

Franklin Boulevard Study Stakeholder Advisory Committee

5-7 p.m. Wednesday, October 24 – Meeting #5
Springfield City Hall, Library meeting room
225 Fifth Street, Springfield

AGENDA

Meeting purpose:

- Review evaluation framework and alternatives evaluation.

5 p.m.	Welcome and introductions <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review agenda	Kristin Hull, CH2M HILL
5:10 p.m.	Public comment	
5:15 p.m.	Review concepts from design workshop and City Council direction	Sam Seskin, CH2M HILL /Tom Boyatt, City of Springfield
5:45 p.m.	Review evaluation framework <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Distribute problem statement• Distribute project outcomes• Review evaluation framework and process	Kristin Hull, CH2M HILL
6 p.m.	Discuss evaluation of alternatives <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review evaluation• Committee discussion and input	Kristin Hull, CH2M HILL
6:40 p.m.	Next steps	Sam Seskin, CH2M HILL
7 p.m.	Adjourn <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Next meeting	

Franklin Stakeholder Advisory Committee

6-8 p.m. Wednesday, August 1 – Meeting #3
Springfield Chamber of Commerce, Depot Room
101 South A Street, Springfield

Meeting summary

SAC members present

Steve Roth, Roaring Rapids Pizza
Joany Armstead, resident
Debbie Nelson, property owner
John Oldham, Oldham Cranes
Guy Santiago, Oregon River Sports
Steve Moe, property owner
Ed Moore, ODOT
Dan Ingram, Apex Development
John Tamulonis, SEDA
John Woodrow, SEDA Board President
Nathan Philips, W&G Development
Stef Viggiano, LTD (for Tom Schwetz)
Dan Egan, Springfield Chamber of
Commerce

Dave Carvo, resident

SAC members absent

Hillary Wiley, Springfield City Council
Randy Hledik, Wildish Development

Staff present

Tom Boyatt, City of Springfield
Kristin Hull, CH2M HILL
Sam Seskin, CH2M HILL
Greg Mott, City of Springfield
Brian Ray, Kittelson Associates Inc.
Jamie Parks, Kittelson Associates Inc.
John Willis, CH2M HILL

Meeting purpose:

- Review and provide input on design concepts

Agenda:

1. Welcome and introductions – Kristin Hull
2. Review cross-section concepts – Greg Tung
3. Review alignment concepts – John Willis
4. Review intersection concepts – Brian Ray
5. Discuss concepts -- All
6. Close/next steps – Kristin Hull

1. Welcome and introductions – Kristin Hull

Kristin welcomed the group and noted that the group would not spend time on the problems statement at tonight's meeting as listed on the agenda. She said that the meeting would focus on reviewing design concepts generated by the consultant team and city staff at meetings over the past two days. She told the SAC that this meeting is their best opportunity to suggest any ideas that they would like to see considered.

Sam explained that Greg Tung would review possible cross-sections, Brian Ray would review intersection concepts and John Willis would review possible alignments. He encouraged the group to ask questions at any time. Kristin told the group that three questions needed to be resolved at this meeting:

1. Which of these ideas should be carried forward?

2. Which of these ideas should be set aside at this time?
3. Are there any other ideas that should be considered?

2. Street cross-section concepts – Greg Tung

Greg presented a slideshow on multiway boulevards that emphasized how multiway boulevards improve the street environment for properties that front the street. He noted that all cross-sections include two separated EmX lanes. The cross-sections presented range from 111' to 169' compared to 73' of right-of-way today. Brian reminded the group that any of these cross-sections, including the enhanced arterial, would be difficult to implement and would dramatically change the street. He told the group that access management would need to be addressed with any design.

The SAC discussed whether the decision to accommodate EmX in dedicated lanes was final and how that decision had been made. A committee member asked if the transit lanes as shown would accommodate light rail. A project team member explained that some modifications would need to be made to accommodate light rail in the bus lanes as shown.

A committee member asked who would pay for expanded right-of-way, business relocation and maintenance of landscaping. John Tamulonis explained that capital costs would likely be shared between a number of agencies and that the city would probably pay for maintenance.

3. Alignment concepts – John Willis

John explained that the consultant team began developing alignment alternatives by looking at how different alignments would affect development near the river and how residential uses could be avoided. He told the group that the project team discovered that the right-of-way was constrained enough that business acquisitions would be necessary, even with relatively modest right-of-way expansions.

A committee member noted that gas, water and sewer lines are currently located under Franklin Boulevard and that those utility locations would have major implications for any realignment scenario. The project team explained that the right-of-way could be used for an interior roadway to preserve the utility corridor. A committee member noted that development could accommodate the utility lines.

A committee member noted that he had always expected that any widening would occur south of the existing Franklin right-of-way.

3. Intersection concepts – Brian Ray

Brian introduced the intersection concepts by explaining that he started with the assumption that the bridgeheads are not going to move. He told the group that the location of the bridgeheads means that the intersection of McVay and Franklin may need to shift west and south to function optimally.

A committee member asked if the roundabout sketch represents a roundabout that would handle truck traffic. Brian confirmed that the roundabout could accommodate trucks. The committee discussed that roundabouts have low operating costs and relatively high capital

costs. A committee member requested that the project team check-in with emergency service providers about these designs.

4. Discussion of concepts

John Tamulonis noted that developers are more interested in Franklin/Glenwood than Franklin/McVay at this point, so the west end of the project area is important and realignments could enhance or detract from the attractiveness of this area for development. A committee member noted that it would be important to consider the size of lots created by realignment.

The following ideas or questions were raised:

- Consider a couplet using Franklin Boulevard and 14th Street.
- Couplets often have one strong street and one weak street.
- May be difficult to accommodate all modes on one street – may need to consider multiple routes.
- Likes the 14th Street alignment because it is a straight, fast road. Bike and pedestrian traffic could be accommodated on a parallel route.
- 14th Street alignment would create bigger parcels for redevelopment.
- Realignment makes sense in some ways, but would be difficult to implement.
- Would moving the road near the river actually create a nicer view or further separate the community from the river?
- Can we consider a southern bypass for through cars or through trucks?
- Bypass of Glenwood should not be considered.
- Ideas are fine, but the key to a project will be cost.
- Ideas that move Franklin Boulevard south and create more land between Franklin and the river are preferred.
- Ideas that reduce the size of parcels near the river should not be considered.
- 14th Street alignment has been discussed for years and should be considered.
- Separated BRT lanes are important in any option. The project needs to ensure that BRT route can accommodate increases in ridership and frequency as the system expands.
- Does recent market study affect where Franklin would go?
- Not sure that Glenwood can support high density residential development fronting a boulevard.
- Think long-term about the corridor.

After discussion, the group agreed to eliminate the “reverse snake” from further consideration and advance the “snake” to the open house though there was not much support for it. The group did generally say that options using the existing Franklin alignment and options on 14th Street should be considered further.

5. Close

Kristin adjourned the meeting and reminded the group that they would have an opportunity to preview the information for the open house at 5 p.m. on Thursday. Kristin told the group SAC would not meet in September, but SAC members were invited to attend the council meeting on September 10 where the results on the design workshop would be presented. The next regular SAC meetings would be held on October 10 and October 24.

Revised Franklin Boulevard Study evaluation process

TO: Tom Boyatt
Stakeholder Advisory Committee

COPIES: Sam Seskin
Brian Ray
Jamie Parks
Greg Tung

FROM: Kristin Hull

DATE: REVISED October 16, 2007

Introduction

Concepts for the Franklin Boulevard Study will be evaluated against a set of criteria. The criteria will measure the concepts relative to each other and will be a way to better understand the attributes of each concept. The evaluation of the concepts will likely be used to develop a hybrid concept rather than to select any of the “pure” concepts as they are currently defined.

The goal of this evaluation process is to understand the trade-offs between the Franklin Boulevard concepts well enough to develop a hybrid concept for the section of Franklin Boulevard between McVay Highway and I-5. Concepts for two segments of the study area, the Franklin/McVay intersection and the McVay Highway, will not be evaluated at this stage. These concepts will be evaluated and refined as part of the development of a hybrid concept. The reason for this is that developing the alignment and cross-section on Franklin Boulevard first allows us to develop intersection concepts that more accurately respond to and minimize impacts. Finally, the refinement of the McVay Highway alignment depends almost wholly on the location and type of intersection at McVay Highway and Franklin Boulevard due to the short distance between the intersection and the existing railroad trestle.

Most criteria are drawn specifically from the study’s evaluative outcome statements reviewed by the Stakeholder Advisory Committee and City staff. The criteria shaded in gray were added based on the revised problem statement and project experience. The criteria are organized within categories to display trade-offs.

We have proposed measures for each criterion. A High/Medium/Low scale along with a qualitative description of the trade-offs between concepts will be developed for each criterion. Some criteria are labeled “will not be measured at this time” because they cannot be evaluated at this level of detail, but they are still shown to denote their importance to the advisory committee and staff.

City staff and the stakeholders will be invited to review the evaluation of the concepts and provide input about which options make the most sense in which segments of the corridor. They will also be invited to provide input on which concepts, if any, should be set aside. City staff and the Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) will then focus on building a hybrid alternative.

Approach to assessing business impacts and benefits

One of the key trade-offs between concepts considers enhancing redevelopment opportunities in the corridor versus protecting existing businesses. This is expressed through the following criteria:

- Promotes mixed-use, clustered redevelopment in Glenwood.
- Benefits the future business community as a whole.
- Minimizes impacts to private property and businesses

To assess the criteria related to enhancing redevelopment opportunities, the consultant team will interview economic development and real estate experts to ascertain the difference between the concepts. The consultant team will ask questions about:

- The role of street design in attracting investment.
- The role of parcel size in attracting investment.
- Likely redevelopment locations and uses.
- Overall redevelopment potential in corridor by use.

To assess business impacts, we propose to make a qualitative assessment of the likelihood that a building would be impacted by each concept with 'High' signifying a building likely to be impacted and 'Low' signifying a building unlikely to be impacted. The number of High, Medium and Low impacts will be totaled for each concept.

To assess property impacts, we propose to calculate the square footage of private property that would have to be acquired to construct each alternative. The square footage of impact will be converted to a size range to better reflect the level of detail of the design concepts.

Proposed criteria and measures

Criteria categories	Criteria	Measures
1. Cost	Project cost (unit costs for roadway and urban design features)	<p>The scale for roadway and urban design features cost will be measured in ranges to accommodate the relatively low level of detail available at this stage. The scale is as follows:</p> <p>High – The concept has a relatively low construction cost.</p> <p>Medium – The concept has a moderate construction cost.</p> <p>Low – The concept has a relatively high construction cost.</p>
2. Natural environment	<i>Enhances the natural environment.</i>	<i>Will not be measured at this time.</i>
	<i>Provides opportunities to incorporate sustainable design principles.</i>	<i>Will not be measured at this time.</i>
	<i>Improves visual and physical connections to the river.</i>	<i>Will not be measured at this time.</i>

<p>3. Community values and economic development</p>	<p><i>Enhances Franklin Boulevard's role as a gateway to Glenwood, downtown Springfield, Eugene and the University of Oregon.</i></p>	<p><i>Will not be measured at this time.</i></p>
	<p>Promotes mixed-use, clustered redevelopment in Glenwood.</p>	<p>Measure will be developed through discussions with real estate experts.</p>
	<p>Benefits the future business community as a whole.</p>	<p>Measure will be developed through discussions with real estate experts.</p>
	<p>Provides for the safety and convenience of pedestrians including alter-abled people</p>	<p>The scale for sidewalk location/relationship to roadway is as follows:</p> <p>High – The concept locates sidewalks adjacent to a low-traffic roadway.</p> <p>Medium – The concept locates some sidewalks adjacent to a low-traffic roadway.</p> <p>Low – The concept locates sidewalks adjacent to a high-traffic roadway.</p> <hr/> <p>The scale for distance to cross roadway is as follows:</p> <p>High – The concept requires crossing distance of less than 140'.</p> <p>Medium – The concept requires crossing distance of 140' to 150'.</p> <p>Low – The concept requires crossing distance of more than 150'.</p>
	<p>Provides for safety and convenience of cyclists</p>	<p>The scale for safety and convenience of cyclists is as follows:</p> <p>High – The concept provides bike lanes.</p> <p>Medium – The concept provides some bike lanes.</p> <p>Low – The concept does not provide bike lanes.</p>
	<p>Provides for efficient operation of transit</p>	<p>The scale for safety and convenience of transit is as follows:</p> <p>High – The concept provides transit lanes.</p> <p>Low –The concept does not provide transit lanes</p>

	<i>Distinctive designs</i>	<i>Will not be measured at this time.</i>
	Minimizes impacts to private property and businesses	<p>Business impacts will be assessed on the following scale:</p> <p>High – The concept will likely require the acquisition of the building.</p> <p>Medium – The concept is within 5 feet of the building.</p> <p>Low – The concept is more than 5 feet away from the building.</p> <p>To compare, the number of low, medium and high impacts will be counted for each concept.</p> <p>Property impacts will be assessed on the following scale:</p> <p>High – The concept will require acquisition of more than x square feet of private property.</p> <p>Medium – The concept will require acquisition of between x and y square feet of private property.</p> <p>Low – The concept will require acquisition of less than y square feet of private property.</p>
4. Transportation performance	Accommodates efficient intersection function	Will not be measured at this time.
	Accommodates freight	Will not be measured at this time.
	Accommodate long-term traffic needs	<p>Long-term traffic needs will be evaluated in terms of speed.</p> <p>Long-term traffic needs will be evaluated in terms of through-put.</p>
	Accommodates local and regional traffic	<p>The scale for accommodates local and regional traffic is as follows:</p> <p>High – The concept separates local and regional traffic.</p> <p>Low – The concept does not separate local and regional traffic.</p>

Attachment 1. Traffic evaluation methodology

Alignment	Corridor Travel Time	Traffic Through-put
14th Street Alignment, Multiway Boulevard, widened to north	High	High
14th Street Alignment, Arterial, widened to north	High	High
Franklin Alignment, Multiway Blvd., center widening	Medium	High
Franklin Alignment, Multiway Blvd., widened to south	Medium	High
Franklin Alignment, Arterial, center widening	Medium	High
Franklin Alignment, Arterial, widened to south	Medium	High

Table 1. Summary of traffic evaluation

Travel speed was compared between the concepts using the corridor travel time as the performance measure:

- Speed evaluation was based on the length of the alignment, as vehicle delay along the corridor is expected to be roughly equivalent between concepts.
- Alignments along the existing Franklin Boulevard have an overall length approximately 4% longer than the 14th Street alignments (.78 miles compared to .75 miles).
- Therefore, Franklin Boulevard alignments expected to have corridor travel times slightly longer than the 14th Street alignments.

Traffic through-put was evaluated by considering the capacity of the concepts to handle expected traffic volumes on the corridor.

- All concepts include 2 through-lanes in either direction, separated BRT lanes, and bicycle facilities separated from through-travel lanes (whether in bike lanes or local access roads).
- Separating BRT and bikes from the automobile travel lanes will serve to increase capacity over the existing Franklin Boulevard cross-section. Additionally, any access management/consolidation along the corridor will also increase capacity.
- Consequently, total capacity of the concepts to handle through-traffic is roughly equivalent.
- Expected daily traffic volumes on the corridor within the study timeframe are expected to be 35,000 vehicles or less. All of the concepts generated have sufficient capacity to handle this volume.
- Any capacity problems/bottlenecks along the corridor will occur at intersections, primarily Franklin/McVay. Concept evaluation at Franklin/McVay will consider intersection capacity.

Franklin Boulevard Study Problem Statement

Franklin Boulevard is the major east-west route within the Glenwood community and one of only four east-west arterials in the region that connect Eugene and Springfield. It is an important gateway to Eugene, downtown Springfield, the University of Oregon, and Glenwood. Franklin Boulevard is a five lane roadway with frequent business accesses and bus rapid transit service that operates in mixed traffic. The corridor has sidewalks in some places, but they are narrow and often located on private property or easements.

The Glenwood area, the City of Springfield's first urban renewal district, is poised for extensive redevelopment. The principal focus for redevelopment has been near the intersection of Franklin Boulevard and the McVay Highway. The proposals for this area, first outlined in the Glenwood Riverfront Plan, favor higher density, mixed-use development oriented toward the river. In their present form, neither Franklin Boulevard nor McVay Highway support these redevelopment goals. Limited transportation dollars combined with the high cost of facility improvements will make these improvements a challenge to deliver.

The current condition and appearance of both corridors is widely perceived as an impediment to the area's economic renewal. Franklin Boulevard's visual environment is defined by frequent access points, unappealing and competing signage, minimal landscaping, inefficient land development and unorganized parking. The Willamette River, a significant environmental asset, is largely ignored and disconnected from the adjacent corridors and neighborhoods.

The existing Franklin Boulevard right-of-way is constrained. Any future improvements will require widening the right-of-way, and any widening of Franklin Boulevard will require property acquisition. Some owners of existing businesses are concerned that improvements will either deprive their property of all economic value or devalue their property by making it unsuitable to current uses. Some residents and property owners are concerned that plans that encourage redevelopment of parcels and relocation of current uses will change the community fabric and ultimately harm Glenwood. Many stakeholders are excited about redevelopment opportunities in Glenwood and see improvements to Franklin Boulevard as an important way to invigorate the area.

Franklin Boulevard serves a wide-range of transportation modes including through and local car and truck traffic, transit, bikes and pedestrians in a constrained right-of-way. In the future, Franklin Boulevard will continue to be a key regional arterial and will need to accommodate 30,000-35,000 cars and trucks each day and offer sufficient mobility and accessibility to support growth in both local and regional traffic, as well as a substantial increase in bike and pedestrian trips. McVay Highway will need to accommodate a similar mix of local and through trips. Both corridors have a variety of access management, parking, connectivity, safety and operational issues that require correction or improvement.

The intersections of Franklin Boulevard and the McVay Highway and Franklin Boulevard and Glenwood Boulevard will need to accommodate anticipated increased traffic volumes. The McVay Highway/Franklin Boulevard intersection today is a "T" configuration; in the future, a fourth intersection leg is planned to allow for access north into the riverfront area. The Glenwood Boulevard/Franklin Boulevard intersection is the area's gateway from I-5 and will need to accommodate traffic generated from new uses in the broader area including the Glenwood Riverfront and a proposed University of Oregon basketball arena.

Franklin Boulevard is a bus rapid transit corridor, where buses operate in mixed traffic. Lane Transit District has built temporary bus rapid transit stations that can be replaced in their current locations or rebuilt in new locations. Any design for the corridor must accommodate bus rapid transit stations that support future land uses.

Franklin Boulevard Study Evaluation methodology

Criteria categories	Criteria	Measures	Methodology
1. Cost	Project cost (unit costs for roadway and urban design features)	Minimizes project cost (High= lowest project cost)	Cost in \$2007, does not include right-of-way
3. Community values and economic	Promotes mixed-use, clustered redevelopment in Glenwood.	Minimize right of way acquisitions on the north side of Franklin	Square footage of right-of-way acquisition north of Franklin
	Benefits the future business community as a whole.	Has potential for phased implementation	Qualitative assessment of phasing potential
	Provides for the safety and convenience of pedestrians including alter-abled people	Provides sidewalks adjacent to low-traffic roadways	Qualitative assessment of sidewalk location
		Provies the shortest crossing distance across Franklin Boulevard	Distance across Franklin Boulevard, curb to curb
	Provides for safety and convenience of cyclists	Provides bike lanes or other bike facilities	Qualitative assessment of presence of bike facilities
	Provides for efficient operation of transit	Accommodates a separate lane for transit	Qualitative assessment of presence of transit lane
	Minimizes impacts to private property and businesses	Minimizes impacts to businesses and residences (structures)	Qualitative assessment of the likelihood a business or residence would be acquired to construct project
		Minimizes impacts to private property (total right-of-way)	Square footage of right-of-way acquisition
4. Transportation performance	Accommodate long-term traffic needs	Minimizes travel times on Franklin Boulevard	Qualitative assessment of travel time on Franklin including speed and distance
		Maximizes through-put on Franklin Boulevard	Qualitative assessment of capacity on Franklin
	Accommodates local and regional traffic	Provies for separation of through and local traffic	Qualitative assessment of through and local traffic separation

Not measured at this time

2. Natural environment	Enhances the natural environment.	Will not be measured at this time.
	Provides opportunities to incorporate sustainable design	Will not be measured at this time.
	Improves visual and physical connections to the river.	Will not be measured at this time.
3. Community values and economic	Enhances Franklin Boulevard's role as a gateway to Glenwood,	Will not be measured at this time.
	Distinctive designs	Will not be measured at this time.
4. Transportation performance	Accommodates efficient intersection function	Will not be measured at this time.
	Accommodates freight	Will not be measured at this time.

FRANKLIN BOULEVARD STUDY CONCEPT EVALUATION

Criteria categories	Criteria	Measures	Existing alignment widened south			Existing alignment widened center			14th Street alignment			
			Improved arterial	Multiway boulevard	Hybrid	Improved arterial	Multiway boulevard	Hybrid	Improved arterial	Multiway boulevard	Hybrid	
1. Cost	Project cost (unit costs for roadway and urban design features)	Minimizes project cost (High= lowest project cost)	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
3. Community values and economic development	Promotes mixed-use, clustered redevelopment in Glenwood.	Minimizes right of way acquisitions on the north side of Franklin	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
	Benefits the future business community as a whole.	Has potential for phased implementation	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
	Provides for the safety and convenience of pedestrians including alter-abled people	Provides sidewalks adjacent to low-traffic roadways		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
		Provides for safe crossing of Franklin Boulevard (all have the same crossing distance for the arterial portion)		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
	Provides for safety and convenience of cyclists	Provides bike lanes or other bike facilities		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
	Provides for efficient operation of transit	Accommodates a separate lane for transit		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
	Minimizes impacts to private property and businesses	Minimizes impacts to businesses and residences (structures)		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
		Minimizes impacts to private property (total right-of-way)		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
4. Transportation performance	Accommodate long-term traffic needs	Minimizes travel times on Franklin Boulevard	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
		Maximizes through-put on Franklin Boulevard	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
	Accommodates local and regional traffic	Provides for separation of through and local traffic		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	

TOTAL SCORE 30 30 N/A 27 27 N/A 27 29 N/A

● High/meets criteria well -- 3 pts
 ● Medium/meets criteria somewhat -- 2 pts
 ● Low/meets criteria poorly -- 1 pt
 ● Not applicable/could not be measured at this level of detail