

Salem Willamette River Crossing Alternate Modes Study

Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #2

Monday September 14, 2009

4:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.

Mid-Willamette Valley Council of Governments

105 High Street / Salem

Attendees

Stakeholder Advisory Committee Members	Consultant Team
Bob Cortright, DLCD ¹	Theresa Carr, CH2M HILL
Steve Dickey, Cherriots	Dana Dickman, Alta Planning + Design
Dan Fricke, ODOT ² Region 2 Planning	Mariah VanZerr, CH2M HILL
Rodger Gutierrez, ODOT Bicycle/Pedestrian	Alternates/Visitors
Mike Jaffe, MWVCOG ³	Herm Boes (West Salem Neighborhood Association)
Roxanne Rolls, Cherriots	Paul Gellar (Go Downtown! Salem)
Julie Warncke, City of Salem	Ray Jackson, MWVCOG
	Eric Lundgren, BTA ⁴
	Alison Wiley, ODOT Public Transit Division

¹ Department of Land Conservation and Development

² Oregon Department of Transportation

³ Mid-Willamette Valley Council of Governments

⁴ Bicycle Transportation Alliance

Meeting Summary

This meeting summary documents the major conversation items from the September 14, 2009 meeting of the Salem River Crossing Alternate Modes Study Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC). The summary is organized by agenda item. Only discussion and action items are documented in this summary. See meeting handouts¹ for additional information.

1. Welcome and Introductions

Theresa opened the meeting and led the introductions. All SAC members were present except for Sherrin Coleman, Doug Parrow, and Tom Clark. Alison Wiley served as a

¹ Meeting handouts included Draft Technical Memorandum 6: Concept Evaluation and Preliminary Recommendations; Draft Technical Memorandum 6 Figures; and Draft Technical Memorandum 6 Appendices.

substitute for Sherin Colman. Eric Lundgren served as a substitute for Doug Parrow, and Herm Boes served as a substitute for Tom Clark.

Theresa introduced Dana Dickman and Mariah VanZerr. Dana is a planner with Alta Planning & Design job sharing with Jessica Roberts. Jessica is on maternity leave until December and Dana will be managing the bicycle/pedestrian element of the study until Jessica returns. Mariah VanZerr is a CH2M HILL transportation planner who has been providing project support.

2. Opportunity for Public Comment

Theresa opened the floor for public comment. No public comments were made.

3. Project Update – What We’ve Been Doing

Theresa provided an overview of the project timeline, where we are at now, and what the consultant team has been doing since the last SAC meeting in June. An overview of the timeline of events is provided below:

- Held a design workshop (July)
- Finalized the evaluation framework (July)
- Finalized the universe of ideas (July)
- Evaluated the ideas – first round (August)
- Developed preliminary recommendations (August)

Theresa explained that the concepts developed at the design workshop had been divided into transportation system management (TSM) solutions and travel demand management (TDM) solutions. The TSM concepts identify physical or operational improvements to the transportation system, while the TDM concepts identify programmatic or policy changes to be implemented.

In total, over 75 unique concepts were developed and evaluated against the set of evaluation criteria created by the SAC. Based on the results, the consultant team sorted the concepts into priority recommendations, secondary recommendations, and concepts not recommended at this time. The preliminary recommendations are those concepts that performed the best on the evaluation criteria. These concepts are outlined in Technical Memorandum #6 and discussed in further detail below. The secondary recommendations are those concepts that the technical team felt would be helpful, however, due to limited resources, they should only be implemented only after the priority recommendations have gone into effect. The concepts not recommended at this time include concepts that the team felt were good ideas, however they either do not reduce peak hour single-occupancy vehicle (SOV) travel across the river, are beyond the scope of the project, or are too costly or politically unfeasible to be implemented. The secondary recommendations and the concepts not recommended at this time are discussed in the Appendices of Technical Memorandum #6.

4. Preliminary Recommendations Discussion

The remainder of the meeting involved walking through each of the draft preliminary recommendations outlined in Technical Memorandum #6 and gathering feedback and comments from the SAC members. SAC members also received a detailed comment form that would allow them to jot down notes and provide feedback on each specific concept. Theresa requested that SAC members either turn in their forms at the end of the meeting, or mail them no later than September 21st, 2009.

Comments and feedback from the SAC on each specific concept is organized by TSM and TDM recommendations and broken down by mode below. The technical team will be evaluating these comments in the coming weeks with the intent of providing revised recommendations in order of priority at the next SAC meeting (November).

TSM Recommendations

Bicycle/Pedestrian Recommendations

1. Stripe Bike Lanes

- A SAC member wanted to know why Marine Drive is recommended to have a bike lane, since the TSP calls for a multi-use-path on this street. Another member noted the recommended width of 12 feet for the multi-use path might not be enough to accommodate faster commuting bicycle traffic.
- A SAC member commented that there should be a bike lane on Rosemont Ave and 8th street, rather than a bicycle boulevard.
- Some SAC members felt a striped bike lane on Cascade Dr. NW would be unrealistic.

2. Add Shared Roadway Markings

- A SAC member noted that shared lane markings should *not* be included on the uphill side of streets in West Salem.
- A question was raised about the distinction between shared lane markings and bicycle boulevards. Mariah responded that shared lane markings are generally located on streets where a bike lane would be indicated, but cannot be accommodated, while bicycle boulevards are generally designated for cyclist priority and include traffic calming and traffic diversion treatments to help minimize through traffic.

3. Extend the Salem Parkway Shared-use Path

- The comment was made that this should be a priority recommendation only if the bridge is built. Specifically, the bridge should not be built simply to put a shared-use path on it.
- A SAC member commented that a new bridge would be required to have bike/ped facilities anyway, per ORS 366.514.

4. Add Bicycle Boulevards

- A SAC member noted that Bike Boulevards are not a bicycle classification used in the Salem TSP and that references to it in the Tech Memo should be deleted.

- A discussion was held about whether there is the need for a bicycle boulevard on 8th Street NW. One SAC member felt bicyclists would just use the low-traffic local roads, or bike to the Glen Creek Road NW or Edgewater Street NW corridors. Others felt there was merit to including a bicycle boulevard in this area, but questioned whether 8th Street was the correct location (due to traffic volume concerns near Walker School). In addition a few SAC members noted that the boulevard should provide more connectivity throughout the east-west corridor as an alternative to Glen Creek. The discussion concluded with general support for a bicycle boulevard running east-west in the area of the Edgewater District, but that further study would be needed to determine the best location for it.

5. Extend Riverfront Pathway Network

- A few SAC members were concerned about how this would be implemented and where the right of way would come from for a shared-use path along the east bank of the Willamette River. One SAC member suggested it could be floating right-of-way like the Eastbank Esplanade in Portland, Oregon. The SAC decided that further information on implementation and funding would be needed for this recommendation.

6. Rail-to/with-Trail

- Some members of the SAC were concerned about putting a rail-with-trail adjacent to the former Burlington Northern Santa Fe/Portland and Western Railroad alignment because of the plans ODOT may have for high speed rail in the corridor. One SAC member commented that the right-of-way may be too narrow.
- The SAC discussed the rail-to-trail recommendation west of Wallace Road and determined that there were currently no other alternate plans for this corridor.

7. Add Shared-Use Paths

- A question was raised about the legal implications of designating shared-use paths, and if vehicles (bicycles) are required to travel at pedestrian speeds per ADA requirements.

8. Complete Sidewalk Infill Projects

- No comments were received on this concept.

9. Enhance Bicycle-Transit Integration

- Several SAC members agreed that this concept was “key and important” because people often need to combine both cycling and taking transit to avoid driving.
- One member provided the consultant team with a map of potential bike & ride facilities (bike parking at key locations where the bike & transit networks overlap).

10. Add Bicycle/Pedestrian Over/Undercrossings

- One SAC member mentioned that an overcrossing at Front and Court Street was already considered in a public process and that an at-grade crossing was selected.
- One SAC member said that an overcrossing at Wallace Road is not merited and that the connections could be improved through other means.
- One SAC member suggested sinking Wallace Road.

- Another SAC member commented that often bike/ped over/under crossings don't get used.
- Some SAC members were concerned about the cost efficiency of building over/under crossings.

11. Build a Secure High Capacity Bicycle Parking Facility

- Some SAC members questioned whether downtown was at capacity in terms of bike parking and whether there would be enough demand for a high capacity bike parking facility.
- One SAC member commented that it would be better to ensure secure long-term bike parking at each key destination in downtown, rather than focusing all the parking in one centralized facility.

12. Add Bicycle Corrals

- One SAC member was unsure whether there was enough density of bike parking demand to warrant bike corrals in downtown. This member felt bike corrals should only be installed at bike destinations. Another SAC member responded that there is currently a bike parking density of 12-14 bikes during happy hour at some downtown restaurants and bars, and that these locations certainly merit bike corrals.
- Another SAC member said that bike corrals increase the utility of bike trips and can encourage mode shift.
- The issue of the difficult political and regulatory environment was raised and a SAC member commented that Salem has a harder standard to meet than Portland to justify a bike corral.

13. Add Bicycle Parking

- One SAC member recommended that there should be a bike locker request system in place, as well as a bike rack request system.

14. Improve Trip-End Facilities

- SAC members wanted to ensure that downtown employers are allowed to construct trip-end facilities.

15. Safe Crossings

- No comments were received on this concept.

16. Continue/Improve Bicycle Wayfinding Signage

- No comments were received on this concept.

Transit Recommendations

1. Implement Transit Signal Priority

- No comments were received on this concept –see recommendation 6 Queue Jump Lanes.

2. Add a Downtown Circulator

- One SAC member commented that the circulator should connect to the potential high priority transit corridor.

3. West Salem Transit Center

- Several SAC members liked this idea.
- One SAC member expressed concern that there are few pedestrian destinations near the intersection of Wallace Road and Edgewater. A discussion ensued about whether moving the Wallace Transit Center would encourage the development of pedestrian destinations at the new location. Several members cited the Gateway plan and short-term plans for redevelopment in vicinity of Edgewater and Wallace, where the transit center could be relocated.
- A SAC member from Cherriots said the new location would improve the efficiency of the transit system and service delivery.
- Another SAC member commented that moving the Transit Center to this location would work well with the goal of connecting the transit system up with the bike/ped system.

4. Provide Real-Time Travel Information

- Several SAC members expressed support for this concept and one noted that the real-time dynamic transit signs would not be a violation of Salem sign code.

5. University/Hospital Route

- One SAC member commented that the University/Hospital Route could be combined with the circulator route.
- Multiple SAC members expressed support for this concept.
- Another SAC member said the University/Hospital Route should connect to the Amtrak station at 14th and Mission Street SE.

6. Transit Queue Jump Lanes

- Some members of the SAC wanted to see the east side transit queue jump lanes extend to Church Street SE to better connect with the downtown transit mall.
- Several members of the SAC expressed support for having the queue jump lanes help transit vehicles bypass the bottle neck at Commercial and Marion St NE.
- One SAC member expressed support for having the transit queue jump lanes bypass the north and south bound ramps off the Center street bridge to Commercial St SE.
- One SAC member commented that it might be more appropriate to have transit signal priority at Center St and Commercial, rather than a transit queue jump lane.

7. CARTS Routes 40 & 50:

- No comments were received on this concept.

8. Extend Route 25

- No comments were received on this concept.

9. Service Frequency

- No comments were received on this concept.

Land Use Recommendations

1. Create a Green Zone in Downtown

- One SAC member noted that the Union Street Bike/Ped bridge will be closed from mid-October until spring of 2010 for lead paint removal.
- One SAC member noted that there is a Les Schwab fence being built between Wallace Marine Park and residences. The member noted that the fence could serve as an impediment for providing bicycle and pedestrian access to the park.

2. Develop Land Use Strategies that Encourage Alternate Modes

- One SAC member noted that the overlay zone in the Edgewater District calls for 8-10 units per acre, so density increases would be modest.
- Another SAC member said they would like to see residential density go higher with retail along Edgewater. This member also noted this would be more profitable for developers.
- One SAC member questioned the map showing increased density directly adjacent to Wallace Road, and cited that the zoning actually extended the higher density area east of Wallace Road to Marine Drive.
- Several SAC members voiced that various density scenarios (including higher density) should be modeled by the city to see how they affect mode split projections.

General Feedback

- A SAC member requested that each concept be prioritized in the final set of recommendations.
- A SAC member requested that the preliminary recommendations that are also listed in the TSP, be identified. Note: These concepts are identified in the memo, however they are not distinguished visually on the maps.

TDM Recommendations

Theresa explained that the TDM program is currently being developed. For the sake of time, she provided a brief high level overview of some of the key concepts, which are listed below:

1. Smart Trips Program/ Transportation Management Authority (TMA)

- The SAC agreed that a program like Smart Trips would be good for Cherriots to organize. Some considered that the program would be like Cherriots' current rideshare program, with a bigger budget.
- One SAC member commented that the Cherriots rideshare program tried something like door-to-door marketing a few years ago. However, individual marketing programs

don't work well unless you have the alternate mode infrastructure to back it up. All agreed that a Smart Trips type program in Salem would need to be implemented in conjunction with major improvements to the alternate mode infrastructure.

- Several SAC members commented that successful TMAs include a mandate for employers over a certain size to implement a trip reduction program. A discussion followed about the type of mandate that would be necessary in Salem to support a successful TMA and employer trip reduction program.

2. Improve Transit Funding/Charter

- The SAC was generally supportive of this concept.

3. Dynamic Carpool/Vanpool Recommendations

- One member of the SAC expressed that the Cherriots Rideshare program will be getting a new tri-state database that will assist with dynamic rideshare matching, help to improve matches, and provide additional marketing funds. This member felt that the carpool/vanpool programs in existence were working; they just needed more support and funding to build the programs.
- Another SAC member expressed that more emphasis should be placed on carpool/vanpool incentives, since the majority of commuters that the study wishes to target live outside typical bicycle and pedestrian distances.

4. Parking Recommendations

- The SAC was generally supportive of the parking concepts, and felt these strategies are key for helping to reduce SOV mode share.

5. What does it all do for Mode Split?

Theresa and Mike Jaffe explained that the grouping of concepts is being modeled to determine their impact on reducing peak hour SOV trips across the river.

6. Next Steps and Adjourn

Mariah provided an overview of the project's next steps, described below:

- Present to Cherriots Board of Directors (Sept. 24)
- Present to Salem City Council (Sept. 28)
- Revise concepts (October)
- Present to SKATS Policy Committee (Oct. 27)
- Next SAC Meeting (November __, set date) November 9th or 16th was set tentatively
- Write plan (November/December)

The SAC set a preliminary date of either Monday, November 9th or November 16th, from 4-6pm for the next SAC meeting. Theresa said she would send out an email to confirm the date in the next few weeks. SAC members were reminded to submit any additional written comments by September 21st.