

Date:	August 15, 2021	Project #: 23021.035
To:	James Feldmann	
From:	Nick Gross, Camilla Dartnell, Phill Worth, Bincy Koshy, Polina Polikakhina, Kittelson and Associates, Inc. Kim Marshall, Barney & Worth	
Project:	Highway OR 99W South Corvallis Facility Plan	
Subject:	Concept Development Workshop Summary	

## Overview

The OR 99W South Corvallis Facility Plan has been underway since late 2020. On July 27, 2021 the Oregon Department of Transportation hosted a Concept Development Workshop and on July 28 the public was invited to view the results of the workshop and ask questions of the project team. The public was invited to participate in the open house in-person or online.

## Tuesday Concept Development Workshop

The purpose of the Concept Development Workshop was to engage and solicit input from the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAG) on near- and long-term solutions for OR 99W through south Corvallis, with particular emphasis on **cross sections, intersections, enhanced crossings, and spot treatments**. Members from the TAC and SAG were co-mingled to promote collaborate between TAC and SAG members.

### *Cross Section*

The purpose of the cross section exercise was to identify a preferred near- and long-term cross section for OR 99W. Particular attention during the workshop was given to the two-way sections of highway south of the Marys River.

### *Parameters, Instructions, and Objective*

The near-term cross section is considered to be an improvement implemented within the next 3-5 years as part of an Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) pavement resurfacing project. The near-term cross section assumes the existing curb-to-curb width of 74-foot is not changed.

The long-term cross section represents a 20- to 30-year visionary concept a major renovation to OR 99W. The long-term cross section assumes a right-of-way (ROW) of 100 feet with opportunities to extend to 110 feet or more.

Workshop participants were provided with cross section “puzzle pieces” depicting cross section elements and dimensions i.e., 11-foot travel lanes, 6-foot bike lanes, 4-foot landscaping buffers, 2-foot hard surface buffers, etc. They were invited individually and then by group consensus to develop their ideal cross

section for each timeframe (respecting the 74-foot curb-to-curb width only under the near-term condition).

### Key Themes and Takeaways

#### Near-Term

General consensus was met for the near-term cross section (74-foot curb-to-curb). All groups were supportive of reducing travel lane widths from 12 feet to 11 feet and reducing the two-way turn lane (TWTL) from 14 feet to 12 feet. The additional 6 feet was allocated to the on-street bike lane, incorporating a buffer between the bike lane and adjacent travel lane.

Unanimous support was voiced for “greening” the corridor through the incorporation of landscaping, vegetation, and trees. Where possible, converting the continuous TWTL into a landscaped median was voiced as a strong preference with recognition for providing left-turn access in and out of adjacent land uses, as necessary.



Figure 1: Cross section station showing proposed near-term cross section

#### Long-Term

The long-term curb-to-curb cross section was generally consistent across the three groups, recognizing the balance between vehicular operations and multimodal needs. Consideration was given to a three (3)

lane cross section and speculations were offered regarding this potential for an extended length of the corridor. A desire to understand the trade-offs of such a strategy were raised during the workshop and has been raised by the public, as well. One participant voiced a strong desire to implement a transit priority bus lane as part of the five (5) lane cross section.

Though generally consistent, input varied for treatments beyond the curb. All three groups agreed that separate facilities for people walking and biking is important, noting a multiuse path may not be the best facility given the potential for increased conflict between non-motorized users. The key difference between input received was focused on how to separate the pedestrian and bicycle facilities: landscaping, flex post, or grade separation.

### *Intersections and Crossings*

The purpose of the intersections and crossings exercise was to identify locations and types of crossings and intersections along the study corridor. Particular attention during the workshop was given to the two-way sections of highway south of the Marys River.

### *Parameters, Instructions, and Objective*

The project team shared Blueprint for Urban Design guidance target crossing spacing, guidance on different types of crossings, and the differences between and considerations around protected, signalized intersections and roundabouts. Each team identified key intersections and determined the type of treatment that they thought would best serve the community for each intersection, then identified crossing locations along the corridor.

### *Key Themes and Takeaways*

The teams came up with a range intersection and crossing concepts. There was consensus about the desire for a roundabout north of or at Chapman Place and roundabouts at each major intersection in the southern section of the corridor, at Kiger Island Drive and Airport Road. Generally, between Chapman Place and Goodnight Avenue, teams included signalized protected intersections at the major intersections and voiced land use constraints as the main impetus for that decision. Some teams continued the protected intersections at Goodnight Avenue and Rivergreen Avenue while others identified roundabouts as the treatment of choice at those locations.

All teams identified the intersections of SE Viewmont Avenue and SW Tunison Avenue as a challenging intersection. The groups agreed that a more visible pedestrian crossing should be provided near these intersections to serve students accessing the school from the west. A protected, signalized concept where left turning vehicles generally make a left turn, then wait for a through signal gained support but all teams identified that this intersection require further consideration to identify the final proposed solution.

For the crossings, teams identified crossing locations that met the target crossing spacing and supported local land uses. The project team explained that a crossing study would be required to determine the final treatment, but all teams identified pedestrian hybrid beacons or signals as the preferred treatments along the corridor.



Figure 2: Intersection and crossing concepts

## Wednesday Public Open House

The next day, the results of the concept development workshop were presented to the public. The open house invitations were distributed beforehand to the City and County elected officials and staff, advisory committee members, the project contact list, and other interested parties. The event was also publicized in the project newsletter and through local news media. Information provided in the open house included:

- A project overview, map, and captioned photos
- Project Vision statement
- Presentation of the Concept Development Workshop results
- Short-term and long-term corridor cross section alternatives
- Short-term and long-term crossing alternatives

Participants were able to offer input through:

- Comment cards
- Live Q&A
- One-on-one conversations with the project team before and after the formal presentation

More open houses are planned for future stages of the project, along with other channels for public involvement. An online open house will be available August 20 – 30 and there are community tabling events planned for August 25.

### **Highlights**

The open house drew strong participation – approximately 35 people attended the open house in-person and another 25 people logged in online. Six City Councilors and two planning commissioners attended as well. South Corvallis residents were in the majority, but many participants lived/worked elsewhere in Corvallis – yet were familiar with and interested enough in the OR 99W corridor to participate.

During the first hour of the open house participants were invited to view the short- and long-term alternatives for the corridor and ask questions of the project team. The second hour of the program was a formal presentation led by Kittelson & Associates. They described the project vision statement, types of treatments that could be used along the corridor to solve existing challenges, and the results of the Concept Development Workshop. Following the presentation the project team took questions from the live audience and online participants.



**Figure 3: ODOT Project Manager James Feldman explains intersection alternatives to open house participants**

### *Summary of Feedback*

Many participants felt that narrower travel lanes would help the corridor and slow traffic speeds – this is in line with the short-term alternative proposed by the Concept Development Workshop participants.

- “Narrower lanes will encourage slower traffic”
- “Lanes should be narrower. More ROW should be dedicated to non-motorized users.”

Attendees would like medians separating car traffic, with trees planted in the medians.

- “I like the medians, separation of pedestrians/cyclists from main traffic. Also like the idea of the median in the center of the highway. There are some sections of SW 3rd, by the coop, where some tall trees could be planted that would cause shade, and not be in the way of the businesses.”
- “Trees! Separation of bike lanes by large area.”
- “Medians with trees to mitigate climate change.”

Several participants raised questions and provided input about intersection options for people walking and biking.

- “How would pedestrians use a roundabout? Would bicyclists be separated from cars? Would bikes cross at a crosswalk like pedestrians?”
- “How are crossings handled at a roundabout? If an actuated crossing is added, are walk signals visible to pedestrians?”

- “A big plus for protected intersections for bikes and pedestrians”
- “Protected intersections are a big improvement!”

Some participants had comments and concerns about specific intersections and locations in the corridor:

- “I think a roundabout at the south end at Kiger Island Drive is a great way to create a gateway that slows people down.”
- “Would the protected cycle lane start at 4th and Western for southbound? The multi-modal path on the east side of OR 99W is nice, but causes hassles for people wanting to head south and west instead of down Crystal Lake Drive.”
- “How do we mitigate unofficial South Corvallis bypass of Alley Park Road and Avery Avenue?”