

The City Council for the City of Junction City, held a work session at 6:30 p.m. on Wednesday, July 16, 2014, in the Council Chambers of City Hall, 680 Greenwood Street, Junction City, Oregon.

PRESENT: Mayor, David Brunscheon; Councilors Karen Leach, Bill DiMarco, Jim Leach, Randy Nelson, Steven Hitchcock, and Herb Christensen; City Administrator, Melissa Bowers; Public Works Director, Jason Knope; LCOG Planner, Denise Walters; and City Recorder, Kitty Vodrup.

I. CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mayor Brunscheon called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

II. TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN DRAFT REVIEW

The City Council provided feedback on questions raised by LCOG Planner Denise Walters, Administrator Bowers, and Director Knope:

Chapter 2: Transportation Mission, Goals, and Policies.

1. Does Chapter 2 reflect input and City vision for transportation system?

- Current TSP needed to be consistent with the UGB (Urban Growth Boundary) amendment and bringing in new commercial properties to the south.
- The TSP draft had prison and hospital traffic allocated to the north, which was not applicable as the prison would probably not be built within 20 years and hospital staff would probably be going south. Council members wondered what assumptions were used for traffic going north.
- Concerns were expressed on relinquishing access management to the state. Planner Walters noted that for Junction City to have its own access management plan, it would be a refinement to the TSP and could be implemented as a stay alone plan or built into the standards and codes.
- A concern with Chapter 2 was that in general, the policies had too much flexibility in them and were written in broad terms. If it came down to interpretation of a broadly written policy, the City could lose in a dispute with the state or regional government over what that means. A local layer of protection and the City's own access management plan would be important.
- The trip count data seemed dated and related to a previous vision which was before the UGB expansion and new plan for the area south of town. Staff could check on the assumptions for this. Planner Walters added that the information could be in the tech memos.
- In addition to prison plan changes, hospital bed counts had initially been higher and there had been plans for geriatric prisoner care. Grain Millers development plans also changed.
- Staff to double check on what measurement DKS used for the trip count numbers to the south (units, number, etc.) and confirm if those numbers will handle the worst case scenario traffic in the UGB expansion area.

Planner Walters noted that when the Council was considering the language that they would like to fine tune in some of the TSP policies that they also remember the other tools the Council has that are in the implementing ordinances, such as the development code or Public Works Design Standards.

Chapter 3: Pedestrian Plan.

2. Are all major deficiencies identified through public and Council input included?

- From what could be remembered, the list seemed to include the projects. Sidewalks were noted.
- Crossings on Highway 99 at 1st, 6th, and 10th were significant issues.
- Since this was prepared a few years ago, would be a good idea to review items at a public workshop to see if these projects still hold true and/or use the Citizen Advisory Committee as the litmus.
- Since this was a 20 year plan, should the TSP include language on the City taking custody of county roads (High Pass, Oaklea, and 18th) that are in the City limits and putting in sidewalks for pedestrian safety and quality of life? It was noted that the City does not request road surrender from the county when properties are annexed into the City. Planner Walters stated that this could be a policy change the City could begin to do and build from there.

- It was noted that the Highway 99 Refinement Plan had included a lot of work and public participation that had produced good ideas on pedestrian crossings and other items. Why was this plan thrown out and were the good ideas from that plan captured in the TSP draft? Planner Walters responded that staff could ask ODOT if the best parts of that plan were captured in the TSP draft.
- 3. Are any constructions projects prioritized earlier missing from Tables 1 – 3 and Figure 2?**
- Planner Walters noted that she wanted to make sure projects were captured here, as this is where the City would draw from for the CIP and would provide back up for grants and things like that.
 - From what Council and staff could remember, nothing to add.
 - It was noted that there were high costs associated with many projects and that in reality, many projects in a TSP do not happen. Planner Walters stated that this was typical for all cities and reiterated that having projects in the plan could make them eligible for grants, etc. She added that there was the full meal deal plan and then DKS had suggested the Financially Constrained Plan that would include the priority projects that align with anticipated funding.
 - Reference was made to the intersection project at 1st and Prairie Road and that at one time there was supposed to be a turn lane on Oaklea Drive; neither happened. Projects like those would need county cooperation.

Chapter 4: Bicycle Plan

4. Are City needs adequately captured?

- This was an area that people dreamed big.
- There was a lot of opposition, as people did not want to give up parking on streets for a bike path.
- Discussion had included removing the diagonal parking on 6th Street and possibly having a bike lane on one side of the street. Director Knope added this first came to light during the Safe Routes to School study.
- It was asked if the City's Parks Master Plan referenced any bike paths that could be included in the TSP. Administrator Bowers responded that there was some language in the Parks Master Plan and staff could look into this further.
- Discussion had included kids crossing Oaklea from the Reserve. Director Knope responded that this would link to the discussion on the City taking county roads and bring able to link crosswalk and other improvements. Planner Walters referred to the maintenance costs, once the City requests surrender of county roads and takes in the right of ways. Director Knope responded that is one of the reasons the City does not take control of county roads in current City policy, because of those costs and impact to the Street Fund. He added there are certain instances where the City takes a county road, such as the recent taking of a portion of 6th Street which aligned with current development.

5. Do Table 4 and Figure 4 reflect input from prior discussions/priority projects?

- Projects seem to be reflect, but there were some things included that some people did not support.
- It was asked if the bike plan reflected the internal needs of the citizens of Junction City or if it was a regional template design, specifically with lanes going to Eugene? Examples were given that not many people seemed to commute on bicycles from Junction City to Eugene and that priorities would seem more in line with citizens being able to safely ride to and from areas within the City. Planner Walters responded that the table reflected local network and Safe Routes to School as the main justification.

Chapter 5: Motor Vehicle Plan

6. Do the functional classifications of streets reflect prior discussions particularly related to collector status (Figure 5) and federal funding eligibility?

- Planner Walters reviewed that DKS had suggested changing the classification on some streets such as Birch, Deal, Front, Holly, Juniper, Kalmia, and Unity from their current classification as "collector" streets to "local" streets because of traffic volumes. Director Knope stated that collector streets were eligible for federal funding, whereas local streets were only eligible for state and local funding. Staff recommended keeping the classifications as collector streets at this time, as the streets experienced high use and to keep the additional funding option. Planner Walter added that just because a

street doesn't meet an engineer's standpoint on collector trip counts does not mean that it could not be defined as one; it really depends on how the street is used.

- The Council consensus was to leave the streets as collectors.
- It was noted that the recommendation for classifying as local streets could dovetail with the concept of local neighborhood streets, with narrower streets, etc.

City Staff Question from AIS

Does the City want to incorporate the concept of Neighborhood Local Street (see Figure 9) in the Draft TSP? This concept does not exist in Public Works Design Standards.

- Planner Walters noted that this concept would include streets with less pave width and parking on only one side.
- Director Knope stated that he flagged this because this would be a philosophical change from the way the community has done things. The standards were originally created in 1996 and the street widths have not changed since then, even with 3 or 4 revisions being done per year. Part of the intent of the TSP update was to bring the TSP, Planning Codes, and Public Works Design Standards into alignment. He cited the example of Oak Street being a narrower street and the problems that have occurred because of that. He noted that having wider streets allowed more flexibility for things like bike lanes, etc. in the future.
- Concerns were expressed on the congestion and other problems that are associated with narrower streets.
- Comments included that local traffic caters to larger agricultural vehicles which need more street room. Director Knope added that even with current street widths there were tight spaces for the garbage trucks. Smaller streets would make it even more difficult for sanitation and fire vehicles.
- It was noted that Chapel Creek had the narrowest streets and that wasn't something that should be repeated. Comments were expressed to keep wider streets to align with the City's agricultural past and future and to add to the livability of Junction City.
- The Council consensus was to keep the current street width standards policy.

Chapter 5: Motor Vehicle Plan

7. Do the cross sections reflect the desired network design?

- Comments included that this did not reflect the desired design. One comment was planter strips did not make sense and someone would have to take care of the trees. Planner Walters noted that the intent and idea behind those was some buffer between the pedestrians and the cars.
- Planner Walter asked if the City's development code had a street tree requirement section. She added that if this were to be changed, Planner Cogburn or another staff person would need to track for the domino effect. Director Knope responded that the Planning Code included street tree requirements; nothing in PW code.
- Options could include the flexibility to put in a buffer such as a bike lane or something different than a planter strip.

Chapter 5: Motor Vehicle Plan

8. Access Management: On page 32 new spacing requirements are proposed to improve the function of minor arterials and collectors which are designed for longer trips at higher speeds. Are there any issues with the proposed spacing?

- Planner Walters asked if this matched current PW Design Standards. Director Knope responded that PW standards did not dictate access as far as spacing. That was in the planning code and he was fine with that. From what he remembered from the planning aspect, it appeared to meet what was done in the past.
- It was asked if the City had a documentable access management plan from the past or current and if the City's Code required or enabled one. Administrator Bowers responded that the City did not have an access management plan. Director Knope stated that the City's Code had a brief reference to spacing requirements and there was some flexibility to modify on local City owned streets, but there was not a comprehensive plan.
- Planner Walters noted that DKS referenced a plan... "following adoption of the access management plan, ODOT's access management regulations change and some elements of the plan prove to be impractical to implement. In response, the adoption of the access management plan has been repealed with policies 6H from this TSP adopted in its place." Director Knope responded that this was for non-City streets. It was noted that ODOT had a plan that included reference to Highway 99. Director

Knobe added that at one point the Council had a discussion about the City creating its own access management plan.

City Staff Question from AIS

Is it the intent of the City to develop its own access management policy?

- If this is something the City would like to do, this should be referenced in the TSP.
- Council consensus was to have the City develop its own access management plan and to put it on the project list.
- Planner Walters added that the county and ODOT would need to review and sign off on the plan, before they would co-adopt the TSP.

Chapter 5: Motor Vehicle Plan

9. Access Management: The old access management plan for state facilities will be repealed because Oregon Administrative Rules have changed.

10. Speed: On page 35 a list of potential speed reductions is included. Does the list reflect discussion? Are any missing?

- Planner Walters noted that DKS listed the following areas to be studied for possible speed reductions at Prairie Road between 1st and 99, Bailey Lane, Pitney Lane, 1st Avenue between Prairie and Oaklea, 18th between 99 and Oaklea. This was based on police and community input.
- Council members noted that the traffic signals throughout town needed to be recalibrated, as there were long wait times during certain times of the day and the signals did not seem to be based on traffic.
- Also noted was finding out if the left turn signal going west at the intersection of 99 and 1st could be changed to solid green. Also look at the timing of crosswalk buttons and citizens having to wait too long.
- Questions were raised on why there were speed concerns on some of these roads. Planner Walters responded that they could find out what the citizen and PD comments were.
- It was noted that if there were sidewalks on some of the noted roads, there wouldn't be a problem. The speeding issued seemed to be more of a pedestrian and bicycle issue.

11. Do the projects in Table 9 and Figure 10 reflect expressed project priorities?

- It was noted that traffic signal optimization was on the list.
- It was noted that page 41 referenced Pitney Lane from High Pass to Bailey Lane; the Highway 99 Refinement Plan had included a different plan for people working in Eugene to go south on Pitney to Highway 36.
- A question was asked on if the TSP included detail that the City would be doing x, y, and z, would that restrict the City in having the flexibility to change some of the project and still be able to receive funding? Planner Walters responded that the City could do a refinement of the project, based on new information that would necessitate a change. Director Knobe added there was less flexibility to make fairly significant changes on more specific grants, but others like the RO fund allow more flexibility in going from concept to design.
- A question was asked if a project could be broken up into phases. Planner Walters responded that it could and sometimes the City might only have funding for part of a project.

Chapter 6: Other Modal Plans

12. Are the City actions related to rail and transit consistent with previous discussions?

- It was noted that in the past Union Pacific had talked about fencing off both sides along the railway so people could not get up to the tracks, but that did not come to pass.
- Planner Walters noted that a lot of this looked like ADA safety so wheelchairs didn't tip when crossing the tracks and other items related to pedestrian movement.
- Council members did not remember having much discussion on this and that it would be beneficial to have more public input and further discussion on topic. Planner Walters added that they could ask the Citizen Committee if they had anything specific on these pieces.
- It was noted that there was local history as to why the City did not have ride source that the engineers were not aware of.

- It was noted that Portland and Western had put in some new crossings and repaired some of the rail beds along Holly Street, which created a hump in the middle of the road, and the asphalt on either side was still in poor condition. Director Knope stated that Portland and Western was just responsible for 1 ½ feet on either side of the rail. The remainder of the street was under the City’s jurisdiction.
- The paving of Holly Street could be added to the TSP.

Chapter 7: Funding and Implementation

13. Does the financially constrained plan (page 49) and Tables 13 -1 7 match public and Council input/priorities to date?

14. Are there any concerns about the project on (or not on) the financially constrained list?

- Planner Walters stated that she wanted to make sure the priority projects showed up on the financially constrained plan, but this was something they could discuss later, if the Council needed more time to discuss.
- Planner Walters noted that it might be worth it to address some of the other items they’ve identified tonight, as that could change the Council’s perspective on the table.
- The Council consensus was to wait to discuss.

Entire Plan

15. What specific questions or concerns do you have for DKS? For the Citizen Advisory Committee? For the Planning Commission?

- Page 44 reads, “Transportation Demand Management describes actions intended to remove single occupancy vehicle trips from the roadway network during peak travel demand periods. The goal is to reduce vehicle miles traveled and promote alternative modes of travels...a wide variety of TDM strategies exist and it’s important to tailor those strategies to meet the needs of a smaller urban community. The implementation of appropriate TDM strategies shall be considered for all employers of 100 workers or more.” What are the implications of this language? Would new employers be discouraged from locating in Junction City because of this language? What would the Council be getting into by adopting a broadly written policy where there is a lot of room for interpretation by bigger agencies? Council members expressed their objections to forcing businesses to have a plan for carpooling.
- Planner Walters noted that as she looked at the draft more, some of the language such as on potential trip reduction needed to be worked on; it’s almost informational and should the City choose to offer something like a certain percent of SDC reduction based on if they demonstrate this that’s one thing, but it seemed like the voluntary component would be very important. Council members asked if the language could be stricken. Planner Walters responded that she would have to check the TPR, because transportation planning would require you to address it somehow. It was noted that a more thorough discussion was needed on this.

Next Steps

The Council consensus was to do the following:

- Staff will work on getting feedback on Council questions, as well as prepare a list of new questions that might come up.
- Staff will bring that information back to the Council for another Work Session after late August/early September with Council and staff only. At that Work Session, the Council can discuss the next steps of providing the draft to the Citizen Advisory Committee and/or Planning Commission and if the Council wants to have DKS and ODOT to attend a meeting.

III. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

As there was no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:33 p.m.

ATTEST:

APPROVED:

Kitty Vodrup, City Recorder

David S. Brunscheon, Mayor