
Independence Transportation System Plan (TSP) Update

Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting #1

Thursday, May 21, 2020 – 6:00 to 8:00 p.m.

Microsoft Team Meeting – [Online Conference Call Link](#)

Call-in Number: +1 971-277-2148; Conference ID: 342 029 988#

Meeting Organizer: Matt Bell, Consultant Project Manager

Meeting Attendees: Brennan S Burbank, Rich Clark, Sally Coen, Harvey Cummings, Kate Schwarzler, Tom Takacs, Fred Evander, Michael Duncan, Matt Bell, Molly McCormick, Matt Hastie

Meeting Purpose: The purpose of Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting #1 was to provide an orientation to the project; outline major tasks completed; consider the draft project goals, objectives, and evaluation criteria presented in Draft Tech Memo #2; and review the existing conditions presented in Draft Tech Memo #3.

Summary:

1. Introductions/Roles and Responsibilities and Roundtable Discussion (All)
 - a. Participants introduced themselves and described their interest in Independence's transportation system. Top priorities identified include advancing health and enjoyment of the outdoors, increased pedestrian and bicycle uses, SW development and a supporting transportation system, consistency with the Comprehensive Plan, community livability, and resiliency of the city.
2. Project Overview (Matt Bell)
 - a. Project schedule
 - i. Question: When was the last TSP adopted, and when is the next TSP expected to be needed?
 1. Generally, a TSP is a 20-year plan but could be updated more frequently depending on how the city grows, evolves, and develops.
 - b. Meetings/Milestones
 - i. No questions.
 - c. Major Tasks/Deliverables

-
- i. Question: What is the time frame for which we should be using to plan for future transportation needs?
 - 1. 2040 timeframe for this update. But if certain issues show up in the 2040 forecast, the team may evaluate at what time period that issue arises.
 - ii. Question: Concerned that the provided memos only speak to existing conditions and that we are not looking forward.
 - 1. This is just the first part of the process. The next memos and tasks include forecasting future traffic conditions and identifying future gaps and deficiencies to add to the list from the existing conditions inventory and analysis.
3. Draft Tech Memo #2: Goals, Objectives, and Evaluation Criteria (Matt Bell)
- a. Review of Goal 1
 - i. The participants agree with the intent of the goal but have suggested edits:
 - 1. Consider mentioning consistency with other local plans, including the Comprehensive Plan.
 - 2. Potential to mention improved community health and enhanced enjoyment of nature here or in Goal 3.
 - b. Review of Goal 2
 - i. Question: Please explain more about 2F
 - 1. Looking to provide adequate access spacing on higher classification roadways. The combination of driveway and intersection accesses can impact pedestrian/bicycle facility comfort and impact traffic flow.
 - ii. The participants agree with the intent of the goal but have suggested edits:
 - 1. Consider providing more description to clarify the goal.
 - 2. Change the wording – not “limit” but “manage”
 - c. Review of Goal 3
 - i. The participants agree with the intent of the goal but have suggested edits:
 - 1. Discuss nature and public health.

-
- a. Transportation is more than just getting to places. It has health and other benefits as well.
2. Discuss Recreational transportation, which is tied into economic development. Ash Creek is a big opportunity.
- d. Review of Goal 4
 - i. The participants agree with the goal.
 - ii. Note of Route 40X: The high ridership stops in Independence may surprise citizens. Picks up the most people at central plaza and going into Salem. A general assumption may have been that it is highly used by students, which is not the case.
 - e. Review of Goal 5
 - i. The participants agree with the intent of the goal but have suggested edits:
 1. Provide further clarification around the word “anticipate”. Does this mean not getting in the way of future technologies or other enhancements?
 2. The City wants to be forward-thinking since intermediate solutions may not reflect where the transportation industry ends up.
 - f. Review of Goal 6
 - i. The participants agree with this goal.
4. Draft Tech Memo #3A: Existing Conditions Inventory (Molly, Matt Hastie)
 - a. Roadway inventory
 - i. Note about Chestnut – why is it not a collector street?
 1. Although the SW Concept Plan shows Chestnut as a collector street, this initial task includes the existing functional classification from the 2007 TSP. The TSP update will create an updated functional classification map, which will include items from the SW Concept Plan.
 - b. Bicycle inventory
 - i. Comment: Bike travel is not comfortable for most people (recreational riding) on OR 51-Monmouth Street. I often see students on bikes when school is in

session by Central in the morning and afternoon. People have expressed wanting a safe way to access the HWY 99 bike path.

1. Yes, ODOT requires 6-foot bike lanes on statewide highways in urban areas. This standard is not met in many places on the west portion of OR 51-Monmouth Street.

c. Rail inventory

- i. Comment: The previous TSP called for a roadway connection to the south which has been difficult due to the railroad.
- ii. Discussion: Typically you have to give up 3 crossing to get one new one.
- iii. Discussion: Maybe the railroad would be more interested in a south arterial to serve the significant SW area growth if close other crossings.

d. Land use and population inventory

- i. Comment: Would like to know more about the PSU demographic projections. Seems like there is a lot of variation they would not catch – UGB, development areas, etc.
 1. PSU looks at previous trends and projects those forward; however, they also look at demographics, such as age, and project how people may move around. They prepare draft projections, then meet with cities and counties to receive feedback.
- ii. Question: When the SW UGB is completed – how many households and/or people will that add to the town?
 1. The SW Independence Concept Plan projected 957-1,503 new housing units in that area, depending on the amount of wetlands that are developed vs. preserved. That would equate to about 2,800 - 4,000+ people, based on the average household size in Independence.
- iii. Comment: DLCD requires a higher density for the SW area
 1. Roughly 280 acres with density of 9-12 units per acre.
 2. Based on current development activities, the wetland impacts are less extensive than what was previously determined.
 3. likely a few thousand units coming online

- iv. The Southwest Independence Concept Plan is available on the project website:
<http://www.independencetsp.com/>

5. Draft Tech Memo #3B: Existing Conditions Analysis (Matt Bell)

- a. Discussion question: What intersections are problem intersections in town?
 - i. 7th/Monmouth
 - ii. 16th/Monmouth
 - iii. Monmouth/Main
 - iv. Locations on F and G Streets
 - v. Main/River
 - vi. Polk/Stryker can get busy depending on time of day
 - vii. Freight-related issues on Polk
- b. Questions: How far back did you look at the connecting pedestrian/bicycle network for transit QMA?
 - i. The adjacent block was considered for the transit QMA.
- c. Discussion question: Are there specific conditions of the pedestrian/bicycle facilities that we should be aware of?
 - i. Comment: The pedestrian environment is pretty nice on a portion Hoffman.
- d. Discussion question: Are there other intersections/segments you would note on the safety perspective?
 - i. Comment: Some of the issues associated with the west portion of Monmouth Avenue are made clear based on this map.
- e. Discussion question: Are there other issues that you see on the ground?
 - i. For the future tasks, pedestrian connectivity along Ash Creek should continue to be planned for. It has been discussed in the city forever and would bring people from the SW area into the city.
 - 1. The South Fork is being completed through development in the SW area, but the rest has not yet been addressed.

- ii. Monmouth - Too much intertwining of all modes in one spot. We need to address multimodal concerns.
- iii. Interested in regional connections as well – recreation, bicycle, and pedestrian.
- iv. As downtown has become a big focus of the city (summer events and such), we need to encourage people to bike and walk to alleviate parking demand.
- v. Main/Monmouth can be a problem location during some parts of the day.
 1. Vehicles can get backed up, and drivers are often impatient.
 2. Heavy traffic from south bridge during the PM period.
 3. Drivers are becoming impatient with pedestrians as more and more people walk in downtown.
- vi. The UGB was recently expanded, so there will likely not be any further expansions of the UGB in the next decade.

6. Next Steps (Matt)

- a. Please provide comments, questions, and edits to Fred by Friday, May 29th.
- b. Please visit the Open House and Workshop #1 online and tell others.
 - i. It is being publicized several ways including: a news release, utility bill, flyers posted in residential developments, and social media.

Action Items:

- Update Objective 1F to include consistency with local plans, including the Comprehensive Plan
- Update Objective 2F to “Manage access to key state...”
- Update Goal 3 to include an objective relate to community health and enhanced enjoyment of nature
- Update Goal 5 to clarify the intent of the goal – not getting in the way of future technologies or enhancements