

# West Linn TSP Update

## Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting #2 - Summary Notes

Thursday, April 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2015 - 6:00 to 8:00 p.m.

West Linn City Hall - 22500 Salamo Road, West Linn, OR 97068 - Bolton Room

**Meeting Organizer:** Zach Pelz, City Project Manager

**Meeting Purpose:** The purpose of CAC Meeting #3 is to conduct an evaluation and prioritization to evaluate, score and prioritize the potential solutions identified in Draft Tech Memo 10.

### 1. Project Updates

- A Summary was provided to members regarding the 1<sup>st</sup> open house held on March 10<sup>th</sup>. 16 people signed in for the open house but there were more people than that attending. There were 112 virtual visitors to the website. The City received positive feedback on the open house with regards to organization, stations and easy access for citizens to provide feedback on what they feel should be prioritized. Intersections along HWY 43 and 10<sup>th</sup> St. were high priorities according to feedback. The City and consultants are actively getting ready for the next open house (04/08/2015). To date, the review of system needs, potential solutions, evaluation of proposed solutions have been completed.

### 2. Review of Draft Tech Memo 10 - TSP Solutions

- This memo outlines various types of improvements or improvement areas. The solution included are TSMO (Transportation System Management & Operations), solutions and improvements, access management solutions, safety solutions, pedestrian, bicycle and Transit solutions (which was combined into a discussion more comprehensively about corridors needs), local street connectivity needs, freight mobility and reliability, and roadway capacity improvements. Separate from that, 10<sup>th</sup> St. and HWY 43 are being reviewed. The HWY 43 concept plan is underway, which identifies a number of intersections in need of improvement. This is a separate plan but there will be further refinement through the TSP update for bike facility access and latest safety data and pedestrian crossings. The discussed and proposed solutions are intended to address the City's goals of safety, mobility, access and the environment, equity, and maintenance.

### 3. Review of evaluation criteria from Tech Memo 3

- Scoring criteria data is located at the end of the memo. The scoring criteria evaluates the listed and identified corridors and provides data with regards to how they relate to the four previously stated goals of safety, mobility, access and the environment, equity, and maintenance. Each individual target (under each of the four goals) is evaluated and provided points and each goal has equal weight. However, if one goal has more than one target listed, the points applied to each of the targets are adjusted so that they don't equal more than 8pts total. The criteria at this point does not distinguish between different proposed solutions, instead the criteria tries to identify which project corridors are most important for investment. Examples of targets related to safety which were evaluated through this point system are: likeliness to reduce injury and fatal crashes, and the likeliness to reduce the number of high collision locations. Example of targets within the Mobility, Access, and the Environmental goal are: likeliness to reduce VMT, likeliness to increase non-SOV modes of travel in commercial districts, and "green street" facilities. There is a single target under the goal of Equity which is whether improving corridor would allow more people considered transportation disadvantaged to access schools, parks, employment and commercial areas. Generally, these areas have high concentrations of elderly or youth populations. Maintenance targets include improvement of the pavement condition index, and whether it would improve a distressed facility. The maximum amount each project corridor could receive through the point system is 32 points; the maximum any got project corridor received was 30. Non HWY 43 improvements scored up to 19 points. There is evidence that the evaluation criteria are prioritizing multi-mobile (bike/ped) projects but vehicular projects are close behind. Willamette Falls Drive, 10<sup>th</sup> St., Hidden Springs, Rosemont Rd. and HWY 43 were top in terms of points ranking. There was discussion by members as to whether providing equal weight to all goals was appropriate considering that financial resources are constrained. Some members felt that certain goals such as safety should have a greater weight overall than others such as proximity to parks or open spaces. Also, should access to certain destinations have greater weight than others such as should access to schools be weighted more greatly than access to commercial areas or visa-versa.

#### 4. Prioritization of TSP Solutions

- At the next open house, citizens will be asked for their feedback on how they would like the roads improved in each corridor. For example, are bicycle lanes and crosswalks needed on both sides of a street or just one? When examining preference of TSP solutions, consideration must also be given to right-of-way constraints. The group inquired if there were additional on-road improvements (beyond crosswalks) that could be applied to address safety concerns such as

speed bumps. Traffic calming devices were discussed and whether these were considered to be within the scope of the TSP update. The group discussed giving higher priority ranking to solutions that would address speeding and/or safety issues. The safety concerns of corridors and proposed solutions were most frequently related to pedestrian and bike access. Another key piece of discussion was ensuring that the Trails Master Plan On-Street Route priorities (developed by Transportation Advisory Board in late spring of 2014 and approved by City Council) are integrated within the TSP with regards to prioritizing funds to improve corridors.

## 5. Next Steps

- a. Comments due to Zach on or before 04/06/2015
  - i. Memo 9 - Regulatory Solutions - Are there any other regulatory issues in the comprehensive plan or Community Develop Code that should be addressed?
  - ii. Memo 10 - What other solutions should be considered for addressing pedestrian, bicycle, transit, motor vehicle, or other transportation related needs?
- b. Upcoming Meetings
  - i. Community Meeting #1 - 04/08/2015
  - ii. CAC Meeting #5 - 05/07/2015
  - iii. Planning Commission Meeting #3 - 05/13/2015
  - iv. City Council Meeting #2 - 05/18/2015
  - v. TAC Meeting #4/CAC Meeting #5 - 06/04/2015