

# 9<sup>TH</sup> STREET IMPROVEMENT PLAN PROJECT ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PAC) MEETING

**November 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2009 1:30-3:00 pm  
Benton County Public Works Meeting Room**

## MINUTES

**Advisory Committee Members:** Ali Bonakdar, Hal Brauner, David Helton, Randy Jones, Jim Mitchell, Steve Rogers, Scott Wilson, Kelley Kaiser, Stewart Wershow, Frank Maudlin (Ex-Officio)

**Members Absent:** Fred Towne

**Staff:** Pam Silbernagel, Theresa Conley

TOPIC	DISCUSSION
I. Agenda Review	Ali Bonakdar called the meeting to order at 1:35 and reviewed the items on the agenda.
II. Call to order and Review of Minutes from June 9th, 2009	Ali asked if there were any comments and corrections about the minutes of June meeting. There were no comments or corrections to the minutes.
III. Review of Comments Received (Attachment)	<p>Ali recapped the October public meeting, stating that it was well-attended and procured many public comments. The public comment period extended prior to the meeting through the end of October. Ali then distributed additional copies of the summary of public comments.</p> <p>Reviewing the summary, Ali stated that there were a total of 61 public comments via phone, email, letters to the editor, letters to Council or CAMPO staff, and input cards at the public meeting. In total, 42 of 61 individuals who commented opposed planted medians; 15 of 61 were supportive of pedestrian improvements (35 did not comment), 10 were opposed to landscaping or trees in the median and/or planting strip (44 did not give an opinion); and 11 were opposed to bike improvements (43 did not give an opinion).</p> <p>Kelley Kaiser asked for clarification on what comments were included in the summary. CAMPO staff confirmed that all comments received through the end of October were included in the summary. Theresa Conley clarified that comments on 'landscaping or trees' included all comments regarding landscaping or trees in the median and/or in the planting strip. Jim Mitchell asked if individuals who submitted two similar comments were included twice and Theresa confirmed that, yes, they would be tabulated as individual comments.</p>

<p>IV. Formulate Recommendations of the 9<sup>th</sup> Street Improvement Plan</p>	<p>The Committee was asked to finalize the recommendations by showing thumbs up or down to the proposed recommendations.</p> <p>Ali distributed copies of the Chapter III-Traffic Operation and described the engineering work performed by PTV America, an expert firm on intersection operation analyses hired by ODOT on behalf of the project. The analyses looked at the operation of major intersections, utilizing the Corvallis travel forecasting model and data from the Corvallis Area Metropolitan Transportation Plan: Destination 2030. The deliverables from the study were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Current estimate of the performance of the intersections relative to existing standards</li> <li>▪ Projected performance for intersections in 2030</li> <li>▪ Estimates of formation of queues (length)</li> <li>▪ Synchronization of traffic lights</li> </ul> <p>Ali noted that, because Good Samaritan had already completed a full intersection analysis and recommendations for the Elk and 9<sup>th</sup> Street area, that intersection was not included in the PTV America analysis. The nine intersections included and the results of the analyses are shown in Table III-2 on page 27 of the current draft. Before explaining the results, Ali defined the terms for measuring defining intersection performance: Level of Service (LOS) and Volume to Capacity Ratio (V/C Ratio). The analysis indicated that intersections projected to have a low LOS by 2030 were Circle and 9<sup>th</sup>, 99W and Circle, 99W &amp; Walnut, and 99W &amp; Conifer.</p> <p>Jim Mitchell and other committee members asked that all assumed future transportation improvements used in the PTV America study be outlined in the report. This includes the recent changes to the 9<sup>th</sup> &amp; Circle intersection and any changes to Elks, Walnut, and Conifer.</p> <p>To address the projected deficiencies, PTV America provided the recommendations in Table III-3 on page 28 of the draft, and included below. The recommendations can be explained in three layers, as shown in the table. These are improvements needed for now and future and improvements needed as the results of Elk Drive modifications as recommended by the Good Samaritan Hospitals plan. The committee discussed the impact of the redevelopment around Good Samaritan Hospital.</p>
--	---

**Table III-3  
Intersections Recommended Improvements**

<b>Intersection</b>	<b>Layer 1</b>	<b>Layer 2</b>	<b>Layer 3</b>
9 <sup>th</sup> St. & Circle	<u>Circle Blvd:</u> Add westbound right turn lane.  <u>9<sup>th</sup> St:</u> Add southbound and northbound right turn lane. Add right turn overlap phase to southbound and northbound approach. Lengthen northbound left turn lane to 260 ft.	None	None
9 <sup>th</sup> St. & Walnut	None	Add one left turn lane on westbound (dual left turn)	None
9 <sup>th</sup> St. & Conifer	None	Close westbound approach toward 9 <sup>th</sup> St.	None
99W & Circle	<u>Circle Blvd</u> Add right turn overlap phase to eastbound approach. Lengthen westbound left turn lane to 270 ft.  <u>Highway 99W</u> Add southbound/northbound right turn lane	<u>Circle Blvd</u> Add one lane to westbound left turn lane (dual left turn)	<u>Circle Blvd</u> Add westbound right turn lane.
99W & Walnut	Add southbound right turn lane.	Lengthen southbound left turn lane	Add westbound right turn lane.
99W & Conifer	None	Close westbound approach toward 9 <sup>th</sup> St.	Add eastbound second left turn lane.

In discussing the needed right-of-way for these expansions, Frank Maudlin and Randy Jones inquired about the use of eminent domain for these improvements. Steve Rogers stated that the City has only used condemnation once in recent history, and avoids using such power. Compensation will always be provided. Hal Brauner outlined the three ways that the right-of-way could be acquired: as a condition of development, through negotiated sale or donation, or through eminent domain. Steve Rogers said that the City is currently talking with any business owner who may be affected by upcoming ROW acquisition processes.

Steve Rogers stated that the analysis seemed to be missing a discussion of the benefits of interconnected traffic signals. Dave Helton stated that this was included in the contract, and should be forthcoming. Ali stated that the analysis also included a calculation of queue lines as another metric for intersection performance.

Frank Maudlin asked what assumptions were used in the model, and Ali explained that the CAMPO 2030 traffic demand forecasting model was used along with employment and household growth projections through 2030. Dave Helton pointed out in the analysis that annual average growth rate assumptions ranged from 1.1% - 1.41%. Steve R. described the difficulty in planning for the future based on projections for a specific year as opposed to overall population growth regardless of year. Kelley K. asked how the PTV America recommendations would impact other improvements such as pedestrian crosswalks, and Ali stated that the recommendations would not impact those improvements.

**Consensus: The Committee determined to:**

- Include the PTV America analysis and its recommended improvements in the 9<sup>th</sup> Street Improvement Plan, provided that that all assumptions used in the analyses be outlined.

**Recommended Improvements (Chapter VI)**

Ali Bondakar next distributed copies of the staff recommended improvements as currently included in the plan, and asked for the group to consider each individual recommendation.

**Walking Improvements**

It was decided that the exact location of each pedestrian crossing be determined by the City's Engineering Division for safety, maximum use, impacts on traffic and businesses and transit friendly. Discussion included the appropriate location for the distance between Circle-Walnut for a pedestrian crossing. The existing crossing at Polk was discussed relative to the recommended crossing north of Polk (Borders Book Store). Jim felt that this particular location would be too difficult and two crossings so close together would be inappropriate. Steve felt that the recommendation should be for a pedestrian crossing between Fremont and Reiman. The PAC agreed to split this into two separate issues, with one recommendation addressing the location of a ped activated crosswalk north of Polk and the other addressing the maintaining or removal of the Polk crossing. Frank M. stated that the pedestrian activated crossings recommended (blinking yellow) do not work, and are dangerous. He inquired about having red lights instead of yellow warning

lights, and the committee stated that the recommendation had always been for yellow lights, and a crossings similar to those on S. 3<sup>rd</sup> St.

**Consensus: The Committee determined to:**

- Include adopt recommendations 1-4 with the following changes:
- Adding a pedestrian crossing between Circle and Walnut Blvd should be contingent upon whether it would be feasible at all to find a safe and sound location in this densely developed stretch of 9<sup>th</sup> Street.
- Split #3 into two recommendations, one addressing the location of a ped activated crosswalk between Fremont and Reiman and the other addressing the relocation/removal of the Polk crossing, based on the results of a traffic engineering study.
- Insert a footnote explaining the role of the City engineers in finding the appropriate locations
- Add a pedestrian crossing between Grant and Garfield.
- Add a pedestrian crossing between Buchanan and Grant.

**Access Management**

Ali informed the Committee that in response to the overwhelming opposition expressed to the construction of planted medians, the technical staff is dropping this recommendation. The Committee concurred. Dave Helton suggested rewording the recommendation to say that the city would ‘seek opportunities as a condition of development’, which would still allow for the placement of medians in case opportunities arise over time. Committee members offered several additional options, but decided to remove the recommendation for medians due to public opposition. Frank Maudlin dissented.

Business owner Will Post commented on the recommendation for right-in right-out driveways, stating that they would result in increased congestion on the east side of the street, especially at the 9<sup>th</sup> & Circle intersection. Steve R. agreed that right-in right-out driveways would work best on the west side of 9<sup>th</sup> St.

**Consensus: The Committee determined to:**

- Remove recommendations 1 & 4 (planted medians)
- Add language as to why the Committee did not recommend construction of planted medians
- Add language for numbers 2 and 3 indicating these recommendations will be implemented as the development occur, with regards to surrounding circumstances and per the requirements of the City of Corvallis Development Code.

### **Transit Improvements**

#### **Consensus: The Committee determined to:**

- Retain the suggested recommendation of increase the number of bus shelters, with the added language ‘where appropriate’.

### **Landscaping Improvements**

Kelley asked for clarification on what the public was opposed to in terms of landscaping. Theresa Conley clarified that the summary of input included all comments about landscaping whether in a median and/or planter strip. Randy Jones shared his experience with regards to difficulties of maintaining landscaping, and expressed that it should be an individual choice of the business owner to have or not have trees and landscaping. The Committee discussed the damage to the sidewalk by tree roots and the impact on obscuring business signs. Stewart shared that he has worked with CBUF to educate business owners about different landscaping options, and supported rephrasing the recommendation to say that ‘businesses will be encouraged to plant trees’ (as per Steve’s suggestion). Jim inquired about the 3 foot minimum for the planter strip, and Ali explained that 3 ft was the current minimum in the study area.

#### **Consensus: The Committee determined to:**

- Rephrase #1 to say ‘Encourage businesses to plant appropriate types of trees and require trees in redevelopments, as per the Corvallis Development Code’
- Rephrase #2 to say ‘Maintain the existing 12 ft planter strip requirement of the Development Code, from Polk to Walnut Avenues.
- Rephrase #3 to say ‘Enforce the maintenance of planter strips by adjacent property owners as per the Corvallis Development Code.

### **Bicycling Improvements**

The committee discussed recommendation #3, which supported the connection of 9<sup>th</sup> St bike lanes to the adjacent bike facilities’. Ali clarified that this was intended to mean connections to bike lane improvements on 10<sup>th</sup> or 11<sup>th</sup>, as discussed and not extension of bike lanes south of Polk along 9<sup>th</sup>. Jim Mitchell noted that this would primarily point to the need for bike lanes on Grant, as the only missing connection.

Steve stated that widening all bike lanes to 6 feet might not be feasible where there is inadequate right-of-way. He also pointed out that the city does allow construction of 5 foot lanes.

	<p><b>Consensus: The Committee determined to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Rephrase #1 to say ‘widen the sub-standard bike lanes to 6 foot wide, on both sides, when right of way is available.</li> <li>▪ Retain #2</li> <li>▪ Rephrase #3 to say ‘support the expansion of bike facilities as per the TSP’. This may require extension of the existing bikeway to south of Polk for connection to the downtown area.</li> <li>▪ Consider the feasibility of adding a multi-use path on the west side of 99W.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Signs and Hanging Wires Improvements</u></b></p> <p>Randy J. suggested that this would be very expensive to implement, and committee members agreed that it would take a bond measure or outside funding opportunity. Pam Silbernagel suggested including bundling of wires as an option. The PAC discussed the actual enforcement of the sign ordinance, and agreed that it was not strictly enforced.</p> <p>Ali will contact the City’s code enforcement office regarding sign enforcement.</p> <p><b>Consensus: The Committee determined to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Break #2 into two recommendations: ‘Look for opportunities to underground utilities when possible’ and ‘Look for opportunities to minimize the visual impact of utilities’.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Land Use Improvements</u></b></p> <p>Ali explained that the recommendations in this section were consistent with the new Development Code.</p> <p><b>Consensus: The Committee determined to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Retain #1 and #2, with the additional language ‘as per the Corvallis Development Code’.</li> </ul>
VI. Next Steps	Ali shared that the next steps will be to finalize edits on the Plan and talk about implementation measures. The PAC suggested November 13 <sup>th</sup> as the next meeting date, but did not confirm.
V. Adjourn	The meeting adjourned at 3:35 pm.