

City of Springfield  
Work Session Meeting

MINUTES OF THE WORK SESSION MEETING OF  
THE SPRINGFIELD CITY COUNCIL HELD  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 2005

The City of Springfield Council met in a work session in the Jesse Maine Room, 225 Fifth Street, Springfield, Oregon, on Monday, September 19, 2005 at 6:08 p.m., with Mayor Leiken presiding.

ATTENDANCE

Present were Mayor Leiken, Councilors Ballew, Ralston, Lundberg, and Pishioneri. Also present were Assistant City Manager Cynthia Pappas, City Attorney Joe Leahy, City Recorder Amy Sowa and members of the staff.

Councilors Woodrow and Fitch were absent (excused)

1. Temporary Traffic Signal at Crossroads Center – Gateway Street.

Traffic Engineer Brian Barnett presented the staff report on this item. Mr. Barnett acknowledged Richard Boyles, who was present in the audience. Newgate LLC, represented by Mr. Richard Boyles, requests approval to install a temporary traffic signal at the entrance to Crossroads Center on Gateway Street.

On February 28, 2005 council directed staff to develop an agreement between Newgate LLC and city allowing installation of a temporary traffic signal on the driveway to Crossroads Center, and to impose appropriate conditions. Staff has prepared an agreement with Newgate's participation. Patron access to Crossroads Center is a driveway onto the west side of Gateway Street, located 600 feet north of Postal Way.

At city direction Newgate commissioned a traffic study to determine if installation of a traffic signal at the Crossroads driveway would cause detrimental impacts in the vicinity. The study concludes that the signal is warranted when using volumes anticipated in 2007 when the center's lease area doubles in size, and the signal can be installed with no adverse effect on the existing adjacent traffic signals.

The major components of the agreement: 1) if a traffic signal is installed at the Crossroads Center entrance, it is very likely that the city will conclude in the near future that it must be removed when the Beltline-Gateway "couplet" project is constructed; 2) construction of the signal shall be under city permit at 100% developer cost and, upon acceptance by the City Council, shall become city property and future disposition of the traffic signal shall be the sole decision of the city; 3) if land easements are needed for the signal they shall be obtained by Newgate LLC at no cost or effort to the city; 4) the agreement runs with the land.

Newgate LLC requested that city commit in the agreement to exercise power of eminent domain if Newgate LLC was unsuccessful in obtaining easements as necessary for the signal. Staff declined to include such provision in the agreement absent council direction. Staff recommends excluding this issue from the agreement.

Councilor Ballew confirmed the location. She said it was difficult to get in and out of that intersection. She asked if it would impact the flow of traffic along Gateway Boulevard.

Mr. Barnett said any traffic signal would alter the flow of traffic, but the queues that would be developed by the new signal would not negatively affect their operation.

Councilor Lundberg asked how the developer felt about this agreement.

Mr. Barnett said the developer was in accord with the agreement.

Ms. Pappas said the developer had requested the traffic signal.

Councilor Pishioneri asked about southbound traffic coming from the eastbound Beltline. He asked if this might cause additional problems.

Mr. Barnett said the right hand turn at that intersection was signal controlled, but was green most of the time. He said the Crossroads signal would not have queues that would extend back to that corner.

Councilor Ballew asked about the cost of maintenance for the traffic signal during its life.

Mr. Barnett said a recent analysis showed it would cost about \$5000 a year in maintenance.

Councilor Lundberg asked how soon the light would be installed.

Mr. Barnett said the engineering was ready for approval. It could take between six to ten weeks for the poles to arrive.

Discussion was held regarding having this in before Christmas shopping begins.

Mr. Boyles was present in the audience. He said they had the drawings and would like to move forward as quickly as possible.

Mayor Leiken asked that this project get completed as soon as possible.

## 2. Highway 126 Expressway Plan Update.

Transportation Manager Nick Arnis presented the staff report on this item. ODOT and city staffs have been working on the Highway 126 Expressway Management Plan (EMP) for about a year and have finished Phase 1 (Conditions Report) and now are beginning Phase 2, the Alternative Analysis of three eastern intersections on the Highway. The Highway 126 EMP will be adopted as part of TransPlan and/or the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and by the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC).

City and ODOT staff met with council in a work session last September about the EMP. At that meeting, council was briefed about the goals of the Plan and status of the work. Since that time, Phase 1, the Conditions Report was completed and consists of an analysis of existing policies, transportation conditions, and interviews with stakeholders. Based on the information in the Conditions Report, staff will begin the alternatives analysis and public involvement for Phase 2. The primary tasks in Phase 2 are to create and evaluate future intersections design concepts and create a public involvement program to review the concepts. Design concepts will be created for

the following intersections on Highway 126: Main Street, 52<sup>nd</sup> Street, and 42<sup>nd</sup> Street. Phase 2 work will take place from September 2005 to about June 2006. During that time, a partnering session between the city, county and ODOT officials will begin the Phase 2 work and throughout the process there will be staff briefings and decision milestones by the council. In addition, there will be at least two open houses and other community events for public comment about the Phase 2 concept designs. ODOT staff and their consultants will attend the work session to describe the Phase 2 tasks and process.

Mr. Arnis introduced Tom Boyatt, ODOT Project Manager.

Mr. Boyatt introduced consultants Sam Seskin, contract project manager from CH2M Hill and Vaughn Brown from Jeanne Lawson Associates. He said the consultants brought up the idea of partnering and Springfield staff asked them to explain to council what partnering meant in this project. He gave a brief background of the Expressway Plan. The management plan was the agreement between the local jurisdictions and the state as to how to manage the system and what future improvements to the expressway would be made. Partnering was key for success. The hope was for the plan to be approved by the city, the county and the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC). The plan would then be adopted into the local plan and as a refinement plan by the OTC. The expressways were designated by the OTC, and were a subfreeway category. There were not expressways on the interstate system, but some were designated on National highway systems and statewide highways. They were routes that connected through travel, regional travel around large metropolitan areas and provided for freight continuity. The higher emphasis was put on through traffic. He discussed the eastern end of the corridor which included the Jasper Road Extension (JRE), the Jasper Natron which was ready for development and the intersection of Highway 126 and Main which was failing today during peak hours. He explained the Phase I study. They were now focusing on what improvements they could collectively agree upon to make to serve both local and state interests.

Mr. Boyatt said the consultant team had suggested partnering. The Expressway Management Plan (EMP) could be approved without the collaboration and cooperation of the City of Springfield, Lane County and ODOT. The OTC would have to make a finding that the EMP was developed cooperatively before funding could be released for a major interchange improvement. It must be done in a public process. A partnering session was scheduled for October 19. The city and county had jurisdictional responsibility for the comprehensive plan, the land use plan and the transportation plans locally, and the OTC had responsibility for the state transportation plan and the many refinement plans that were part of that plan. By statute the local and state plans must be in agreement.

Mayor Leiken referred to Attachment A, page 3, goal 3 which stated that “the OR 126 EMP works to be consistent with goals and objectives of the state, region, county and local communities regarding transportation”. He said he would be interested to know how we become consistent with goals, because they did conflict. He hoped this was a real goal and a way we could truly work together. He agreed that the best way to get to the objectives and be positive was through positive partnerships. He mentioned some of the other positive agreements in the community. He said looking at the expressway and the future growth in the Jasper Natron area, there was an opportunity for positive impacts and development.

Mr. Boyatt said he agreed that the city and ODOT needed each other to get there. If a solution was formed that could not be supported by the OTC or the City Council, it would be no solution

at all. He said he was looking to staff from all involved and others to guide them through this process.

Mayor Leiken said ODOT and council had remained consistent and knew each other.

Councilor Ballew said she had a concern that the OTC had a policy of getting traffic from the California border to the Washington border with no stops. She said she was not sure they were going to get past that. She discussed use of the expressways and freeways by city citizens as well.

Mr. Boyatt agreed that was a valid concern. He said the balancing of the different missions of the different agencies and organizations was very complex. He referred to freeways and highways. There were different express policies and needs on the part of the state than of the local jurisdictions. The most difficult part was to balance those needs.

Mr. Brown further discussed the partnering sessions. Representatives from the city, county and OTC would work to come together. Mr. Brown distributed a Draft Partnering Session Outline. Councilors Ralston and Pishioneri would be the city representatives.

Councilor Lundberg asked about the acronyms on the outline.

Mr. Boyatt explained.

Councilor Pishioneri asked what role he and Councilor Ralston would be playing in the partnering meetings. He asked if this meeting would be the time to offer suggestions for these areas.

Mr. Seskin and Mr. Boyatt said the councilors could speak on any issue at any of the meetings they attended. They suggested councilors contact either Mr. Seskin or Mr. Boyatt if they would like to talk outside the meeting.

Councilor Lundberg asked about the schedule that was distributed. She asked about the project discussions.

Mr. Seskin said he would go over the schedule which would cover the next three to nine months.

Councilor Ballew asked if ODOT already had a plan they would be presenting.

Mr. Seskin said they did not. He said there would be open and honest discussions about designs. Comments were always welcome, but in addition there was a Functional Planning Workshop scheduled for all day on October 21 to go over potential concepts.

Councilors noted that none of them would be available on October 21.

Mr. Seskin said they would look at altering that schedule.

Mr. Arnis said he knew that Councilor Ralston had specific ideas. The design workshop could be a time to narrow down the proposals.

Mr. Seskin said they would be preparing for that meeting. He recommended the councilors bring their suggestions to those meetings.

Councilor Ralston referred to Main Street, 42<sup>nd</sup> Street and 32<sup>nd</sup> Street intersections. Part of the concept in partnering was that there would be give and take. He said he had sat at the intersection at Mohawk and 42<sup>nd</sup> for 10 minutes to try to get out. He said it was much more impacted than the intersection at 52<sup>nd</sup> Street. He said there were significant things that could be done. He discussed a connector street off of 28<sup>th</sup> Street. He said it seemed more feasible than any other option, but had been told it could not be done because of ODOT's rules regarding spacing between exits. He said he looked forward to partnering, but wanted to know that the city would actually get something out of it. He said he was more interested in how traffic was moved in the city for specific purposes.

Mr. Boyatt said the east end of the corridor was under more pressure than the rest of the corridor. He said they would work on getting the corridor up to speed before going back to look at new locations for interchanges.

Councilor Ralston discussed some of the many issues at Mohawk Boulevard. Those issues become a safety issue.

Mr. Boyatt said there were future phases in the work plan that included Mohawk and Q Street. He said he could bring those areas back to the project management team when Springfield staff were present and determine if they should be moved up on the priority list.

Councilor Ballew asked what other things would be evaluated.

Mr. Seskin said they would be looking at interchanges and improving function and capacity of those interchanges. They would also be looking at how the state highways connected with local streets, signaling and turn lanes.

Councilor Pishioneri asked if this would include new construction.

Mr. Boyatt said eventually they would be looking at new construction. He explained some of the locations and the issues faced at those intersections. The general idea was to bring the entire corridor up to some kind of a high capacity situation.

Councilor Pishioneri said he was happy to work with ODOT and was pleased they were interested in the input by the city.

Mr. Arnis discussed the at-grade solutions. He said by keeping intersections at-grade, the options were better for access. He said it was important to go slow and to look at all options. He referred to the Jasper Road Extension and the things that would have to be done before proceeding. He discussed issues surrounding these projects.

Mayor Leiken discussed the intersection at Highway 126 and Main Street. He said it was an issue of coordination once the JRE was finished. That would be a key factor to the expressway as a whole. He discussed the opportunities in that area for development and growth.

Mr. Seskin reviewed the schedule. He said draft problem statements had been written. He said an evaluation framework had also been developed. He said they would now move into the stage where solutions would be developed. He discussed the remaining schedule. He said by the end of March some concepts should be developed. He noted that they met with Springfield staff once a month. He discussed future meetings with the City Council in November, January and April or May. A series of meetings, including two open houses, were scheduled to include the public at large. He discussed sounding boards, or meetings with affected property owners. He said between now and the end of March, they would be developing, evaluating and selecting concepts that would be building blocks of the Expressway Management Plan. Council was encouraged to contribute as early and as often as they would like.

Mr. Boyatt introduced Jane Lee, the Area Manager for Area 5, who replaced Bob Pirrie. She was previously the Area Manager for Area 3.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 6:55 pm.

Minutes Recorder – Amy Sowa

---

Sidney W. Leiken  
Mayor

Attest:

---

Amy Sowa  
City Recorder