The meeting location is wheelchair-accessible. For the hearing-impaired, an interpreter can be provided with 48 hours’ notice prior to the meeting. For meetings in the Council Meeting Room, a “Personal PA Receiver” for the hearing impaired is available, as well as an Induction Loop for the benefit of hearing aid users. To arrange for these services, call 541.726.3700.

Meetings will end prior to 10:00 p.m. unless extended by a vote of the Council.

All proceedings before the City Council are recorded.

March 11, 2019

5:30 p.m. Work Session
Jesse Maine Room

(Council work sessions are reserved for discussion between Council, staff and consultants; therefore, Council will not receive public input during work sessions. Opportunities for public input are given during all regular Council meetings)

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL - Mayor Lundberg ____. Councilors VanGordon____, Moe____, Moore____, Stoehr____, Woodrow ____, and Pishioneri____.

1. Main Street Safety Project
   [Molly Markarian] (45 Minutes)

2. Transportation System Plan Implementation Project
   [Emma Newman] (40 Minutes)

3. Update of Springfield’s 2019 Legislative Session Priorities
   [Niel Laudati] (20 Minutes)

ADJOURNMENT
ITEM TITLE: MAIN STREET SAFETY PROJECT

ACTION REQUESTED: Review key themes from first major round of community engagement and the existing conditions analysis, and provide feedback on draft Goals and Objectives.

ISSUE STATEMENT: The project team has completed the first major round of community engagement, as well as technical analysis of existing transportation, land use, and environmental conditions on the corridor. The purpose of this Work Session is to review the technical findings and key themes that emerged from the community outreach with the Council and seek feedback on the draft Goals and Objectives that will ultimately be used to evaluate infrastructure solutions developed for the corridor.

ATTACHMENTS:
ATT1: Draft Council Work Session Slideshow
ATT2: Focus Group Summaries
ATT3: Online Open House Summary
ATT4: Other Comment Submission Summary
ATT5: Draft Goals & Objectives

DISCUSSION/FINANCIAL IMPACT: In spring 2018, the City and ODOT launched the Planning Phase of the Main Street Safety Project in coordination with the Main-McVay Transit Study. In May 2018, the project team reviewed the process to develop a Main Street Facility Plan with the City Council and sought input to inform development of community engagement strategies. In October 2018, the project team updated the Council on the adoption of the Community Engagement Plan and appointment of Strategic Advisory Committee members by the Planning Commission, acting in its capacity as Springfield’s Committee for Citizen Involvement (CCI). During the last quarter of 2018, the project team delivered the first major round of communication and engagement with the community and completed technical analysis of existing transportation, land use, and environmental conditions, as summarized in the Communication Packet Memo shared with the Council in January.

During the Work Session, the project team will present findings from six transportation, land use, and environmental existing conditions-related technical memos and the first round of community engagement activities (Attachments 1-4). The project team will also review and seek feedback on draft Goals and Objectives that will shape the development of transportation improvement options to create a safer Main Street (Attachment 5).
CITY COUNCIL
WORK SESSION

March 11, 2019
• Project Updates
  • Timeline & Milestones
  • Community Engagement

• Existing Conditions Inventories
  • Land Use
  • Environmental
  • Transportation

• Project Goals & Objectives
  • Review and provide feedback
Springfield’s Main Street is consistently ranked as one of the most unsafe city streets in Oregon based on the severity and frequency of traffic crashes. ODOT and the City must address this problem to save lives, reduce injuries, and lessen property damage due to crashes. The purpose of the Main Street Safety Project is to select infrastructure solutions that will make Main Street safer for people walking, biking, driving, and taking transit.

The selected safety improvements will provide for the movement of goods and people, support the economic viability of the corridor, accommodate current bus service and future transit solutions, and complement safety education and traffic enforcement.
PROJECT TIMELINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Kickoff/Community Priorities</th>
<th>Existing Conditions/Inventory and Analysis</th>
<th>Goals and Objectives</th>
<th>Develop Solutions</th>
<th>Evaluate Solutions</th>
<th>Recommended Solutions</th>
<th>Draft Plan and Policies</th>
<th>Adoption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT
DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

Adopt/ Acknowledge
- Metropolitan Policy Committee
- Oregon Transportation Commission
- Department of Land Conservation and Development

Decide
City Council

Recommend
Planning Commission

Advise
Corridor Strategic Advisory Committee

Input
Adjacent: Residents/Business Owners/Property Owners
General Public

Project Management Team
(Springfield, ODOT, Consultant Team)

Technical Advisory Committee
(Springfield, LTD, Utilities, ODOT, DLCD, WPRD, School District #19)
KEY MESSAGES

SAFETY
This section of Main Street is one of Oregon’s most unsafe city streets for those who walk, bike and drive.

WE’RE GROWING
Traffic on this corridor will likely increase by 40% in 20 years, so problems will be even worse in the future.

THE HEART OF OUR CITY
Main Street is a key east-west transportation corridor, an economic engine in the heart of Springfield, and a major transit route.

A MAJOR TRANSIT CORRIDOR
This is one of the most heavily used transit routes in Lane County.

A HEALTHY AND SAFE MAIN STREET FOR ALL
Improvements are needed to ensure safe, accessible transportation for everyone, whether by foot, bike, mobility device, bus or car.
Round 1 activities reached over 2,000 people

- Media releases (RG article, KVAL & KEZI stories)
- Social media announcements (Facebook/Twitter)
- Introductory mailer (906 recipients)
- E-Updates (803 recipients)
- Online Open House (450 unique users/177 comments)
- Focus groups & tabling (95 participants)
- SAC meeting (12 members)
- Public comments via email/phone/in-person (24)
Online Open House

Background

Springfield’s Main Street is consistently ranked as one of the most unsafe city streets in Oregon based on the severity and frequency of traffic crashes. ODOT and the City must address this problem to save lives, reduce injuries, and lessen property damage due to crashes.

Project Purpose

The purpose of the Main Street Safety Project: Planning Phase is to select infrastructure solutions that will make Main Street safer for people walking, biking, driving, and taking transit.

The selected safety improvements will provide for the movement of goods and people, support the economic viability of the corridor, accommodate current bus service and future transit solutions, and complement traffic safety education and enforcement.

The Main Street Corridor Vision Plan, ODOT’s 2011 Safety Study, the Pedestrian Crossing Project and the Main-McVay Transit Study are some of the building blocks of this project, and coordination between projects is a key part of our planning phase.
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Focus Groups & Tabling

Melissa Cariño and Emma Newman demonstrating value rating activity

Youth discussing safety issues on Main Street
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Focus Groups & Tabling

Project Area Map

Mapping activity at Catholic Community Services
Values Exercise

- **Safety**: I value solutions that reduce the risk of fatalities and serious injuries.
- **Local Business Access**: I value solutions that support the viability of the businesses on Main Street by providing access and minimizing other impacts.
- **Traffic Mobility**: I value solutions that minimize congestion and maintain the flow of traffic.

More…
Values Exercise cont.

- **Cost**: I value solutions that are cost-effective and make good use of public funds.

- **Main Street Character**: I value solutions that improve the appearance of Main Street and make it a vibrant place for those who live, work, shop, and travel through the corridor.

- **Transit**: I value solutions that support reliable and frequent transit service that is accessible from destinations along Main Street.
Values Exercise: Focus Groups

![Bar Chart]

- Transit
- Safety
- Cost
- Local Business Access
- Main Street Character
- Traffic Mobility

Legend:
- Downtown Languages
- Catholic Community Services
- Briarwood Senior Living
- Willamalane Two50 Club (youth)
Values Exercise: Online Open House

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>0 (least important)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6 (most important)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local business access</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic mobility</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street character</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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EXISTING CONDITIONS

Inventories to understand Main Street

• **Tech Memo #5**: Intersection Operations
• **Tech Memo #6**: Transportation Conditions
• **Tech Memo #7**: Environmental Summary
• **Tech Memo #8**: Land Use Summary

Related documents

• **Tech Memo #2**: Plans and Policies Framework
• **Tech Memo #4**: Transportation Analysis Methods & Assumptions
EXISTING CONDITIONS

How we will use this data?

• Confirming problems that need to be addressed

• Turn into Goals & Objectives for the project
Inventory includes:

• Street network characteristics, traffic volumes, speed, and classification data

• Multimodal inventory and analysis

• Corridor collision analysis

• Traffic operations analysis for 15 intersections
Roadway Characteristics

- 5-lane arterial with bike lanes
- Posted speed 35 – 45 MPH
- 16K – 20K vehicles per day
- Study intersections meet ODOT mobility standards
- Access spacing does not meet ODOT standards
TRANSPORTATION

Freight

• Represents 2% to 4% of vehicle traffic

• City truck route, Federal/RRR east of Bob Straub Parkway

• Freight value and tonnage higher east of Bob Straub
High-stress Pedestrian Environment

- Proximity of vehicles
- High roadway speeds
- Narrow sidewalks with no buffer
- Sidewalk obstructions and ADA ramps
High-stress Cycling Environment

• Many unsignalized intersection and driveway crossings
• Proximity of vehicles
• High roadway speeds
• Two lanes of traffic in each direction and center left turn lane
• 5 to 7 ft wide bike lanes, no buffer
Transit Service and Access

• Route 11: approximately 3,000 daily boardings

• 2\textsuperscript{nd} highest ridership in LTD service area

• Headways of 10 to 30 minutes

• Lack of safe and accessible routes to bus stops
High crash corridor

- 653 crashes (2012 – 2016)
- Approximately 1-1/3 crashes per week
- Crashes occur throughout the corridor

BREAKDOWN OF CRASH SEVERITY ON MAIN STREET (2012–2016)

- 46% Property Damage Only
- 35% Minor Injury
- 16% Moderate Injury
- 3% Severe Injury
- .6% Fatal
Fatal and Injury Crashes

Figure 14
FATAL & INJURY A, B, C CRASHES
1/1/2012–12/31/2016
Property Damage Only Crashes

Figure 15
PROPERTY DAMAGE ONLY CRASHES
1/1/2012–12/31/2016

OR 126 MAIN STREET SAFETY STUDY
Springfield, Oregon

Legend
- PDO CRASH
Collison Analysis

Pedestrians

• 3% of all corridor crashes

• 75% of fatal crashes and 10% of severe injury crashes
Crash Trends

- High percentage of rear-end and turning movement crashes: typical for roadways with high number of driveways and intersections
COLLISION ANALYSIS

PRIMARY CAUSES OF FATAL AND SEVERE CRASHES ON MAIN STREET (2012–2016)

- 38% Failing to yield right-of-way
- 12.5% Disregarded a traffic signal
- 12.5% Followed too closely
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location (Intersection Cross-Street or Segment Extents)</th>
<th>Excess Crash Frequency (HSM)</th>
<th>Excess Crash Types (HSM)</th>
<th>SPIS Location (ODOT)</th>
<th>Excess Crash Rate (ODOT)</th>
<th>ARTS Location (ODOT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28th Street</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30th Street</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32nd Street</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36th Street</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41st Street</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42nd Street</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapman Lane (non-study intersection)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48th Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 51st Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53rd Street (non-study intersection)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54th Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Straub Pkwy</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58th Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62nd Place</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69th Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71st Street (non-study intersection)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18: Locations Flagged in Safety Evaluation
## Table 18: Locations Flagged in Safety Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location (Intersection Cross-Street or Segment Extents)</th>
<th>Excess Crash Frequency (HSM)</th>
<th>Excess Crash Types (HSM)</th>
<th>SPIS Location (ODOT)</th>
<th>Excess Crash Rate (ODOT)</th>
<th>ARTS Location (ODOT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28th Street</td>
<td>30th Street</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30th Street</td>
<td>32nd Street</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32nd Street</td>
<td>35th Street</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36th Street</td>
<td>41st Street</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41st Street</td>
<td>42nd Street</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42nd Street</td>
<td>48th Street</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 51st Street</td>
<td>54th Street</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Straub Pkwy.</td>
<td>58th Street</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58th Street</td>
<td>62nd Place</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62nd Place</td>
<td>69th Street</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69th Street</td>
<td>S. 72nd Street</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Main Street Vision Plan (2015)

- Identified nodes and opportunity sites – should be a focus for safety and other improvements

**Segment 2:** 23rd Street to Bob Straub Parkway

**Segment 3:** Bob Straub Parkway to 69th Street
LAND USE SUMMARY

Vacant and Developable Land

• Mix of commercial, industrial and residential development is happening and projects anticipated near 28th, 51st, and 65th Place

• Permit requirements for sidewalks and access consolidation creates opportunities
Residential uses and community features prompt pedestrians crossing Main Street
Federally-funded projects must be cleared for compliance with NEPA

- Wetlands, Waterways, and Water Quality
- Archaeological and Historic Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources and Threatened and Endangered Species
- Noise
- Visual Resources
- Hazardous Materials
- Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice
- Floodplains
High-level Desktop exercise (no site visits)

Potential future reconnaissance:

• Wetlands, Waterways, and Water Quality
• Stormwater Management Plan
• Archaeological and Historic Resources
• Air Quality conformity
• ESA documentation
• Noise Study
• Hazardous Materials Corridor Study
GOALS & OBJECTIVES

A **goal** is an overarching principle or a broad statement of intent that informs the range of possible transportation solutions and guides decision-making.

**Objectives** are specific, measurable, and relevant steps that are taken to meet the goal.
GOALS & OBJECTIVES

Feedback* thus far:

• TAC: 2/21
• SAC: 3/4
• PC: 3/5

*will note feedback during presentation
GOALS & OBJECTIVES

**Safety:** Increase the safety of Main Street for all users

Objectives:

- Achieve a significant reduction in fatalities and serious injuries
- Achieve a significant reduction in the frequency of crashes along the corridor
Business Community: Support the viability of existing and future businesses

Objectives:

✓ Provide access for customers and deliveries to businesses along Main Street corridor
✓ Respond to business owner needs and support the visibility and economic development of Main Street
✓ Respond to property owner needs and support the potential for future businesses to locate on Main Street
MOBILITY: Ensure people and goods travel efficiently and reliably through the corridor

Objectives:

✓ Maintain the efficiency and reliability of passenger vehicle operations through the corridor

✓ Maintain the efficiency and reliability of transit operations through the corridor

✓ Retain freight vehicle mobility along Main Street
GOALS & OBJECTIVES

Transportation Choices: Create a multimodal environment that connects people and destinations

Objectives:

✓ Ensure access to services and destinations along Main Street for all members of the community at all income levels, including seniors, people with disabilities, children, and people of color.

More...
Transportation Choices: cont.

Objectives:

✓ Create safe, comfortable and efficient pedestrian and bicycle access along Main Street.

✓ Support existing transit service and accommodate enhanced transit service in the future.
Vital Community: Support the vitality of the community and its vision for Main Street

Objectives:

✓ Improve the appearance and aesthetics of Main Street to make it a vibrant place for those who live, work, shop and travel through the corridor

✓ Create an environment consistent with the Main Street Vision Plan

More…
GOALS & OBJECTIVES

Vital Community: cont.

Objectives:

☑ Support access to destinations along Main Street, as well as those that rely on access from Main Street
**GOALS & OBJECTIVES**

**Feasibility:** Develop a plan with a clear and achievable approach to implementation

**Objectives:**

✓ Can be implemented within five years through anticipated funding sources and acceptable project delivery approaches

✓ Ensure the cost-effective expenditure of resources
Discuss
UPCOMING MEETINGS

Existing Conditions and Goals & Objectives

• 3/21: Governance Team

Project Overview and Goals & Objectives

• 3/12: Spfld Board of Realtors
• 3/12: Spfld Chamber of Commerce – Government Affairs Committee
• 4/18: Spfld City Club
• TBD: Persons w/ Disabilities (LILA), Twin Rivers Rotary, Springfield Rotary Club
June

Next CC meeting

- Economic impact literature review
- Future baseline travel forecasts
- Key Principles & Methodology
THANK YOU
Briarwood Senior Living: Outreach Summary

**MEETING DATE:** Wednesday, November 7, 2018  
**LOCATION:** Brookdale Springfield Briarwood, 4865 Main St, Springfield, OR 97478  
**TIME:** 2-3:30 PM

**In Attendance**  
**Staff and Consultants**

Emma Newman, Senior Transportation Planner, City of Springfield  
Allison Brown, Facilitator, JLA Public Involvement  
Mary Augustine, Coordinator, JLA Public Involvement

**Overview and Purpose**

This outreach event was a partnership with Brookdale Senior Living, engaging the senior and assisted living community. This engagement fulfills, in part, Title VI Focus Group #1 Community Engagement Activities, outlined in the Main Street Safety Project: Planning Phase Community Engagement & Communications Plan. Twenty-four (24) community members were engaged in the outreach process.

The outreach process was a hybrid model, combing a facilitated focus-group discussion with interactive voting and guided mapping activities. The project was introduced by Emma Newman, City of Springfield, and Allison Brown, JLA Public Involvement, led the group in a facilitated large-group discussion.

Following the group discussion, participants ‘voted’ on their top three community values related to Main Street, placing coins into jars that correspond with six values: traffic mobility, local business access, cost, safety, transit and main street character.
Outreach Review
City of Springfield and JLA Staff engaged twenty-four community members that live at the Brookdale Springfield Briarwood Senior living facility. The facility is located in the heart of the project area, with some residences directly overlooking the Main Street corridor.

A majority of participants rely on mobility devices for travel, moving independently along the project area to access services. Using informal audience polling, we found that more than half use motorized scooters to travel along the project corridor. Additionally, seven use transit and two drive cars along Main Street. Within the group of seniors, 3% had near-miss accidents within the last 2 months and one mobility device/bike collision on the sidewalk was reported. Near-misses were a high priority for the audience, with many participants providing stories and first-hand experiences of conflicts between cars, bikes and mobility devices.

Also, the poor condition of sidewalks was a high priority for those traveling with mobility devices along the project corridor. Safety issues were identified specifically to and from St. Vincent DePaul Main Street Thrift Store, including usage of mobility devices in bike-lanes due to poor sidewalk conditions.

Values
Participants were given three plastic coins to ‘vote’ on their top three values by placing them into labeled ‘values’ jars. Staff clarified that participants could put multiple coins into one jar, if they felt strongly about that value. A total of twenty people participated in the values exercise, casting sixty coins as votes.

Safety was the highest ranked value (50%) with thirty votes as a top-three value. Traffic mobility (15%) and Local Business Access (13%) were a close second. Cost (10%), transit (7%) gained four votes each and Main Street Character (5%) gained three.

Elderly Focus Group Values Rating
### Safety: I value solutions that prevent fatalities and serious injuries

- Pedestrians are on the street at all hours.
- Improper and illegal pedestrian crossing is a major problem, at all areas of Main Street.
- People are driving way faster than the posted speed limit.
- Low visibility, it is hard to see pedestrians at all times of the day.
- When crossing signs are flashing, drivers speed through, instead of stopping.
- Flashing crosswalks are hard to see, using red lights might be better than yellow.
- Sidewalks need repair, so people are walking and use mobility devices in the street and bike lanes.
- Sidewalks are not safe for people in wheelchairs and mobility devices.
- Crossings are not safe for people in wheelchairs and mobility devices.
- Southside of East 51st Street has poor sidewalks.
- Experience many near accidents on pedestrian crossings.
- Jaywalking is an issue and needs more enforcement from police and officials.
- Could we post signs around areas with senior and vulnerable populations encouraging people to slow down and drive safer? Similar to school speed limit signs.
- Have police and sidewalk stings that are not advertised on the radio and television.
- Speed is an essential issue.
- Need more speed camera enforcement.
- Sidewalks are un-even and hard to use with mobility devices.
- Some roundabouts are more dangerous when they include pedestrian crossings.
- Driveway access near NW Community Credit Union is dangerous and poorly placed.
- Bikes are riding on the sidewalks, causing accidents with pedestrians and mobility devices.
- Conflicts with cars and cyclists at crossings.
- Officials should use mobility devices on Main Street to see how dangerous and difficult it is to get around.

### Traffic Mobility: I value solutions that minimize congestion and maintain the flow of traffic

- Bob Straub and McKenzie Highway have good connectivity when driving, especially traffic flow.
- Flashing yellow left turn signal lights are helpful for traffic flow when driving, especially around 58th Street.
- Roundabouts are working well, especially the Glenwood roundabout.
**Main Street Character:** *I value solutions that improve the appearance and aesthetics of Main Street and make it a vibrant place for those who live, work, shop, and travel through the corridor.*

- It should look like a “Main Street”, presently it looks like a free-way.

**Transit:** *I value solutions that support good transit access.*

- Roundabouts that have bus lanes are working well.

**Local Business Access:** *I value solutions that support the viability of the businesses on Main Street by providing good access and minimizing other impacts.*

- St. Vincent De Paul is a key destination for seniors and it feels unsafe getting there and back.
  - Trying to access this location feels unsafe with many near accidents.
- I feel like a ‘nervous wreck’ trying to access businesses on Main Street by mobility devices and walking.

## Mapping

A mapping activity with the senior community members was done by real-time mapping during the facilitated large-group discussion. Seated participants were encouraged to identify issues throughout the discussion and staff placed dots on the map for them.

**A total of seven dots** were placed on the map, all identifying issues or concerns. The concerns raised by the group include:

- Low visibility on 20th and Main Street; especially when raining
- Low visibility around 42nd Street, at night
- Poor sidewalk conditions on 35th Street, near St. Vincent DePaul
- Cracking and broken sidewalks were also identified on the north and south sides of 45th Street and 52nd Street
- The driveway for Northwest Community Credit Union on 51st Street, due to low visibility and pedestrian crossings.

![Project Area Map](image)

Brookdale Briarwood Outreach, Mapping Activity
Catholic Community Services: Outreach Summary

DATE: Wednesday, November 7th, 2018
LOCATION: Catholic Community Services, 1025 G St, Springfield, OR 97477
TIME: 11AM-1PM

In Attendance

Staff and Consultants

Emma Newman, Senior Transportation Planner, City of Springfield
Melissa Cariño, Senior Planner, City of Springfield
Allison Brown, Facilitator, JLA Public Involvement
Mary Augustine, Coordinator, JLA Public Involvement

Overview and Purpose

This outreach event was a partnership with Catholic Community Services’ (CCS) G Street Oasis, engaging low-income individuals and families. This engagement fulfills, in part, Title VI Focus Group #1 Community Engagement Activities, outlined in the Main Street Safety Project: Planning Phase Community Engagement & Communications Plan. Twenty-eight community members were engaged in the outreach process.

Two interactive strategies were employed to gain feedback from these community members. Participants ‘voted’ on their top three community values related to Main Street, placing coins into jars that correspond with six values: traffic mobility, local business access, cost, safety, transit and Main Street character. Secondly, participants placed dots on a large map of the project area, highlighting safety concerns and identifying where they live (if their residence was within the project area).
Outreach Review

City of Springfield and JLA Staff engaged community members who were visiting the CCS G Street Oasis for social service needs, including, but not limited to, food, clothing and energy assistance. Before and after appointments with CCS staff, community members were invited to interact with staff and engage in the values and mapping activities. The activities were designed to reduce time-burden on individuals and could be done within 2-3 minutes. Most community members stayed longer and provided additional comments. Project fact-sheets and newsletter sign-up sheets were displayed on the table. Additionally, City of Springfield staff were able to direct community members to an appropriate City of Springfield department, if comments or concerns were outside of the project scope.

Melissa Cariño and Emma Newman demonstrating the value rating activity

Values

Participants were given three plastic coins to ‘vote’ on their top three values by placing them into labeled ‘values’ jars. Staff clarified that participants could put multiple coins into one jar, if they felt strongly about that value. A total of twenty-four people participated in the values exercise, casting seventy-three coins as votes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street Character</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Mobility</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Business Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Safety was the highest ranked value (41%) gaining thirty votes as a top-three value. Main Street Character (16%) and Traffic Mobility (16%) were tied with 12 votes each. Transit (11%) and Cost (10%) were ranked similarly, gaining eight and seven votes. Local Business Access (5%) was the lowest ranked, gaining four votes.
Comments

Comments gained through conversation and dialogue with staff were written down and grouped to correspond with project values. All documented comments are presented in the table below.

| **Safety:** I value solutions that prevent fatalities and serious injuries | • 34th and Main: a fence blocks visibility and flashing crossings.  
  • Pedestrians and bike-riders need brighter clothes and lights.  
  • Sidewalks need repair at 1072 Main Street.  
  • Increased officer enforcement needed (x2).  
  • Increased driver responsibility for effects on safety.  
  • I do not like crossings because people walk out right after pushing the button, making it unsafe for drivers and pedestrians.  
  • Flashing signs are helpful for pedestrians and drivers.  
  • Crossing streets around Willamalane Wave Pool (Thurston) is dangerous, especially for kids. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traffic Mobility:</strong> I value solutions that minimize congestion and maintain the flow of traffic.</td>
<td>• Willamalane Wave Pool (Thurston) has congestion problems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Main Street Character:** I value solutions that improve the appearance and aesthetics of Main Street and make it vibrant place for those who live, work, shop, and travel through the corridor. | • The corridor needs more street lights.  
  • I am happy for new businesses along the corridor, including Cornbread Café.  
  • Main Street needs better landscaping. |
| **Transit:** I value solutions that support good transit access. | • Provide better crossings near bus stops for pedestrians.  
  • I would like a free trolley car for Main Street. |

Comments Outside of Project Scope

- 5th and G St. is a safety issue.  
- The roundabout @ Pioneer Parkway: Harlow and Hayden Br. is a problem.  
- Crosswalk is dangerous for pedestrians from Eugene, going South on Pioneer Parkway.
Mapping

Catholic Community Services’ participants placed dots on a large map of the project area to identify safety concerns and key issues. Some wrote comments directly on the map, adding descriptive text next to their dot. Pink dots highlight issues or concerns, purple dot identified residency and a yellow dot was used for ‘other’ comments.

Participants placed 34 dots on the map: 26 issues or concerns, seven participant residences and one ‘other’ comment. Additionally, five comments are documented on the margins, commenting on the entire map. Areas of concern were identified all along the project corridor, with comments extending from 14th Street to 72nd Street. Some dots included multiple comments (‘pedestrian safety and signal timing’).

Catholic Community Services Outreach, Mapping Activity

A cluster of eight comments were placed between 28th to 32nd Streets and the Bob Keefer Center:

- Four general issues (with no description provided)
- A crosswalk is needed for residents at Wentworth
- No crosswalk near the DMV
- Fresh paint/reflective markings needed at the 28th Street intersection
- Visibility of ‘flashers’ on pedestrian crossings, with east-bound lanes not yielding to pedestrians

Near the Hwy 126 and Bob Straub Parkway area, nine issues of:

- Signal timing between the four-way intersection
- Concern with cars pulling out of driveways, spanning from Hwy 126 to 58th Street
- Pedestrian safety
- The belt-line intersection area is a concern
- General safety concerns on 54th Street intersection (four dots)

Four issues with lighting were identified:

- Inadequate flashing pedestrian crosswalk with low visibility at 35th Street
- Increased lighting needed near 20th Street and 58th – 72nd

Areas near schools presented concern (Riverbend Elementary, Ridgeview Elementary and Thurston High School), with four illegal pedestrian crossing concerns identified from 45th Street into the Riverbend Elementary School area. Additionally, five dots identified illegal pedestrian crossings extending from Thurston High School and Ridgeview Elementary to 72nd Street. The five comments addressing the overall project described an area with ‘a lot going on’, desire for increased police patrols, a dislike for lower speed limits, more lighting and additional crosswalks.
Downtown Languages: Outreach Summary

MEETING DATE: Monday, November 5th, 2018
LOCATION: Two Rivers-Dos Rios School - 1084 G St, Springfield, OR 97477
TIME: 7-8:00 pm

In Attendance
Staff and Consultants

Allison Brown, Facilitator, JLA Public Involvement
Molly Markarian, City of Springfield

Overview and Purpose

This outreach event was a partnership with Downtown Languages’ PILAS literacy program, engaging Spanish speaking individuals and families. This engagement fulfills, in part, Title VI Focus Group #1 Community Engagement Activities, outlined in the Main Street Safety Project: Planning Phase Community Engagement & Communications Plan. Twenty-six community members were engaged in the outreach process, with four PILAS staff joining in conversation.

The outreach process combined facilitated small group discussion with interactive voting and guided mapping activities. The project was introduced by Molly Markarian, City of Springfield, and discussion was led by PILAS staff and Allison Brown, JLA Public Involvement. Outreach activities and discussion were held Spanish and engaged a variety of ages and family groups. All participants were compensated for their time with fifteen-dollar gift cards to Albertson’s grocery store.

Additionally, two interactive strategies were employed to gain feedback from these community members. Participants ‘voted’ on their top three community values related to Main Street, placing coins into jars that correspond with six values: traffic mobility, local business access, cost, safety, transit and Main Street character. Using a map of the project area, participants identified areas of safety concerns along the project corridor.
Outreach Review

The Spanish-language focus group opened with an introduction from Molly Markarian, City of Springfield. Molly outlined the project’s importance, purpose and location. She then described how participants’ feedback will be used within the planning process and incorporated into future safety measures and improvements. The Main Street Safety Project video was shown (with subtitles) providing a visual representation of the project scope and geographic area.

Participants broke into small groups of 4-5 people and were guided through small group discussion by Allison, Molly and PILAS Staff. The small groups were asked a set of questions to gain feedback on values regarding the project corridor. Answers were recorded by hand by staff, and translated from Spanish to English by Allison Brown, JLA and Molly Markarian, City of Springfield.

- How do you travel on Main Street?
- How do you feel on Main Street? Safe? Unsafe? Why or why not? *(PILAs staff members clarified that this question was specifically referring to traffic safety, as opposed to other forms of community security)*
- Are there places that you frequently visit?
- Are there areas that you have seen/experienced safety issues? Where are those areas, and what happened?

Values

The session concluded an exercise on rating values. These values were explained verbally to participants and labelled on jars in Spanish. Participants were given three plastic coins to vote on their top-three values. Staff clarified that participants could put multiple coins into one jar, if they felt strongly about that value. The total votes possible was 87 with 26 participants given three votes each. Three PILAs staff members also participated in the exercise, expressing their opinions as local residents.

Values Rating Exercise Results

Safety (51%) was the top value, gaining 43 votes from the group. Transit was the second most valued choice, gaining 14 votes (17%). Twelve percent (12%) identified Traffic Mobility as a top-three value with 13 votes. Cost was valued by seven participants (8%) and Local Business Access was valued by six (7%). Main Street Character was identified as a top value by four participants (5%).
Comments
Comments are grouped to correspond with project values and are presented in the table below.

| Safety: *I value solutions that prevent fatalities and serious injuries* | • I do not walk with children (i.e. in summer to Dairy Queen).  
• Observation of more accidents when it is hot out.  
• Taking shortcuts through neighborhoods to avoid Main Street.  
• Needing to waive jacket behind self so cars more likely to notice crossing.  
• Lights only flash yellow and cars ignore them (why is there no red?)  
• Multiple comments on pedestrians crossing without pressing button.  
• Pedestrians start crossing before cars stop.  
• Cars start going through crossing as pedestrians still exiting crosswalk.  
• Cars speed up before pedestrians start crossing to avoid stopping.  
• Pedestrians are not paying attention when crossing the street (focused on phones, listening to music on headphones or not paying attention to the crossing signals).  
• Too dark in sections.  
• There are many street lights that do not function (example of stranger urinating near apartments because dark enough that hardly noticed).  
• Not enough illumination at pedestrian crossings.  
• Some confusion over what the flashing yellow light means at an intersection.  
• It can be difficult to see the street signs at night.  
• Felt that increased police presence would help.  
• We call it a street, but it feels like a highway.  
• Do not observe speed enforcement (yes closer to 33rd but no closer to 43rd) and observe cars not respecting speed limit.  
• People don’t respect the speed limit, and stops would help to slow things down.  
• Cars drive too fast and follow too closely (don’t put enough space between cars when driving).  
• Have to had to switch lanes to avoid crashes with other cars.  
• Participant felt that more stops and a roundabout system would help to reduce speed along the street. |
| --- | --- |
| Traffic Mobility: *I value solutions that minimize congestion and maintain the flow of traffic.* | • Observation that not enough onsite parking, so too many cars parked on street.  
• Example of when people ask son if bothered that lives on Main Street, he says ‘nooo, nooo’ (but imitates sound of vroom vroom). |
| Local Business Access: *I value solutions that support the viability of the businesses on Main Street by providing good access and minimizing other impacts.* | • Wal-Mart, Winco, Walgreens, Albertsons, BigLots and BiMart were key.  
• Panaderia Daisy, Panaderia Piolin are noted as key destinations.  
• Lowell is noted as a key destination.  
• DMV, Department of Health Services, Bob Keefer Center, Splash, Goodwill.  
• The business entrances and exits off Main are really short (and make it difficult to access key locations).  
• Human Resources, “El Angel” store and “Caliman”.  
• Grocery Outlet (west of project area). |
| Cost: *I value solutions that are cost-effective and make good use of public funds.* | • We continue to pay but improvements don’t happen |
Mapping
A total of 26 community members were engaged in a mapping activity, identifying places frequented and areas of safety concern along the project area. **Participants identified 17 significant locations of interest and 13 safety issues.**

Locations of interest
Participants identified 17 locations of interest including three food/restaurant establishments and eight stores. Additionally, six places were identified that were important for school, family and recreation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food/Restaurant</th>
<th>Stores</th>
<th>School, family and recreation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panadería Daisy</td>
<td>Wal-Mart</td>
<td>Lowell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panadería Piolin</td>
<td>Winco</td>
<td>DMV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Angel</td>
<td>Walgreens</td>
<td>Department of Human Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Issues and Concerns
In total, participants identified 13 areas on the map that caused safety concerns and/or issues and provided 18 associated comments.

One participant pointed out the density of shops in the blocks between 20th and 21st Streets and recommended additional crosswalks. Also, additional speed limit signs were recommended for the entire project area. One participant identified all areas from 20th Street onward as ‘too hard’ to travel. One participant commented on limited business access at 42nd Street and Main Street.

Areas near schools (Riverbend Elementary, Ridgeview Elementary and Thurston High School) presented special concern, with seven issues identified from 48th to 66th Streets.

- Two participants identified safety issues for pedestrians near Riverbend Elementary where students are crossing the ‘near a curve off Main’, and drivers going too fast.
- Long distances between safe pedestrian crossing opportunities are an issue, especially 42nd to 54th Streets.
- One participant noted a need for stoplights between the school streets, with no good areas to cross currently.
- The area around 54th Street feels dangerous because of speeding and distracted drivers.
- No stoplight near Riverbend Elementary School is a safety concern.
- Concern over the amount of traffic within the Hwy 126 beltline area and a need for a pedestrian crosswalk.

The area from 28th to 37th Streets was identified as key, with 5 comments total.

- 28th to 35th Streets feels unsafe due to mill-oriented businesses with large trucks entering and exiting traffic flow.
- Traveling from 20th to 48th Streets causes a feeling of ‘insecurity’ and reported feeling generally unsafe.
- Blind spots were identified around the Bob Keefer Center, causing a safety issues for pedestrians and vehicles.
- Two issues in the area of the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV), concerns with low visibility (due to trees obstructing views) and traffic congestion.

Two comments identified issues located outside of the project scope:

- 37th and Oregon has no stop signs. Cars exiting and entering Main go really fast through residential area. Resident had complained and filed a report with the police and the City but hasn’t seen any change with the signage here.
- A crash was observed in the area of Grocery Outlet.
Willamalane Two50 Club Focus Group: Outreach Summary

MEETING DATE: Tuesday, December 18, 2018
LOCATION: Bob Keefer Center, 250 S. 32nd Street, Springfield, OR 97478
TIME: 4-4:30 PM

In Attendance
Staff
Loralyn Spiro, DPW Communications Coordinator, City of Springfield
Molly Markarian, Senior Planner, City of Springfield

Overview and Purpose
This outreach event was a partnership with Willamalane’s Two50 Club, engaging the youth community. This engagement fulfills, in part, Tabling Events & Stakeholder Liaison Opportunities (First Round), outlined in the Main Street Safety Project: Planning Phase Community Engagement & Communications Plan. Seventeen (17) youth community members were engaged in the outreach process.

The outreach process was a hybrid model, combing a facilitated focus-group discussion with interactive voting and guided mapping activities. Loralyn Spiro, City of Springfield, introduced the project, and Molly Markarian, City of Springfield, led the group in a facilitated large-group discussion.

Following the group discussion, participants ‘voted’ on their top three community values related to Main Street, placing coins into jars that correspond with six values: traffic mobility, local business access, cost, safety, transit and main street character.
Outreach Review

City of Springfield engaged seventeen middle school aged community members (ages 11-14) who participate in free after school activities at Willamalane’s Two50 youth center, located at the Bob Keefer Center just south of Main Street.

The youth focus group opened with an introduction from Loralyn Spiro, City of Springfield. Loralyn outlined the project’s importance, purpose and location. The Main Street Safety Project video was shown, but due to Willamalane’s audiovisual equipment malfunctioning, only the audio feature was employed (several students followed the video on their phones).

The majority of the youth frequent the food and beverage businesses on the corridor while some live or have parents who work on Main Street, as well. Using informal audience polling, we found that about half of the group walks along Main Street (including one who skateboards), and three had experiences crossing Main Street. Additionally, 30% of participants travel by bus and two bike along Main Street. Given the ages represented, none themselves drive along Main Street, but most have travelled along the corridor as passengers in motor vehicles.

Within the group of youth, most shared stories of observing crashes on Main Street and feeling less safe as pedestrians given their awareness of the frequency and severity of crashes (only four or 24% of participants, reported not having seen or experienced safety issues on Main Street). Youth observations of safety issues included observing turning vehicles not paying attention to pedestrians crossing the street, vehicles traveling at high speeds, and distracted drivers.
Values

Participants were given three plastic coins to ‘vote’ on their top three values by placing them into labeled ‘values’ jars. Staff clarified that participants could put multiple coins into one jar, if they felt strongly about that value. A total of sixteen youth participated in the values exercise, casting 48 coins as votes.

Safety was the highest ranked value (71%) with 34 as a top value.

Transit (13%) with 6 votes and Cost (8%) with 4 votes distantly rounded out the top-three values.

Local Business Access (4%) gained 2 votes, and Traffic Mobility and Main Street Character (2%) each gained 1 vote.

Youth Focus Group Values Rating

Comments

Comments are grouped to correspond with project values and are presented in the table below.

| Safety: I value solutions that prevent fatalities and serious injuries | • The lights on the crosswalk are always on long after the ‘crossers’ are gone; cars run straight through crosswalks because they assume no one is there.  
  • Kinda safe, kinda unsafe because the people who walk around and car crashes.  
  • I feel unsafe going down Main Street because of how many crashes happen daily.  
  • People don’t pay attention enough. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit: I value solutions that support good transit access.</td>
<td>• I really prefer to take the bus because I feel safe and it’s pretty fun to ride on.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mapping

A total of 17 youth were engaged in a mapping activity, identifying places frequented and places they have seen safety issues along the project area. **Participants identified 21 significant locations of interest and 10 safety issues.**

Locations of interest

Popular locations included eight food/restaurant establishments and seven stores. Additionally, six places were identified that were important for school, family and recreation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food/Restaurant</th>
<th>Stores</th>
<th>School, family and recreation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dutch Bros</td>
<td>Goodwill</td>
<td>Thurston Bus Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Bean</td>
<td>St. Vinny’s</td>
<td>Thurston Medical Center (parent workplace)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subway</td>
<td>Autozone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack-In-The-Box</td>
<td>China Market</td>
<td>Riverbend Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arby’s</td>
<td>AM/PM</td>
<td>Willamalane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy Queen</td>
<td>Shell Gas</td>
<td>Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taco Bell</td>
<td>Bi-Mart</td>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee’s Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Issues and Concerns

Youth identified 10 safety problems within the project area. Four crashes were described by the youth: ‘near Papa’s’, near the retirement home, and a chain reaction car wreck observed by the train tracks. Additionally, a crash was observed when pedestrian flashers malfunctioned midway through crossing near Thompson’s Market.

The crosswalk at 42nd by Taco Bell is an issue because people do not pay attention to signals. Distracted driving, including being on the phone while driving, putting on makeup while driving and other people in the vehicle distracting the driver. One comment raised concern of people racing/driving really fast and one comment about drunk drivers along the whole project area.
Online Open House Outreach Summary

Introduction

Overview and Purpose
In winter 2018-2019, the City of Springfield, in partnership with ODOT, held an Online Open House which asked for input from the community on the Main Street Safety Project. The purpose of the Online Open House was to provide background on the project and solicit community input on values, identify key areas of concern and general feedback on how to improve safety in the section of Main Street between 20th Street and 72nd Street. This engagement activity is outlined in the project’s Community Engagement Plan as a part of Round 2 of engagement.

This report summarizes the Online Open House format and feedback received.

Outreach and Notification
The Online Open House was launched to the public on November 7, 2018 and was scheduled to close December 5, 2018. However, the project team identified incongruities in mailing address data, hand delivered notices to 50 businesses on the corridor, and reopened the Online Open House on December 18, 2018 through January 2, 2019.

The project team invited the community to participate in the Online Open House using a variety of tools, including:

- Social media (Facebook and Twitter): posted on October 31st and November 7th;
- News releases issued on November 2nd and November 7th, resulting in stories of KVAL and KEZI on November 7th, 8th and 9th and a Register Guard article on November 26th;
- Email updates sent to interested parties on October 31st and November 7th; and
- Letters mailed to business and property owners within 300 feet of Main Street on November 6th (hand-delivered to 50 businesses week of December 5th).

Participation
There were a total of 177 comment submissions via the Online Open House, with a total of 450 new users. New users are calculated based on the number of first-time visitors to the Online Open House.
This new user number is not representative of the people who actually spent time reviewing and participating in the Online Open House, and therefore the number of submissions is a better indication of how many people actually spent time participating in the Online Open House.

A majority (120) of responses were gained within the first week. A total of 57 additional comments were received prior to the end of the Online Open House, 28 of which were submitted on November 26th, 2018. The bump in participation on November 26th is likely due to the timing of media coverage in the Register Guard.

There were an additional two emailed comments from stakeholders that experienced technical difficulties participating in the Online Open House. These comments have been integrated into the general comment summary, and can be viewed in full in Appendix C.

**Format**

The Online Open House contained six sections: Project Background and Purpose, Crash Data, Issues and Values, Concerns Mapping, Coordinating Safety and Transit, and Next Steps. Participants were able to provide feedback through the Issues and Values, Concerns Mapping, Coordinating Safety and Transit, and Next Steps sections. The sections can be described as such:

- **Project Background**
  - This section of the Online Open House informed participants of the background, purpose and importance of the Springfield Main Street Safety Project, as well as providing the opportunity to review a map of the project area.

- **Crash Data**
  - In this section participants could review crash data within the project area from between 2012 and 2016, including history and trends of collisions, contributing factors, and most frequent crash locations.

- **Issues and Values**
  - For this section participants were asked to rate the proposed community values, which included: Safety, Traffic Mobility, Local Business Access, Main Street Character, Transit, and Cost. Proposed community values were identified through previous visioning and community outreach processes, a work session with City Council and initial conversations with the project team.
  - Following the rating exercise, participants could submit additional values they felt were missing.

- **Concerns Mapping**
  - This section included an interactive map where participants could assign markers with their comments that correspond to different categories, including: Important Destinations; Lighting and Visibility; Vehicle Speed; Difficult Crossing; Unsafe Location; Property Access; and Other Comments.

- **Coordinating Safety and Transit**
For this section participants were given an overview of the Enhanced Corridor transit mode and its various potential elements. Participants were then asked to respond to whether they felt the elements were appropriate for Main Street.

**Next Steps**

- In this section participants were thanked for their participation and shown a graphic illustrating the project’s target schedule. Additionally they were encouraged to stay involved and watch for upcoming meetings by checking the project website and signing up for email updates. Participants were also provided the project team contact if they desired further information.
- In addition to asking demographic questions (including zip code, primary mode of travel, transit use, gender, language, race/ethnicity), participants were given the opportunity to provide any additional comments they wanted shared with the project team.
- Note: Demographic questions did not affect the collection of the participants’ responses (for example, if a user indicated their ZIP code was outside the Springfield/Eugene area, their answers were still collected along with users from within the project area).

**Feedback Summary**

**Issues and Values**

In this section participants were given 21 points and asked to assign up to six points to each of the various community values based on priority – the highest number of points indicates the highest priority, while the least amount of points indicates the least priority. The community values were developed by the project team based on issues the community raised about the corridor. These values included safety, traffic mobility, local business access, Main Street character, transit, and cost. A total of 170 people participated in this section. Participants showed the strongest support for safety which garnered over twice the number of participants assigning six points than the next highest ranked values, local business access, and traffic mobility. The community value with the least support was transit.

The graph below illustrates how many participants assigned their points (0-6 points) to each community value, and are listed based on the aggregate total of the assigned points. For instance, while one less person assigned six points to local business access than to traffic mobility, the total number of points for local business access is greater than that for traffic mobility.
Participants were also given the opportunity to provide any additional values they felt were important to include. A total of 103 participants provided additional input in this section. To review the full comments in this section, refer to Appendices A and C. Common themes of the comments (listed from most to least common) included:

- Improve and increase traffic and speed enforcement (18)
- Support and improve active (bike/pedestrian) and public transportation options, including adding bike lanes (12)
- Reduce speed limits (10)
- Improve pedestrian access (7)
- Implement roundabouts to increase safety (6)
- Replace flashing crossing with signals to improve pedestrian safety (5)
- Discourage improper pedestrian crossing (5)
- Install traffic cameras to reduce speeding and discourage people from running red lights (4)
- Improve and increase lighting for pedestrian safety (4)
- Reduce pedestrian access (2)
- Limit left turns (2)
- Increase the speed limit (2)
- Allow left turns at each intersection to support business access (2)
Concerns Mapping

Participants were shown a map of the project area and asked to place icons indicating where they feel there are safety issues and concerns along the corridor. Comments were identified using seven categories: important destination, lighting and visibility, vehicle speed, difficult crossing, unsafe location, property access, and “other.” Participants were able to self-select which category they felt corresponded with their comment. A total of 26 participants provided 83 comments on the map (concerns regarding specific locations are subject to further review and analysis as the project team develops alternative solutions for this project).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concerns category</th>
<th>Number of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Important destination</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting and visibility</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle speed</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult crossing</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe location</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property access</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Other”</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Important Destination

A total of nine participant comments indicated important destinations (frequently visited places, or places are important for access) on the map. These locations included:

- Goodwill
- NE corner of 42\textsuperscript{nd} and Main Street
- Hutch’s Bicycle
- From Upriver to 126
- Giant Burger
- Mini Pet Mart
- Planet Fitness
- Bob Keefer Center
- St. Vincent de Paul

Comments included:

- Access to food destinations is critical from all directions
- Decrease conflicts with transit to reduce congestion
- Improve driveway access to businesses
- Improve safety
- Reduce speeds and promote pedestrian access to businesses

Lighting and Visibility

A total of six participant comments indicated locations with lighting and visibility issues. These locations included:

- All of Main Street (1)
- Main Street from 58\textsuperscript{th} to 75\textsuperscript{th} (1)
- 72\textsuperscript{nd} (1)
- West of 42\textsuperscript{nd} and Main Street (1)
Additionally, two participants indicated the downtown section of Main Street as having lighting and visibility issues, however that section is outside the project area.

Comments included:

- Replace existing light with fixtures to reduce glare that hinders safety for all users
- Decrease electricity needs by strategically installing lights in places that will provide the most visibility, and use energy efficient lighting
- Use intentional and thoughtful designs to increase visibility of pedestrians, especially when it’s raining
- Increase the visibility of lanes to prevent illegal merging

**Vehicle Speed**

A total of 21 participant comments indicated locations where vehicle speeds feel unsafe. The locations identified by participants were relatively spread out throughout the project area with grouping of comments occurring near the intersections of 28th Street, 46th Street, 51st Street, 52nd Street, and Bob Straub Pkwy along Main Street.

Comments included:

- The new design needs to discourage and prevent speeding – narrower streets will help reduce speeding
- Reduce speeds to promote safety for all modes, specifically active (bike/pedestrian) and public transportation users
- Increase speed and traffic enforcement
- Implement roundabouts to reduce speeding
- Increase visibility of lanes, crosswalks, and speed limit signs along the corridor to promote safety
- Increase the safety of driveways onto Main Street

**Difficult Crossing**

A total of 20 participant comments indicated locations where it is difficult for pedestrians and cyclists to cross Main Street. The locations identified by participants were relatively spread out throughout the project area with grouping of comments occurring near the intersections of Hwy 126 and 23rd Street along Main Street.

Comments included:

- Increase bike connectivity
- The new design needs to promote pedestrian visibility
- Calm traffic and reduce speeds to increase pedestrian safety
- Replace flashing crosswalks with signals in strategic places
- Implement roundabouts to provide safer access for pedestrians
- Install dedicated right hand turn lanes
- The new design needs to increase pedestrian access to transit stops
• Install medians or islands to promote pedestrian safety
• Improve crosswalks to increase safety

Unsafe Location

A total of 15 participant comments indicated locations that feel unsafe for travel or experience vehicle conflicts or “near misses.” The locations identified by participants were relatively spread out throughout the project area with grouping of comments occurring near the intersection of 42nd Street. Additionally, three comments indicated locations outside of the project area.

Comments included:

• Improve left turns for vehicles to prevent conflicts with pedestrians
• Increase safety and visibility of bicycles along the entire corridor
• Prevent U-turns to reduce conflicts with active (bike/pedestrian) transportation users and other vehicles
• Improve crosswalks that are frequented by youth to prevent congestion due to crowded pedestrians crossing
• Increase signage and enforcement to prevent illegal parking along Main Street
• Prevent cars from using bike lanes for right-hand turns
• Increase enforcement to prevent people from running red lights and speeding
• Increase safety and visibility for vehicles making right-hand turns from the driveways
• Increase the safety and ability of bicycles to make left-hand turns across oncoming traffic

Property Access

A total of four participant comments indicated locations where it is difficult to turn into or out of businesses and residences. These locations included:

• The intersection of Main Street and 30th Street
• Mckenzie Feed and Supply
• Round Table Pizza
• St. Vincent de Paul

Key themes of the comments included:

• Left turns onto Main Street can be difficult and unsafe
• Reduce need for crossing multiple lanes, making U-turns, or driving out of the way to access businesses

Other Location Comments

A total of seven participant comments indicated locations where there were additional issues or concerns not covered in the provided categories. These locations included:

• The intersection of Main Street and 60th Place
• The Royals Apartment Complex
• Railroad tracks east of 28th Street
• Flasing beacon near 34th Street
• Pizza Hut
- Railroad crossing at 29th Street
- Rosboro Lumber

Key themes of comments included:

- Improve north to south access from business to business
- Address conflicts related to railroad crossings and tracks
- Ensure sidewalks are accessible, clear, and maintained for ADA users
Coordinating Safety and Transit

Participants were given an overview of the Enhanced Corridor transit mode as follows:

The transit study’s community outreach and technical analysis indicate the most viable transit mode for Main Street at this time is Enhanced Corridor. EmX remains a possibility depending how development, traffic volumes, and funding opportunities change over the next 10 to 30 years. Based on input received in response to the question below, LTD and the City will identify key transit improvements in coordination with other transportation improvements identified in the Main Street Facility Plan.

Participants were asked to consider the potential investments of an enhanced corridor on Main Street, which could include:

- Transit queue jumps (a special lane and signals for buses to “jump” ahead of other traffic at intersections with congestion delays);
- Better amenities at ground-level stops (such as trash receptacles, benches, shelters, automated fare collection);
- Consolidating stops to 1/3-mile spacing (provides faster, more reliable service and may attract more riders through improved travel times and stop amenities); and
- Deploying different sized buses – 40 to 60 foot – to accommodate fluctuations in peak and off-peak ridership.

In addition, the Online Open House explained that EmX stations and exclusive transit-only lanes east of 20th (except potentially at major congested intersections) would not be included in the Enhance Corridor option for Main Street.

Following the explanation of the elements of a potential Enhanced Corridor transit mode for Main Street, participants were asked whether they felt this option was appropriate. A total of 116 participants responded to this question. The highest number of participants indicated that they feel the list of elements makes sense with 38 responses.

Below is a graph illustrating the complete breakdown of how participants responded.
Open Ended Comments
At the end of the Online Open House participants were asked if they had any additional input they would like to provide in regards to the project. A total of 84 participants provided additional feedback. Common themes are listed below. For a full list of the raw comments, refer to Appendix B.

Key themes (listed from most to least common):

- **Speed and traffic enforcement** (29)
  - Increase police monitoring and enforcement of vehicle speed and traffic laws (12)
  - Reduce the speed limit (10)
  - Discourage illegal pedestrian crossing (6)
  - Increase enforcement of bike and pedestrian laws (1)

- **Pedestrian crossings** (18)
  - Increase and improve safety and access to pedestrian crossings (9)
  - Replace flashing crosswalks with signals to increase pedestrian safety and visibility (4)
  - Increase pedestrian access to businesses (2)
  - Consider building pedestrian bridges over Main St (2)
  - Implement medians and islands to provide safety for pedestrians (1)

- **Visibility, lighting, signage, and safety** (15)
  - Increase and improve signage to support safety, provide clarity, and reduce congestion (7)
  - Improve visibility for all modes (4)
  - Improve lighting in strategic areas and use lighting that does not cause glare that impacts visibility of bikes and pedestrians for drivers (3)
  - Limit driveway access onto Main St to promote safety (1)

- **Transit** (7)
  - Extend EmX to Thurston (2)
  - Make improvements that promote and increase transit ridership (1)
  - Increase frequency and reliability of transit (1)
  - Improve transit access (1)
  - Consider implementing dedicated bus lanes (1)
  - Create bus pull outs to reduce congestion (1)

- **Support and promote business** (7)
  - Support and promote existing, expanding, and new businesses (3)
  - Ensure access for deliveries to businesses along the corridor (2)
  - Ensure parking for business along the corridor (1)
  - Allow left turns across traffic to provide access to businesses along the corridor (1)

- **Bike lanes and bike connectivity** (5)
  - Consider implementing separated bike lanes (5)

- **Promote and support active (bike/pedestrian) transportation** (5)

- **Reduce congestion**, specifically during rush hours (4)

- **Cost** (2)
  - Concern about the cost to taxpayers (2)
Demographics

Zip Code
A total of 144 participants provided their zip codes, 81% of which are in Springfield.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97477 Springfield</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97478 Springfield</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97405 Eugene</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97402 Eugene</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97401 Eugene</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97404 Eugene</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97408 Eugene</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97487 Veneta</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97475 Springfield</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97452 Lowell</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97426 Creswell</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97413 McKenzie Bridge</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97403 Eugene</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Primary Mode of Transportation
Participants were asked what their primary mode of transportation is. A total of 152 participants responded to this question.

- Car (mostly alone): 102
- Carpool or vanpool (two or more people): 18
- Bike/walk: 18
- LTD fixed route service (bus or EmX): 10
- Other: 4

Of the participants that responded “other,” participants indicated a combination of biking and driving, and motorcycling.

Transit Use
Participants were asked how often they use public transit. A total of 150 participants responded to this question.

- I don’t ride transit: 61
- A few times a year: 29
- I have ridden before, but not in the past year: 25
- A few times a month: 18
- A few times a week: 9
- Everyday: 8
Age

Participants were asked to provide their age. A total of 137 participants provided their age. Below is a graph illustrating a breakdown of participant ages based on age range.

![Age Breakdown Graph]

Gender

Participants were asked to provide their gender. A total of 143 participants responded to this question.

![Gender Pie Chart]
Language Spoken at Home
Participants were asked what language they spoke at home. A total of 143 participants responded to this question, all of which indicated that they speak English at home.

Hispanic or Latino Descent
Participants were asked whether they are of Hispanic or Latino descent. A total of 136 participants responded to this question. A majority (133) indicated that they are not, and three responded that they are of Hispanic or Latino descent.

Race/Ethnicity
Participants were asked what their race/ethnicity is, and could select all that apply. A total of 137 participants responded to this question.
Appendices

Online Open House Outreach Summary
## Appendix A: Online Open House – Issues and Values Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment number</th>
<th>Full comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>54th st is a big problem. Install traffic cameras or put in a left turn signal on 54th st for cars turning from the No. side. Pol presence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>58th &amp; Main a death trap for pedestrians as drivers run the red light when turning left from 58th to Main heading west. Often 3-4 run light.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A reduction in the glare-bomb style of lighting would be a significant improvement in safety and aesthetics. Light downward, not outward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>All city needs is put sm. retaining wall up along side walk like in Vegas &amp; have bridges or tunnels to get across. Solutions not Band-Aids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>All the pedestrian crossings are too close together on Main St are people really that lazy Ride bus free but can’t walk to next block to cross?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Allow PPLT using the FYA for left turns at all the intersections along Main Street. This will alleviate congestion and improve safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>As a business owner Within the 7 mile section of Main. There is not a single best option, each block should be addressed individually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Avoiding impacts to businesses is critical, avoid medians that restrict access to businesses, do not widen existing corridor, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Better enforcement of existing speed limits. Pedestrian crossing somewhere between 58th and 69th.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Better lighting and more raised meridians would help. Police need to start ticketing drivers AND pedestrians who seem to have a death wish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Bicycles need to stay off sidewalks and use bike lanes. Those of us walking have to move aside to avoid being injured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Bicycles off sidewalks going opposite way on one way has caused close calls. Following speed limits with enforcements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Build safety stuff soon Less people hurt or killed Use medians to limit left turns &amp; give peds refuge, roundabouts for safety and U-turns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Don’t let LTD make a mess of things as they did in Eugene, they have consistently wasted tax payers money, LTD needs to buy smaller buses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Emergency Vehicle access, safe and expedient travel to best serve the public within &quot;Traffic Mobility&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Emphasis on best practices for active transportation infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Enforce existing speed and traffic laws. Use red lights for stop, not yellow. Patrol!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Enforce speeding laws.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Enforce traffic laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Enforcement of traffic laws is a big issue. Why isn’t that taken in account? I see distracted drivers each day on main street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment number</td>
<td>Full comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Find a way to connect the bike route on D Street to get across 21st over the tracks and connect with east Springfield, north of Main street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>flashing x-walks don’t give drivers time to stop peds just push button and go w/waiting for traffic, use ped x-ing link on harlow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Get the Police to ticket j walking, the bicycle riders going the wrong way people and bicycles crossing improperly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Greenhouse gas/VMT reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Hire local architects and construction companies. Reach out to Springfield businesses and residents. Keep the money in our community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Historic tributes to the city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I believe that Main Street should be more pedestrian and bicycle friendly. These improvements help local businesses and increase safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>I certainly value an inclusive process - The public input should be the foundation that guides decisions made relating to Main St. Great Job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>I have witnessed a lot of speeding and aggressive driving, not to mention distracted drivers and pedestrians. Reduce the speed limit! Patrol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>I live on south 35th and even when driving a lot of pedestrians do not use the crosswalk with light they still run across main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>I think lowering the speed limit was a good step, but every day see it not enforced. I am constantly being passed while doing 35mph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>I value putting pedestrians, cyclists, and non-car forms of transportation first in any plan. Opposed to additional ticketing/enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>If planned well all these values will get optimized. As of right now every mile of Main street is a hazard for all travels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Implement old fashion design. Four lane traffic, center barriers, well marked cross-walks/traffic lights, and curbing. Rumble barriers 35mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>In my opinion, not all side streets need to have direct access to an arterial like Main St, maybe cutting off access would help flow+safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Increase police presence and citations issued for violations. I commute this rd morning lunch and afternoon. Use unmarked if need be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Increased police monitoring; use of radar and traffic cameras; better enforcement to change the behavior of drivers and pedestrians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>It is a better idea to choose a separate bus/bike and pedestrian corridor away from high car traffic area as far as safety is concerned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>It should be an area you like to frequent and would take out of towners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Keep buses from being delayed at intersections and railroad tracks. Design with the intent of person trips and multi mobility as a factor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment number</td>
<td>Full comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Last year I tripped and fell on the sidewalk near 2nd and Main and got a concussion, broken nose, etc. Uneven sidewalks are very dangerous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Lower speed limit. Enforce it! Bike helmets are rare! Red lights instead of flashing yellow. Educate, educate, educate! Hire more police!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Lower speed to 35 out to 72nd and more crosswalks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Lower speeds on Main Street. There should be traffic calming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Make it LOOK pretty- don't spend several million dollars on UGLY!! Traffic circles work GREAT!! Blinking street spacers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Make more of an effort to divert through traffic to 126 and off of Main. Make crossings safer for pedestrians and cyclists. Add bike lanes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Make sure whatever solution is chosen the City can support ongoing maintenance and replacement costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Make the flashing x-walks a red stop light. Something that means STOP, not something that doesn't mean anything more than &quot;look&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Mobility for all; not just safety vs. &quot;traffic mobility&quot; which reads as motor vehicle mobility but better walking, biking, &amp; transit access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>More pedestrian education/enforcement as well as policing speeders and erratic driving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Narrow the road for safety and businesses. Roundabouts may reduce fatal accidents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>New pedestrian crossings working well. Gives walk traffic a place to cross and also gives pause in traffic flow for safer entry for cars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>No EMX, no roundabouts and no medians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>No median, No roundabouts, No EMX, No additional ROW! The business and property owners have delivered this message to city counsel already</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Our UGB is finite. Main Street is our community’s last and best chance for new development. Focus on transit, mixed use &amp; livability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Pedestrian crossings and the reduced speed limits are good and have been asked for long ago. Continue common sense low cost approaches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>People aren’t dying on Main Street at an alarming rate! We come down Main Street &amp; there is no problem! Look how LTD has messed Eugene up!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>People need to use crosswalks Police need to ticket speeders. Businesses are vital. We have plenty of buses. Most people prefer driving a car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment number</td>
<td>Full comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>People using lights to cross the street s/b accountable too. Wait &amp; look both ways before stepping of the curb. Cars cannot stop on a dime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Please give Main Street a much - needed &quot;road diet&quot;!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Please install roundabouts at 28th, 42nd and 126/Bob Straub. Please increase the number of marked crosswalks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>PLEASE use RED lights to stop traffic for pedestrians. Solid or flashing red only. I understand that is federal DOT standard. Not yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Policing red light runners 42 &amp; 58 St The speed limit was reduced and it is not enforced Education on using the lighted crosswalks installed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Policing speeders and lower the speed limit in areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Raise speed to 45. Enforce Jaywalking law on main. Remove flashing crossings. Install pedestrian overpasses at 28th, 32nd, 56th and 58th.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Reduce speeders from Pioneer parkway to 20th on s. A. That's where they get a running start east bound on main street. Never see a cop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Reduced spd/protected bike lanes/evry corner is a crosswalk, all should be safe. 'Access to business' must include bike/walk/transit access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Replace signals with roundabouts. Roundabouts are safer,provide u-turns and work well with a median. Access to businesses will feel safer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>RESTRICT pedestrian access crossing via barrier or raised median refuge islands: U-turn allow within corridor: Decorative-medians-river rock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Roundabout at 58th and Main would work better than the traffic lights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Safe ways to get to Main Street. 28th is not pedestrian or bike friendly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Safety first, then Main Street character to promote local business. Medians are fine with me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Save lives - people are dying at an alarming and unacceptable rate on Main Street. Enhance local economy and increase access for people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>seismically sound pedestrian bridges would be a help. Not everyone can cross this broad road in the time allowed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment number</td>
<td>Full comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>shared business driveways will prevent lots of crashes. If enough driveway access points are shared, it may warrant a signal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Solid dividers will help with traffic passing over cross traffic too early and allow center 'refuges' for pedestrians crossing over.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Something needs to be done where pedestrians cross the onramp to the freeway from westbound 126. COMPLETELY UNLIT! NO SIGNAL! Poorly marked!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Speed limit signs with digital readout of drivers speed. Addresses low resource of officers. Illuminated crosswalks in Thurston area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Speed limit signs with digital readout of drivers speed. Addresses low resource of officers. Illuminated crosswalks in Thurston area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Speeds are too high. It is immoral to prioritize your convenience over other's safety. Is a highway really appropriate for our Main St?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>The biggest problem as I see it is people who are too lazy to find a crosswalk and instead cross anywhere and everywhere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>The downtown area needs attention too! There are 3 High Schools there and I have seen many near misses from cars running red lights. Danger!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>The main problem with Main Street is the laws on the books are not inforced Bicycle and pedestrian are never accountable with anything.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>The Royals Apartment complex on Main St. houses a pedophile club where they rape kidnapped children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>The speed limit should be changed back to 40 mph. Pedestrians and bicyclists not paying enough attention is what makes main st dangerous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>The street is so busy, crossing the street should not be a safety concern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>The street should prioritize walking, cycling, and transit, especially between 20th and Highway 126/Bob Straub Parkway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>There cannot be a divider down main street. Cars need to be able to access business from a center turn lane as it is today.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>This is not the type of road anyone should be crossing on foot. This is a main traffic mover. Try smaller access roads off main faster road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>This Project should be designed to benefit downtown Springfield by slowing traffic and making it safer for pedestrians to access businesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Traffic circles at the main intersections would keep traffic moving and be a traffic calming solution at the same time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment number</td>
<td>Full comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Traffic/Pedestrian enforcement. I drive main every day and can't remember when the last time I witnessed a car pulled over was.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Truth please! The City clearly has an unsubstantiated goal; info is skewed. Is this project even necessary? Main St community says NO!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Truth please! The City clearly has an unsubstantiated goal; info is skewed. Is this project even necessary? Main St community says NO! Don't let LTD make a mess of things as they did in Eugene, they have consistently wasted tax payers money, LTD needs to b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Universal crosswalks same throughout city. Red light cameras. Tickets for jaywalking! Flowing traffic stops speeding and light running.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Use full-stop cycle signals for pedestrian crossings. Lower speeds. Safer refuge zones in center islands with bollards and lighting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Use full-stop cycle signals for pedestrian crossings. Lower speeds. Safer refuge zones in center islands with bollards and lighting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Values we all share safety, walking, bike riding, driving. The slower one drives..I know a town that as you drove through it was 20mp..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Vegetated ped refuges crossing the street each block will beautify Main, cue drivers to slow down, provide ped protection, and treat runoff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Water treatment/management from the roads should be considered as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>What is the hidden agenda? The local businesses have spoken in opposition to most of LTD's desires. Springfield needs to send LTD packing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Working and living on Main, no matter what you build, you will have to contend with distracted drivers, drug use &amp; homelessness first.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment number</td>
<td>Full comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>You really need to consider breaking the bus, pedestrian and bike traffic away from the major roadways—trying to keep all of these on the same roadway doesn't work for anyone. Major auto traffic cannot travel just anywhere, but bikes, bus and peds. have much more flexibility. Eugene, for instance, could have used a less auto traveled east to west roadway for bus, ped &amp; bike traffic only rather than try to do it all on an already congested roadway that is so important for travel. Don't make the same mistake here--find another parallel street that would work and reduce the auto traffic on that street to accommodate alt. transit more safely. Additionally, use smaller buses to run on the major roadways--they are mostly empty anyway. Lower speeds and hand out plenty of tickets to cars, bikes and pedestrians. I daily see bikes and pedestrians crossing in roadways unsafely (dark clothes, no crosswalk, not even looking before darting or riding into traffic) and I can only surmise these people don't value their personal safety. As a taxpayer, I am not at all interested in tax dollars being spent to try to mitigate a lack of personal responsibility. If you start handing out appropriate tickets to all of these groups you will also be able to track problem areas. Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Why not make small walk-through tunnels for pedestrians to use for crossing Main Street rather than crossing traffic on Main Street all together. They could be monitored by surveillance cameras and officers patrolling them. Couldn't possibly cost more than hundreds of thousands of dollars that were spent on those yellow flashing cross walks that you cant see with several miles to cross between each one?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>When turning off of 32nd street on to main st. drivers are almost forced to encroach the crosswalk in order to see. Pedestrians then usually walk behind the vehicle making a dangerous situation. Shrub of businesses and homes are at times to close or crowded at intersections making it difficult to see when turning. Speed limits are not enforced due to lack of officers. Speed limit signs equipped with radar to tell the driver their speed would help. Illuminated crosswalks in the Thurston area of main st., especially where students cross to go to the schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>When turning off of 32nd street on to main st. drivers are almost forced to encroach the crosswalk in order to see. Pedestrians then usually walk behind the vehicle making a dangerous situation. Shrub of businesses and homes are at times to close or crowded at intersections making it difficult to see when turning. Speed limits are not enforced due to lack of officers. Speed limit signs equipped with radar to tell the driver their speed would help. Illuminated crosswalks in the Thurston area of main st., especially where students cross to go to the schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>When I travel the corridor as a nearby but not Springfield resident, I often don’t know exactly where I am going. I am looking for street signs and indicators to help me know if I am close to the address I am looking for. Easy to read street signs can help keep traffic moving rather than slowing or being distracted. This is a jumbled and confusing stretch of road for occasional and infrequent users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>We need to rethink any ped use of Main St. It is too dangerous to cross 5 lanes on foot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>This section of street/highway is super busy and crossing the street is incredibly dangerous. There are no where near enough places for pedestrians and cyclists to safely cross. Since this section of street is also a highway I would support several small pedestrian bridges that go over the street so as not to constantly stop traffic at the busiest crossing agreas, as well as more safety beacons at other, less busy locations along this stretch of highway/street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>This is a wonderful way to communicate! Hats off to you!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment number</td>
<td>Full comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>There are better ways to use public funds rather than chopping up main St and congesting the lanes for everyone except Busses. I cannot use public transportation for my job, public transportation does nothing to help me because I suspect most other people and businesses are in my position and there is no way that you can run enough busses and have WILLING riders to make up for the loss of a lane for cars to travel. Cars are the best way for people to travel in our society and in how our towns have been set up, so trying to change that now is just going to hurt the people that pay the majority of the costs of these projects. If people would pay attention to the traffic laws and the measures already implemented, there would be no accidents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>There are a host of &quot;values&quot; promoted in this survey. How highly do we as a community value truthfullness? Are we messaging the data to fit an agenda or are we accuratly identifying issues of concern and addressing them effectively? It is a costly mistake to pursue solutions where no problems exist!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>the royals apartment. kidnapped children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The main problem with Main Street is only the drivers are ever pulled over. The people can cross wherever they want, (30' from a cross walk) the bicycles can ride down both sides of the road the wrong way, or on the sidewalks even though they have a land, in each direction. The bus need to have its own pullout so traffic can keep moving. PLUS don't have a bus stop at 42nd &amp; Main 25' from the drive way of the shopping center. Especially without a full pullout. Also it's a total waste to be having a double bus running with 2 or 3 people on it.. The light timing needs fixed at 58th &amp; Main left turn lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The last thing I want to see happen to main is what happened to 6th and 7th in Eugene. I could see the benefit of more bus pull outs but not dedicated lanes and or signals. Keep it simple.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Thank you for being so thorough in your planning and for giving the public a chance to comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Street lighting in some areas is poor. Hate those yellow street lights as they do not conduct much light. Educating walkers, bikers, etc. at a younger age and showing by example are important. Police officers also need to use lights and turn signals more!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>speeding is a real issue on Main, even with the lowered limit. I attempted to place speeding notices on the map and it didn't show them, at least right away. But speeding is a big problem and enforcement needs to take place. People will not slow to posted speed without ticketing speeders/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Slow traffic down. Make Main Street calm travel zone. Dedicate full stop cycle signals to crossings where there are long distances to signal intersections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Slow traffic down. Make Main Street calm travel zone. Dedicate full stop cycle signals to crossings where there are long distances to signal intersections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>See previous comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Reducing speed would help the most safety wise...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Put up more signals all along the route and have all of them timed to allow traffic to roll along at 35mph. Time the lights so the side streets and pedestrians get an allotted time to cross without slowing down traffic flow. Do not let pedestrians or traffic change the timing of the lights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment number</td>
<td>Full comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Please remember, transportation, access and businesses are interconnected. Businesses bring guests onto Main St. if there is no access, there is no business and no reason to live or shop on Main.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Please be cost effective in designing and implementing any changes. We see far too many wasteful expenditures while basic maintenance of streets and sidewalks are overlooked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Pedestrians using lights to cross the street s/b accountable too! Wait &amp; look both ways before stepping of the curb, cars cannot stop on a dime. Too many times the pedestrian pushes the button and steps right off the curb out in front of a car. Educate the pedestrian. How about a law regarding using non use of cell phone while crossing the street, would save lives since some peds don't have common sense. Also some of the lights on Main St. are obstructed by signs and trees...Main and 51st is an example (Thurston bound). The bus service should run 365 days a year!!! No extra lanes needed for the bus!!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Pedestrian crossing of onramp to freeway from westbound 126 is very dangerous; no control lights, no street light for 100 feet, poorly marked; let's not wait for someone to get killed before we do something about it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Nothing will change until people CANNOT cross this corridor EXCEPT at certain points. Driving daily I witness idiot people EVERY DAY crossing...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once everyone gets use to rolling along at 35, traffic and pedestrians will all have ample asses to a safer street.

When a car enters the street (somewhere between the timed signals) they could have no more than one stop at a red light and then they are in the flow of 35MPH.

This is a well know way of moving cars and keeping places safe for all other users.

This does mean you will take away the flashing pedestrian signals you currently use, very disruptive to traffic. When traffic flows everyone benefits and the environment (air quality) benefits as well.

If some wants to speed, they will be rushing to red light after red light. Everyone will learn to roll along.

This method does not prioritize cars over all else, it opens up space (in timed allotments) for cars to roll and for pedestrians to move safely. This is a win win for all. Once everyone gets use to this, both car drivers and pedestrians relax because they know they will have their turn soon. Real timed lights can calm the roadway for all users, and help the street flow smoothly.

Doing the timed light method could eliminate the need for many of your individual ideas to help, all over the street.

Thank you,

RB Garden Electric Car Driver
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment number</th>
<th>Full comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Need to find alternate routes that avoid main street for bikes. Going from Thurston to Eugene.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>My family live in West Springfield and travels primarily by bike, aside from our few beloved restaurants in Downtown Springfield, we spend our money in Eugene because that's what we have access to. The entire section covered by the project is too fast, and won't be safer until it's been designed to move significantly less fast. This street needs narrower auto lanes, protected bike lanes, raised crossings and street trees. The excuse that the street is currently occupied by mostly auto-oriented businesses should be a non-issue - what other businesses could survive on such a terrible streetscape? What other businesses might move into the area if the street was calmed and configured so that it actually had street life?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>More Police patrol during commute hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Main Street MUST keep the Center turn lane as it would kill many businesses if it becomes difficult to access them. You cannot stop people from crossing the street where they shouldn't and we need to stop trying to make things safe for the small percentage of people that do not pay attention to traffic. Main Street functions well and serves the community businesses as it is. Changing it would be devastating.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Main Street is not safe for pedestrians. There are not enough areas for them to safely cross so many just cross anyway, dodging traffic. I live on the south side of Main Street. As a result, my daughter is not allowed to walk to school as I will not allow her to cross Main Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Looking forward to changes that improve Main Street for safety, the local economy, and creating a space where people want to spend more time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Let's keep Springfield downtown nicer than Eugene... not just by watching Eugene downtown become a shitty area, but by continuing the efforts to make downtown Springfield nice and attractive to people looking for a place to spend their money.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Less focus on buses/LTD and more on traffic safety and law enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Keep traffic moving. Use visible crosswalks that are the same design throughout the city. I work in downtown Eugene and see the dedicated bus lanes on Franklin do help with traffic flow. As for roundabouts (Glenwood (which is beautiful and wonderful) and Pioneer Pkwy)…why do pedestrians cross inside of them? I thought the whole point was to NOT stop in a roundabout. The sudden brake lights is alarming. It would make more sense to have the pedestrians cross before on each arm of the roundabout. In addition; there should be some signage/direction regarding appropriate roundabout use given the large amount of out of state traffic from the UO and being close to I5 that we receive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Just look at what has been done to the Glenwood area. I know lots of people that now totally avoid doing business in that area. The so-called improvements in Eugene out 6th and 11th also have sent many people to other places to do business. Springfield businesses have been benefitting from these LTD blunders in Eugene, so now LTD wants to make Springfield suffer too. Springfield needs to put a rein on LTD, before it's too late.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>I've never seen or heard of any &quot;crashes&quot; involving this part of Main St. I love to see the city of Springfield changing into a very quaint and...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment number</td>
<td>Full comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>beautiful downtown area, but the upper part of main street seems to be alright; at least as far as the Paramount area is concerned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Is it a good idea to further lower the speed limit and add more hinderances to the busiest street in town, while we’re experiencing unprecedented population growth in the area? That is a recipe for more congestion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>A smart plan does away with flashing crossings and puts in pedestrian overpasses with spiral wheelchair access ramps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>As for reducing vehicle-only accidents, not much can be done, as it's already a straight road with frequent traffic signals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Improving safety on Main Street is important and that should be the focus. Trying to address transit issues and appearance of the corridor at the same time should be a secondary concern. Don't try to do everything when the real problem is safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Important work! I'm happy to see that these issues are being taken on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Implement feeder driveways, so each business does not need a separate driveway. Add more traffic lights. Those yellow-lights cross-walks were a stop gap and now the middle-of-the-road, concrete island gets in the way of trying to turn onto Main St. Put a light there, make a traditional cross-walk. PLEASE no more roundabouts. How about some feeder bus routes, that run in and out of subdivisions all along Main St, these would unload passengers to transfer to the Main St bus. Use small vans for this service, use online reservations or call for service? REDUCE bus fare. I say no on the Jump Ahead bus idea, more image than substance, and probably really expensive equipment to put in. It's not THAT congested in this area to require something like Jump Ahead bus idea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>I'd like to support more of the businesses on the eastern side of Springfield more often, but frankly there have been so many times that it is been difficult getting back onto the road after visiting a business makes it less appealing to do so. And the number of pedestrians that don't watch before crossing, especially at dusk, can be scary. I'm glad you are looking at improving this stretch of road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>I'd like to see pedestrians and bicyclists getting tickets for dangerous behavior. SPD doesn't seem to be interested in doing that though.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>I would like to see the police address the drivers breaking the traffic laws on Main st., but I would also like to see pedestrians that have all of these safety aids at their disposal and deliberately avoid using them also held accountable. There is a lighted pedestrian crossing very close to my house, and I constantly see people walking through it without pressing the indicator button, or sometimes crossing on the opposite side of the intersection where there are no markings at all. All of the money you want to throw and safety features is pointless when you have to deal with people who refuse to take advantage of them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>I work as a Community Health Worker in the community and I hear many elderly people in our community say that they don't feel safe trying to get to the grocery store. Many of our side streets leading to Main are unsafe, don't have sidewalks, are in disrepair, or not well lit. We only have one grocery store left in town and getting there can be a huge barrier. Not to mention riding the bus to get to Grocery Outlet or Winco or Walmart is not easy when you have reduced mobility. It's important to keep in mind the most vulnerable populations when looking at roads and transportation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 47             | I wish I could bike more! It seems like there are very few safe bike corridors in Springfield. I just moved here, so maybe I just haven't found the bike corridors yet, but I've felt like everywhere I need to go I need to drive to. :(
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment number</th>
<th>Full comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>I understand there are right-of-way issues on the north side of Main Street, but there desperately needs to be an East-West route between 28th and 58th on that side to help alleviate congestion/speeding on Daisy Street (South of Main St.) which is a resid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>I think the crosswalk on W. 11th by Walmart is a great option for Springfield to use in unsafe places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>I think it's essential to decide whether or not Main Street is going to cater primarily to cars- there can be no major safety changes if it continues to do so. There is a highway that runs parallel to Main Street and is designed, built, and maintained to move as many cars as efficiently as possible. Main Street is the corridor that hosts most of Springfield's small businesses. This corridor could be enhanced by street trees, protected bike lanes, easy and fast transit options, and outdoor sidewalk seating. Studies show that implementing this infrastructure greatly benefits businesses and property values. This is something that the younger generation is looking for when deciding where to live. These changes could make Springfield a more attractive destination for community members, employers, developers, and investors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>I take exception to the format and the time frame used to engage the community to render comments on this project. I've raised issues regarding the information presented to the public on this site but unfortunately they will not be addressed until after the deadline of December 5th! The time for comments on this online open house should be extended for an additional 30 days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>I recommend talking signal lights at 31st., 48 st., and 66 st.. Talking pedestrian crosswalks with regular red stop lights, close to bus stops by 64 st. and 68st.. Like the lights at Gateway. Fire station on 68st. and Main St. alert signs and flashing to solid red lights for exiting emergency vehicles. Recommendation by clerk at Dari-mart. 58st. and 69 Ssignal lights have a flashing yellow light to cross traffic, I've seen to many near car and pedestrian misses. I recommend they be removed. I recommend lowering the m.p.h. speed limit on Main St., From Hwy. 126 to 72 St. and Led street lights on both side of the street. 69 St. needs M.P.H. speed limit lowered, cars go to fast on the road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>I notice that speed limit signs are few and far between also police presence itâ€™s critical limit lions are not define well either Highway 126 and business Highway 126 I believe is confusing for some people it needs more definition with signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>I notice that many of the accidents are around the area between 28th and 32 Streets. I live in Brentwood estates which have around 1000 persons. Yet there is not good pedestrian access across Main St at 30th St. Some of the few businesses within walking distance from Brentwood are across Main at 30th. So some sort of cross walk would be helpful in many ways. I also bike from 30th to places to the west and coming home I choose to ride on the sidewalk rather than try to cross Main Street twice with in 2 blocks. I am wondering if there could be two way bike lanes on both sides of the street in this area from 28 to 32?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>I hope this corridor becomes a safer and more pleasant place to walk and take transit and also be able to handle traffic as efficiently as possible while making improvements for all modes of transportation from personal to public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>I have friends who live in the Thurston area and work downtown, and my responses to the survey reflect the concerns I hear most from them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>I fear access will be restricted for semi trucks making deliveries or pickups at our location, if a median is installed. This would impact financially us and others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>I don't think our traffic planners have a realistic picture of what people want. Most people drive cars because cars are more convenient than</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
bicycles or public transit. The majority of us will continue to feel that way no matter how many more bike lanes and bus stops you put in. Changes that negatively impact vehicle traffic simply inconvenience the maximum number of people to benefit a few. They merely increase congestion and driver frustration; they don’t significantly alter people’s choices. Forcing people to give up driving – as the Eugene city planners have openly admitted they’re trying to do -- is not a form of representative government, it’s a form of government shoving its own agenda upon people without regard for what the public wants. What most people want is good roads that can be traveled smoothly and efficiently to their destination – by car.

I don’t feel it’s right for a private company (LTD) to get the sole benefit from this proposed idea. And I certainly don’t approve of any person or business having to give up property for LTD to make more money in the name of “safety”. Lowering the speed limit and ENFORCING it, holding pedestrians liable for walking distracted (drugs, phone use, dark clothing, etc), more crosswalks with lights, enforcing code 5.054 to keep people from crossing in traffic without using designated crosswalks.

I don’t feel it’s right for a private company (LTD) to get the sole benefit from this proposed idea. And I certainly don’t approve of any person or business having to give up property for LTD to make more money in the name of “safety”. Lowering the speed limit and ENFORCING it, holding pedestrians liable for walking distracted (drugs, phone use, dark clothing, etc), more crosswalks with lights, enforcing code 5.054 to keep people from crossing in traffic without using designated crosswalks.

I am very concerned with traffic, pedestrians and LTD stop near the 51 street area. It is VERY congested in this area when there is Westbound traffic flowing, Eastbound traffic is moving into the center lane to turn north onto 51 street, the pedestrian signs are flashing, bicycles in the bike lane, an LTD bus is stopping at their stop. It is just too much happening in a short area. As a driver only through this area, I am always very cautious through here and worried about the drivers who always seem to move in and out of lanes in a hurry and driving faster than the posted 35 mph. Rarely do I see traffic moving less than 40mph even though the limit was reduced to 35mph a couple years ago. I doubt that reducing the limit would change the traffic. I don’t have any suggestions for improvements, but I wanted to let you know of my concerns.

Good questions ? Easy to navigate ! Thank you for asking for our input and please listen.

Get going on EmX extension out to Thurston ASAP. Get Rep. DeFazio to help secure federal funds while he is chair of House Transportation Committee. Locate some of the EmX platforms in center of ROW. Those stations would each have a pedestrian overpass with a stairway down to the platform. This way we get much-needed pedestrian overpasses, but we get the feds to cover the bulk of the cost. Visit the Las Vegas Strip to see many different configurations of pedestrian overpasses with stairways, elevators, and escalators.

Fixing Main Street is a safety issue, but it’s also an economic development issue. I don’t shop on Main St. outside of Downtown Springfield because it’s challenging to access, even in a car. High speeds don’t make it easy for cars to access. We have an actual highway (I-105/126), what we need is a street for people to use. The way Main St. is currently used completely prohibits the city from making it anything resembling a safe and accessible place. Fix the unsafe conditions and you will see many other benefits, including economic development, GHG reduction, increased transit/walk/bike usage, and most importantly happy residents.

first, you can’t fix or regulate stupid. second, change the cross walks crossing light from flashing yellow to similar to Harlow road that warns
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment number</th>
<th>Full comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>drivers and site peds that feel that they can just push a button and start walking across the street without looking. I think that they think that time just stops for everyone else when that button is pressed. Time the traffic lights better, saves fuel and fewer stops. pull outs for the buses so you don't block traffic and force traffic to go around. Better lighting at intersections. add a few more speed signs stating 35mph, other than that there is nothing that you can do if people don't use common sense like looking before crossing the road and if it is not safe to cross, don't fight for your right-a-way. finally, bad drivers, following too close, etc. education and enforcement. I know people that don't stop for stop signs. when I tell them the danger (and the law) of what they are doing, the comment is mostly, &quot;oh, I did not realize&quot; lastly, no more round-a-bouts! Franklin Blvd, OMG! was the architect drunk? That's an accident waiting to happen especially at night in the rain.</td>
<td>67 Even though some things have been done and it has helped, there are still many who don't cross at crosswalks and divers who don't follow the rules. Human nature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMX should be extended to Thurston.</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't ignore safety issues downtown. All the wonderful new businesses &amp; 3 High Schools bring a lot of pedestrians &amp; it is dangerous to cross Main St.</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donâ€™t be duped by LTD! I was in a meeting where a LTD Executive said he didnâ€™t care what the people wanted, it they decided they wanted to do it, theyâ€™d do it! I was shocked!</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider EmX lanes in medians to both improve transit and make for easier crossings with median stations (similar to EmX design on Franklin with large landscapes median).</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cars run thru the 42nd light even after its red. Sometimes 4 cars will turn in front of pedestrians when we have the walk sign. They also speed . My other concern us gateway st. Its light and pedestrian system is totally dangerous. Just like main st. Please look at it a)so</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bring speed down to 35 out to lane reduction to two lanes. That should keep speed at maybe 40 for most. This is not a freeway as one officer once stated as he was attending to an accident between 58th . and 61st.. MORE crosswalks.. This is still residential out to around 70th</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges over main for pedestrians cause they don't use the light crosswalk the still run across the street even just when they are a block or less from them I live on south 35th street and see this all the time so cameras maybe to see those who don't use the crosswalk signal the signal can captured on tape and then ticket then like they do for drivers I use those lighted crosswalk and drivers do stop so they work for those of us who do drive and walk but I've seen accident from someone just a block from the crosswalks cause people don't want to walk a block so us drivers are very alert here on 35th as I've seen cause their a lot of children just in my little road it's a dead end street we feel safe here but once u get to main it goes away sorry it's so long but it's a real concern my autistic sons use this crossing every-day and I worry about them I have them call me as soon as they Cross with the light to make sure they get across safety but maybe crossbridge would be better sorry to go on but I was born and raised here this is home I just want everyone to be see safe on main</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better street lighting past 58th would help as would restriping the streets with a higher volume of reflective beads in the paint. When it is dark and wet, the lane markers are so hard to see. More traffic circles at major intersections would keep the traffic flowing better, eliminate the &quot;need&quot; for speed to slip through a yellow light, and is a natural traffic calming agent.</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment number</td>
<td>Full comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Because of my job at times I have found myself driving this corridor many times a day. I have observed pedestrians who are literally a few feet away from the safety of guarded intersections or crosswalks and do not use them. Instead they simply walk out across all of the lanes of traffic, sometimes dodging traffic or standing in the lanes waiting for cars to pass so they can proceed. All the while seemingly clueless that they cannot be seen very well standing alone in the lanes. I’ve also noticed a decrease in the posted speed limit but most motorists still drive at or above the old 40 mph speed limit. Rarely have I seen law enforcement enforcing the posted speed limit along this corridor. I think there needs to be more enforcement towards pedestrians violating crossing rules and educating also.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Bear in mind businesses do not have enough parking or access for deliveries as it is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Although I live in Eugene, I travel through this corridor frequently for work. The section of the survey on transit improvements was poorly worded and the choices weren’t thought through well; for example, it’s not the size of the bus that impacts the cost of the service; it’s the cost of the driver.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Allow new business to open or expand along main street. Encourage housing in unusual spaces like an upper floor of a business or industrial loft space. A little more congestion with cars and trucks going slower and people living along and accessing the business there could be a positive outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Absolutely need police patrol and speed enforcement. That will solve all other issues. South A is crazy during rush hour. Allowing railroad traffic at 28th during peak traffic times is also crazy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>A potential solution for bicycles could possibly be a bike path from Island Park to 28th on the South side of South A st giving bicycles a route absolutely free of automobiles as well as extending the path from the park to the UofO. This would give bikes an alternative route to Main Street and theoretical lessen accidents involving bicycles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>A Dutch Engineer, Hans Monderman found that signs that show movement work...running children,moving horses,rocks falling got people’s attention...lots of signs not just a few, also posted double or triple fines for speeding in high traffic areas trucks in one lane only...or speed bumps that still must travel this road but slower hope I helped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>(Prodject Team, AKA. City Council) stop selling out the american people, AKA. People of Springfield by implementing for LTD. At the expense of our pacheck, AKA. Tax dollars.!!!!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix C: Email Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| LK MORRIS (added to general comments list and values data) | Issues & Values:  
Safety - 6  
Traffic Mobility - 4  
Local Business Access - 0  
Main Street Character - 2  
Transit - 3  
Cost - 6  
---------  
COMMENTS:  
I have lived on Main St. near 60th Place for almost 20 yrs.  
Drop Main St./Hwy 126 speed limit to 35 all the way East to city limit. Synchronize ALL traffic lights on Main St. for a smooth traffic flow. You'll get there!  
On Main on each side of 60th Place: Keep sidewalks clear for wheelchairs, strollers- ie; clear off thick pine needles and leaf debris collecting over half the sidewalks. Dangerous to navigate, jog or walk to avoid ankle/leg injuries or worse. Garbage and recycling cans block sidewalks for wheelchairs, pedestrians, strollers, often left out for days. Employ daily trash pickup from bus stop receptacles on Main to beautify the corridor through our beautiful town. Please add my comments in your consideration. Thank you. |
| RB Garden | Put up more signals all along the route and have all of them timed to allow traffic to roll along at 35mph. Time the lights so the side streets and pedestrians get an allotted time to cross without slowing down traffic flow. Do not let pedestrians or traffic change the timing of the lights.  
Once everyone gets use to rolling along at 35, traffic and pedestrians will all have ample asses to a safer street. When a car enters the street (somewhere between the timed signals) they could have no more than one stop at a red light and then they are in the flow of 35MPH. This is a well know way of moving cars and keeping places safe for all other users.  
This does mean you will take away the flashing pedestrian signals you currently use, very disruptive to traffic. When traffic flows everyone benefits and the environment (air quality) benefits as well. If some wants to speed, they will be rushing to red light after red light. Everyone will learn to roll along. |
Other Comment Submission Summary

Overview
During the first round of community engagement (10/31/18 – 1/2/19), the project team received 26 total inquiries/comments related to the project from 25 individuals outside of the online open house, focus groups, and SAC Meeting #1 forums. Eleven comments were submitted via the project webpage, ten were sent via email to the project email address or directly to project team members, four comments were made over the phone, and one comment was made in person at the City of Springfield Development and Public Works counter.

Observations & Values
In the case of two comments the individuals had experienced difficulties sharing their input via the online open house, so the content of those comments was incorporated into the Online Open House Summary. Of the remaining 24 submissions, one-third primarily pertained to planning process-related questions/comments. Main comment themes for those sharing experiences on the corridor and values we should consider as the project team develops alternative solutions to address safety problems on Main Street: observations of safety problems (speeding vehicles, inadequate bicycle/pedestrian facilities, and unpredictable/erratic pedestrian/cyclist/skateboarder movement) and suggestions for increased traffic enforcement (automated and motor team) and safety education. To a lesser degree, submissions touched on local business access, cost, transit, and traffic mobility. Refer to Appendix A for comment details.
Appendix

Other Comment Submission Summary
## Appendix A: Other Comment Submissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Full comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Alberty</td>
<td>Sp I am a resident of the area of 54th and Main. I am one of the statistics of hit and run. Our intersection is in major need of some safety upgrades. I would like to suggest traffic cameras to catch photos of the vehicles along with more specified time for pedestrians to cross and more police presence to enforce the laws and regulations of the Dmv about crosswalks. Thank you for taking the time to read my concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie Leech</td>
<td>If you would put in roundabouts. You would solve all your problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad Marks</td>
<td>You need to re-open the OPEN HOUSE. I'm sure there are others like me who had no notification until my &quot;Main Street&quot; letter was hand delivered, after the 12/5 deadline. I would like to comment via the open house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudia Potter</td>
<td>Why not save lives, save property, save money, save jobs. It's a win win. I keep both my jobs, yes one at each end of town. Both bosses get to keep their property yes at both ends of town. You save money usable elsewhere and you won't have to pay out thousands to a lawyer fighting people who want to keep their property. Or thousands for roundabouts that just DON'T work takes me an average of 3 1/2 min to enter Franklin Blvd and 5 min. to get to the bridge entering Springfield. You've raised the taxes and lowered the value but I noticed that a lower value was only on property the City wants, strange how that works. The way I see it the city should have planned for extension of city limits and potential growth when 1st established. But it seems it's easier to take eminent domain and nothing the property owner says will change it. I can guarantee that not ONE of the men and women sitting on ANY city counsel, Bicycle and pedestrian advisory committee, Committee Development committee, Glenwood renewal advisory committee, planning commission, public safety council, and all the rest of the committees involved in the take over and theft of private property. are losing any of theirs, guaranteed! Oh and we can't forget about the Metro policy committee made up of privately held companies that pretty much tell the city the who, what and where and how to jump of what they want. And it makes no difference whether I got all the names correct or how you all plan the take over, what matters is the city will lie and steal to get what they want! God help us all!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Corliss</td>
<td>Craig left a voicemail. Craig said that he owns property at 4343 Main Street and that he is on City’s mailing list and that he completed the online survey. He was inquiring if the City has any information about possible zone changes and wants to make sure he has an opportunity to comment. He shared his email address and his cell phone number.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daren Dawson</td>
<td>Hello, Having lived and commuted main street for 2 decades, I have noticed a steady increase in traffic density over the years. With this increase in traffic, there has also been an increase in foot traffic in the area. My observation has been that a larger portion of pedestrians are not using cross walks regularly or cutting diagonal across main st (58th-72nd) when they should be crossing at street corners. This is especially prevalent around the 57th &amp; 58th street area of main street which is frustrating as there are stoplight crossings in this area. The new crosswalks crossing further west (56th - 32nd), are often times treat it like a game of chicken, waiting for a car to get close, hit the button and run out in front of traffic or cut the corners outside of the designated crossings. I personally would like to see the police step up effort of citing illegal Jay-Walking. Any new crossings will only be effective if the the pedestrians use them correctly. There are 2 ingredients in vehicle/pedestrian crashes, and both need to obey the laws designed to keep the community safe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Allen</td>
<td>Mr. Allen saw Register Guard article promoting Online Open House but preferred to share comments in person. He is a retired mail carrier who worked in Springfield for many years on Main Street. He suggested a media blitz to educate jaywalkers, as he doesn't think the City...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Full comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evan Morris</td>
<td>install traffic lights at 48th/main. Poles are already there. have police &quot;run radar&quot; on main. I drive main street all the time never see any radar enforcement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanalei Rozen</td>
<td>I ride my bike on the sidewalk. Street too dangerous. Unfortunately the side walk is upheaved a lot or otherwise not the best for biking( tree limbs, berries...) Nor should that be my preferred lane. Would be glad if BPAC had an open house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hank McCormick</td>
<td>Hank spoke with City staff who left a note with Emma. Emma returned his call. He was inquiring about the traffic study at 21st and Main and wanted to know the status. He owns property at 21st and Main (103 S. 21st St) and 40th and Main. He is concerned about the potential for right-of-way impacts of a roundabout at 21st and Main. He would also like to see more police enforcement, specifically of people walking, biking, and skateboarding in unpredictable and illegal ways. He said that he has seen officers observe people skating and biking the wrong way in the bike lane and not doing anything about it. Emma shared information about the crosswalk enforcement efforts that happened in 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ina Mounir</td>
<td>Ina left voicemail with Molly, and she forwarded message to Michael Liebler as her concerns were related to crosswalks in Downtown Springfield (outside of project scope).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Andress Jr</td>
<td>Vehicles using center turn lane for a merge lane is so very dangerous and i thought illegal. But I see people do it and police do nothing about it. Last week a bicycle rider was going the wrong way in bike lane and a springfield police man sitting watching main let him ride by without the police man doing anything about the law breaking individual. ENFORCE THE LAWS WE ALREADY HAVE . The buses need pullout bus stops so they are not stopping in the right lane. We should have jay walking laws enforced to stop all the pedestrians from crossing in dangerous spots. Pedestrians need to get off their phones and take some responsibilities and look both ways. Call me old school or common sense minded. Thank you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Rombach</td>
<td>Sirs; As a longtime property owner on Main St. (and an on-going person who has interest), I am interested in knowing on how project funding will be done. I did not see on existing web-site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Wetzell</td>
<td>Dear Springfield Public Works, I am not sure this is going to the right place, and if it's not, maybe you could forward it to the right person. Why has Springfield, not put actual red lights at pedestrian crossings on Main Street, like they have in other parts of Springfield? Such as the one on Harlow Road by the Pheasant Street EMX stop. Those little flashing lights on the side of the road are hard to see, and especially so, when most people unfortunately don’t pay attention to cross walks. Is there anyway to make some more pullouts for the bus, so the bus doesn’t always stop on the road? Unfortunately, even with the pedestrian crossings, not everyone will use them. So, if someone is caught not using one, they need a ticket. And that is hard to enforce because we don’t have the resources or police force to enforce a jay walking law. Not sure if we even have one. Someone suggested installing cameras, and sending tickets to those that don’t stop at cross walks that are lit up. How about speed radar cameras that will catch those going over the speed limit by more than 3-5 miles an hour? Speeding is a major issue! The 126 is awful. Until consequences are given out for speeding, not a lot will change on Main Street, the 126, or anywhere else for that matter. With a lack of police officers, cameras are the next best thing and yet both cost money. The question then becomes, what is most cost effective and will get the job done to make Springfield a safer place to live. These red lights for pedestrian crossing would also be great to have on Pioneer Parkway where very few people ever stop to let pedestrians cross at the cross walk. There are also issues with the timing of lights on Springfield, but I will leave that topic for another time. Warm regards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Full comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Lax</td>
<td>Hi Michael, Hope you are well. Does this mean they are revisiting the crosswalk by our house?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Edelberg</td>
<td>Molly, I am the owner of AAA Budget Storage on Main Street. I know that last year there was some discussion about widening main street by between 8 and 16 feet to make “improvements”. This would have a devastating effect on my business as well as many others along Main Street. I am wondering if any of these plans are still on the table. Thank you for your time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LK Morris</td>
<td>Hello Molly, I had trouble twice with the jla website twice when it crashed and I had to start over! This was on Dec. 4th, the day before the deadline to submit my comments/survey. It didn’t go through, as I checked it later. I am soo disappointed. Here is what I submitted: Issues &amp; Values: Safety – 6 Traffic Mobility – 4 Local Business Access – 0 Main Street Character – 2 Transit – 3 Cost - 6 COMMENTS: I have lived on Main St. near 60th Place for almost 20 yrs. Drop Main St./Hwy 126 speed limit to 35 all the way East to city limit. Synchronize ALL traffic lights on Main St. for a smooth traffic flow. You'll get there!On Main on each side of 60th Place: Keep sidewalks clear for wheelchairs, strollers-ie; clear off thick pine needles and leaf debris collecting over half the sidewalks. Dangerous to navigate, jog or walk to avoid ankle/leg injuries or worse. Garbage and recycling cans block sidewalks for wheelchairs, pedestrians, strollers, often left out for days. Employ daily trash pickup from bus stop receptacles on Main to beautify the corridor through our beautiful town. Please add my comments in your consideration. Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcia VanOrman</td>
<td>What is the current thinking about cameras to catch those who run red lights?? I'm amazed that this hasn't been put in place in this area long ago. I understand there is a cost to implement them, but on Main Street, there are only 3 such intersections that are critical at this point, in my humble opinion. It would be a start. The crosswalk signals and lights are GREAT, but many pedestrians just wander across anywhere they please and sometimes are stuck in the median strip, waiting for a break in the traffic to complete their journey. I sometimes wonder if they are drunk or just plain stupid!!!! I've had to suddenly stop many times, to avoid hitting such people. There's no system possible to protect against such behavior, but those in cars can certainly be photographed and charged accordingly, reducing that behavior in a fairly short time. The sudden change in Portland's jaywalking behavior was astounding. People just don't want to deal with large fines. When logic doesn't work, fines do! Thank you for responding to me. I'd be happy to participate in any way to assist with this process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcia VanOrman</td>
<td>My biggest concern in this part of Oregon (Eugene and Springfield) is the chronic running of red lights. Since living here, I've finally gotten to automatically expect someone to enter the intersection, crossing my path, after they have a red light. Running a caution light happens, on rare occasions, anywhere in the State, but here it is common to enter the intersection after the red light appears. I've almost been hit on several occasions after moving here almost 3 years ago. If the offenses are caught on camera and the fines are significant, this problem will diminish greatly and lives will be saved. This happened in Portland, in order to control the chronic jaywalking downtown, which was the standard for decades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilla Cook</td>
<td>I think it would help if people were taught the proper way to cross streets. Stop, look both directions. If cars are coming, don't cross. I have seen people walking along the sidewalk, then suddenly turn and start across the street. If cars are coming, there is a screeching of brakes, honking of horns, and the pedestrian usually yells at the driver of the car. Also...the crosswalks are a good idea, but the pedestrian should always wait on the sidewalk until the cars have stopped. Don't start across the street assuming the cars will stop. They often don't. If I pushed the button and as soon as the flashing yellow lights came on I started across the street...I would've been roadkill many, many times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Full comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Eyster</td>
<td>Thank you for the information. Will you be issuing instructions on how to log in to the open house? Is there a particular time frame for the open house on Nov. 7?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miki Van Winkel</td>
<td>Good Afternoon to whom it may concern, The business I work for received your letter regarding what to do to make Main St. a safer place for all. Until the people start acting in a safe manner your improvements will not be very effective. I have seen people crossing main street not 50 feet from the designated lighted up cross walks that the city spent so much time and energy putting in. It is not a city issue that those people choose to take the unsafe path, that is a personal responsibility issue. I sit and look at Main Street all day and even though the speed limit has been decreased you would not know it by the speed at which the cars travel. Once again, it the responsibly of the person to monitor their speed and actions. The city has done what it thought was best by lowering the limits. Unless the police start sitting there daily and getting the speeders they will continue. Take me for example, I drive faster than the posted limits on the freeways but several years ago I knew to slow down going through the Coburg area because I did not want a ticket. It was the knowledge that he was there and it was up to me to either slow down or get a ticket because I knew there was someone there to enforce it. As far as the new round about in Glenwood, I must say it has been great for business. There are more accidents coming to body shops because of that than there was from light that used to be there. Once again until the people start taking self responsibly you as a city and ODOT can throw as much money as you want into all the projects but at what point do you also realize that there are factors out side our control that money cannot fix? Like the actions of the people you are trying your best to protect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB Garden</td>
<td>Put up more signals all along the route and have all of them timed to allow traffic to roll along at 35mph. Time the lights so the side streets and pedestrians get an allotted time to cross without slowing down traffic flow. Do not let pedestrians or traffic change the timing of the lights. Once everyone gets use to rolling along at 35, traffic and pedestrians will all have ample asses to a safer street. When a car enters the street (somewhere between the timed signals) they could have no more than one stop at a red light and then they are in the flow of 35MPH. This is a well know way of moving cars and keeping places safe for all other users. This does mean you will take away the flashing pedestrian signals you currently use, very disruptive to traffic. When traffic flows everyone benefits and the environment (air quality) benefits as well. If some wants to speed, they will be rushing to red light after red light. Everyone will learn to roll along.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Kuehn</td>
<td>Hi Molly, Your name was on the mailing we got today (so you get this!). You may know who we are - EDMS - we pick up and process the mail for the City every day. We did pick up and mail this one 1st class presort, but I just wanted to let you know that if you sent more than 200, it would have qualified for bulk. Maybe it was not that many since it looks like it was directed to a limited area... I also want to let you know that we have really increased our color printing capacity in the last couple of years, so this is something we could print and mail. We do some bulk mailings for Public Works and Planning. Just letting you know! And lowering the speed limit out here really helped!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Hartman</td>
<td>Sue Hartman called to explain she thought she had an issue with the Main Street Safety Project Online Open House since when she clicked a button all of the data entry fields seemed to go blank. She was also wondering when the Online Open House would be open until since Dec 5th is the last day. Emma called JLA, confirmed her comments had been submitted and documented, and returned the call to Sue to let her know. She also shared that the Online Open House will be available for people to submit input all night.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobin Fetters</td>
<td>Traffic enforcement, every one knows that the City doesn't enforce the speed limit on Main. A larger Police presents would do wonders for safety. Start writing tickets for once...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Safety – Increase the safety of Main Street for all users
Objectives: Identify infrastructure solutions that:

✓ Achieve a significant reduction in fatalities and serious injuries
✓ Achieve a significant reduction in the frequency of crashes along the corridor

Note: The primary purpose of the Main Street Safety Project is to improve safety. For a design solution to advance, it must demonstrate an improvement to safety above all other goals.

Business Community – Support the viability of existing and future businesses
Objectives: Identify infrastructure solutions that:

✓ Provide access for customers and deliveries to businesses along Main Street corridor
✓ Respond to business owner needs and support the visibility and economic development of Main Street
✓ Respond to property owner needs and support the potential for future businesses to locate on Main Street

Mobility – Ensure people and goods travel efficiently and reliably through the corridor
Objectives: Identify infrastructure solutions that:

✓ Maintain the efficiency and reliability of passenger vehicle operations through the corridor
✓ Maintain the efficiency and reliability of transit operations through the corridor
✓ Retain freight vehicle mobility along Main Street

Transportation Choices – Create a multimodal environment that connects people and destinations
Objectives: Identify infrastructure solutions that:

✓ Ensure access to services and destinations along Main Street for all members of the community at all income levels, including seniors, people with disabilities, children, and people of color.
✓ Create safe, comfortable and efficient pedestrian and bicycle access along Main Street.
✓ Support existing transit service and accommodate enhanced transit service in the future

Vital Community – Support the vitality of the community and its vision for Main Street
Objectives: Identify infrastructure solutions that:

✓ Improve the appearance and aesthetics of Main Street to make it a vibrant place for those who live, work, shop and travel through the corridor
✓ Create an environment consistent with the Main Street Vision Plan
✓ Support access to destinations along Main Street, as well as those that rely on access from Main Street

Feasibility – Develop a plan with a clear and achievable approach to implementation
Objectives: Identify infrastructure solutions that:

✓ Can be implemented within five years through anticipated funding sources and acceptable project delivery approaches
✓ Ensure the cost-effective expenditure of resources
### AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting Date:</strong></td>
<td>3/11/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting Type:</strong></td>
<td>Work Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff Contact/Dept.:</strong></td>
<td>Emma Newman/DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff Phone No:</strong></td>
<td>541.726.4585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Time:</strong></td>
<td>40 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council Goals:</strong></td>
<td>Maintain and Improve Infrastructure and Facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SPRINGFIELD CITY COUNCIL

### ITEM TITLE:
TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN IMPLEMENTATION PROJECT

### ACTION REQUESTED:
Decide whether or not to develop a Council Alternative for motor vehicle parking and street standards sections of the recommended Springfield Development Code amendments. If a Council Alternative is desired, direct staff on developing the Alternative.

### ISSUE STATEMENT:
The City of Springfield adopted the 2035 Transportation System Plan (TSP) in 2014. The Transportation System Plan Implementation Project is following direction from the adopted TSP to update the Springfield Development Code, adopt a Conceptual Street Map as a new TSP Figure, and make some changes to the TSP Project List and existing Figures to further implement already adopted policies.

### ATTACHMENTS:
- Attachment 1: Communication Briefing Memo

Please bring your paper copies of the TSP Implementation Project Planning Commission Recommendation that were provided to Council via mailboxes on December 3, 2018 and the Transportation System Plan that was provided following the January work session. The Planning Commission Recommendation can be found in electronic form on the project website.

### DISCUSSION/FINANCIAL IMPACT:
Council is preparing for a joint public hearing with Lane County. During the 1/14/19 work session, Council gave direction to staff to develop Council Alternatives for specific pieces of the Planning Commission Recommendation in order to seek public comment on those Alternatives in addition to the Planning Commission Recommendation.

In prior work sessions, Council has asked for more information on motor vehicle parking and street standards as recommended by the Planning Commission. To answer these questions and determine whether or not Council would like to develop Council Alternatives for these sections of the Code, staff will share the draft Springfield Development Code amendments that were proposed, the comments that the Planning Commission received, and how the Planning Commission chose to respond to the comments and address the topics raised. Staff will provide options to the Council and seek input on how to proceed in preparation for the public hearing. Attachment 1 provides information on both the motor vehicle parking and street standards topics.

Copies of the Springfield 2035 TSP were provided to each Councilor in their City Manager’s Office mailboxes. Chapter 2 of the TSP provides adopted goals, policies, and actions that this project is working to further implement. Chapter 7 provides direction for the TSP Implementation project.

The May 6 work session is reserved for continued discussion on the TSP Implementation Project.
MEMORANDUM

City of Springfield

Date: 3/11/2019
To: Gino Grimaldi
From: Tom Boyatt, Interim DPW Director
      Sandy Belson, Interim CMD Manager
      Emma Newman, Senior Transportation Planner
Subject: TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN IMPLEMENTATION PROJECT

ISSUE:
The City of Springfield adopted the 2035 Transportation System Plan (TSP) in 2014. The Transportation System Plan Implementation Project is following direction from the adopted TSP to update the Springfield Development Code, adopt a Conceptual Street Map as a new TSP Figure, and make some changes to the TSP Project List and existing Figures to further implement already adopted policies.

COUNCIL GOALS/
MANDATE:
Maintain and Improve Infrastructure and Facilities

BACKGROUND:
In preparation for a joint public hearing with Lane County on the full package of TSP Implementation project materials, staff has provided information below regarding the motor vehicle parking and street standards sections of the Springfield Development Code (SDC) amendments (Exhibit A of the Planning Commission Recommendation). Options for action are provided at the bottom of each section. Where recommendation or “recommended” is mentioned, it refers to the Planning Commission Recommendation for this project.

Per Council’s process direction from the January 14, 2018 work session, Council may decide to develop a Council Alternative for specific topics to put out for public comment alongside the Planning Commission Recommendation.

1. Motor Vehicle Parking
Location in Code: The motor vehicle parking standards are located in Springfield Development Code sections 4.6-110, 4.6-115, 4.6-120, and 4.6-125. The recommended amendments to these standards and supporting commentary, which provide explanation of the recommended changes and relevant TSP policies from TSP Chapter 2, are shown on pages 47 – 59 of Exhibit A of the Planning Commission Recommendation. Council received paper copies of Exhibit A in the TSP Implementation project packets that were provided for the January 14, 2019 work session.

Overview
The recommended amendments:
1) Reduce the number of on-site motor vehicle parking spaces developers must provide for single-family dwellings, duplexes, and manufactured dwellings when on-street parking is provided;
2) Reduce the multi-family dwelling requirement from 1.5 parking spaces per dwelling unit to 1;
3) Set a maximum number of parking spaces allowed (125% of the minimum) for non-
residential uses; and
4) Provide a broader range of options (SDC 4.6-110G-M) for reducing motor vehicle parking space requirements through a streamlined process that does not require a Variance application and approval.

These changes are intended to implement TSP Policy 2.7 Action 1 by allowing more land to be utilized for development. Based on input from Councilor Wylie, serving as the Council Liaison on the project’s Stakeholder Sounding Board, SDC 4.6-110C was added to ensure parking reductions will not reduce the number of required ADA parking spaces.

The recommended amendments also align with broader transportation trends to reduce motor vehicle parking spaces across the state and nation, given the recent evolution in mobility options (i.e. rideshare, increased transit, etc.) and the acknowledgement that many jurisdictions have required developments to provide more parking spaces than are actually utilized. The amendments are a moderate, incremental step in the direction of reducing motor vehicle parking space requirements and providing more flexibility in how the number of required off-street parking spaces is determined.

**Question 1A - Does Council want to propose any changes to the recommended number of motor vehicle parking spaces required (Table 4.6-2)?**

**Table 4.6-2 Recommended Motor Vehicle Parking Space Amendments**

The following code amendments section is copied and pasted from the Planning Commission Recommendation Exhibit A document (SDC 4.6-125, Table 4.6-2, showing the changes to existing code highlighted in yellow.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Minimum Parking Requirements (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwellings-single-family, duplexes and manufactured</td>
<td>2 for each dwelling; 1 for each dwelling when on-street parking is planned and provided; or 2 for each dwelling when no on-street parking is provided, or when provided on-street parking is planned to be eliminated or repurposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwellings-cluster subdivisions</td>
<td>See applicable dwelling unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwellings-multiple family other than quads or quints</td>
<td>1.5 for each dwelling unit; 1 for each dwelling unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwellings-quads or quint</td>
<td>0.75 for each bedroom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Minimum and Maximum Parking Requirements (1) (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Centers</td>
<td>1 drop-off space for each 700 square feet of gross floor area, plus 1 long-term space for each 350 square feet of gross floor area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Facilities</td>
<td>Public/Private 2 for each classroom, plus 1 elementary/middle school for each 100 square feet of 6 or more student’s the largest public assembly area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Care Facilities</td>
<td>0.25 for each bedroom or dwelling unit plus 1 per full time employee on the busiest shift.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Utility Facilities</td>
<td>None, unless utility vehicles will be parked overnight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transient Accommodations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bed and breakfast facilities, boarding and rooming houses and hotels</td>
<td>1 plus 1 for each guest bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency shelter homes</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth hostels</td>
<td>0.3 for each guest bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating and drinking establishments</td>
<td>1 for each 100 square feet of gross floor area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational facilities and religious, social and public institutions</td>
<td>1 for each 100 square feet of floor area in the primary assembly area and 1 for each 200 square feet of gross floor area for the remainder of the building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail sales, personal service, including small scale repair and maintenance and offices</td>
<td>1 for each 300 square feet of gross floor area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping centers and malls</td>
<td>1 for each 250 square feet of gross floor area, exclusive of covered pedestrian walkways. Once a shopping center or mall has been approved, no additional parking shall be required, unless there is new construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation facilities</td>
<td>1 for each 300 square feet of gross floor area not including vehicle storage areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehouse commercial sales</td>
<td>1 for each 600 square feet of gross floor area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacture and assembly, and other primary industrial uses</td>
<td>1 for each 500 square feet industrial of gross floor area (manufacture and assembly) for each 1000 square feet of gross floor area (warehousing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary industrial uses</td>
<td>See applicable use in this table</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Table 4.6-2 establishes minimum off-street parking required for various uses except as may be reduced in accordance with the provisions of Section 4.6-110.
2. Table 4.6-2 establishes maximum off-street parking requirements for all uses except residential dwelling units. Maximum off-street parking is 125 percent of the minimum off-street parking required above in Table 4.6-2, except as may be increased by the Director based upon an approved Parking Generation Study prepared by a professional Transportation Engineer licensed by the State of Oregon and an approved Transportation Demand Management Plan.

**Public Input**

Bree Nicolello, in her public comment submitted to the Springfield Planning Commission on February 13, 2018, stated “I am in support of streamlining parking requirements to support livable development that prioritizes housing units over vehicular parking. In my work as a land use planner, I have had to eliminate dwelling units to accommodate the required amount of parking spaces. As our area is facing a housing crisis and there is a shortage of units throughout Lane County, it is difficult to sacrifice a place for an individual or family to live in favor of a parking space.”

**Planning Commission Deliberation**

The Planning Commission agreed with the testimony and did not make any changes to the initial proposal.
Council Options for Question 1A:

- Proceed with a public hearing on the Planning Commission recommended amendments to Table 4.6-2 in SDC 4.6-125 for motor vehicle parking space requirements.
- Develop a Council Alternative for Table 4.6-2, direct staff on development of the Alternative

Question 1B - What additional options does Council want to provide to allow for a reduction in the number of required parking spaces (implementing TSP Policies 2.7 and 3.8)?

Existing Code Compared to Recommended Code Amendments

Existing SDC 4.6-120.1 allows a developer to substitute additional bicycle parking for up to 25% of required vehicle parking. The recommended code language (see SDC 4.6-110.G-M) provides more options to reduce required motor vehicle parking spaces. The following table shows a comparison of the existing code to the recommended code for parking space reduction options and processes.

### Parking Space Reduction Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Code</th>
<th>Planning Commission Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On-street parking may substitute for some parking spaces (SDC 4.6-110F)</td>
<td>On-street parking may substitute for some parking spaces – <em>clarifies that on-street parking must be planned and provided</em> (i.e. cannot count planned bike lane space as “on-street parking” for reduction purposes) (SDC 4.6-110G)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Additional bike parking may substitute for up to 25% of required vehicle parking (SDC 4.6-120I) | Parking reduction of up to 20% total for a combination of:
  - Additional bike parking (≤20%)
  - Abutting frequent transit corridor (≤15%)
  - Nearby frequent transit corridor (≤10%)
  - ADA improvements near frequent transit corridor (≤10%)
    (SDC 4.6-110 H-L)
  Reduction does not apply to ADA spaces (SDC 4.6-110C) |
| Variance process requiring professional engineering analysis                  | Exception allows for additional reduction based on substantial evidence (SDC 4.6-110M)            |

Recommended Parking Space Reduction Options Amendments

*The following code amendments section is copied and pasted from the Planning Commission Recommendation Exhibit A document (SDC 4.6-110C and SDC 4.6-110G-M).*

**C.** Parking reductions under Sections 4.6-110.H-L and Special Provisions to Table 4.6-2 shall not reduce the number of ADA parking spaces required in accordance with the minimum parking in Table 4.6-2 or under Section 4.6-110.M.

**GE.** Parking: When on-street parking is planned and provided, parking spaces in a public right-of-way directly abutting the development area may be counted as fulfilling a part of the parking requirements for a development as follows: For each 18 feet of available on-street parking,
there will be 1/2 space credit toward the required amount of off-street parking spaces. The developer is responsible for marking any on-street spaces.

H. **Motor Vehicle Parking Space Reduction Credit for Additional Bicycle Parking.** Bicycle Additional parking beyond the minimum amount required in Table 4.6-3 that complies with the bike parking standards in Sections 4.6-145 and 4.6-150 may substitute for up to 20 percent of required vehicular parking off-street motor vehicle parking otherwise required in Table 4.6-2. For every two (2) non-required bicycle parking spaces that meet the short or long term bicycle parking standards specified in Table 4.6-3, the motor vehicle parking requirement is reduced by one (1) space. When existing parking converted to bicycle parking under this subsection results in surplus motor vehicle parking spaces, the surplus parking may be converted to another use in conformance with the requirements of this Code. Existing parking may be converted to take advantage of this provision.

I. **Motor Vehicle Parking Space Reduction Credit for Frequent Transit Corridors – Abutting Sites.** Development sites abutting an existing or proposed Frequent Transit Corridor may request a reduction of up to 15 percent from minimum off-street motor vehicle parking required in Table 4.6-2.

J. **Motor Vehicle Parking Space Reduction Credit for Frequent Transit Corridors – Nearby Sites.** Development sites not abutting but within 1/4-mile of an existing or proposed Frequent Transit Corridor may request a reduction of up to 10 percent from minimum off-street motor vehicle parking required in Table 4.6-2.

K. **Reduction Credit for ADA Improvements for Frequent Transit Corridors.** Development sites abutting or within 1/4-mile of an existing or proposed Frequent Transit Corridor may receive a reduction of up to 10 percent from the minimum off-street motor vehicle parking required in Table 4.6-2 in exchange for contribution to the City for ADA improvements in the public right-of-way. The required contribution will be equal to the Base Curb Ramp Fee multiplied by each set of four parking spaces to be reduced, rounded up to the next whole number (e.g., one Base Curb Ramp Fee for 1-4 parking spaces reduced, double the Base Curb Ramp Fee for 5-8 parking spaces reduced, etc.). The Base Curb Ramp Fee must be set by Council resolution and must be approximately the cost of constructing one ADA-compliant curb ramp. Nothing in this subsection waives or alters any requirement for a developer to construct or provide on-site or off-site ADA improvements.

L. **Outside of the Downtown Exception Area and Glenwood Riverfront Mixed-Use Plan District, a cumulative maximum reduction of 20 percent of the minimum off-street parking required in Table 4.6-2 may be applied using the credits, allowances, and exceptions to minimum parking requirements established in this Code.**

M. **EXCEPTION:** The Director may authorize reductions to the minimum number of parking spaces required in Table 4.6-2, including reductions in excess of the cumulative maximum reduction specified in Section 4.6-110.K. above, based on substantial evidence that less than the minimum required parking spaces would be utilized. Substantial evidence includes, but is not limited to, the parking requirements based upon the current version of the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Parking Manual, an approved Parking Generation Study prepared by a licensed engineer, evidence regarding specific use characteristics, or evidence regarding site proximity to multi-modal improvements that are likely to reduce on-site parking demand.

**Public Input**

The Stakeholder Sounding Board (SSB) supported providing flexibility in vehicular parking requirements to allow the developer to more efficiently use a development site in locations that would be more likely to see walking, biking, and transit trips. In most situations, the sites where the on-site parking reduction would be applied would be at sites where additional bike parking is provided, at sites that are located along or nearby a frequent transit corridor, and/or for developments that have contributed to better walking access to or from the bus to the site by contributing to ADA ramp improvements. Reducing required parking allows developers to more easily use their sites for economic development, such as allowing for larger building area. Using more site area for economic uses has the effect over time of decreasing the distances between destinations and making walking, biking, and taking transit in Springfield along these specific
corridors more attractive. This aligns with the direction for the TSP Implementation project from TSP Chapter 7, which states, “Recommended implementation measures address the following... ways of supporting and promoting walking, biking, and taking transit.”

**Planning Commission Deliberations**
Commissioner Koivula raised concerns regarding the initial draft proposal to allow cumulative parking space maximum reduction of 25% of the minimum off-street parking required using a combination of space reduction options. He was not comfortable granting a total reduction of that magnitude without requiring a parking generation study (see SDC 4.6-110G-M.) to ensure that there would be no detrimental impact to the neighbors.

**Planning Commission Revisions**
- After deliberating, the Planning Commission changed the originally proposed 25% to 20% as the cumulative maximum reduction to minimum off-street parking space requirements that would be allowed without an Exception (see SDC 4.6-110.L).

**Council Options for Question 1B:**
- Support Planning Commission language for reduction options for motor vehicle parking spaces (SDC 4.6-110)
- Develop a Council Alternative for motor vehicle parking standards, direct staff on development of the Alternative

**2. Street Standards**

**Location in Code:** Public Streets and Private Streets standards are located in Springfield Development Code sections 4.2-105 and 4.2-110 respectively. Table 4.2-1, within SDC 4.2-105, sets the minimum street standards for right-of-way and curb-to-curb widths. The recommended amendments to these standards and supporting commentary, which provide explanation of the recommended changes and relevant TSP policies from TSP Chapter 2, are shown on pages 9 – 34 of **Exhibit A of the Planning Commission Recommendation**. Table 4.2-1 is on pages 13 - 14. Council received paper copies of Exhibit A in the TSP Implementation project packets that were provided for the January 14, 2019 work session.

**Overview**
The recommended amendments to the Public Streets section of the Springfield Development Code add certain street and intersection typologies (i.e. multi-way boulevard and roundabout, respectively), which have unique right-of-way and design needs. The amendments also clearly articulate the relationship between various planning documents in relation to Table 4.2-1 (see SDC 4.2-105.C).

The recommended amendments to Table 4.2-1 clarify the various minimum measurements of the components of a given street classification. Street widths for different classification streets are broken down into specific measurements for travel lanes, turn lanes, bicycle lanes, planting strips/crubs, and sidewalks. The recommended revised Table 4.2-1 provides flexibility to allow narrower street cross-sections by not including parking on one or both sides of the street. The new, recommended table also provides different standards for Major Collectors and Minor Collectors. All of the street standards except for the steep (>15 percent grade) local streets include planter strips on both sides of the street to help implement TSP policy direction to enhance the walking environment by providing a buffer between pedestrians and travel lanes.

Per feedback from the Stakeholder Sounding Board, illustrative cross-section graphics were added into SDC 4.2-105 and referenced in the Figure Number column of Table 4.2-1 to help
people visually picture what a potential street configuration that meets the standards could look like in an effort to make the Code easier to use. See pages 25 – 33 of 104 of Exhibit A of the Planning Commission Recommendation for illustrative figures of what each street classification cross-section could look like.

### Table 4.2-1 Recommended Amendments

The following code amendments section is copied and pasted from the Planning Commission Recommendation Exhibit A document (SDC 4.2-105). The current Table 4.2-1 is struck and replaced by a new table, as shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Street</th>
<th>Minimum Right-of-Way</th>
<th>Minimum Curb-to-Curb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major Arterial</td>
<td>100’</td>
<td>76’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Arterial</td>
<td>70’</td>
<td>48’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>60’</td>
<td>36’ (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— &lt;15 percent slope [1]</td>
<td>50’-57’</td>
<td>36’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— &gt;15 percent slope [1]</td>
<td>40’</td>
<td>28’ (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— &lt;1200’ length and &lt;1,000 vehicle trips/day</td>
<td>40’</td>
<td>28’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cul-de-Sac Bulb</td>
<td>83’</td>
<td>70’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alley</td>
<td>20’</td>
<td>20’ (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 2A - What standards does Council want to set for street widths (Table 4.2-1)?**

**Public Input**
The existing Development Code does not require on-street parking in all cases. One public comment opposed removing the requirement for on-street parking on some streets (see Ron and Michelle Barth written testimony). The Planning Commission also considered feedback from the Stakeholder Sounding Board (SSB). The SSB supported the draft code due to the flexibility it provided by indicating the right-of-way and curb-to-curb widths for the various different street layouts (parking both sides, parking one side, no on-street parking), the options for more context sensitive design flexibility, and more land that could be dedicated to additional housing and economically productive uses.

**Planning Commission Deliberations**
The Planning Commission spent time over the course of several meetings talking about traffic calming as a priority in response to concerns from community members about traffic speeds on local, neighborhood streets. The recommended revisions allow more flexibility for street design and could result in traffic calming benefits. If on-street parking lanes are provided on a street and...
not utilized, the wider street width conditions encourage speeding and less safe traffic conditions. Narrower streets reduce crossing distances for pedestrians and increase safety.

Planning Commission Revisions
- The Planning Commission chose to keep the street standards that allow for on-street parking on both, one, or no sides of the street

Council Options for Question 2A:
- Support Planning Commission recommended Table 4.2-1
- Develop a Council Alternative for street widths Table 4.2-1, direct staff on development of the Alternative

Question 2B - Are Planning Commission’s recommended changes sufficient to provide assurance that the standards in Table 4.2-1 will not trigger additional right-of-way dedication for Main Street?

Public Input
A few property and business owners from the Main Street corridor provided comments expressing their concerns with Table 4.2-1 Arterial Street Classification Standards (see above) since they were concerned about potential right-of-way impacts along Main Street.

Planning Commission Deliberations
The Planning Commission considered the need to have clear and objective dimensional standards for streets per state Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) requirements. The Planning Commission also discussed how the amendments to SDC 4.2-105.C explain the applicability of the Springfield TSP and other planning documents in determining street and right-of-way widths for specific streets throughout Springfield where there are planned projects.

Planning Commission Revisions
- The Planning Commission added footnote 5 to Table 4.2-1 that reads “Arterial streets that are Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) facilities are not subject to the standards in Table 4.2-1, but must meet ODOT design standards.”
- The Planning Commission also verbally responded to the concerns raised by sharing about the Main Street Safety Project planning process that is currently underway, which will result in a Main Street Facility Plan that will be adopted into the TSP. The Commission clarified that the Main Street Safety Project is separate from the TSP Implementation project.

Council Options for Question 2B:
- Support Planning Commission recommended SDC 4.2-105C, including Table 4.2-1 with footnote 5
- Develop a Council Alternative, direct staff on development of the Alternative

Question 2C - Should there be different standards for private streets? If so, what should they consist of?

Overview
Council asked about whether or not it would be possible to have a different standard for private streets inside developments. There is a Private Streets section of the code (SDC 4.2-110) for
Manufactured/Mobile Home Parks and singularly owned developments (such as apartment complexes), but staff has not been applying the Private Street standards in those instances since the Driveway standards apply to singularly owned properties. Upon closer look, staff recommends deleting SDC 4.2-110.A since the driveway standards are the appropriate standard in these cases.

Staff is seeking input from Council on whether or not to have a Private Streets standard and if so, what it should consist of. Should there be a Private Street option for partitions and subdivisions? Does Council want to create an option that limits public access to neighborhoods (such as gated communities)? If there is a Private Street standard, staff recommends keeping SDC 4.2-110.B to ensure that there are legal assurances for continued maintenance of private streets.

**Recommended Private Streets Section Amendments**

The following code amendments section is copied and pasted from the Planning Commission Recommendation Exhibit A document (SDC 4.2-110). Planning Commission did not recommend making any changes to this section.

### 4.2-110 Private Streets

**A.** Private streets are permitted within Mobile Home/Manufactured Dwelling Parks and singularly owned developments of sufficient size to permit interior circulation. Construction specifications for private streets shall be the same as for public streets.

**EXCEPTION:** During the Site Plan Review, Partition or Subdivision processes involving private streets, the Director may allow alternative construction materials and methods to be used.

**B.** The Approval Authority shall require a Homeowner’s Agreement or other legal assurances acceptable to the City Attorney for the continued maintenance of private streets.

**Council Options for Question 2C:**

- Develop a Council Alternative that removes the Private Streets section and standards from the Code (SDC 4.2-110)
- Develop a Council Alternative for Private Streets Standards, direct staff on development of the Alternative

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:** Decide whether or not to develop a Council Alternative for motor vehicle parking and street standards sections of the Springfield Development Code amendments. If a Council Alternative is desired, direct staff on developing the Alternative.
## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY</th>
<th>Meeting Date:</th>
<th>3/11/2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting Type:</td>
<td>Work Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff Contact/Dept.:</td>
<td>Niel Laudati/CMO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff Phone No:</td>
<td>541-736-7800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated Time:</td>
<td>20 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council Goals:</td>
<td>Provide Financially Responsible and Innovative Government Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SPRINGFIELD CITY COUNCIL

### ITEM TITLE:
UPDATE OF SPRINGFIELD’S 2019 LEGISLATIVE SESSION PRIORITIES

### ACTION REQUESTED:
Provide an update and get feedback on priorities for the 2019 session.

### ISSUE STATEMENT:
Based on Council direction, the City Manager’s Office developed a legislative program focusing on increasing the participation and reach of the City related to our state and federal priorities. The City’s Legislative Committee has met and discussed priorities for the session. They Committee requested council review and approve the priorities.

### ATTACHMENTS:
- Attachment 1 – Final Legislative Agenda 2019
- Attachment 2 – Legislative Update 03/05/19

### DISCUSSION/FINANCIAL IMPACT:
The Oregon Legislature convened for the long session on January 22, 2019. We have reviewed nearly 3,000 bills and more than 250 are currently being tracked. The city will work closely with Kylie Grunow who will provide a full-time presence in Salem and our regional partners to participate on behalf of the community.

The following areas are high priorities for the session (as identified by the Council Legislative Committee):

1. Housing (including mobile home park development funding bill HB3313).
2. Innovation and Economic Development (including enterprise zones and e-commerce).
3. Finance (including ROW management and PERS Reform).
4. Forest Policy (including support for advance wood projects).
5. Workforce (including reduction of limitations currently hampering high school apprenticeship programs).
6. Other priority items including: Court recordings, Telecom, Carbon Reduction and Transportation.
Springfield Legislative Agenda - 2019

In an effort to gain input and work towards an efficient and clear process for the upcoming 2019 Oregon Legislative session that runs from January 22 – June 30, 2019 the following informational outline is provided. The goal is to ensure that the Springfield community’s interests are advanced and protected throughout the legislative session.

1. Goals:
   a. Actively engage the Mayor and Council on legislative issues – identifying opportunities for leadership and participation in the legislative process.
   b. Establish ongoing communication with the local and federal delegation.
   c. Protect Springfield’s interests by monitoring proposed legislation
   d. Maintain positive working relationships with partner agencies

2. Resources and Roles:
The City is fortunate to have engaged professionals within the city who are also involved with external groups including policy bodies, advisory groups, professional associations and general interest.

Internally, we have assembled the following team to track and review bills.
1. Housing and homelessness: Sandy Belsen or Erin Fifield – DPW
2. Economic Development: Courtney Griese – CMO
3. Finance/Taxation: Nate Bell – Finance
4. Emergency Management: Ken Vogeney – DPW
5. Land Use: Sandy Belsen – DPW
6. Natural Resources: Josh Newman - DPW
7. Public Safety: Law Enforcement – Rick Lewis SPD, Joe Zaludek
8. Telecom: Neil Obringer – Finance
10. Public Contracting: Jayne McMahan – Finance
11. Labor/Risk Management: Tom Mugleston – HR
12. IT: Brandt Melick - IT

Staff roles include:
Niel Laudati: Oversees the process, communicating with City Manager, Elected Officials (state and local), supporting LC’s and staff with strategy and lobbying efforts. Coordinating with Executives as needed.
Kylie Grunow: Salem presence. Lobbying on the City’s behalf, utilizing established relationships and knowledge to advance our wants and protect our interests. Communications from the ‘field’. Coordinate LC testimony and visits to Salem.
Legislative Coordinators: Policy area leads that serve as the primary point of contact IGR Team for a related bill. Issue experts that can align internal city staff to provide testimony and also connected to external groups to clarify a bill’s impact to the City or community.
Schedule:

January 14: Initial meeting with Council Legislative Committee

January 22: Session began all Bill Managers and reviewers uploaded analysis, response, and priority recommendations.

June 21 – Session ends.

3. Communications

The Intergovernmental Relations (IGR) team will be prioritizing communications through the following resources and activities:

- Planned meetings with the Council’s IGR Committee.
- This includes a meeting of the full IGR Committee in late January to discuss upcoming legislation.
- A mid-session IGR Committee meeting if required.
- A post session IGR Committee meeting to recap the outcomes of the session.
- A weekly memo to Council, IGR Committee, and LC’s.

We will produce a bi-weekly memo that provides an overview of the major events from the legislature, status of Springfield’s Priority 1 bills, and identification of upcoming committee meetings that pertain to Springfield Priority 1 and 2 bills. City Staff will send onto Mayor and Council.

4. Draft Legislative Priorities

Through discussions with city staff and the League of Oregon Cities – along with researching of other Oregon cities the following draft priorities are provided for your approval:

1. Housing (including mobile home park development funding bill/Rep. Lively)
2. Innovation and Economic Development (including enterprise zones and e-commerce)
3. Finance (including ROW management and PERS Reform)
4. Forest Policy (including support for advance wood projects)
5. Workforce (including reduction of limitations currently hampering high school apprenticeship programs)
6. Other priority items including: Court recordings, Telecom, Carbon Reduction and Transportation
Springfield Legislative Update – March 5, 2019

Mobile Home Park Bill HB3313

The City’s Mobile Home Park bill had its first reading on March 3 and will be assigned to the House Human Services & Housing committee later this week. The chief sponsors are Rep. Lively and Senator Beyer, and Rep. Marsh was a regular sponsor. Our next steps are:

- Carefully review the bill language and identify any edits that need to be made. At this point, any changes we make will need to be amendments, but Rep. Lively is happy to help with any changes that need to be made.
- Meet with all of the members of the Housing Committee. We are looking for a date next week for city representatives to meet with members of the Committee.
- Rep. Marsh has a series of other bills supporting manufactured housing and appreciated the opportunity to sign on to ours.
- Link to the bill: https://olis.leg.state.or.us/liz/2019R1/Downloads/MeasureDocument/HB3313

Springfield provided a letter of support for HBs 2893, 2894, 2895, 2896, all aimed at stabilizing and improving the availability of manufactured homes in Oregon and all complimenting HB 3313

UGB

Following the City’s 2/15 meeting with Jim Rue, head of DLCD, and DLCD attorney Steve Shipsey, both Sen. Beyer and Rep. Lively, have some urgency to address this issue. Staff plans to speak to both the Governor’s Housing policy advisor, James LaBar, along with DLCD’s government relations director, Palmer Mason. The goal is to determine a course of action to provide more timely decisions by DLCD, including either a statutory deadline by which to make those decisions, additional funding to address the agency’s capacity issue, or both.

HB 2001 One-Pager

DPW Staff compiled a comprehensive one-pager to share with Rep. Lively that outlines what the City is already doing to address the goals of HB 2001, concerns we have with HB 2001, and suggested amendments for the Speaker’s consideration. The document has been shared with Rep. Lively and the Speaker.

Bill Tracking

City staff with assistance from Kylie Grunow has worked diligently to maintain the latest details and perspective on the 250-plus bills we are currently tracking.

General Activity

- The first deadline of the session has passed with all bills having to be introduced by last Tuesday, February 26th. There has been a large wave of bills released and they are currently under review.
- SB 608 (rent control) was passed by the Senate on the 12th, the House on the 26th, and signed by Governor on February 28th. Vote count can be seen here: https://olis.leg.state.or.us/liz/2019R1/Measures/Overview/SB608