Note: Anyone wishing to speak at any Transportation Advisory Committee meeting is encouraged to do so. If you wish to speak, please rise and, after you have been recognized by the Chair, give your name and complete address for the record. You will then be allowed to speak. Please note the public testimony may be limited by the Chair.

# TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE <br> May 25, 2023 <br> AGENDA 

I. CALL TO ORDER: 6:00 PM, Meeting held virtually via Zoom

Link: https://zoom.us/j/96161760895?pwd=SmVMRFJBNkx6UkhpeDNON2w2MXgxdz09

## II. ANNOUNCEMENTS

## III. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Approval of April 20, 2023 Minutes
IV. PUBLIC FORUM (6:05-6:20)
A. Public Forum-if you wish to speak during public forum please register with Scott.fleury@ashland.or.us by 10am May $17^{\text {th }}$.
B. If you wish to discuss an agenda item please contact Scott.fleury@ashland.or.us by May $17^{\text {th }}$ by 10am to register to participate. Written comments can also be submitted in the same time frame.
C. If you are interested in watching the meeting via Zoom please utilize the following link: https://zoom.us/j/96161760895?pwd=SmVMRFJBNkx6UkhpeDNON2w2MXgxdz09

## V. NEW BUSINESS

A. Bike Rack Inventory and Mapping Project (6:20-6:45, action required, discuss and develop plan to inventory and map bike racks in the downtown core).
B. B Street Bike Boulevard and Corridor Analysis (6:45-7:00, action required, discuss engineering analysis requirements for B Street associated with Capital Improvement Plan Project).

## VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Safe Routes To School Project Identification Program (7:00-7:30, action required, review recommendations and provide comments if any to staff).
B. North Mountain Rehabilitation Bike Facility Discussion (7:00-7:20, action required, discussion bike facility improvements).
C. Parklet Program (7:20-7:40, action required, continue discussing development of parklet program similar to the City of Medford).

## VII. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

A. ODOT ADA Project Update and Schedule

## VIII. AGENDA BUILDING - Future Meetings

## IX. ADJOURNMENT: 8:00 PM

## Next Meeting Date: June 15, 2023

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please email scott.fleury@ashland.or.us. Notification 72 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to the meeting ( 28 CFR 35.102-35.104 ADA Title 1).

CALL TO ORDER: 6:00pm
TAC Members present: Mark Brouillard, Joe Graf, Corinne Vièville, Linda Peterson-Adams, Derrick Claypool-Barns
Staff Present: Scott Fleury
Liaison Present: Eric Hansen
Guests Present: Edem Gomez (RVTD)

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Transportation Advisory Committee still has spots open. Citizens are encouraged to apply and participate if interested. The Rogue Valley Bike Swap sponsored by RVTD and the Ashland Parks Department is back on Saturday, April 29 from noon to 2:30pm at The Grove, 1195 E Main St.There are multiple Earth Day events this weekend. There's one Friday (April 21) at SOU and Science Works, and one on Saturday in Phoenix.

## CONSENT AGENDA

Vièville motioned to approve the minutes from last month's meeting. Brouillard requested the correction of the statistic regarding Speed Awareness Month. There is a $55 \%$ increase in traffic related fatalities and injuries in 2022, not $50 \%$. Peterson-Adams requested that "thermos paint" be changed to "thermo paint" as it was originally intended.

Vièville moved to approve the minutes with the noted changes. Brouillard seconded. All ayes.

## PUBLIC FORUM

A citizen submitted a letter that Fleury was asked to read. It was presented when the group discussed the North Mountain Rehabilitation Bike Facility.

## NEW BUSINESS

## Rogue Valley Transportation District Route Update

Edem Gomez presented to the group regarding RVTD route updates. The Ashland Circulator Route 17 will be offered in Ashland starting June 26th. Route 17 was created when RVTD identified a need for transit in unserved neighborhoods of Ashland. It will help fill in gaps left by the Ashland Connector Service that was discontinued in 2021 due to driver shortages during the pandemic. Gomez explained that RVTD is doing a fixed route instead of restarting the Ashland Connector because they're using RVTD's fixed route drivers.

Route 17 will go from the hospital to Helman St, down Oak St to Hersey St, to North Mountain Ave, to East Main St, down Wightman St near the student housing, crossing over with some of the Route 10 stops, then down Tolman Creek Rd near Albertsons, then loop around to Clay Street where there's new housing being developed. It will run from 9am to 4pm and will be an hourly route, meaning about every hour a bus will stop at one of the stops. RVTD is still working on the schedule. Most of the stops will be regular signed stops, but there will possibly be few flag stops. Some will have shelters and seats, depending on the more popular stops. Gomez stated that he has already given information to Dorinda Cottle who will put the route and information in one of the upcoming city newsletters.

Peterson-Adams asked what to say when people ask about the Ashland Connector. Gomez stated that the limitations are that when the Connector was running it took more driver resources to operate because it wasn't using fixed route drivers, also the vehicles used for it are now being used for paratransit services. However, that doesn't mean the Connector is gone forever. RVTD still has the software for running the Connector. Eric Hansen asked if there's a plan to get from point A to point B on Siskiyou Blvd, or if one of the route loops would include Siskiyou Blvd. Gomez stated that there's already Route 10 which services Siskiyou Blvd and the 99 corridor, and Route 17 will be able to get people to and from the outer unserved neighborhoods to stops on Route 10 if needed. Hansen then asked if the funding for this new route was grant driven. Gomez responded that it would be using the Statewide Transportation
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Improvement Fund (STIF), which is generated locally through the statewide transit payroll tax.
Brouillard asked where the route would terminate at 4pm and asked if people could take it to the Front Street station at the end. Gomez responded that the route would not stop at the Front Street station, and that the end place will probably be the hospital.

Peterson-Adams asked if there would be a possibility of keeping some RVTD buses in Ashland and building a fueling/charging station, specifically for evacuation purposes. Gomez suggested that at a later time Andy Swanson who is the Emergency Services Coordinator for RVTD could do a presentation to the group on how they plan to handle an evacuation situation. His position was created in response to the Almeda Fire to try to make response times better. Peterson-Adams also asked if there would be an extension of hours on any of the routes. Gomez said they're currently looking at that and have plans for it as part of the STIF planning process, but the next plan of action will be implementing a route like Route 17 in Central Point.

Graf asked why RVTD chose to go down Wightman for Route 17 instead of Walker, since Walker would have stops at all the schools. Gomez responded that they did look at Walker but they felt Wightman better served the needs of the community, particularly SOU. Fleury pointed out that school starts earlier than 9am for most kids.

Brouillard asked if there was a way to get more bike racks on the buses, as there's a lot of bicyclists in Ashland. Gomez said RVTD is looking to see if there are racks that would fit the standard they need that would hold more bikes, and RVTD is aware of the need. Gomez also stated that previously, electric bikes weren't allowed on the buses due to a warranty issue, but as of last month electric bikes are allowed.

Fleury asked how often RVTD plans to survey the users on the route to identify needs and make adjustments. Gomez said there is a way to submit comments and opinions via an online survey. The information on how to do that is displayed on the bus. They also plan to do an on board passenger survey, but generally it's an ongoing process for the first 3 years of a route.

## North Mountain Rehabilitation Bike Facility Discussion

Fleury stated that the city won't start the bidding process for construction until the end of this year, so there's time to make adjustments as part of the overall design process, including a potential public hearing and recommendations that have to go to council for council support, especially if talking about eliminating parking. Previously, the discussion was had about Ashland Street, and Dowell came up with a design to reduce some of the travel lane widths and provide a 5 foot wide bike lane with a 2 foot protected buffer along all of Ashland Street. At that same time, Dowell was in the design phase for the North Mountain Ave rehabilitation and they were asked to see if it was feasible to include a protected bike lane on North Mountain from East Main to the l-5 overpass. They did that and there are designs in the packet for this meeting. There's a couple stretches between Hersey and the bridge over Bear Creek where it's feasible if the parking on East Main is removed. It's not feasible between the bridge and Nevada/Fair Oaks, but it's feasible for the stretch past Fair Oaks. The discussion for the committee for this meeting was to decide the next steps, because parking, especially removal of it, tends to need a big discussion. No matter what, there will be disconnected protected bike lane sections throughout. Traffic count and speed for N Mountain Ave is another consideration. Speed reduction is also a component and not just for traffic calming but also for general residential speed limit reduction, like what Portland is doing.

Fleury read a letter from Ann Seltzer who stated that her and her husband live on North Mountain Ave across from the park and have seen the amount of vehicular traffic increase in the last 20 years. They're happy to hear about the North Mountain Rehabilitation project. Recently they met with Karl Johnson (City Associate Engineer) who explained
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that one of the traffic calming methods being considered is narrowing the vehicle lanes and widening the bike lanes from the base of the bridge to Hersey St. They fully support the proposed design. Seltzer noted that from Mountain Meadows to Hersey, motorists often speed down the hill, and she and her husband have brought it to the attention of the committee in the past. Traffic counts and speed measurements have been put in place by Public Works. North Mountain Park is very busy year-round, and implementing traffic calming measures in that section of roadway would help reduce the vehicle speeds and make it safer for everyone.

Graf asked if when the study was done if it was with the knowledge that there would be bus service between Hersey and E Main on North Mountain, because that might affect what's possible to do. Fleury stated that a 10 ft wide travel lane is a tight fit for buses and they prefer 11 ft , but in this circumstance since it's a fairly straight run it may not be as impactful as a road with more curvature. However, it is something that can be raised with RVTD in the future.

In order to accommodate for the 5 ft bike lane with 2 ft buffer, parking needs to be eliminated on the west side. There's no parking on the east side. The nearby subdivisions may have been given credit for their on-street parking, which Fleury will need to check with Planning about. Brouillard later confirmed that 51-61 N Mountain Ave did receive parking credits. Graf stated that the residents will still expect on-street parking and they may not be able to put a buffered bike lane there, especially with the number of driveways and parking bays. Graf questioned if a bike lane that stops and starts and is broken up will provide as much safety as the group is hoping. Fleury stated that that's another reason he mentioned speed reduction as it would help with safety. Also included in the initial design are rapid flash beacons (RFB) at Village Green Drive and Briscoe near the park, which would slow people down. PetersonAdams asked if the lane width could be reduced so there could be a bike lane without removing the parking. Fleury stated they can take the travel lane down to 10ft and make the bike lane as wide as possible then have it taper into the travel lane. Brouillard expressed concern about the Beach Creek development being built because bicyclists who use the road often won't be used to the extra traffic. Fleury stated that on either side of the development access points they could have green striping to make a visual delineation. Fleury expressed support for getting information out when new developments are built, utilizing reader boards and mailers, as Graf had suggested in the past. The group agreed that speed enforcement by Officer MacLennan would also be helpful in slowing people down.

Fleury stated that it's known that the bike facility can be improved through the whole length of the road by reducing the travel lanes and widening the bike facility, so the question is if the group wants protected bike lanes from E Main St to the bridge and effectively get rid of the parking there. If parking was to be removed, there would need to be a public notice for a hearing for every resident/building along the corridor, then once feedback and comments were collected the Transportation Advisory Committee would make a recommendation on the next steps and take it to city council. Going that route would allow for about $90 \%$ of that stretch of road to have a protected bike lane.

Brouillard inquired if by designating that section of N Mountain as a bicycle boulevard if that would automatically get the speed limit reduced to 20 mph , and also asked if it would be possible to do solid green bike lanes as it would be better at visually delineating the bike lane. Brouillard also mentioned that having a bike lane in place may be an issue for the bus stop and the mail carrier truck. He also stated the importance of having a street sweeper for the bike lane, because if it's dirty then bicyclists won't use it, like in Talent.

Graf agreed with Brouillard about doing something to make the road have a 20 mph speed limit, and suggested painting a double line to delineate the bike lane. Graf also inquired if the speed limit could be lowered to 20 mph without designating the road as a bicycle boulevard, as that may come with other requirements.

Brouillard motioned that Public Works recommend to city council that the speed limit be lowered on N Mountain Ave starting at S Mountain Ave and Ivy, all the way to the I-5 overpass. Graf seconded. All ayes.
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Brouillard motioned that Public Works ask city council about remediations for both the travel lanes and bicycle boulevards on N Mountain Ave. Graf seconded. Brouillard amended the motion to specify the area of $N$ Mountain Ave from S Mountain Ave and Ivy to the I-5 overpass. All ayes.

## Parklet Program

In the last city council meeting Councilor Hansen brought up instituting a parklet program similar to City of Medford's. Brouillard mentioned that Graf has brought up the 21 loading zone spaces in the downtown area for years, and the issue of those would need to be addressed, because they could potentially be new parking spaces since the parklet would take some away. Graf stated that it may cause the issue of having to ask one of the downtown businesses to give up a parking space, but the downtown businesses could work out the parking situation amongst themselves. Fleury stated that he has asked ODOT about the ability and willingness to permit parklets on 99 through downtown but hasn't heard back yet. If they're willing to permit it then it's feasible to move on to the next steps but if not there may need to be a conversation about where a parklet could go. Peterson-Adams suggested S Pioneer, Oak Street where they do the Saturday market, or the plaza as alternatives. Fleury mentioned that logistically there could be issues such as if a business needed to use a crane to replace their HVAC system. Hansen suggested using the Chamber of Commerce's resources to do some of the business investigation prior to doing any heavy lifting, because it would depend on if the adjacent businesses want to participate in the program, and if so how many of them.

Brouillard motioned to add 15 minutes to the meeting time. Vièville seconded. All ayes.
Graf mentioned that if there was to ever be a bike lane downtown then the parklets would need to be removed. Also, there's places like A Street that are too narrow for a parklet as it would take away parking, so there will need to be guidelines about where it's possible. Claypool-Barnes stated that it's critically important to install a bike lane downtown. Fleury suggested that a survey be put together to gauge interest that would be sent to downtown businesses and other eligible areas. Brouillard asked if this process could be done as a CUP to be non-permanent, and Fleury responded that it would align with the Encroachment Permit process that was used for outside dining during the pandemic, so it could be implemented as a resolution instead of a full blown ordinance. The resolution would go away at a certain point and would need to be redone or turned into an ordinance.

## UNFINISHED BUSINESS

## Near Miss Application

Peterson-Adams noted that information for the Near Miss Application was put in the utility bills, and the police chief posted it on the police department's Facebook page. Fleury encouraged the group to look at the data when they can. Brouillard stated that in 2 days there have been 4 new entries.

## INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

## ODOT ADA Project Update and Schedule

Fleury stated there isn't much new to report. Van Ness has some ramps now, as well as Nursery St. Hopefully between now and June the crosswalks will be marked.

## ADJOURNMENT: @ 8:15

Respectfully submitted,
Elizabeth Beckerich, Administrative Assistant
**Full Video Available by Request** ASHLAND

Date: May 17, 2023
From: Scott A. Fleury
To: Transportation Advisory Committee
RE: Bicycle Parking Inventory -Downtown Project

## BACKGROUND:

The Committee was previously interested in developing a bicycle parking inventory for the downtown core with a goal aimed and improving access to bike parking.

GIS staff have developed an existing conditions map showing known locations for bike parking downtown.

Public Works staff is looking for assistance in doing an actual site survey of the downtown core and confirming bicycle parking locations in order to update the map and also develop locations of need for additional bicycle parking.

GIS has a new technician that could be part of this walking audit in order to help update the map and itemize areas of need for future bicycle parking installations.

## CONCLUSION:

Action required; Review and outline a plan of action to survey bicycle parking locations and plan to provide adequate bicycle parking downtown.


## ASHLAND

Date: May 17, 2023
From: Scott A. Fleury
To: Transportation Commission
RE: B Street Traffic Calming, Bike Boulevard-Corridor Analysis

## BACKGROUND:

In 2022, the B Street neighborhood submitted a traffic calming application. Unfortunately to date because of diminished staffing levels, staff has been unable to compile and analyze corridor data for discussion at the Transportation Committee meetings.

As part of the 2023-2025 Budget Biennium process the City Council recently accepted the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) document. The CIP includes development of a bicycle boulevard along B Street with a functional cost of $\$ 125,000$ over the biennium.

With the defined project in place, a traffic calming application having been submitted and general concern over safety along the corridor (crashes), staff is recommending engaging a consultant engineer (firm) to develop a corridor study. The general scope of the corridor study is outlined below.

Scope:

1. Review 1999 B Street Transportation Plan relative to today's standards for corridor improvements
2. Evaluate intersections for intersection control (Stop or Yield)
3. Evaluate for Traffic Calming Opportunities
4. Evaluate for Bike Facility Improvements
5. Evaluate Parking (Expansion and Elimination)
6. Evaluate for General Signage, Wayfinding and Striping Improvements
7. Recommended corridor improvements that can be completed in total or phased as an improvement plan

## CONCLUSION:

Action required; Does the Transportation Committee support staff's recommendation and will the TC review and make recommendation as part of the corridor study development and final improvement plan?

## CITYOF ASHLAND

Date: May 8, 2023
From: Scott A. Fleury
To: Transportation Advisory Committee
RE: $\quad$ Safe Routes to School Recommendation Review

## BACKGROUND:

The City was previously awarded a Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Project Identification Program Grant. Alta Planning has been the lead consultant firm developing project information.

Walking audits occurred in April at the Ashland School District Schools and Alta has since developed a host of "draft" recommendations for each facility.

Staff is requesting the Transportation Committee review the draft recommendations and provide comments/feedback that will be given to Alta Planning for incorporation into the final recommendation report.

Staff has included all of the recommendations along with the proposed final schedule for review.

## CONCLUSION:

Action required; Review and comment on recommendations developed by Alta Planning as part of the SRTS Project Identification Program.

## City of Ashland Safe Routes to School Plan Project Schedule

APRIL 17, 2023

## SRTS Plan Process (all dates are end of day)

| Draft Recommendations to PMT for review | May 8 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Draft Recommendations Review PMT Meeting (\#3) | May 17 |
| PMT Comments on Draft Recommendation due to Alta | May 19 |
| Memorial Day Holiday | May 29 |
| Draft SRTS Plan to PMT for review | June 2 |
| Draft SRTS Plan Review PMT Meeting (\#4) | Week of June 12 (Date to be confirmed) |
| Draft SRTS Plan Comments due to Alta | June 16 |
| Alta shares Draft Final SRTS Plan to Council, PMT, Public | June 23 |
| Public Comment Period | June 26 - July 7 |
| Final PMT + public comments submitted to Alta | Week of July 3 |
| Final SRTS Plan Complete | Week of July 17 |

## SCHEDULE

Ashland SRTS Plan


## Ashland High School <br> Safe Routes to School Plan <br> DRAFT Infrastructure Recommendations

Oregon Department of Transportation Safe Routes to School Ni ) 令

## DATE - APRIL 2023

Table 1. Infrastructure Needs and Recommendations

| \# | ISSUE/ CHALLENGE | RECOMMENDATION | RESPONSIBLE AGENCY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| On the School Campus |  |  |  |
| 1 | School leadership reports issues with bike theft. | Move most existing bike parking inside the school campus, so that it is more protected for all day bike storage. | Ashland School District |
| 2 | During the walk audit, participants observed congestion issues during student dismissal. Parents or other vehicles picking up students stop and wait in many different parking lots and double park along Mountain Ave and Morse Ave. | Consider closing the Siskiyou Blvd entrance into the Oregon Oncology Clinic parking lot to prevent cut-through traffic and school drop-off and pick-up. | Ashland School District and private business Oregon Oncology Clinic. |
| 3 | School leadership reports issues with speeding in the parking lot just south of the track, near the gym. | Install speed bumps through the parking lot to reduce vehicle speeds | Ashland School District |
| 4 | School and district leadership are looking for more structured places to stage vehicle pick-up and drop-off to alleviate congestion at main entrances. | Consider developing a driving loop around the staff parking lot at the southwest corner of campus. Timing of staff arrival and parents is staggered so it could still be used as staff parking and drop-off. | Ashland School District |
|  | Mountain Ave |  |  |

Many students cross Mountain Ave mid-block north of the lowa St intersection traveling from a student parking lot to the main school entrance and walk along Mountain Ave to the north and south.

School district leadership report issues with speeding and
6 high volumes of through traffic along Mountain Ave. Mountain Ave is a designated school zone.

Stripe a mid-block, high visibility crosswalk and a pedestrian path into the student parking directly across from main school entrance, in addition to the lowa St crossing.

Install about 1600 ft of sidewalk along the east side of Mountain Ave between Siskiyou Blvd and E Main St.

Consider installing speed humps or other traffic calming elements along Mountain Ave, between Siskiyou Blvd and E Main St. Coordinate with emergency services on feasibility of installing speed humps.

## Morse Ave

| 7 | Morse Ave is a lower volume and lower speed street that is heavily used for student parking, particularly north of the track entrance. Many students access the High School from the north by crossing E Main St at the crosswalk at $8^{\text {th }}$ St, then traveling on Alida St and Blaine St. | Designate the route from the Central Bike Path, along $8^{\text {th }}$ St, Alida St, and Blaine St an official SRTS route and neighborhood greenway. Stripe continental, high visibility crosswalks and corner ramps at all legs of the Morse Ave and Blaine intersection. Install school zone signage. | City of Ashland |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8 | The City is considering a north/south bike route near the high school. | Consider designating Morse Ave as a neighborhood greenway and installing speed humps and sharrows. | City of Ashland |
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DATE - APRIL 2023
Table 1. Infrastructure Needs and Recommendations
\# ISSUE/ CHALLENGE RECOMMENDATION RESPONSIBLE AGENCY

## Siskiyou Blvd

The intersection of Siskiyou Blvd and Tolman Creek Rd is notorious among the school community for being congested and difficult to cross during rush hour and school arrival and dismissal. A crossing guard is stationed at the intersection in the morning and in the afternoon.

As of April 2023, ODOT is nearly finished with a project at the intersection, details illustrated in Figure 1 below. During the walk audit, a few issues with roadway striping and sign installation were observed. The pavement markings on the north leg of the intersection are misaligned with the curb. The westbound stop sign appears to be installed too high to be properly visible to traffic.

Re-stripe pavement markings in southbound lane to align with the curb.

Lower the westbound stop sign so that it is more visible to traffic. Bottom of the sign should be 7 feet from the ground.
Install rumble strips as a traffic calming measure for ODOT westbound traffic approaching the intersection.

In the long term, consider an RRFB on the east leg of the intersection, roundabout or traffic signal if the volumes meet the necessary engineering warrants and requirements.

As vehicles approach City limits, the first thing they reach is the school zone. In the long-term, complete placemaking and traffic calming efforts to make it feel more like you are entering a city and need to slow down.

Reconfigure sidewalks on north side of OR-99 to be more pedestrian- friendly by narrowing driveway widths, straightening alignment for walking routes, and including trees in the furnishing zone. Clarify the pavement markings and appropriate signage for the bike lane, so that that area does not look like a right turn lane.

## Tolman Creek Rd



Many students live on Tolman Creek Rd or the surrounding area and walk to and from school.

Install approx. 1300ft of sidewalk on the east side of ToIman Creek Rd from Siskiyou Blvd to Morada Ln. Alternatively, City of Ashland. consider installing a sidewalk on Bellview Ave.

Bidding Plans


## Helman Elementary School <br> Safe Routes to School Plan <br> DRAFT Infrastructure Recommendations

DATE - APRIL 2023
Table 1. Infrastructure Needs and Recommendations

| \# | ISSUE/ CHALLENGE | RECOMMENDATION | RESPONSIBLE AGENCY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| School Campus |  |  |  |
| 1 | Helman Elementary School was rebuilt several years ago, with covered, $u$-shaped bike parking and accessible sidewalks. However, there is a curb on the north side of the school on Randy St that prevents students from being able to bike or roll easily onto the sidewalk without going into the school driveway. | Install a curb cut to align with the sidewalk and bike parking area to improve safe access for people biking or using a wheelchair. | Ashland <br> School District |
| Nevada Street |  |  |  |
| 2 | Walk audit participants reported issues with visibility crossing W Nevada St to access the Bear Creek Greenway trailhead on the north side. | Stripe a high-visibility, continental crosswalk and appropriate signage (S1-1, W16-7P, W16-9P) across Nevada St at the trailhead. | City of Ashland |
| 3 | Walk audit participants reported issues with people parking too close or blocking their driveway for school access. | Stripe "No Parking" within 20 feet on both sides of each driveway in areas with specific issues. <br> Conduct a school communications campaign reminding parents not to block driveways, as well as other safe travel tips and encouragement to walk, bike and ride the school bus. . | City of Ashland, Ashland School District |

## Helman Street

4
Existing curb extensions lack truncated domes for ADA
accessibility.
Walk audit participants reported speeding along Helman
St.

Existing curb extensions lack truncated domes for ADA

Walk audit participants reported speeding along Helman
5
St.

Install truncated domes on the curb extensions along Helman St at the crosswalks adjacent to campus. Consider traffic calming measures (such as speed humps, travel lane narrowing, etc.) if necessary to reduce

City of Ashland vehicle speeds.

City of Ashland

# Willow Wind Learning Center <br> Safe Routes to School Plan <br> DRAFT Infrastructure Recommendations 

DATE - APRIL 2023
Table 1. Infrastructure Needs and Recommendations
\# ISSUE/ CHALLENGE RECOMMENDATION RESPONSIBLE AGENCY

## School Campus

Currently, students biking to school are asked to ride on a crushed gravel path and then to a sidewalk that wraps around the parking lot. Walk audit participants report issues with conflict with students walking along the path and the lack of easy curb cuts to access it.

## East Main Street



Install buffered or protected bike lanes along E Main St. Relocate the RRFB on the east leg of the E Main St at Campus Way intersection to the west leg of the intersection City of Ashland at the bike path location for the school. Install an additional curb cut for waiting cyclist E Main to activate the RRFB.

Install a wider side path along the school access and build a fine gravel path around the outside of the sidewalk for bikes Ashland School District to reach the bike parking area.

RESPONSIBLE AGENCY W16-9P) to alert vehicles to the crossing.

Consider installing speed feedback signs with school zone signage for eastbound and westbound traffic (eastbound

City of Ashland

# Ashland Middle School, TRAILS Outdoor School, and Walker Elementary School <br> <br> Safe Routes to School Plan <br> <br> Safe Routes to School Plan <br> <br> DRAFT Infrastructure Recommendations 

 <br> <br> DRAFT Infrastructure Recommendations}

Oregon Department of Transportation Safe Routes to School


DATE - APRIL 2023

## Table 1. Infrastructure Needs and Recommendations

\# ISSUE/CHALLENGE RECOMMENDATION RESPONSIBLE AGENCY

School Campus

All three schools have new campuses with improved pedestrian and bike access and modern, well-designed bike parking. However, a few small issues remain.

## Walker Ave

Speeding, parking in the bike lane, and failing to stop for students in the crosswalk were observed during the walk audits in front of Ashland Middle School and TRAILS Outdoor School. The area is a designated school zone.

Install speed humps or other traffic calming measures along Walker Ave between Holmes Ave and E Main St, including a raised crosswalk at the Ashland Middle School entrance. Consider installing an RRFB at this location to help with City of Ashland driver compliance and improve safety for students crossing

Install "School" pavement markings and End School Zone signs.

Walker Ave is an important bike route for students and other community members traveling north/south and accessing the college campus.

Install additional No Parking or No loading/unloading signs along Walker Ave, particularly north of the railroad tracks. Consider performing a parking study to potentially remove parking to create protected or buffered bike lanes along Walker Ave, between E Main St and Ashland Ave. Another option to provide more bike lane space would be to narrow the travel lanes.

At Walker Ave and Holmes Ave intersection, install curb
ramps and high visibility continental crosswalks at all legs of the intersection. Consider utility relocates on the southern

City of Ashland side of the intersection if feasible.

Repair sidewalk uplift on south of lowa St.
City of Ashland

The Walker Ave and Holmes intersection lacks ADAcompliant curb ramps and is impacted by utility poles limiting access to the sidewalk.

City of Ashland
-

Date: May 17, 2023
From: Scott A. Fleury
To: Transportation Advisory Committee
RE: North Mountain Avenue Rehabilitation Design and Bike Facility Improvements

## BACKGROUND:

The Committee discussed the potential inclusion of protected bike lanes along North Mountain from East Main St. to the interstate overpass at the April $20^{\text {th }}$ meeting. The Committee recommended pursuing a speed reduction to 20 mph for the corridor in association with bike boulevard treatments as allowed by Oregon Revised Statute 810.180.

The City can through an ordinance adopt a speed that is five miles an hour lower than statutory for roadways within a residence district, see below. Staff's review of the definition for residence district creates issues with a speed reduction along North Mountain Avenue. North Mountain is an Avenue (collector) as defined in the City's Transportation System Plan. North Mountain Avenue does not have the approaches/access spacing defined in ORS 801.430. Staff has included the Ordinance the City of Eugene adopted to lower residential roadway speeds to 20 mph and it specifically states the speed reduction does not impact arterial or collector roadways pursuant to ORS 801.430.

The Committee was also interested in reviewing collected data along the corridor. The data is attached and was used by Dowl as part of the engineering design phase for safety/traffic calming improvements. No other data was collected by Dowl as part of the design process.

## ORS 810.180:

(10) A road authority may establish by ordinance a designated speed for a highway under the jurisdiction of the road authority that is five miles per hour lower than the statutory speed. The following apply to the authority granted under this subsection:
(a) The highway is located in a residence district.
(b) The statutory speed may be overridden by a designated speed only if:
(A) The road authority determines that the highway has an average volume of fewer than 2,000 motor vehicles per day, more than 85 percent of which are traveling less than 30 miles per hour; and
(B) There is a traffic control device on the highway that indicates the presence of pedestrians or bicyclists.
(c) The road authority shall post a sign giving notice of the designated speed at each end of the portion of highway where the designated speed is imposed and at such other places on the highway as may be necessary to inform the public. The designated speed shall be effective when signs giving notice of the designated speed are posted.
(11) A city may establish by ordinance a designated speed for a highway under the jurisdiction of the city that is five miles per hour lower than the statutory speed. The following apply to the authority granted under this subsection:
(a) The highway is located in a residence district.
(b) The highway is not an arterial highway.
(c) The city shall post a sign giving notice of the designated speed at each end of the portion of highway where the designated speed is imposed and at such other places on the highway as may be necessary to inform the public. The designated speed shall be effective when signs giving notice of the designated speed are posted.

## ORS 801

801.430 "Residence district." "Residence district" means territory not comprising a business district that is contiguous to a highway that:
(1) Has access to property occupied primarily by multifamily dwellings; or
(2) Has an average of 150 feet or less between accesses or approaches to:
(a) Dwellings, churches, public parks within cities or other residential service facilities; or (b) Dwellings and buildings used for business. [1983 c. 338 §79; 1997 c. 404 §4]

As part of safety and traffic calming improvements, the project will install Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFBs) at the Village Green intersection along with a raised crosswalk and install an RRFB near the Nepenthe Road and Briscoe Place intersections, see attached advanced plan set.

## April 20, 2023 Background:

Dowl Engineering is currently in the design phase for the North Mountain Rehabilitation Project. They are looking at options to include protected bike lanes along the total project length (East Main Street - I-5 overpass). Dowl is also looking at pedestrian crossing enhancement for the corridor and traffic calming options.

There are functional issues that need to be address regarding providing a protected bike lane facility on North Mountain Ave.

Right of Way (width) Analysis (reducing to 10' travel lane):

- All on-street parking from East Main Street to top of hill adjacent to the Avista regulator station would need to be eliminated to allow for a protected bike lane.
- Top of the hill to Bear Creek bridge generally appears to be wide enough to allow for the separated bike lane.
- Bear Creek bridge to Fair Oaks Drive is too narrow for the entire length to allow for a separated bike lane.
- Fair Oaks Drive to E Nevada Street appears to be wide enough to allow for the separated bike lane.
- E Nevada Street to I-5 bridge is too narrow to allow for a separated bike lane

Questions:

- Should the City design a continuous run of protected bike lanes where feasible?
- Should the City increase the existing bike lane width in combination with a travel lane width reduction to 10 ' and not install protected bike lanes throughout the entire corridor length?
- Do we eliminate all on street parking from East Main Street to the top of the hill at North Mountain Park? What is the process for discussion on this option?

Staff has included a drawing created by Dowl as reference to understand the issues throughout the entire corridor.

## CONCLUSION:

The Committee should continue to discuss the issues and develop any recommendations for staff to moving forward with the design process. Staff has requested Dowl Engineering review ORS 810 and 801 in conjunction with the speed reduction and provide there feedback.
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## N Mountain Ave

Traffic Count Map

Date: 7/7/2022

(1) | 0 | 25 | 50 | 100 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  | Feet |
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| D01 | Drainage \& Utilities |
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Perforated Stee/ Square Tube (PSST) Sign Support Installation
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Temporary Pedestrian Access Routes
Temporary Pedestrian Access Routes

- Bridge Construction








| REPAIR LOCATIONS |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STA. START | STA. END | LeFt OfFSET |  | RIGHT OFFSET |  |
|  |  | A | B | C | D |
| "M" $505+39.20$ | "M" $505+58.20$ | 0 | 0 | $1.25{ }^{\prime}$ | $6.75^{\prime}$ |
| "M" $505+53.20$ | "M" ${ }^{\text {5 }}$ 05+59.20 | $2^{\prime \prime}$ | $6^{\prime}$ | 0 | 0 |
| "M" $006+06.20$ | "M" $506+36.20$ | 0 | 0 | 1.5' | 6.5 ' |
| "M" $506+55.20$ | "M" $506+75.20$ | $5.5^{\prime}$ | 9.5' | 0 | 0 |
| "M" $506+88.20$ | "M" $506+94.20$ | 5.5' | 9.5' | 0 | 0 |
| "M" $506+91.20$ | "M" $507+11.20$ | 0 | 0 | $3^{\prime}$ | $8^{\prime \prime}$ |
| "M" 0 07+15.20 | "M" $507+30.20$ | $6^{\prime}$ | $9^{\prime}$ | 0 | 0 |
| "M" $507+99.20$ | "M" $508+10.20$ | 0 | 0 | $3^{\prime}$ | $8^{\prime \prime}$ |
| "M" $408+09.20$ | "M" ${ }^{\text {a }}$ 08+45.20 | 5.5' | 9.5' | 0 | 0 |
| "M" $508+47.20$ | "M" $508+71.20$ | 0 | 0 | $2^{\prime}$ | $6^{\prime}$ |
| "M" $544+89.20$ | "M" $544+92.20$ | 0 | 0 | $l^{\prime}$ | $5^{\prime}$ |
| "M" $445+11.20$ | "M" ${ }^{\text {c }}$ 45+19.20 | $2.5^{\prime}$ | $5^{\prime}$ | 0 | 0 |
| "M" $445+35.20$ | "M" $445+53.20$ | $5^{\prime}$ | $10^{\prime}$ | 0 | 0 |
| "M" $445+78.20$ | "M" ${ }^{\text {L }}$ 45+81.20 | 3.5' | $7.5^{\prime}$ | 0 | 0 |
| "M" $446+66.20$ | "M" $546+88.20$ | 0 | 0 | ${ }^{\prime}$ | $7{ }^{\prime}$ |
| "M" $446+92.20$ | "M" $547+02.20$ | 0 | 0 | $4.5^{\prime}$ | $0.5^{\prime}$ |
| "M" $447+09.20$ | "M" ${ }^{\text {5 }}$ 48+07.20 | 5.5' | 9.5' | 0 | 0 |
| "M" $548+22.20$ | "M" ${ }^{\text {5 }}$ 48+29.20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $11^{\prime}$ |
| "M" ${ }^{\text {a }}$ 48+64.20 | "M" $448+76.20$ | 0 | 0 | $2^{\prime}$ | $6^{\prime}$ |
| "M" $449+08.20$ | "M" $449+22.20$ | 0 | 0 | $6^{\prime}$ | $9^{\prime}$ |
| "M" ${ }^{\text {a }}$ 50+29.20 | "M" ${ }^{\text {a }}$ 51+07.20 | $2.5{ }^{\prime}$ | $5.5{ }^{\prime}$ | 0 | 0 |
| "M" $550+44.20$ | "M" $550+59.20$ | 0 | 0 | 1.5' | $6.5^{\prime}$ |
| "M" 5 51+26.20 | "M" ${ }^{\prime} 52+17.20$ | $2.5^{\prime}$ | $5.5{ }^{\prime}$ | 0 | 0 |


 SECTION A-A

## CUT THROUGH CURB RAMP DETAIL

## NOTES:

See C sheets for landscaping type and location
2. Subgrade surface to be weed-free prior to
3. Lawn seeding:

3: $M i \times 1 / 4$ " fine compost with lawn seeding.
4. Bark mulch:
a: Nominal thickness - 4"
4b: Match existing color/size.
5. Rock mulch:

5a: Nominal thickness - 4"

12" SUBGRADE STABILIZATION
NOTE:
Subgrade stabilization to be used in areas not meats.
requirements.
2. Depth of subgrade stabilization
to be deter
to be determined per field conditions.


BACK OF WALK STANDARD CURB DETAIL














| RAMP POINT | STATION | OFFSET | $\underset{\substack{\mathrm{FL} \\ \text { ELEVATION }}}{\text { cose }}$ | TFC/SW elevation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (1) | "M" 509+35.26 | 16.89' Lt. | $F L=1832.36$ | TFC=1832.86 |
|  | "CRO6" 0+47.00 | $0.00{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{Lt}$. |  |  |
| (2) | "M" 509+39.64 | 16.92' Lt. | $F L=1832.63$ | TFC= 1833.13 |
|  | "CRO6" 0+51.38 | $0.00^{\prime} \mathrm{Lt}$. |  |  |
| (3) | "M" 509+42.64 | 16.95' Lt. | $F L=1832.83$ | $T F C=1832.83$ |
|  | "CRO6" 0+54.38 | 0.00' Lt . |  |  |
| (4) | "M" 509+48.14 | 17.03' Lt. | $F L=1833.02$ | TFC= 1833.52 |
|  | "CRO6" 0+59.88 | $0.00^{\prime} \mathrm{Lt}$. |  |  |
| (5) | "M" 509+62.44 | 24.43' Lt. | $F L=1833.40$ | TFC=1833.90 |
|  | "CRO6" 0+76.40 | $0.00^{\prime} \mathrm{Lt}$. |  |  |
| (6) | "M" 509+66.01 | 30.81' Lt. | $F L=1833.51$ | TFC= 1834.01 |
|  | "CRO6" 0+83.78 | 0.00' Lt . |  |  |
| (7) | "M" 509+66.84 | 38.85' Lt. | $F L=1833.63$ | TFC=1834.13 |
|  | "CR06" 0+91.92 | $0.00{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{Lt}$. |  |  |
| (8) | "M" 509+35.20 | 24.61' Lt. | N/A | SW $=1833.00$ |
|  | "CRO6" 0+47.00 | 7.73'Lt. |  |  |
| (9) | "M" $509+35.16$ | 30.46' Lt. | N/A | SW=1833.06 |
|  | "CRO6" 0+47.00 | 13.57' Lt. |  |  |
| (10) | "M" 509+37.26 | 30.51' Lt. | N/A | $S W=1833.17$ |
|  | "CRO6" 0+49.10 | 13.60' Lt. |  |  |
| (11) | "M" 509+37.37 | 35.51' Lt. | N/A | SW=1833.36 |
|  | "CRO6" 0+49.26 | 18.60' Lt . |  |  |
| (12) | "M" 509+41.16 | 30.60' Lt. | N/A | $S W=1833.38$ |
|  | "CRO6" 0+53.00 | 13.66' Lt. |  |  |
| (13) | "M" 509+41.25 | 35.60' Lt. | N/A | $S W=1833.52$ |
|  | "CRO6" 0+53.13 | 18.66' Lt. |  |  |
| (14) | "M" 509+42.58 | 24.63' Lt. | N/A | $s W=1833.36$ |
|  | "CRO6" 0+54.38 | 7.68' Lt. |  |  |
| (15) | "M" 509+42.53 | 30.63' Lt. | N/A | $S W=1833.45$ |
|  | "CRO6" 0+54.38 | 13.68' Lt. |  |  |
| (16) | "M" 509+48.08 | 24.67' Lt. | N/A | $S W=1833.44$ |
|  | "CRO6" 0+60.68 | 7.61' Lt. |  |  |
| (17) | "M" 509+48.03 | 30.67' Lt. | N/A | $s W=1833.53$ |
|  | "CRO6" 0+62.54 | 13.55' Lt. |  |  |
| (18) | "M" 509+54.46 | 24.72' Lt. | N/A | SW=1833.63 |
|  | "CRO6" 0+69.66 | 5.53'Lt. |  |  |
| (19) | "M" 509+59.97 | 24.76' Lt. | N/A | $S W=1833.55$ |
|  | "CRO6" 0+74.96 | $2.07{ }^{\text {' Lt. }}$. |  |  |
| (20) | "M" 509+59.93 | 30.76' Lt. | N/A | SW=1833.64 |
|  | "CRO6" 0+80.98 | 5.60' Lt. |  |  |
|  |  |  | FL - Flow line SW - Sidewalk TFC - Top face |  |


| RAMP POINT | STATION | OFFSET | $\begin{gathered} \text { FL } \\ \text { ELEVATION } \end{gathered}$ | TFC/SW elevation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (21) | "M" $509+54.92$ | 30.73' Lt. | N/A | $S W=1833.72$ |
|  | "CR06" 0+76.56 | 9.81'Lt. |  |  |
| (22) | "M" 509+60.94 | 41.10' Lt. | N/A | $S W=1833.41$ |
|  | "CR06" 0+94.61 | 5.97' Lt. |  |  |
| (23) | "M" 509+55.96 | 41.58' Lt. | N/A | $S W=1833.44$ |
|  | "CR06" 0+95.07 | 10.76' $t$. |  |  |
| (24) | "M" 509+60.69 | 46.93' Lt. | N/A | $S W=1834.10$ |
|  | "CR06" 1+00.44 | 5.82' Lt. |  |  |
| (25) | "M" 509+55.77 | 46.51' Lt. | N/A | $S W=1834.91$ |
|  | "CR06" 1+00.37 | 10.75' Lt . |  |  |
| FL - Flow line <br> SW - Sidewalk <br> TFC - Top face of curb |  |  |  |  |












| RAMP POINT | Station | OFFSET | $\underset{\text { ELeVATION }}{\text { FL }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TFC/SW } \\ & \text { ELEVATION } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (1) | "M" $519+14.80$ | 27.80' Lt . | $F L=1785.37$ | TFC= 1785.92 |
|  | "CR17"0+43.98 | $0.00^{\prime} \mathrm{Lt}$. |  |  |
| (2) |  | 27.77'Lt. | $F L=1785.32$ | TFC= 1785.82 |
|  | "CR11" $0+50.05$ | $0.00^{\prime} \mathrm{Lt}$. |  |  |
| (3) | "M" $519+34.30$ | 19.57'Lt. | $F L=1785.59$ | TFC= 1785.59 |
|  | "CR17" 0+65.99 | $0.00^{\prime} \mathrm{Lt}$. |  |  |
| (4) | "M" 519+43.55 | 19.24' Lt. | $F L=1785.53$ | TFC= 1785.53 |
|  | "CR11" $0+74.99$ | $0.00^{\prime} \mathrm{Lt}$. |  |  |
| (5) | "M" $\mathrm{M}^{\prime} 19+66.67$ | 18.00' Lt. | $F L=1784.86$ | TFC=1785.36 |
|  | "CR11" 0+97.99 | 0.00' 18.0 |  |  |
| (6) | "M" $\mathrm{M}^{\prime \prime}$ (19+74.47 | 18.20' Lt . | $F L=1785.00$ | TFC= 1785.39 |
|  | "CR11" $1+05.85$ | 0.00. Lt. |  |  |
| (7) |  | 32.44' Lt . | N/A | $S W=1785.97$ |
|  | "CR11" $0+43.99$ | 4.63'Lt. |  |  |
| (8) | "M" $\mathrm{M}^{\prime} 19+21.20$ | 32.86' Lt . | N/A | $S W=1785.93$ |
|  | "CR17" $0+50.03$ | 5.08' 2 t. |  |  |
| (9) | "M" 519+26.25 | 28.27' Lt. | $N / A$ | $S W=1785.85$ |
|  | "CR11" $0+54.10$ | 2.03' Lt . |  |  |
| (10) | "M" 519+26.35 | 32.77'Lt. | N/A | SW=1785.77 |
|  | "CR11" $0+52.78$ | 6.05'Lt. |  |  |
| (11) | "M" $519+34.59$ | 28.06' Lt. | $N / A$ | $S W=1785.69$ |
|  | "CR11" $0+57.45$ | $7.90{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{Lt}$. |  |  |
| (12) |  | 32.56' $L$ t. | N/A | SW=1785.77 |
|  | "CR17" $0+55.88$ | $10.65{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{Lt}$. |  |  |
| (13) | "M" $519+43.95$ | 27.72'Lt. | $N / A$ | $S W=1785.65$ |
|  | "CR11" $0+75.00$ | 8.49'Lt. |  |  |
| (14) | "M" 519+44.17 | 32.21'Lt. | N/A | $S W=1785.71$ |
|  | "CR17"0+75.01 | 12.99' Lt . |  |  |
| (15) | "M" $519+54.50$ | 27.30' Lt . | $N / A$ | $S W=1785.15$ |
|  | "CR17" $0+85.16$ | 8.48'Lt. |  |  |
| (16) | "M" 519+54.90 | 31.80' Lt . | N/A | $S W=1785.21$ |
|  | "CR11" $0+85.16$ | 12.98' Lt . |  |  |
| (17) | "M" 519+66.92 | 22.99'Lt. | N/A | $S W=1785.43$ |
|  | "CR17" 0+97.99 | 4.99' 2 t. |  |  |
| (18) | "M" 519+74.47 | 23.12'Lt. | N/A | SW=1785.31 |
|  | "CR11" $1+05.85$ | 5.53'Lt. |  |  |
| FL - Flow line <br> SW - Sidewalk <br> TFC - Top face of curb |  |  |  |  |







































## STAGE VII



Stage VII Work:
. Full depth pavement reconstruction and
near and raised crossing near Village Green Dr.
2. Construct full depth pavement repair between 47+00 and Clear Creek Dr.
3. ADA ramp and sidewalk improvements.

NOTES:
Construct Stage VII using daytime flagging.
2. Maintain existing sidewalk access. Install temporary pedestrian detour per dwg. no. TM844 at Village Green Dr. and Clear Creek Dr. when necessary. Detour pedestrians onto the opposite side of N. Mountain Ave. from the work.
3. Close Village Green Dr. Detour route is Fordyce St.
to Main St.
to Main St.
4. At the end of each work day, provide two $10^{\prime}$ min. travel lanes on N. Mountain Ave.
5. For intersection details, see sht. EAOZ.



|  | LEGEND |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\rightarrow$ | Direction of traffic |
|  | Under traffic |
| - <lollor | Under construction |
| - < | Construction under traffic |

Stage VIII Work:
Full depth pavement reconstruction at
2. ADA ramp and sidewalk improvements.

NOTES:

1. Construct Stage VIII using 24 hour flagging.
2. Maintain existing sidewalk access. Install temporary pedestrian detour per awg. no. TM844 at villag
Green Dr. and Clear Creek Dr. when necessary.
Maintain traffic and pedestrian access to Clear Creek



|  | LEGEND |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\rightarrow$ | Direction of traffic |

(\%) Existing traffic signal
$\square$ Under traffic Under construction

Stage IX Work:

1. Full depth pavement reconstruction between

Clear Creek Dr. and E. Main St.
2. Railroad crossing improvements.
3. ADA ramp and sidewalk improvements.
4. Stormwater conveyance.
5. Signal modifications.

NOTES:
Construct Stage IX under staged partial road closure. Instal/ advance signing and TCDs per dwg. no. TM84O.
2. Maintain existing sidewalk access. Detour pedestrians onto the opposite side of N. Mountain Ave. from the work when necessary.
3. Detour thru traffic onto Hersey St. and E. Main St. and
Oak St. Provide access to local traffic through the work Oak St. Provide as
zone at all times.
4. Close B St. Detour route is Oak St. to Hersey St
5. For intersection details, see sht. EAO2.

















## GENERAL NOTES

dESIGN NOTES:
Provide all materials and perform all work according to the "Oregon Standard Specifications for Construction 2021
Existing features and dimensions shown are based on original construction records. Measure and verify these dimensions in the field prior to ordering materials.

The overlay has been designed in accordance with the 2020 edition of the "AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications" and the October 2022 edition of the "Oregon Bridge Design Manual". The overlay replacement
has been designed for an allowance of O psf future wearing surface.

The Type "F" concrete rail replacement connection has been designed to meet NCHRP TL-2 loading.
CONSTRUCTION NOTES:
Provide all reinforcing steel according to ASTM Specification A706, or AASHTO M3I (ASTM A615) Crade 60.
Use a $l^{\prime}$ '9" splice length for $\# 4$ bars. Increase splice lengths $30 \%$ for horizontal or nearly horizontal bars
placed so that more than 1 l'0" of fresh concrete is cast below the bar.
Splice reinforcing
shown othervise.
Place bars 2 " clear of the nearest face of concrete unless shown otherwise.
Provide General Structural Concrete Class $3300^{3} / 4,1$, or $1^{1 / 2}$ concrete in sidewalk.
Resin Bonded Anchor Notes:
Provide and instal \#5 ASTM A706 Crade 60 or ASTM A615 Crade 60 resin bonded anchors with epoxy Insin the QPL for the Type "F" concrete rail. The characteristic bond strength used in the design is 1200 psi. The minimum pullout strength is 9000 Ib with a
anchors according to the manufacturer's recommendations.

Temporary Work Notes
Provide work containment at bridge \#29Cr4.
Utility Notice:
Oregon law requires the rules set forth in OAR 952-001-0010 through 952-001-0090, adopted by the Oregon Utility Notification Center, to be observed. Copies of these rules may be obtained from the Center by calling 1-800-332-2344 or 811.




NOTES:
Construct sidewalk expansion joints above bridge expansion joint (see details, this sheet).
See Dwg. RD722 for sidewalk expansion joint details not shown.



## LEGEND



Inst. 4" white line
Inst. $8^{\prime \prime}$ white line
Inst. 4"yellow line
Inst. 4" yellow broken line
Inst. 4" white dotted line
Inst. narrow double no-pass two 4" yellow lines
Inst. stop bar 1'white bar
In Inst. standard crosswalk two I' white bars
Inst. staggered continental crosswalk $l$
inst. left turn arrow (white)
inst. right turn arrow (white)
RSA Inst. right turn straight arrow (white)
BS Inst. bike lane standard stencil (white)
Inst. green supplemental bicycle lane
dotted line extension (green)
BRR Inst. bike path railroad crossing marking (white)
RR Inst. railroad crossing marking (white)
ON Inst. "ONLY" (white)
P Inst. on-street parking markings (white)
Inst. pedestrian stencil (white)
Inst. disabled parking detail (white)
$N=$ Sign Number
$M=$ Material
Material options:
$\begin{aligned} P & =\text { Round Pipe Support }\end{aligned}$
SSC = Stainless Steel Clamp
ST $=$ Perfforated Steel Square Tube Sign Support


PEDESTRIAN STENCIL (white) Center marking within lane width
(CW-SC2)

## , <br> 

STACGERED CONTINENTAL CROSSWALK 1 ft WHITE BARS Ift WHITE BARS
. Match points to existing pavement marking and station call-outs are approximate and shall be field verified.
2. All permanent longitudinal pavement markings shall be Method A except as noted. See Section 00865 in Special Provisions. All except as noted. See Section 00865 in Special Provisions. All
3. Existing signs not shown are to remain in place unless otherwise directed by Engineer.
4. Remove existing conflicting pavement markings outside of paving limits.






| z. |
| :--- |
| i |
| u |









SIGN \& POST DATA TABLE


SIGN \& POST DATA TABLE


SIGN \& POST DATA TABLE


## CONTROLLERS

(cc) Install rectangular rapid flashing beacon

POLES
$\left(\begin{array}{l}\text { PP } \\ N\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{l}\text { Install pedestrian signal pedestal } \\ \text { on }(N=N \text { Number) foundation frangible base } \\ \text { see }\end{array}\right.$
N on ( $N=$ =Number) foundation. See TM457 for details.

$\left(\frac{\mathrm{EX}}{2}\right)$ Retain and protect existing Utility pole
SIGNALS
PBH Install pushbutton with mount and sign
PBH) ("PUSHBUTTON TO TURN ON WARNING LIGHTS"RIO-25)
CONDUITS
(S) Install ( $S=$ size) inch conduit

HDD Install conduit by horizontal directional driling, open trench not
$\left(\begin{array}{c}X-\mathrm{M} \\ \mathrm{C}\end{array} \begin{array}{l}\text { Install ( } X=\text { number of cables) control cable }(s) \text { with ( } N=\text { number }) \\ \text { ( } C=A W G \text { wire size) AWG conductors }\end{array}\right.$
SIGNS

* See signing plans for details on sign and attachment





$\left(\frac{E X}{L P}\right)$ Retain and protect existing illumination pole and appurtenances.
EX Retain and protect existing wood illumination pole and WP appertunances.
FDN Install City of Ashland standard 5-LB precast footing
(N) Install light pole ( $N=$ number) (See metal light pole table).


## LUMINAIRES

EX Retain and protect existing luminaire
LED Install light emitting diode luminaire. (See light pole table). Bond luminaire CONDUITSInstal/ (S=size) inch conduit.
W) Install conduit and wire as required by power company.
(EX) Retain and protect existing electrical conduit.
HDD Install conduit by horizontal directional drilling,
open trench not allowed.

## LUNCTIONBOXES

$\left(\frac{E X}{\sqrt{1 B}}\right.$ Retain and protect existing junction box
$\frac{J B}{1}$ Install $17^{\prime \prime} \times 10^{\prime \prime} \times 12^{\prime \prime}$ (min. dimension) precast concrete junction box.
$\left(\frac{1 B}{1 A}\right.$ Instal/ $17^{\prime \prime} \times 10^{\prime \prime} \times 12^{\prime \prime}$ (min. dimension) precast concrete junction Install $17 " x 10 " x 12$ (min.
box with concrete apron.
$\frac{J B}{2 A}$ Install $22^{\prime \prime} \times 12^{\prime \prime} \times 12^{\prime \prime}$ (min. dimension) precast concrete junction box with concrete apron.

## WIRES \& CABLES

$N$ Install ( $N=$ number) No. ( $G=A W G$ wire size) XHHW wires.
L\#N Roadway illumination circuit no. (N).
G(S) Install one No. (S) copper ground wire.
(PS) Power source for 120 volt.
$\left(\frac{E X}{W}\right.$ Retain and protect existing wiring.
CABINETS
FSD Instal/ free standing streetlight disconnect per City of Ashland Electric Department Standards, Figure 10.3.7.

ILLUMINATION LEGEND

| AND LIGHT POLE TABLE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LIGHT POLE TABLE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pole No. | Street | Station | Offset | Style | Mounting <br> Height (ft) | Luminaire Wattage | Notes |
| 1 | N Mountain Avenue | 505+55.0 | 26.5'L | Antique Street Lamps EML17-ST-49LED350MA-3K-GCF-MVOLT-R2-DBL | 18 | 59 |  |
| 2 | N Mountain Avenue | 506+08.6 | 20.4'L | Antique Street Lamps EML17-ST-49LED350MA-3k-GCF-MVOLT-R2-DBL | 18 | 59 |  |
| 3 | N Mountain Avenue | 507+21.0 | 19.9'L | Antique Street Lamps EML17-ST-49LED350MA-3K-GCF-MVOLT-R2-DBL | 18 | 59 |  |
| 4 | N Mountain Avenue | 507+49.1 | 33.5'R | Antique Street Lamps EML17-ST-49LED350MA-3k-GCF-MVOLT-R2-DBL | 18 | 59 |  |
| 5 | N Mountain Avenue | $509+31.5$ | 27.0'R | Antique Street Lamps EML17-ST-49LED350MA-3k-GCF-MvoLT-R2-DBL | 18 | 59 |  |
| 6 | N Mountain Avenue | 509+51.7 | 32.4'L | Antique Street Lamps EML17-ST-49LED350MA-3k-GCF-MVOLT-R2-DBL | 18 | 59 |  |
| 7 | N Mountain Avenue | 510+01.7 | 30.2' R | Antique Street Lamps EML17-ST-49LED350MA-3k-GCF-MVOLT-R2-DBL | 18 | 59 |  |
| 8 | N Mountain Avenue | $516+55.6$ | 26.4'R | Antique Street Lamps EML17-ST-49LED350MA-3k-GCF-MvoLT-R2-DBL | 18 | 59 |  |
| 9 | N Mountain Avenue | 516+99.5 | $26.4{ }^{\text {R }}$ R | Antique Street Lamps EML17-ST-49LED350MA-3k-GCF-MVOLT-R2-DBL | 18 | 59 |  |
| 10 | N Mountain Avenue | $519+21.8$ | 25.9 ' | Antique Street Lamps EML17-ST-49LED350MA-3K-GCF-MVOLT-R2-DBL | 18 | 59 |  |
| 11 | N Mountain Avenue | 519+58.0 | 22.1' | Antique Street Lamps EML17-ST-49LED350MA-3k-GCF-MVOLT-R2-DBL | 18 | 59 |  |
| 12 | N Mountain Avenue | $525+91.8$ | 18.4'R | Antique Street Lamps EML17-ST-49LED350MA-3k-GCF-MVOLT-R2-DBL | 18 | 59 |  |
| 13 | N Mountain Avenue | 526+23.7 | 21.9' | Antique Street Lamps EML17-ST-49LED350MA-3K-GCF-MVOLT-R2-DBL | 18 | 59 |  |
| 14 | N Mountain Avenue | 531+11.4 | 19.8'R | Antique Street Lamps EML17-ST-49LED350MA-3K-GCF-MVOLT-R2-DBL | 18 | 59 |  |
| 15 | N Mountain Avenue | 531+74.0 | $20.9{ }^{\text {L }}$ | Antique Street Lamps EML17-ST-49LED350MA-3k-GCF-MVOLT-R2-DBL | 18 | 59 |  |
| 16 | N Mountain Avenue | 550+14.8 | 24.1'R | Antique Street Lamps EML17-ST-49LED350MA-3k-GCF-MVOLT-R2-DBL | 18 | 59 |  |
| 17 | N Mountain Avenue | 550+62.9 | 17.4'L | Antique Street Lamps EML17-ST-49LED350MA-3k-GCF-MVOLT-R2-DBL | 18 | 59 |  |
| 18 | N Mountain Avenue | 559+62.3 | 24.2'R | Antique Street Lamps EML17-ST-49LED350MA-3K-GCF-MVOLT-R2-DBL | 18 | 59 |  |


| INTERSECTION LIGHT LEVELS SUMMARY |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Target Values |  | Achieved Values |  |
| Road Name | Roadway Classification | Pedestrian Conflict Area | Avg Maintained Horizontal Illuminance (fc) | Horizontal Uniformity (Avg/Min) | Avg Maintained Horizontal Illuminance (fc) | Horizontal Uniformity (Avg/Min) |
| Mountain Ave/Skylark PI | Collector/Local | Low | $\geq 0.9$ | ¢4.0:1 | 1.1 | 2.7 |
| Mountain Ave/Nevada St | Collector/Collector | Low | $\geq 1.1$ | <4.0:1 | 1.4 | 3.5 |
| Mountain Ave/Fair Oaks Ave | Collector/Local | Low | $\geq 0.9$ | S40:0:1 | 1.2 | 3.9 |
| Mountain Ave/Mountain Meadows Dr | Collector/Local | Low | $\geq 0.9$ | S40:1 | 1.3 | 3.3 |
| Mountain Ave/Briscoe Pl | Collector/Local | Low | $\geq 0.9$ | ¢4.0:1 | 1.5 | 3.8 |
| Mountain Ave/Village Green Dr | Collector/Local | Low | $\geq 0.9$ | S4.0:1 | 1.0 | 3.3 |
| Mountain Ave/B St | Collector/Local | Low | $\geq 0.9$ | ธ40:0:1 | 0.9 | 3.1 |


| PEDESTRIAN CROSSING LIGHT LEVELS SUMMARY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Target Values |  |  | Achieved Values |  |  |
| Road Name | Roadway Classification | Pedestrian Conflict Area | Avg. Maintained Horizontal Illuminance (fc) | Horizontal Uniformity (Avg/Min) | Avg. Maintained Vertical Illuminance (fc) | Avg. Maintained <br> Horizontal Illuminance (fc) | Horizontal Uniformity (Avg/Min) | Avg. Maintained Vertical Illuminance (fc) |
| Midblock Crosswalk 1 - Mountain Ave (Mountain Meadows Dr to Nepenthe Rd) | Collector | Low | $\geq 0.9$ | <4.0:1 | $\geq 0.95$ | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.6/1.5* |
| Crosswalk 2-Briscoe P//Mountain Ave | Collector/Local | Low | 20.9 | S4.0:1 | $\geq 0.95$ | 2.0 | 1.3 | 1.6/1.1.0* |
| Midblock Crosswalk 3-Mountain Ave (East Dr to Clinton St) | Collector | Low | 20.9 | S4.0:1 | 20.95 | 1.9 | 1.2 | 1.8/1.8* |
| Crosswalk 4-village Green Dr/Mountain Ave | Colle etor | Low | 20.9 | 54.0:1 | $\geq 0.95$ | 1.4 | 1.2 | 1.0/1.0* |





AVALIGBETEOPON REQUEST









Date: May 17, 2023
From: Scott A. Fleury
To: Transportation Advisory Committee
RE: Parklet Program

## BACKGROUND:

The Parklet Program was discussed at the April $20^{\text {th }}$ Transportation Committee meeting. The outcome of the discussion was to work with the Chamber of Commerce to develop a survey to gauge interest of downtown business for pursuing a Parklet Program.

At that time, staff was also waiting for a decision from the Oregon Department of Transportation on if they would permit a Parklet Program within their right of way. ODOT has informed staff they will not be permitting parklets within their jurisdiction moving forward. The only remedy to this situation would be jurisdictional transfer from ODOT to the City and thus City rules/regulations could apply within the right of way.

Since ODOT won't be permitting a Parklet Program, this only leaves the side streets under City jurisdiction within the downtown corridor and Railroad District Businesses that could support a Parklet Program.

## Next Steps:

- Schedule meeting with Chamber representatives and City staff to discuss and develop survey questions (June/July).
- Develop map of survey/outreach area (June/July)
- Send out survey (July/August)
- Obtain business feedback (August/September)
- Determine next steps (September)


## Previous Background April 20, 2023 Meeting:

At the April 4, 2023 Business Meeting the City Council requested staff begin the process of reviewing and developing a parklet program similar to what the City of Medford previously developed and adopted.

In brief the Council motioned for the Transportation Committee to "Develop a feasibility study on a parklet program".

Staff has included background information the City of Medford has developed for their program as initial reference materials.

The following items should be considered in the feasibility analysis:

1. Code Review:
a. Implementing a Parklet will require a new section to the municipal code and review of the existing encroachment guidelines to avoid generating confusion or problems. The current encroachment code only focuses on sidewalk dining, not dining in parking spots.

## 2. Permitting:

a. To implement this approach along E. Main Street, Public Works will be required to coordinate with the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT). E. Main is ODOT right-of-way necessitation their review of permitting and proposed design standards for parklets.
b. Application of the program in Ashland right of way would be more straightforward as the City controls the right of way and can permit applications once the code is developed and approved by the City Council. A parklet program limited to Ashland right of way could generate questions of unfair competition by E. Main Street businesses if ODOT denied the use of their right-of-way for parklets.

## 3. Parking:

a. Parking in general is an issue downtown and the loss of parking spaces in the right of way is very likely to be a point of contention for all business operations downtown. It would be best to conduct an outreach effort to involve downtown businesses in any discussion/development of a parklet program.

## 4. Design Standards:

a. Design standards either similar to Medford's or another jurisdiction need to be developed. These design standards also need to account for safety of the traveling public and appropriate accessibility needs.
5. Stakeholder Engagement:
a. Who are the stakeholders and how are all of the parties engaged in the process to generate appropriate information and recommendations to bring forward to Council for discussion?

Developing a parklet program for Ashland will involve most City Departments and various stakeholders and outside agencies in order to develop a successful outcome. This type of process takes time to put together and navigate.

## CONCLUSION:

Action required, this is a continued discussion on the parklet program, and the Transportation Committee is asked to weigh in on next steps, including participation in survey development and meetings with the chamber.

