

Street Design Working Group Meeting for Milwaukie TSP Update
6:00-8:30 p.m. Wednesday, June 6, 2007

MEETING SUMMARY

Purpose:

- Wrap up the street design preference discussion from the May 23 meeting.
- Identify where to use different street design treatments.
- Review and refine street design policies and action items.

Agenda:

| | | |
|-----------|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 6:00 p.m. | Welcome, staff introductions and purpose | Susan Shanks |
| 6:05 p.m. | Summary and review of street design preferences | Kristin Hull & Susan Shanks |
| 6:30 p.m. | Where should different street designs be used? | Kristin Hull & Alan Snook |
| 7:30 p.m. | Policy development discussion | Kristin Hull & Susan Shanks |
| 8:20 p.m. | Next steps | Susan Shanks |
| 8:30 p.m. | Close | |

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

Susan welcomed attendees and introduced staff. Susan told the group that the focus of this meeting was to wrap up street design preferences from the last meeting, discuss where different street design options should be used, and have a policy development discussion.

2. Summary and review of street design preferences – Kristin Hull & Susan Shanks

Susan reviewed the items that she added to the meeting notes from the last meeting identifying areas of consensus and disagreement related to traffic management elements. The group made the following comments:

- No single traffic calming approach is preferred over another. All are viable options. What option to use should depend upon the nature of the problem and the preferences of nearby/adjacent residents.
- One member noted that she did not like speed humps but understood that other people liked them.
- There should be a public process for traffic management and street design decisions in each neighborhood.
- Traffic circles are often poorly designed, but they should still be in the street design tool box.

Kristin updated the group consensus street design preferences handout based on the discussion about traffic management and on points made by attendees that clarified certain items already on the list. The revised list of street design preferences is attached. (See Attachment 1.)

3. Where should different street design treatments be used? – Kristin Hull & Alan Snook

Alan explained where different street classifications fit on the mobility vs. access continuum. Kristin then led the group through a functional classification design exercise to determine what types of design treatments or elements the group felt were appropriate for different street classifications. The group completed the exercise independently and then discussed their answers as a group. The completed Functional Classification Design Exercise table is attached. (See Attachment 2.) It shows areas of group consensus and disagreement and includes relevant group comments.

4. Policy development discussion – Kristin Hull & Susan Shanks

The group had a very short policy development discussion. Susan agreed to update the working draft of street design policies and action items based on the suggestions made during this meeting and distribute them to the group by email for review. An updated copy of the group's working draft of policies and action items is attached. (See Attachment 3.) This was sent to active working group members under separate cover.

5. Next steps – Susan Shanks

Susan reminded the group about other upcoming meetings, such as the TSP Open House in July, and invited working group members to participate in the Street Design Working Group's presentation at the June 13 Advisory Committee meeting. She'll forward more information about the details of this Advisory Committee later this week.

Susan and the group agreed to work together by email to draft policies and action items for inclusion in the TSP.

Attachments

Attachment 1: Street Design Preferences

Attachment 2: Functional Classification Design Exercise

Attachment 3: Working Draft of Street Design Policy Ideas & Action Items

STREET DESIGN PREFERENCES

Areas of Group Consensus

May 23, 2007

STREET CROSS-SECTION OPTIONS

Things to include in the “tool box”

- Separation between bike and pedestrian facilities and roadway, but choices about how this occurs (i.e. row of plants, rumble strips, curbs).
- A variety of landscaping choices

Things to avoid

- Wide streets or streets where it is not clear who belongs where
- Streets without any pedestrian facilities (based on functional classification and ADA standards)
- Unfinished or incomplete streets (based on functional classification and ADA standards)

PEDESTRIAN AND BIKE FACILITY OPTIONS

Things to include in the “tool box”

- Grade-separated crossings of high volume streets
- Design treatments to increase safety:
 - Bike lanes and sidewalks
 - Pedestrian refuges/medians
 - Landscape buffers between sidewalks and travel lanes
 - Bike routes
 - Bike and pedestrian paths separate from autos (e.g. Springwater Trail)
 - Striped lanes for bikes and pedestrians on shared use paths

Things to avoid

- Narrow sidewalks (i.e. narrow for street functional classification and adjacent land uses), but any sidewalk is better than no sidewalk

STORMWATER OPTIONS

Things to include in the “tool box”

- Green street cross-sections for water quality, place making, and aesthetic benefits.

Things to avoid

- Streets without any stormwater management facilities

TRAFFIC CALMING OPTIONS

Things to include in the “tool box”

- No single traffic calming approach was preferred over another. All are viable options. What option to use should depend upon the nature of the problem and the preferences of nearby/adjacent residents.

Things to avoid

- Non-landscaped traffic calming treatments
- Overgrown landscaped areas

TRAFFIC DIVERTING OPTIONS

Things to include in the “tool box”

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

Things to avoid

- Non-landscaped traffic diverting treatments

IN ALL AREAS OF STREET DESIGN

- Provide for neighborhood choice in implementation
- Provide for appropriate street lighting on arterials and collectors, at crosswalks, around schools and parks, and at bus stops.
- Street trees and landscaping wherever feasible

Functional Classifications Design Exercise
 Group Discussion Notes
 June 6, 2007

(P) = Priority, (O) = Optional, (-) = Inappropriate

| Street Design Elements | | Street Functional Classifications | | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------|-----------|--------------|-------|
| | | Regional Routes | Arterial | Collector | Neighborhood | Local |
| Travel Lanes | Minimum Width (ft) | | 12 | 11 | 10 | 10 |
| | Two-way Travel | | P | P | * | O |
| | One-way Travel | | - | - | - | O |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Group discussed the need to have options about travel lane direction within neighborhood-level streets depending on relationship to other area streets. | | | | | | |
| Medians | Access Management | | O | O | - | - |
| | Pedestrian Refuge | | P | P/O | O | - |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff should research the appropriateness of pedestrian refuges on neighborhood streets. Staff should research how pedestrian refuges could be accommodated on collectors given limited right-of-way conditions in certain areas. | | | | | | |
| Pedestrian facilities | One-Sided | | - | - | O | O |
| | Two-Sided | | P/O | P/O | O | O |
| | Intersection Extension | | O/- | O/- | O | O |
| | Mid-block Extension | | O/- | O/- | O | O |
| | Horizontal & Vertical Separation | | P | * | O | O |
| | Vertical Separation | | P | * | O | O |
| | Horizontal Separation | | * | * | O | O |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some type of pedestrian facility is necessary on all streets. Some group members had strong preferences for traditional curb and sidewalk configurations while others preferred more flexibility to meet pedestrian needs without curbs and sidewalks. A variety of separation between pedestrian facilities and roadways should be allowed. Horizontal separation (with and without vertical separation) was more important to the group than vertical separation, but vertical separation (curb tight sidewalks) was considered better than no pedestrian facility. If right-of-way is limited, pedestrian facilities on one side are appropriate. The group recognized that minimum standards are necessary and that not everything can or should be optional. The question is—how does one develop standards while allowing for reasonable flexibility that is in line with neighborhood preferences? Staff to research this more. One suggestion was to take the atypical streets out of the mix and identifying them as “exceptions to the rule” up front and have standards apply to the rest. | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|--|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Storm Water Management | Curb-Gutter-Pipe | | O | O | O | O |
| | Curb-Gutter-Swale | | O | O | O | O |
| | Swale | | - | - | O | O |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The group liked green street treatments, but did not feel educated enough about stormwater facilities to provide more specific guidance. | | | | | | |
| On-street Parking | Pockets | | - | O | O | O |
| | One-sided | | - | O | * | O |
| | Two-sided | | - | P/O | P/O | * |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The group wanted staff to look at on-street parking requirements more carefully to balance needs for resident parking in limited right-of-way situations. One group member thought on-street parking was an effective traffic calming measure. One group member thought on-street parking was dangerous on certain streets (with higher speeds or higher volumes) and should not be allowed. Some group members thought parking on both sides of the street should be encouraged wherever possible. | | | | | | |
| Bicycle Facilities | Striped Bike Lanes | | P | * defer to bike group | * defer to bike group | * defer to bike group |
| | Shared Lanes | | - | * defer to bike group | * defer to bike group | * defer to bike group |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some group members expressed a strong preference for striped bike lanes on all streets. | | | | | | |
| Traffic Management | Diversion | | - | - | - | O |
| | Calming | | * | * | * | * |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The group did not reach consensus on traffic management tools. The group felt that having lots of traffic calming options was important, but differed about whether traffic calming was ever appropriate on arterials. | | | | | | |
| Street Trees | | | P | P | P/O | P/O |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The group expressed a strong preference for street trees in Milwaukie. They also expressed concern about who would be responsible for maintaining trees. The group also wondered about how best to incorporate street trees onto neighborhood and local streets while honoring residents' desires to grow other plants in the landscape strip. | | | | | | |

* No consensus was reached on these items.

Working Draft of Street Design Policy Ideas & Action Items

Milwaukie TSP Update
Street Design Working Group

June 2007

- Goal 1: Livability.** Design and construct transportation facilities in a manner that enhances the livability of Milwaukie's established neighborhoods and business community.
- **Support the community's street design preferences**
 - **Provide for public involvement in the design phase of Capital Improvement Projects.**
 - **Develop community-supported street design guidelines/standards.**
 - **Allow for neighborhood street design master plans.**
 - **Develop a decision-making process for when to allow alternative pedestrian walkway construction in lieu of traditional sidewalk construction.**
 - **Develop alternative pedestrian walkway design standards.**
 - **Incorporate design flexibility into design standards/guidelines to avoid costly and time-consuming variance process requirements.**
 - **Give more decision-making authority to Engineering and Planning Directors.**
 - **Underground utilities wherever possible.**
 - **Provide for the ongoing maintenance of "green street" treatments to preserve their functionality and appearance.**
 - **Incorporate vegetation into street designs wherever possible.**
 - **Develop a list of appropriate, low-maintenance species for use in different design treatments.**
- Goal 2: Safety.** Develop and maintain a safe and secure transportation system.
- **Consider maintenance and emergency access safety needs and issues when designing streets.**
 - **Consider bike/ped access safety needs and issues when designing streets.**
 - **Provide for appropriate lighting of streets, especially around crosswalks, bus stops, and activity centers such as parks and schools.**
- Goal 3: Provide travel choices.** Plan, develop, and maintain a transportation system that provides travel choices and allows people to reduce the number of trips made by single occupant vehicles.
- Goal 4: Quality design.** Establish and maintain a set of transportation design and development regulations that are sensitive to local conditions.
- **Develop design standards/guidelines that balance the larger community's needs, local design preferences, and best safety and design practices.**
 - **Research best practices and consider innovative approaches during design standards/guidelines development, including, but not limited to, skinny streets and "green streets."**

- **Update Transportation Design Manual & Zoning Code as needed.**
- **Apply Metro design guidelines where appropriate.**
- **Ensure that street design treatments function as intended.**
- **Maintain design consistency along a street's length where appropriate.**
- **Maintain regulatory consistency between all City street design documents.**

Goal 5: Reliability and mobility. Develop and maintain a well-connected transportation system that reduces travel distance, improves reliability and manages congestion.

Goal 6: Sustainability. Provide a sustainable transportation system that meets present needs while facilitating the needs of future generations.

- **Preserve and grow Milwaukie's street tree canopy.**
 - **Develop street tree & street tree replacement policies.**
- **Support "green street" development.**
 - **Develop "green street" policies and design standards.**

Goal 7: Efficient and innovative funding. Efficiently allocate available funding for recommended transportation-improvements, and pursue additional transportation funding that includes innovative funding methods and sources.

- **Update the Funds-in-Lieu-of-Program to maximize the fair and effective use of these funds.**

Goal 8: Compatibility. Develop a transportation system that is consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan and that coordinates with County, State, and regional plans.

Goal 9: Economic vitality. Promote the development of Milwaukie's, the region's, and the State's economies through the efficient movement of people, goods and services, and the distribution of information.