

# Meeting Summary & Notes



## Roseburg Transportation System Plan Update: TSP System Conditions

**LOCATION:** 700 SE Douglas Avenue – Umpqua Room

**DATE:** Thursday, August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2019

**TIME:** 3:00 – 5:00 PM

### Attendees:

- Tom Guevara, ODOT (APM)
- John Lazur, Associate City Planner, City of Roseburg
- Nikki Messenger, City Manager, City of Roseburg
- Stu Cowie, Community Development Director, City of Roseburg
- Loree Pryce, Public Works Engineer, City of Roseburg
- Angela Rogge, DEA (Consultant Deputy PM)
- Shelly Alexander, DEA (Consultant PM)
- Dick Dolgonas, Bike Walk Roseburg
- Dr. Bob Dannenhoffer, Douglas County Health
- Jenny Carloni, League of Women Voters Umpqua Valley
- Matt Droscher, Umpqua Valley Disabilities Network
- Jessica Hand, Blue Zones

### Introductions

Shelly briefly reviewed the meeting agenda which includes a PowerPoint (PP) presentation, and introduced Angela, the consultant deputy project manager and lead transportation engineer. The PP is attached and covers the following: the basics of a Transportation System Plan (TSP), why it is needed, the current stage of the process, the draft outline, and code recommendations.

### Presentation

Shelly presented the initial presentation slides (1-4) which covered the basics of a Transportation System Plan (TSP), why it is needed, and at what stage of the process things stand currently. The draft TSP outline was reviewed. The framework for updating the City code to be consistent with the TSP and Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) was discussed.

Angela presented on the outline of the TSP draft, TSP Guidance, and the code recommendations (slides 5-16). The following were the *comments (shown in blue italic font)* and points of discussion:

1. Slide 5 (Draft TSP Outline):
  - a. The TSP is to provide guidance and not a mandate;
  - b. It's a tool to help the City build projects;
  - c. The local street system is not the focus of the TSP (rather collector and arterial roadways); but provides a toolkit for improvements;
  - d. Future look (20-year planning horizon): looks at employment, population, operations and connections (discussed by mode), and funding;
  - e. Funding plan (TM 5, CIP, available funding): reconcile and prioritize;
  - f. Aspirational projects can be funded later (typically with grants).
2. Slide 6 (TSP Guidance):
  - a. Can a proposed project be implemented with the current code?

- b. Functional classifications and planned connections.
- 3. Slide 7 (Code Recommendations):
  - a. Get the code, planned projects/standards on the same page.
- 4. Slide 8 (Big Picture):
  - a. Code changes/updates need to be implemented.
  - b. If needed, City will take the suggested language and write new code language to amend the code.
  - c. *Can Angelo Planning Group (APG), a subconsultant specializing in code/policy, add a column to Table 1 that includes a 4<sup>th</sup> column "Why Policy XX" 1A, for example?*
  - d. *Dick Dolgonas would like a correlation between Draft TM 6 and the policy.*
- 5. Slide 9 (Code Recommendations 1):
  - a. ADA Language:
    - i. Not ADA transition plan
    - j. Overlap between TSP and ADA Transition Plan
    - k. *Is there an ADA deficiency? If so, the nexus of the ADA transition plan is needed to address it.*
    - l. *Strengthen language for land use development re: ADA (Universal Design); new term "intersectionality"- opportunity to "get ahead of the curve".*
- 6. Slide 10 (Code recommendations 2):
  - a. Suggest expanding the code language to provide parking for all non-vehicular mobility devices (bikes, scooters, etc.)
- 7. Slide 11 (Code Recommendations 3):
  - a. Recommendation 8 ("crosswalks" in parking area) not needed, but may facilitate non-vehicular modes.
  - b. Recognition that "code trumps policy"
  - c. *Suggest utilizing references in the code to the policy. For example, "include design standards by reference".*
  - d. Recommendation 11 explicitly states bike/ped as options for off-site improvements- strengthens code to provide bike/ped facilities.
- 8. Slide 13 (Code Recommendations 5)
  - a. Recommendation 15: provide consistency between City groups (Parks is installing shared-use paths).
  - b. Skinny Streets (for consideration): cross section samples (for example, 40' ROW); current minimum ROW width is 60'.
  - c. Recommendation 16: ODOT submittal of a land use application may want further discussion. *Tom suggested making the language more general (road authorities) and not specific to ODOT.*
  - d. Tom provided comments on various aspects for consideration, such as mixed use zones, trip increases.
  - e. Intent of TM 6: Flag current code that could not facilitate implementation of the selected projects in its current form (or is missing)
    - i. *TM 6 to note: "why" it is needed (see comment 4c above)*
    - j. Management actions are the next steps: deficiency that is not addressed by a project in TSP may result in a new management action and/or policy.
    - k. 2 page summary of management actions (1. Mobility targets; 2. IAMPs; 3. Reduced lane widths)

9. Slide 16 (Next Steps):

- a. The PAC will provide comments on TM 6 and the Consultant will work to address comments from City, ODOT and PAC.
- b. *Request to have the comment log circulated. Project team will distribute comment log to date.*
- c. *Add policy to address acceptable congestion.* Consultant notes that the TSP provides updated Mobility Targets that streamline the current standards and focus analysis on the entire hour instead of the peak 15 minutes.
- d. There will be a draft TSP for review in September
- e. PAC and Open House meeting will review draft TSP