

**REVISED**  
**ROSEBURG URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY**  
**BOARD MEETING AGENDA**  
**May 12, 2014**



**7:00 p.m. City Hall Council Chambers**  
**(Immediately following City Council meeting)**

---

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Larry Rich, Chairperson
  
2. **ROLL CALL OF BOARD MEMBERS**  
Bob Cotterell      Ken Fazio      Victoria Hawks      Mike Hilton  
Steve Kaser      Marty Katz      Lew Marks      Tom Ryan
  
3. **CONSENT AGENDA**
  - A. Minutes of March 10, 2014 Meeting
  - B. Minutes of March 17, 2014 Meeting
  - C. Chestnut Signal Bid Award
  
4. **DISCUSSION ITEMS**
  - A. Washington/Oak Parking Design Concepts
  
5. **AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION**
  
6. **ADJOURNMENT**
  
7. **EXECUTIVE SESSION – ORS 192.660(2)**

**REMINDER – RENEWAL DISTRICT TOUR**  
**MAY 19, 2014 – 4:30 P.M. – COURT STREET PARKING LOT**

---

Please contact the office of the City Recorder, 900 SE Douglas Avenue, Roseburg, Oregon, 97470; phone (541) 492-6866, at least 48 hours prior to the scheduled meeting time if you need an accommodation in accordance with the Americans With Disabilities Act. TDD users please call Oregon Telecommunications Relay Service at 1-800-735-2900.

**MINUTES OF THE ROSEBURG  
URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY BOARD MEETING  
March 10, 2014**

A meeting of the Roseburg Urban Renewal Agency Board was called to order by Chair Larry Rich at 8:25 p.m. on Monday, March 10, 2014, in the Roseburg City Hall Council Chambers, 900 SE Douglas, Roseburg, Oregon.

ROLL CALL

Present: Board Members Ken Fazio, Steve Kaser, Marty Katz, Lew Marks, Tom Ryan, Victoria Hawks and Mike Hilton.

Absent: Board Member Bob Cotterell

Others present: City Manager Lance Colley, City Attorney Bruce Coalwell, City Recorder Sheila Cox, Public Works Director Nikki Messenger, Management Technician Debi Davidson; Community Development Director Brian Davis, Human Resources Director John VanWinkle, Fire Chief Mike Lane and Kyle Bailey of KQEN Radio.

CONSENT AGENDA

Ryan moved to approve the following consent agenda:

1. Minutes of the January 27, 2014 meeting

Motion was seconded by Fazio and carried unanimously.

AIRPORT APRON REHABILITATION ENGINEERING CONTRACT

Messenger reported on the airport apron rehabilitation project which is needed due to asphalt failure. Total project cost is estimated at \$1.8 million with 90% FAA funding. She outlined the steps required by FAA in negotiating an engineering contract. Engineering services over \$100,000 require an independent fee estimate which came in 35% higher than the estimate provided by the City's airport consultant. FAA stated that they do not want the City to pay more for the same product as a result of the IFE and would concur with the consultant's cost estimate. However, Staff recommended a 10% cushion on the estimate to ensure that the fully eligible 90% would be reimbursed. There is an indication that another airport with a similar project won't be able to go forward this year; if so, Roseburg could potentially receive FAA funding in 2014 instead of 2015. Ryan moved to award a task order for design services for the Apron Rehabilitation Project to Mead & Hunt for a lump sum not to exceed \$153,651. Motion was seconded by Fazio and carried unanimously.

WASHINGTON/OAK/KANE IMPROVEMENT ENGINEERING AMENDMENT

Messenger reported that work is proceeding with design on the Washington/Oak/Kane improvement project which was discussed in detail with the Board in January. Since that time, some additional aspects need to be addressed in the engineering contract including sidewalk panel insert design, intersection waterline replacement and a traffic operations analysis. Those amendments total \$28,370.

The traffic analysis, which would be conducted by Gilson and Associates of Portland, would cost \$13,230. The need for the study was raised by the Planning Commission in regard to whether the reduction of two short-blocks to one lane would impact traffic. If parking in those two blocks was not converted to back-in diagonal parking, there would be no need for the study. Colley indicated that Staff did not believe there would be a significant impact, but we

do not have the technical Staff to formally make that decision. Overall, the expense of \$13,000 was nominal for a \$1.2 million project. Messenger explained that the Transportation System, which is part of the Comprehensive Plan, indicates collector streets are two-way two lanes; however there is no reference to one-way collector streets. If the study is not done, someone could challenge compliance with the Comprehensive Plan.

Considerable discussion was held on the public process used to develop design concepts for the project, previous approval of those concepts by the Board and whether the study and/or the back-in parking were necessary.

Kaser moved to approve a contract amendment with i.e. Engineering, Inc. for \$28,370 for the Washington/Oak/Kane Improvement Project, including the traffic analysis. Motion was seconded by Fazio. Ryan opposed the motion due to inclusion of the traffic study as he saw no benefit in having two blocks reduced to one lane. Motion was voted on and failed with Kaser, Fazio and Hawks voting in favor Katz and Marks, Ryan and Hilton opposed. Hawks and Fazio expressed concern that the engineer has proceeded with design based on previous Board approval. Rich supported revisiting the issue of the back-in parking before proceeding further.

Ryan moved to approve all engineering contract amendment options except the traffic operations analysis, seconded by Hilton. Councilors shared interactions they have had with citizens regarding the back-in parking proposal, with some receiving largely negative response and others receiving only positive response or upon providing further information about the proposal, citizens changed their mind about their opposition. It was clarified that if the motion were adopted, project design would proceed as previously approved as the motion does not eliminate back-in parking, it only eliminates the traffic study. Motion was then voted on and failed with Marks, Ryan and Hilton voting in favor and Katz, Kaser, Fazio and Hawks voting against.

Ryan moved to forward this discussion item to the next meeting in conjunction with revisiting the parking issue and post office parking. It was determined that waiting until March 24<sup>th</sup> would not work effectively. Therefore, the motion was withdrawn.

Ryan moved to conduct a special meeting on March 17, 2014 at 7:00 p.m. in the City Council Chambers to discuss the project and engineering contract amendments. Motion was seconded by Marks and carried unanimously.

#### AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Kerry Atherton, 1236 SE Mill, expressed support for the back-in parking, noting that typically, elected officials only hear from the vocal minority and not the silent majority that are satisfied with a decision.

#### ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 9:19 p.m.



Debi Davidson  
Management Technician

**MINUTES OF THE ROSEBURG  
URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY BOARD MEETING  
March 17, 2014**

A meeting of the Roseburg Urban Renewal Agency Board was called to order by Chair Larry Rich at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, March 17, 2014, in the Roseburg City Hall Council Chambers, 900 SE Douglas, Roseburg, Oregon. Board Member Cotterell led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Present: Board Members Bob Cotterell, Ken Fazio, Steve Kaser, Marty Katz, Lew Marks and Tom Ryan. Victoria Hawks arrived at 7:35 p.m.

Absent: Board Member Mike Hilton.

Others present: City Manager Lance Colley, City Recorder Sheila Cox, Public Works Director Nikki Messenger, Finance Director Ron Harker, Community Development Director Brian Davis, Police Chief Jim Burge, Management Technician Debi Davidson, Christina George of the News Review and Kyle Bailey of KQEN Radio.

WASHINGTON/OAK/KANE IMPROVEMENT ENGINEERING AMENDMENT

Messenger shared a presentation outlining the project area, project goals, previously approved design concepts and four questions which seemed to be at issue for finalization of project design. Specifically noted were design concepts that would be impacted if a decision was made to not modify four short blocks on Oak and Washington to one-lane traffic. The four questions were 1) whether to reduce from two lanes to one at Washington and Oak; 2) changing the post office from head-in parking to back-in parking; 3) style of parking for the Washington and Oak short-blocks (back-in angled, head-in angled, parallel) and 4) completion of a traffic analysis to determine any impacts by the lane reduction. Downtown includes 48 blocks of parallel parking. The proposed parking changes impact 4 blocks with the post office and two without.

Positives for changing from two lanes to one included the provision of space to provide amenities (art, benches, kiosks, etc), continuation of bike lanes that will be included as part of ODOT's 138 project, angled parking for those that don't like to parallel park and improved safety. Negatives were the potential decrease in capacity which would be determined by the traffic analysis and elimination a "passing" lane while vehicles are diagonal parking.

Specifically to the post office parking, positives were to improve sight distance and safety when pulling out of spaces, improved ADA access and parking spaces, improved layout for a raised pedestrian crossing from the west side and removal of the dip between the parking area and the travel lane. Cons are the learning curve for back-in parking and the perception that people would avoid going to the post office because of the back-in parking. Retaining head-in parking would impact the location of the pedestrian access crossing and likely result in loss of one parallel parking space on the west side of Kane. The median proposed for the Kane Street centerline is approximately one foot or the equivalent of the striping it would replace.

Discussion was held on other cities that have tried back-in parking. Pendleton returned to head-in parking after only a two month period which was believed to be an insufficient period to determine its success. The City of Sisters is using a two year trial period and at this point

indicates the parking is working. Fazio noted that regardless of how angled parking is installed or parallel parking is retained, backing up is required.

The purpose of the project was restated as an attempt to revitalize the downtown infrastructure and meet current ADA requirements. When the Downtown Master Plan was developed, the provision of diagonal parking was a primary interest area for the downtown. The parking determination will affect the size of the corner bulb-outs which were intended to be designed for additional amenities. If parallel parking is retained, that would be limited. (Hawks arrived at 7:35 p.m.) Parallel parking requires 7.5' to 8' in width versus diagonal at 9' to 10'. From curb to end of the stripe would generally be 20'.

Frank Rusch, 1118 SE Washington, believed the City spent too much money on studies and should expend any further. He cited parking in the area of the Portland Art Museum which was reverted from back-in parking back to head-in parking.

Dick Dolgonas, 1338 SE Overlook, pointed out correspondence from the Bike/Ped Coalition which addressed a lot of the points brought up by the Board. The improvements proposed are exactly the type AARP claims are beneficial for seniors. He cited research on back-in parking which indicated major reductions in accidents.

Nancy Pittman, 1910 NW Delridge, requested parking remain as is at the post office expressing frustrations people have with backing up and difficulty seeing out of rear windows in bad weather conditions. She asked that the benches shown in the schematic designs be reconsidered.

Gary Quist, 1152 Harris Hills Drive, had no preference as to the parking proposals but was concerned about emergency vehicle access and traffic back-up at 5:00 with the reduction to one-lane. Rather than doing a study he believed the City should survey downtown merchants regarding their desires or invest in a downtown restroom.

Burt Tate, 1042 NE Barager, supported the back-in parking and bicycle lanes stating that they would improve walkability to the benefit of the downtown businesses.

Marty Verberkmoes, 2523 NE Stephens, believed the current downtown traffic pattern was the best in the City's history and shouldn't be changed. He was concerned about seniors' ability to back-in park at the post office and suggested back-in parking be implemented on a trial basis in front of the Courthouse.

Ron West, 1034 W Pilger, discussed the difficulties seniors have in backing up, drivers' inability to appreciate center of gravity and admonished bicyclists to be as considerate of vehicles as they demand vehicles to be toward bicyclists.

#### Post Office Parking

Discussion then centered on only the post office parking aspect of the project design with each Board Member expressing their views. Marks shared demographic information he found on the topic on the internet and the largely negative reaction he has received from the public. Ryan believed the proposal created unnecessary controversy. While believing back-in parking would be safer, Cotterell did not wish to impose that upon the general public.

Kaser agreed back-in parking was safer and the arguments regarding difficulties backing up or seeing in various weather conditions applied to all parking situations. He believed that no matter how good an argument was made for back-in parking, people would remain unconvinced, quoting George Willis: "many people when they've made up their minds and form an opinion, will ignore a Mt. Everest of evidence." Fazio agreed with Kaser and noted there would still be parallel parking near the post office. He has a school team of bicyclists that won't go to downtown because of the lack of bike lanes and feared the Board was going to scale the project down to nothing. Hawks supported the project for addressing ADA issues, spoke to drivers' need/ability to back-in in all parking variations and believed that more naysayers express their opinion than those that were satisfied with the proposed improvements. Rich supported retaining head-in parking at the post office noting that often drivers will hold up traffic while waiting for someone to back out into traffic so they could occupy that space.

Ryan made a motion to eliminate the back-in parking proposal for the post office, but retain the median and all other parts of the proposed design. Motion was seconded by Marks who then questioned the composition of the advisory committees that worked on the project. It was noted that business owners, seniors and females were all included. Motion was then voted on and carried with Katz, Marks, Cotterell and Ryan voting in favor and Kaser, Fazio and Hawks voting against the motion.

#### Oak and Washington Lane Reduction and Parking

Kaser pointed out that the Downtown Master Plan has a stated purpose to encourage the highest quality design and development and promote strong pedestrian orientation. The improvement attempts to do that with the raised crosswalks, medians, improved lighting, bulb-outs and one-lane traffic as traffic calming devices, ADA improvements, safety improvements, etc. The citizen advisory committee made recommendation to continue the flow from ODOT's 138 project which will include bicycle lanes and pedestrian amenities as well. He doubted congestion would result from the short area of one-lane traffic and did not believe a traffic analysis was necessary except to comply with the Comprehensive Plan.

Ryan stated that while he did not mind accommodating bicyclists he objected to allowing bicycles to dictate motor vehicle movement. He opposed the creation of the bike lane and the back-in parking. If the traffic analysis indicated it was possible, he could support head-in parking. Cotterell expressed his previous objections to imposing back-in parking on the citizens, but did not believe a 3-4 minute delay due to the lane reduction would be substantial. He would consider head-in parking.

Katz requested clarification regarding collector streets. Messenger explained that the Transportation System Plan has three classifications for streets. Arterials move substantial traffic such as Garden Valley, Stephens, Stewart Parkway and Harvard. Arterials lead to collector streets which directly come off collectors to connect with local streets. She viewed Washington/Oak as a couplet with two lanes/two directions. The TSP shows a standard section for a collector street with two lanes.

Fazio expressed his continued support for the original design which still leaves parallel parking available and provides for additional amenities. Hawks believed there would be a "slush area" with the one-lane reduction that would allow vehicles to pass when a car is backing up. Marks suggested a pilot period to test the back-in parking. Colley indicated that

would be possible. If the back-in parking was not used, it could be converted to head-in parking. It would be difficult, however, to revert to parallel parking with the bump-out design. Burge did not believe the improvements would have any impact on emergency response. If it had, he would have expressed those concerns during Staff deliberations. Quist again commented on getting input from the downtown businesses but supported a one-year trial as long as it did not impact the beautification aspects of the project. Rich wished to support those that served on the design committees and implement the changes.

Fazio moved to approve a contract amendment with i.e. Engineering for \$28,370 for the Washington/Oak/Kane improvement project, including the traffic analysis. Motion was seconded by Hawks and carried with Katz and Ryan voting nay. Ryan believed the action would cause unneeded controversy and Katz saw no need for the lane changes.

Fazio moved to proceed with design of two blocks of Oak and Washington Streets to single-lane with back-in parking to be given a one year trial. Motion was seconded by Marks and carried with Ryan voting nay.

#### ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 9:06 p.m.

Debi Davidson  
Management Technician

# ROSEBURG URBAN RENEWAL BOARD AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY




---

## Chestnut Avenue Traffic Signal Project Bid Award Recommendation 12UR01

---

Meeting Date: May 12, 2014  
Department: Public Works  
[www.cityofroseburg.org](http://www.cityofroseburg.org)

Agenda Section: Consent  
Staff Contact: Nikki Messenger  
Contact Telephone Number: 541-492-6730

---

### ISSUE STATEMENT AND SUMMARY

The City received bids for the Chestnut/Stephens Traffic Signal Project. The issue for the Board is whether to award the project to the low bidder.

### BACKGROUND

**A. Board Action History** In April 2012, the Board awarded a design contract to Pace Engineering. In February 2013, the Board adopted a resolution authorizing property and/or easement acquisition to facilitate the project. In December 2013, the Board authorized an amendment to the design contract to recognize additional costs associated with the property negotiations.

**B. Analysis.** Stephens Street is an arterial roadway with heavy traffic volume. Signalization of the intersection at Chestnut has been recommended in numerous plans over the years, including the Transportation System Plan and the Transportation System Analysis of Stephens Street from Garden Valley Blvd to Washington Street. Signal warrants for this intersection have been met since at least 2001. The study performed in 2007 indicated that the eastbound approach to this intersection (Chestnut) is a level of service (LOS) F during the am peak hour. Constructing the signal will change this to a LOS A. In addition, it will provide a safer crossing location for pedestrians and will create gaps for vehicles making left turns to and from Stephens Street upstream and downstream from the signal.

All necessary property acquisition has been accomplished. Construction documents were completed in March 2014 and the project was advertised for bid. On April 29<sup>th</sup>, four bids were received. The bids are summarized below.

#	Bidder	Total Bid Amount
1	Knife River Materials	\$ 275,944
2	Electrical Construction	\$ 291,757
3	Guido Construction	\$ 324,098
4	Signal Construction Group LLC	\$ 347,777
	Engineer's Estimate	\$ 369,275

**C. Financial and/or Resource Considerations.** The FY 2014-15 budget includes \$465,000 for construction of this project. Of this, \$150,000 is budgeted in the

Sidewalk/Streetlight Fund and \$315,000 is budgeted in the Urban Renewal Fund. The total project costs are estimated below:

*Spent to date:*

Design	\$100,387
Property Acquisition	\$ 50,200
Misc.	<u>\$ 2,460</u>
<i>Total Spent to Date</i>	<b><i>\$153,047</i></b>

*Remaining Project Costs*

Design (FY13/14)	\$ 11,031
Construction	\$275,944
Construction Mgt. Support	\$ 18,379
ODOT Support	\$ 5,000
Contingency (7.5%)	<u>\$ 20,696</u>
<i>Total Remaining Costs</i>	<b><i>\$331,050</i></b>

**D. Timing Issues.** If the Council and Urban Renewal Board award the contract, the Notice to Proceed would be given immediately after execution of the contract. The contractor is allowed 120 calendar days to complete the project.

**BOARD OPTIONS**

The Board has the option to:

- a. Award the contract to the lowest responsive bidder, Knife River Materials.; or
- b. Reject all bids.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

The Public Works Commission will discuss the bid results at their May 8th meeting. Staff will report the results of that discussion at the Board meeting. The lowest bidder submitted all required documentation and is considered responsive. Money has been budgeted and is available to construct the project. Pace Engineering has reviewed the bids and recommended award to the lowest bidder, Knife River Materials. Staff concurs with this recommendation.

**SUGGESTED MOTION**

***I move to award the Chestnut Avenue Traffic Signal Project, after expiration of the 7 day Notice of Intent to Award period, to the low bidder, Knife River Materials, for \$275,944.***

**ATTACHMENTS**

None.

# ROSEBURG URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY



---

## Washington/Oak Parking Design Concepts

---

Meeting Date: May 12, 2014  
Department: Public Works  
[www.cityofroseburg.org](http://www.cityofroseburg.org)

Agenda Section: Action Items  
Staff Contact: C. Lance Colley  
Contact Telephone Number: 541-492-6866

---

### ISSUE STATEMENT AND SUMMARY

It has come to staff's attention that the Board may want to revisit the decision to install back-in angled parking as part of the Washington/Oak/Kane Improvement Project.

### BACKGROUND

#### A. Board Action History.

- On October 28, 2013, the Board awarded the design contract to i.e. Engineering, Inc.
- On January 27, 2014, the Board approved the design concepts for the Washington/Oak Project and included keeping Rose Street as a two-way street.
- On March 17, 2014, the Board revisited the project and decided to:
  - Keep the parking at the Post Office head-in.
  - Proceed with a traffic study to evaluate the impacts of reducing one lane of traffic on Washington and Oak between Jackson and Kane Streets.
  - If the traffic study indicated that one travel lane was feasible, proceed with constructing back-in angled parking on Washington and Oak as proposed for a one-year trial period.

**B. Analysis.** The Urban Renewal Agency Board has approved a one-year trial for back-in angled parking on Washington and Oak Street between Jackson Street and Kane Street. However, there continues to be concerns expressed about the one-year trial period and back-in parking. It is feasible to construct traditional head-in angled parking on these four blocks. In order to accommodate the head-in parking, staff would recommend eliminating the bicycle lanes and evaluating the use of shared lane markings in these sections.

Staff has reviewed a draft of the traffic study regarding the reduction of travel lanes in these sections from two lanes to one. The analysis confirms that the roadways will meet the City's collector street mobility standards with this reduction. A copy of the final report will be forwarded to Council once it has been completed.

**C. Financial and/or Resource Considerations.** There should be no significant financial impact to the project to change from back-in to head-in angled parking.

**D. Timing Issues.** This project is currently in design. Decisions regarding the direction of parking will impact the design of the intersections and should be made as soon as practical. We are currently evaluating our initial timeline. It no longer appears feasible to begin this project in early summer. We would like to provide clear direction to our consultant

on the final parking design parameters so that we can re-evaluate the project timeline and determine when we can bid and construct the project.

### **BOARD OPTIONS**

The Board has the option to:

1. Direct staff to move forward with head-in angled parking in lieu of the back-in parking;  
or
2. Request additional information; or
3. Take no action and proceed with a one-year trial period for the back-in angled parking.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

The purpose of the project included many design elements including angled parking. The angled parking allowed for a number of the amenities outlined in the project goals. There have been many discussions regarding the merits of back-in angled parking, however it appears recent information that has been shared indicates there may be a preference by the Board to develop the project with head-in angled parking. If that is the preference of the Board, a motion to that end would allow us to direct the consultant to move forward with head-in angled parking and include the other amenities as outlined in the project through the CAC, Public Works Commission and this Board.

### **SUGGESTED MOTION**

If you concur – the appropriate motion would be:

I move to direct staff to move forward with head-in angled parking in lieu of the back-in parking.

### **ATTACHMENTS**