

Eugene Active Transportation Committee



City of Eugene
99 E Broadway Ste 400
Eugene, Oregon 97401
(541) 682-5291
(541) 682-5032 FAX
www.eugene-or.gov/bpac

Date: Thursday, November 10, 2016
Time: 5:30 to 7:30 p.m.
Location: Sloat Conference Room
Atrium Building, 99 W. 10th Ave
Eugene, OR 97401

BPAC Members in Attendance: Vivian Schoung, Eliza Kashinsky, Susan Stumpf, Allen Hancock, Mike DeLuise, Seth Sadofsky, Amy Harter, Brian Johnson, Joel Krestik, Bob Beals, Shane MacRhodes, Kelsey Moore, Alpha Wilson, Steve Bade

BPAC Members Absent: Bob Passaro

Staff in Attendance: Lee Shoemaker, Reed Dunbar, Chris Henry, Matt Rodrigues, Larisa Varela

Members of the Public: Jerry Hooten, Michele O'Leary, Howie Bonnett, Vicky Mello, Rob Zako, Ken Murdoff, Jim Patterson, Andy Peara, Daniel Wilson, Emily Eng

Notes

1. Open Meeting

2. Public Comment (5:30-5:40)

ATC is recruiting for new members. If interested, see website or contact Lee Shoemaker.

Carla LaFleur: Principal Village School. Stresses urgency for getting a RRFB on Willamette Street. 4 traffic crashes since school started. Reprioritize funding to put school first. 218 students at the school. No marked crosswalks on Willamette Street now.

Andy Peara: Executive Director of Village School. Wanted to emphasize the need for improved crossings at the school site. Willamette is a very busy street, so is Donald, both need some work to make it safer for children to walk/bike to school. Want flashers for the school speed zone. Just moved to this site. Discussed traffic issues with city before opening school. 4j sold off all the parking, there is no on-site parking for the school which creates a lot of traffic, movement on the streets. (Note, the Village School bought the site, so will be there for the long-term. Working on an SRTS Action Plan.)

Rob Zako: member of Lane ACT. Had presentation from region on safety at last ACT meeting. Will distribute the plan to the committee.

3. Approve October 13, 2016 Meeting Summary Notes (5:40-5:45)

Action Requested: Approve Meeting Notes

Notes approved.

4. Vision Zero in Sweden and Denmark (5:45-6:30)

Action Requested: Presentation and Discussion

- Presenter: Matt Rodrigues, Interim Traffic Engineer

Mr. Rodrigues received a fellowship to study Vision Zero in Sweden through a grant from the American Public Works Association. Matt showed some major points and lots of pictures of what implementation looks like in Sweden.

Vision Zero

- Ethical Platform
- Safety philosophy: no loss of life is acceptable
- Design a transportation system around what a human body can take (impacts)
- System designers have primary responsibility

Implementation

- Speed reduction
- Centerline cable rail on high speed roads
- Intersections to roundabouts
- Integration of traffic calming at pedestrian crossings
- Safe bicycle facilities
- Safety systems in vehicles

Vision Zero became a national priority in 1997. Fatality trend lines show effectiveness of VZ program. Matt discussed data gathered and impressions from being in different Swedish cities.

5. 2017 Walking-Biking Projects (6:30-6:55)

Action Requested: Presentation and Feedback

- Presenter: Reed Dunbar
- Reed discussed the 2017 Pavement Bond Measure Projects identified by the ATC Infrastructure Subcommittee. The projects include:
- RRFB: Maxwell Road at N Park Avenue
 - RRFB: Royal Ave at Throne Dr
 - E 24th Avenue protected bike lanes (Cost match with 4j)
 - Street signs on Fern Ridge Path to Accessways
 - eBike Lockers (grant match for ODOT funding)
 - Annual Accessible Pedestrian Signal (APS) contribution
 - Shared lane markings on 3rd Avenue (by REI)

Comments:

- Not sure that all criteria are necessary, or equal. Could weight the projects.
- How weigh Village School safety v. Maxwell Road. The matrix was a straw poll. A deeper dive can be done.

- Leverage is important. The bike lockers may not be sexy, but the amount of money we get through the grant allows this investment to make more sense.
- Equity means that we invest in different parts of the city. The RRFB projects occur in places that have not been invested in to the same level as others.
- Maxwell – the leverage piece is the \$300K investment for sidewalks to the school. Sidewalks now from Maxwell to the school, but nothing across Maxwell. This was on the SRTS priority list since 2013.
- School zone flashers – did we have to use bike/ped funds for this before? Should come out of traffic funds.
- Why is Maxwell more money? The design of the street may require a different beacon device, probably one that is more expensive (PHB versus RRFB).
- Likely that we'll winnow this list down; some projects may drop off after evaluation.
- SRTS: Thinks that Village School is a difficult situation, watched it and thinks something should be done. Maxwell is not a great street to cross either.
- Considering equity, this year we did do 2 RRFBs in River Rd and Santa Clara.
- Seeing a lot of RRFBs for this funding. Long-term, will we still need them or are there other tools available to accomplish the goals? (It will take decades to redesign all city streets. RRFBs will have a place for many years to come.)
- Comfortable with this amount of money? Not really, seems like too much if there are two years of money left to spend. And projects never get cheaper. Can we leave the meeting with projects that aren't as necessary?
 - Throw out school flashers because they should utilize another source
 - W Bank Path signs could fall off too
- What's the yellow highlight? It's a "good project". Well, then add yellow highlight to the Willamette RRFB too.
- Motion: Move ahead with selected projects and report back when estimates are determined. Amendment: add the Willamette/34th as a 2nd tier project. Amendment: remove the \$10K signs. No, separate category. Failed.
 - Motion: price all recommended projects from the draft list. Failed – more discussion.
 - Revote: price all recommended projects from the draft list. One non-contest. Passes.

6. Walking-Biking Connections to South Bank River Path (6:55-7:15)

Action Requested: Presentation and Discussion

- Presenter: Allen Hancock

Ran short of time. Allen offered to come back in 2017 and discuss the projects in more detail with new members of the ATC.

7. Information Share (7:15-7:30)

Action Requested: Information Share

Joel: elections for new chair and vice chair in December.

Vivian: downtown planning discussion is ongoing (County Courthouse, etc.). Next Monday, scenarios will be available online for comment.

Bob B: having returned to Eugene from visiting other cities recently; we should know that we have it pretty good here.

Allen: will not be at December meeting. Will be cycling in Taiwan. Will be back in January.

Eliza: land use issues still prevalent in city. Can talk to me privately.

Lee: give time in December for members terming-out to speak about their experience and give advice. New folks will be on in January.

Reed: CMAQ discussions moving forward with ODOT. Should mean more money to the region.

Shane: last day at 4j SRTS will be November 16th. Have three great candidates who will have final interviews with Superintendent. Was told Springfield has hired their coordinator. Bethel has job posting available now. December 6th there will be a regional SRTS information meeting.

Michael: today's Eugene Weekly has article about bicycling in Eugene.

Seth: saw the ad went out for Traffic Engineer. Looked like some language was used that we had recommended. Good!

8. Adjourn

Future Agenda Topics

- Vision Zero – December
- Bike Theft – to be determined
- Pro Walk, Pro Bike, Pro Place Conference Report - to be determined
- Moving Ahead - to be determined
- Pedestrian-Bicycle Pavement Bond Measure Projects – As needed
- Community Design Guide – to be determined
- Automobile Parking Requirements – to be determined
- Pedestrian and Bicycle Strategic Plan – to be determined
- Traffic Enforcement/Citations – to be determined
- Improved Crash Data/Traffic Enforcement – to be determined
- Development Code – to be determined
- Pedestrian-Bicycle 101 – regular agenda topic
- Parks and Recreation System Plan – to be determined

Respectful Environment – No Harassment

Members of City boards, commissions, and committees are agents of the organization and are subject to City policies related to maintaining a respectful work environment:

The City of Eugene is committed to fair and impartial treatment of all employees, applicants, contractors, volunteers, and agents of the City, and to provide a work environment free from discrimination and harassment, where people treat one another with respect. It is the responsibility of all employees to maintain a work environment free from any form of discrimination or harassment based on race, creed, sex, sexual orientation, color, national origin, age, religion, disability, marital status, familial status, source of income, or any other legally protected status. The City prohibits unlawful harassment and/or discrimination.

Accordingly, derogatory racial, ethnic, religious, age, gender, sexual orientation, sexual, or other inappropriate remarks, slurs, or jokes will not be tolerated.

[Administrative Policies and Procedures Manual, Section 1.4 (Revised 05/14/04)]