to come back for items like this.

Callahan asked how costs are determined. Morgan explained we use ODOT methodology, specific standard costs for things such as sidewalk installation, lights, etc. and we use past experience to develop the costs. Callahan asked if this is a project that would be bid out. Morgan answered typically on a CIP project, staff puts together a design package and then bid it out through a competitive bidding process.

Morgan reiterated that County and Springfield staff are a unified front of support and the next step is for the committee to make a recommendation. Barnett stated there are 250 households and more in the future that need accessibility.

Motion: Anderson moved to recommend option 2 by adding this to the CIP projects for future development list. Fleming said option 2 doesn't get the project done but allows us to do the right thing by doing the preliminary work that will be required to secure funding opportunities as they arise. D.W. commented he'd prefer to see the example at Gateway first. Anderson said he will vote in favor of option 2 because we as a committee make recommendations to the Board, who then can decide whether they want to do something or not, or which option to ultimately go with.

Motion: Anderson moved to recommend option 2 by adding this to the CIP projects for development list. Paschall seconded. Fleming called for a vote for all those in favor. D.W. abstained; all others voted in favor.

VI. FINALIZE COGNITIVE MAP/THE EVOLVING ROLE OF THE RAC – Postponed until next meeting.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

Fleming said Lane Act had their first meeting. Barry provided the history and purpose of the ACT for the two new members. General discussion ensued.

VIII. NEXT MEETING – March 30, 2011 due to spring break.

IX. 7:00 P.M. PUBLIC HEARING – 2012-2016 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM –

Chair Fleming called the hearing to order, explained the format, and stated we are here to take public comment in order to deliberate and make a recommendation at our next committee meeting on March 23. On March 23 we will make our recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners. Bajracharya gave a brief presentation along with printed materials.

Chair Fleming requested comments:

PUBLIC COMMENT –

- **Brian Barnett, City of Springfield – 225 Fifth Street, Springfield OR 97477.** Barnett addressed the project brought up in the RAC meeting and said he appreciated the recommendation of it being placed on the projects to be developed list. Barnett restated that it's important that the 250 homes and their traffic patterns of 50-150 pedestrian trips a day have safety and accessibility.

Fleming closed the public hearing at 7:12 p.m. Meeting adjourned.

Christy Mosier, Executive Assistant – Director's Office