

Street Design Working Group Meeting for Milwaukie TSP Update
6:30-8:30 p.m. Wednesday, May 23, 2007

MEETING SUMMARY

Purpose:

- Learn about the pros and cons of different Street design options.
- Discuss and identify street design preferences.

Agenda:

6:30 p.m.	Welcome, staff introductions and purpose	Susan Shanks
6:40 p.m.	What are the pros and cons of street design options?	Alan Snook
7:10 p.m.	What street design options are preferred?	Kristin Hull
8:20 p.m.	Next steps	Susan Shanks
8:30	Close	

1. Welcome, staff introductions, and meeting protocols – Susan Shanks

Susan welcomed attendees and introduced staff. She told the group that the focus of this meeting was to learn about what they like and dislike about different street designs and what likes and dislikes the group shares in common.

2. What are the pros and cons of street design options? – Alan Snook

Alan gave a presentation that summarized the pros and cons of different street design options including traffic calming treatments, traffic reduction treatments, alternative stormwater management options, and alternative cross sections options (including skinny streets and pedestrian walkway options). He noted the relative costs, maintenance requirements, environmental impacts and benefits, and effectiveness of each street design category option.

In response to a question, Alan explained that “after studies” about speed bumps tend to focus on effectiveness of reducing speeds and not on how well neighbors like them.

In response to another question about the costs associated with green street development, Gary Parkin, the City’s Engineering Director, indicated that storm pipes often have to be installed with green street improvements to catch storm overflow that the green street can’t handle. This contributes to the cost of green street development.

3. What street design options are preferred? – Kristin Hull/All

Kristin explained that the next agenda item would be a visual preference exercise that would facilitate the group’s discussion about which street design options they did and did not like. Approximately 80 photos (which were taken by group members or provided by staff) that showed a variety of street treatments and designs were spread out on tables. Working individually, participants placed these photos under “like” or “don’t like” within the following categories:

- Pedestrian and bike facilities
- Stormwater management

- Street cross section
- Traffic diversion
- Traffic calming

The group then discussed what they liked and didn't like about the photos in each category. There were some instances of strong consensus and others instances of disagreement. The latter will be discussed further at the next meeting. The meeting came to an end before the group was able to discuss all five categories. The group agreed to have staff do some preliminary synthesis of the preferences displayed in the remaining two categories (traffic calming and traffic diversion) for group review at the next meeting.

The group's discussion is captured below. Areas of strong consensus are noted with an asterisk (*).

A. PEDESTRIAN AND BIKE FACILITY OPTIONS

Likes

- Overpasses for pedestrians and bikes*:
 - Where busy (i.e. Hwy 224)
 - Increases safety and connectivity
- Good safety features:
 - Bike lanes and sidewalks*
 - Pedestrian refuge*
 - Pavement treatments on crosswalks (well-defined)
 - Landscape buffers between sidewalks*
 - Curb-tight sidewalk better than no sidewalk*
 - Bike routes*
 - Off-street bike and pedestrian pathways (i.e. Springwater Trail)*
 - Lanes striped on off-street multi-use paths for bikes and pedestrians*
 - Bike boulevards (this relates to street design because it could require a new cross section)*

Staff Response: The Bike Boulevard concept is about focusing bike travel on corridors where there are lower traffic volume and speeds and where there are no striped bike lanes. Bike Boulevards, at a minimum, use signage to direct bicyclists. Some of them also utilize a variety of traffic calming or traffic diverting treatments. Bike Boulevards would not show up as an element in a street cross section because, similar to traffic management treatments, bike boulevard street improvements are location-specific and not continuous along a corridor.

Dislikes

- Wide street with on-street parking and no bike lanes. Who belongs where?
- Right side bike lane – it's confusing. Is wide lane by curb for parking, for bikes, or for both?
- Narrow curb-tight sidewalks*
- Curb tight sidewalks
- Dirt sidewalks

- Sidewalks on quiet rural-looking streets; prefer other pedestrian treatments; sidewalks can draw people into neighborhood
- Obstruction of sidewalks

B. STREET CROSS SECTION OPTIONS

Likes

- Pedestrians and bikes separate from roadway*
- Sidewalk on one side better than no sidewalk
- Landscaping*
- A full-width cross-section has its place
- Provision for transit
- Differentiation between pedestrians and cars, but choices about type: row of plants, rumble strip, curb*
- Variations that respond well to location-specific needs and constraints
(Staff added this bullet upon closer review of the visual preference survey results)

Dislikes

- Boring streets
- Obstruction of sidewalks
- No sidewalks*
- Unfinished streets*

C. STORMWATER MANAGEMENT OPTIONS

Likes

- Green, landscaped treatment*
- Green streets*:
 - Good for water quality
 - Good for environment
 - Aesthetically pleasing
 - Place making
 - Flexible application (should use on flag lot driveways)

Dislikes

- Maintenance costs of green streets
- No stormwater treatment*

D. THINGS TO FOLLOW UP ON

- Neighborhood choice in implementation
- Lighting
- Underground utilities (Is this an option or in the scope of this group?)

4. Next steps – Susan Shanks

Since the group did not finish the discussion and did not talk about traffic diversion or traffic calming, staff will work on synthesizing this category of information for the group's review at their next meeting.

5. Post-meeting synthesis of visual preference survey by staff for Traffic Calming and Traffic Diversion – Susan Shanks

Note: Numbers in parentheses denote how many times each preference appeared on the visual survey.

TRAFFIC CALMING

Likes

- Street narrowing
 - Landscaped medians with or without pedestrian crossing/refuge (5)
(Benefit: Provides gateway opportunity)
 - Landscaped sidewalk extensions, chicanes, chokers or neckdowns (5)
(Issue: Can be problematic for bicyclists if not designed well)
- Vertical deflection
 - Speed humps (2)
 - Raised Crosswalks (2)
(Benefit: Increases pedestrian safety as well)
- Traffic circle (1)
- Narrow street without on-street parking (1)
- Street trees (1)
(Landscaping was a commonality among all preferred traffic calming treatments with the exception of speed humps and raised crosswalks)

Dislikes*

- **Non-landscaped traffic calming treatments**

*Note: Not all dislikes are summarized here due to staff's inability to correctly interpret what the photos placed in this category were meant to convey. Group members will have the opportunity to clarify their preferences at the upcoming meeting.

TRAFFIC DIVERTING

Likes

- Full closure and partial closure where appropriate, when nicely landscaped, and when designed for pedestrian and bicycle access

Dislikes

- Non-landscaped traffic diverting treatments
- Traffic circle?