



Collaboration Corvallis
PARKING AND TRAFFIC



MINUTES

DATE	October 29, 2013
FACILITATOR(S)	Steve Clark
MINUTES TAKEN BY	Digital Recording – Transcribed by JayLene Seeley and Rhonda Thomson
ATTENDEES	Bradon Trelstad, Courtney Cloyd, Steve Clark, Gary Angelo, Eric Adams, Jeff Davis, Rainier Farmer, Stan Nudelman
GUEST SPEAKERS	
VISITORS OF THE COMMUNITY	

INTRODUCTIONS
<p>Brandon Trelstad – OSU, Sustainability Coordinator Courtney Cloyd – Central Park Neighborhood Association Steve Clark – OSU, VP University Relations & Marketing Gary Angelo – College Hill Neighborhood Assoc. Eric Adams – Project Manager Jeff Davis – Linn Benton Community College Rainer Farmer – OSU Alternative Transportation Advisory Committee Stan Nudelman (other attendees who were inaudible during introductions)</p>

DISCUSSION ITEMS
<p>Steve: Offered a chance for comments, No one had a comment. No meeting minutes to approve. Transportation system safety, there are recommendations to complete on pedestrian and bicycle safety.</p> <p>Eric: Discusses the meeting packet and what modifications have been added to final revised draft. Shows committee the changes on screen.</p> <p>Jeff: Not suggesting changes but had a question on a sentence about involvement community based state group and among the city of Corvallis groups there is a bicycle advisory committee. The city property and not necessarily the university, would they have a role in this context. Or a separate group that meets that criteria or OSU purposes.</p> <p>Rainer: Certainly the city bike commission would meet that criteria.</p>

Courtney: Are you suggesting that we name them?

Jeff: I am fine recognizing that. Rather than try to form a separate group.

Gary: I think it depends on what the (inaudible)

Steve: Give the number of assessments and quarter based evaluations to emphasis we need to allow the counsel to acknowledge which group is the most appropriate. Everyone comfortable with that? Specify the timing around the planning.

Eric: The rest of the modifications were to reorganize the goals and move one item out of the goals and into a consideration section for the assessment, but the actual text did not change.

Brandon: Had a question on about a sentence and whether the city calls it a city or master plan.

Eric: Confirms it is named a Transportation Master Plan or City Transportation Plan.

Steve: Calls for a motion to approve

Brandon: Approves language as written and updated version.

Motion was seconded, a vote was taken. All approve, none opposed.

Steve: Brings up subject of remote parking lots.

Eric: Discusses problems with formatting and calls attention to more information in the packet.

Steve: The attempt was to minimize and speak to offside or remote parking lots to create places for cars otherwise stored or stored overnight. Opening campus parking to be day and hour by hour as opposed to overnight storage.

Committee Member: Discusses license plate recognition technology for identify turnover and violators.

Steve: Calls for comments or changes.

Jeff: Calls attention to a bulletin and potential wording and clarification of existing lots and/or new lots. Searching for properties that aren't being used or developed as parking lots today.

Steve: Brings attention to another paragraph that discusses that point and asks if that is sufficient to cover and clarify it.

Jeff: I am good with that.

Steve: Thoughts? Additions? Calls for a motion to approve the recommendation.

Jeff: Moves to approve.

Motion is seconded. A vote is taken. All in favor, none opposed.

Steve: Moves to next item, traffic system function.

Eric: Brings attention to memo dated the 22nd and materials shared at last meeting with preliminary locations that would be studied through analysis as part of Campus Master Plan Update. Followed-up with Dave Dodson about how the effort is tracking and the timeline for securing a consultant and initiating the analysis. Request for proposal is due to be published by November 1. David felt it was not possible to help inform that RFP and scope of work as far as potential intersections to be studied. He did indicate it would be possible for a supplemental analysis within the same time frame of Spring 2014 to look at average daily traffic volumes at intersections. Those potential hotspots. That data, if collected, could serve as a baseline of parking districts and permit pricing down the road. I received information from Ken Gibb that the city has tentatively secured funding from Oregon Department of Transportation to initiate an update to the Transportation Master Plan and that should begin this coming July. Those two efforts should coincide.

Steve: The potential list of locations, this is what they are going out with on November 1.

Eric: I don't believe this is the final list.

Brandon: This is not the final list there is a final walk through this week to assemble the final list.

There was some discussions about meetings that had taken place that week and if there if there were outcomes to that.

Steve: As far as making a recommendation to advise the university, the supplemental analysis the base line information is stretched and be made into a recommendation by supplemental analysis.

Eric: What we have to work with are the preliminary locations shown on the maps and list received from campus planning. Earlier on in the effort within the Collaboration there were traffic volumes collected from 2004 - 2006, as well as similar traffic counts done by Mackenzie in spring 2012. In addition to observations to neighborhood traffic pattern within the areas. To get to that level of specificity, specific locations to include with supplemental analysis with collected average daily traffic to determine hotspot and go back to counts after changes are in place to see the effectiveness.

Gary: There have already been additional measurements done through OSU by requests from city and neighbor. They didn't do traffic counts but service and that does not meet our objective. I propose we have vehicle counts between 30th and Jackson. Vehicle counts impact neighborhood. Service impacts the driver.

Steve: Are there other neighborhood streets that are collectors that we want to advise analysis?

Courtney: I am not sure we know yet.

Steve: It would be appropriate to ask neighborhood associations to identify other streets that appear to be burdened by traffic volumes. That appear to be collector street status. I don't know how it is determined but there must be a form of benchmarking. How many neighborhood associations surround the campus?

It was determined there were five and possibly another area that would be included.

Steve: Is the Campus Master Plan development on campus or the activities on campus?

Eric: It primarily regulates construction building activities and the size of building determines what type of activities take place near it. The current Master Plan the sectors within campus that specifies the projected square footage.

Steve: More in keeping with our goals to provide for an analysis on vehicle counts in neighborhoods surrounding the campus as related to Collaboration Corvallis and even the update of the Campus Master Plans, our recommendations as it relates to future assessments and one should be vehicle counts and utilization of parking. If the campus plan is more development based it won't get to the issues we want the city and university to assess on an ongoing basis. Which could include parking, behavior and traffic counts. Suggesting the basis of why we want to do this is in keeping with the collaboration project goals. It might actually make the city participate more fully.

Gary: It depends on specific cases where it is a campus plan issue. Jackson is one of those. This issue was in the existing campus master plan. That issue needs to remain in there.

Steve: Measuring the impacts of improvement intended solutions and vehicle cut through traffic. Doing both is more substitute and doing on. If we only did Jackson, it doesn't serve the community. If we look at one traffic count the community would believe other locations should be measured as well. Work with the neighborhood associations and tie to the goals of Collaboration Corvallis.

There was discussion between Gary and Steve on the specifics of what Steve was saying.

Rainer: I don't know if the neighborhood associations encircle our study area and would we want to pick up impact of neighborhoods that aren't involved in an association and if they are included. I don't think just going to the associations is sufficient to determine.

The committee then took a look at map to discuss the different neighborhood associations including; Cedar, College Hill, Harding, Gentility, North college Hill, Job's Additions, Central Park, Avery Addition, Avery Helms and West Hills.

Gary: The one area that hasn't been established but it has been strongly suggested that they form one is the one northwest of Harding.

Steve: For example, we could cite working with the identified neighborhood associations in receiving community input on other traffic hot spots so we are not restricting ourselves.

Eric: Because it is conceivable that over time the times or number of neighborhood associations might change, you could simply say neighborhood associations that have a portion of their boundary within the Collaboration project area.

Steve: So we are going to cite the Oregon State Master Plan as it relates to Jackson. Call upon the City and the University through Corvallis Collaboration Project to engage with neighborhood associations within the collaboration project boundaries and the community to identify locations to analyze neighborhood streets for current and future traffic quality.

Eric: If you want to use the term hot spots – I am not sure if that will have the same meaning to everyone. People may have varying understandings of what hot spot is or isn't. I would say identify potential locations, potential streets with traffic volumes that may adversely impact neighborhood livability?

Steve: I think we should say neighborhood streets. We are not talking about collectors.

Eric: Typically not, no. As an example, Harrison west of 29th Street is classified in the City's transportation plan as an arterial street – meaning it is expected to carry upwards of 10,000 or more trips a day – it is obviously two lanes along that stretch – has limited capacity to being expanded to more than a 2-lane street – regardless, it is still classified as an arterial. In other cases, Harrison east of 29th Street or Van Buren east of Kings, most people would agree that is an arterial and designed to function that way.

Steve: The reason I was bringing the distinction is the transportation plan update going to focus on collectors and arterials or will it also consider neighborhood streets?

Eric: The current plan assesses every classification level from local all the way up to arterial highways and I would expect a full and complete review of the entire system. Understanding that there are some neighborhood streets that are having similar issues.

Gary: An arterial street is below 10,000 and arterial highway is above 10,000.

Rainier: I am uncomfortable with criteria that negatively impacts – I think what we are looking for is where the streets are, the volume is exceeding the designation of that street to where we have a neighborhood street acting as a collector.

Gary: I think that's too narrow. If you have, for example, if you go to the left of the Harding district north of Harrison, where there are s-curved streets, that's where cars are turning off of Harrison and cutting through neighborhoods to get over to 29th or to come down 34th or 35th because they are trying to avoid the back-up on Harrison. A traffic count may not necessarily be turning into a collector but it is adversely impacting the character of the neighborhood. So I don't think we should narrow it just too street classification.

Steve: Are we attempting to measure what the transportation improvement plan is seeking to evaluate – the future of transportation in Corvallis – or are we seeking to measure the impacts of OSU's growth and the resulting impacts of the recommendations such as parking districts and other things that we have advised? I

think it is the latter. I think if we are clear and specific about what we are seeking to measure then we can say in addition, the City's transportation improvement update should also consider the more broad aspects of transportation systems in the community. Are job is the collaboration goals and outcomes related to the growth of OSU.

Eric: This is how we handled the recommendation for the Neighborhood Planning work group regarding re-zoning last Thursday so we will just write this on the fly...

(Eric is heard working on his laptop as the committee waited. There was background discussion about the wording regarding the livability aspect of the recommendation as Eric continued working on his laptop.)

Stan: They are going to be doing this in two phases, is that correct? It would be good to consider the project area in this case the second phase as well if they are going to do a study, it would make sense to do both even though the second phase may not be implemented yet.

Eric: What's the second phase?

Stan: I thought that they were limiting when we talked about parking districts. I thought when they were talking about parking districts they were going to institute the first system and then later on consider the second. Am I thinking correcting? And if they were going to do a study it would seem to me they should include the second area as well or it seems that they might have to repeat the whole thing again for something else.

Courtney: By staying inside the project area boundaries we covered the whole thing.

Steve: As it relates to Jackson and the reference to the Campus Master Plan, we need a new paragraph.

Rainier: Before you leave that can you get my pet topic in there for neighborhoods that aren't represented by a neighborhood association?

Eric: My only question is how to determine how far you go?

Steve: Neighborhood associations and neighborhoods.

Eric: There are portions not represented by associations.

Rainer: Just say and other neighborhoods and neighborhood associations.

Steve: Moving the paragraph that deals with Campus Master Plan and Jackson.

Brandon: Is the need to add an intersection?

Gary: I'd like to see it counted in the Campus Master Plan study.

Brandon: If that is the only thing then we can add one or two spots, there are already areas being studied and that is in fact why the meeting is happening next week.

Gary: The key piece is to measure volume. It needs wording to make that specific request.

Steve: The issue is that we will not be able to affect this particular project with this timing of when this goes to the Steering Committee. If it can include that in the meeting Monday or we specify a separate recommendation.

Brandon: The second recommendation would be on a slope timeline.

Eric: This recommendation calls on OSU and the city to survey neighborhood association in order to figure out daily average counts, there is opportunity to pick up Jackson in that analysis. As long as the time frame, do you want to specify a time frame for this recommendation? To have it integrate with the update to the CMP and the cities update to the transportation master plan.

Steve: You are saying this sufficient.

Eric: It creates an opportunity for someone to say Jackson needs to be in these counts.

Gary: Jackson would be included in this because we put it in there. The separate conversation around the CMP plan because this collaboration is not associated with it directly. I would make a request that it be put into that meeting and if it doesn't come to pass there will be other opportunities.

Rainer: I think that would be a change in scope because they are not doing volume it is all service. The only volume is the multi (inaudible)

Brandon: There a few for major intersections. They are all highway. They all involve the highway intersection at 26, 15, and 35th.

Steve: So this recommendation with a little bit of editing on project areas, is there a motion?

Gary: Was there a time frame?

Eric: It could be as simple as to be conducted in coordination with analysis to be completed with the CMP and Transportation Master Plan update.

Gary: We need a baseline and date so that we can recommend an established deadline.

Eric: I think logically professional technicians that understand the process for completing assessments that in order to establish a baseline you need to do it soon rather than later.

Courtney: That doesn't mean decision makers and people associated that would be directing the city to take these actions, would understand that.

Eric: My caution is, with TMP our understanding how it will be initiated and how it will track is preliminary. To set a certain date I am not sure how that would correlate with how that project with scope out.

Steve: we Are providing strategic recommendation to create a baseline about impacts of parking districts because we don't need to say when they need to do it. The only way to establish a baseline is to do it before the parking districts and permits. It should be understood that you have to do that before and carry it forward after.

Gary: We are a steering committee and we are issuing recommendations because have already established it will happen Spring 2014. It is supplemental to CMP. We are actually saying in conjunction with TMP, it seems to be a simple, let's get it done Spring 2014 in anticipation to Fall of 2014.

Steve: We should say measure against Spring 2014. Let's add that clause. Calls for a motion.

Rainer: I agree with the status thing all we are saying is to say to establish a baseline in spirit of having a strategic and monitored on going and add a new paragraph. The way the current master plan assess the impacts and development should we develop a recommendation that we do this based on activity or whether his assessment is done periodically and it becomes incorporated into the base transportation.

Steve: I understand the point, regardless of why we do it. The collaboration is the why and what upon completed the baseline, periodic measurements should occur to continue to measure the effectiveness.

Rainer: Short term, rather than ongoing effort to make sure we are staying on top of things.

Eric: Do you want to insert a sentence before or after the last sentence?

There was discussion on where to place it and whether to make a new paragraph as well as wording.

Rainer: Move to approve recommendation.

Brandon: Second.

A vote was called for.

Stan: Suggested a word change.

A vote was taken, all in favor. None opposed. Motion passes.

Steve: That completes it.

Eric: Unless there are other recommendations under that topic. The last item on the agenda for what happens next.

Steve: We completed and identified as the addressed within this work group. We can revisit in a future meeting the various work group charges presented by the steering committee and other areas of interest. Eric's evaluation and mine was that this really took us through that work group scope.

Eric: There were five specific objectives for this work group out of the overall scope of work for the Collaboration and we have responded to each of them.

Gary: Do we get back in the new year to assess the outcomes to what the status of the recommendation of progress being made? Is it going through public process? An evaluation of where we stand.

Eric: The steering committee meets on November 8th and take this recommendation and others completed along with three recommendations from the neighborhood planning work group and part of their agenda will be to determine what additional ongoing actives need to take place on the steering committee or work group level on how things progress in response to the recommendations from the work groups. There is a lot of work and effort that needs to put towards the body of work the collaboration. One idea discussed within the project team is that the steering committee meet quarterly to give status updates. Another idea is the recommendation from the neighborhood livability work group to form a community relations advisory body to take over that role moving forward, but the course of action is not clear at this point. There is a need to continue at least some form of communication of how things are progressing.

Steve: So in addition to the communication, walk we talked about with Julie Manning and Ed Ray, was measuring and communicating. How are the various recommendations being acted upon, with what result and then making sure that the benefit of what's occurred with all these meetings and the public has had an opportunity to observe and contribute to the recommendations and also to see the progress. The Steering Committee has provided another opportunity.

Brandon: How about some course correction along the way if needed. Who is managing that?

Steve: The Collaboration Project was committed to at least 3 years. That will continue through at least January 2015, is that right?

Eric: December 2014.

Steve: So the measurements taken, communication (inaudible) as required, the Steering Committee could call upon the work groups to get back together and advise on course corrections. The University could direct staff to do that. The City Council could direct staff to do that. There are opportunities for that to concern. Seemingly if there was regular communication there would be an opportunity for people to comment on the measurements. When the Steering Committee meets in November, members could say that they would like to be called back together semi-annually to be updated.

Courtney: As a neighborhood association representative, I fully expect to be monitoring the progress of all the work group recommendations. And I expect that other neighborhood associations will do the same thing. That is also quite a burden when you look at 60 recommendations. Not all of them are of the same magnitude as changing zoning or establishing parking districts. Even though I think that is an important role for

neighborhoods to have, we in the work groups have specific knowledge that the neighborhood associations will not necessarily have. I think we should recommend a bi-monthly meeting to at least evaluate what's going on or at least think about whether or not we need to meet.

Steve: Given where we are right now, I think meeting quarterly would be sufficient. There is a lot of work to do and we are not going to see easy solutions right off the bat.

Stan: The Steering Committee meets quarterly, is that correct? Could we suggest that we meet at some point following the Steering Committee meetings? Nothing much is going to happen until after Spring 2014, but on the other hand if the Steering Committee is meeting I would be interested in getting a report on what they are doing, what they are saying and what we think about it.

Rainier: I think quarterly is about the right frequency given the number of recommendations and the amount of progress that we can expect.

Courtney: Responding to Stan's suggestion that we meet after the quarterly Steering Committee meetings and evaluate what comes out of those meetings, it makes me wonder whether we want to be meeting prior to the Steering Committee meetings and following up on the key recommendations that we made and being in a position to comment to the Steering Committee so that they have an informed opinion about whether or not satisfactory progress has been made or whether or not they need to crack the whip... We would be in a position if we meet prior to their quarterly meeting we have a chance to tell them how we think things are going and we are better informed than they are about the details.

Steve: The way to do that is to send a letter to the Steering Committee letting them know that we are going to continue to meet quarterly – say a month, three weeks prior to each Steering Committee meeting and report back any conclusions or recommendations that we have that would inform the Steering Committee about next steps. Do we want to do that verbally or in writing?

Stan: My only question about before is what kinds of information will we gather prior to the Steering Committee meeting that will possibly be influential in that.

Steve: There is a matrix that is being maintained by the City and the University that details the progress of a variety of recommendations as they pertain to the perspective groups. Within those there are measurement requirements and deadlines.

Stan: So we could have that information as well? Then I agree with Courtney that it makes more sense than doing it after.

Courtney: I think just for the heck of it we should send a letter – just a simple letter with a brief statement of rationale so that it is clear and public information?

Steve: Eric do you have time to draft something during the next couple of days?

Eric: Yes.

Jeff: I am wondering if there is a way to tie that idea back to your earlier comment about this group was intended to be representative of particular groups including neighborhood associations and in doing so, kind of formalizing that in a letter it reinforces that... There are folks that would expect ongoing communication, periodic updates and the like.

Steve: Eric will shoot us a draft of the letter. On behalf of the Steering Committee, the City and the University thanks for the significant time, personal commitment, contributions and good decision making each and every member of this work group has contributed. Thank you very much. Eric, thank you as well.

Eric: It has been my considerable pleasure to work with all of you. I mean that with absolute sincerity. I look forward to meeting with you quarterly. I wanted to put some perspective into this and went back and counted the number of work group meetings that have been held since this effort started in March 2012 and then multiplying the number of hours that that represents on an individual basis collectively... at this point we are over 7000 volunteer hours that has gone into just work group meetings. It is significant. The community owes you a dept of gratitude whether they agree with your recommendations or not.

Meeting adjourned.