

# *City of Canby*

## ***CANBY CITY COUNCIL & PLANNING COMMISSION***

### ***Work Session Notice***

***March 12, 2012***

***6:00 PM***

***City Council Chambers***

***155 NW 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue***

***Canby, Oregon***

This Work Session will be attended by the Mayor, City Council, and Planning Commission to discuss the Canby 99E Corridor and Gateway Plan.

For information regarding this meeting, please contact City Hall at 503.266.4021.

*\*The meeting location is accessible to persons with disabilities. A request for an interpreter for the hearing impaired or for other accommodations for persons with disabilities should be made at least 48 hours before the meeting to Kim Scheafer at 503.266.4021 ext. 233. A copy of this notice can be found on the City's web page at [www.ci.canby.or.us](http://www.ci.canby.or.us).*

## Canby OR 99E Corridor and Gateway Plan Community Meeting #2 – Meeting Summary

---

<b>Meeting Date:</b>	Tuesday, January 10, 2012 6:30 pm – 8:00 pm
<b>Location:</b>	Hope Village Community Center (Canby, Oregon)
<b>Project Team Attendance:</b>	Matilda Deas, City of Canby Tom Litster, Otak Kaitlin North, Otak Chris Maciejewski, DKS Brad Coy, DKS
<b>Community Attendance:</b>	23 people signed in

### Meeting Purpose:

The purpose of the community meeting was to solicit input on the draft conceptual designs that have been prepared for the Corridor and Gateway treatments.

### Flow of the Workshop:

Matilda Deas, the City project manager, began the workshop by welcoming participants, discussing the context of the meeting (including the project status), and introducing the consultant and agency team members. Chris Maciejewski (DKS) then provided an overview of the stations and posters situated around the room. After describing the general layout of stations and content of posters, Chris provided an opportunity for the group to ask questions. After answering the questions, the attendees were invited to roam around the room and provide feedback at each individual station. The meeting ended at approximately 8:00 p.m.

### Public Input:

Public input was provided at the stations during the meeting. Each station was manned by a consultant staff member who recorded feedback on sticky notes, which were then posted to the applicable poster. Detailed notes and poster comments are attached to this summary.

In addition, comment forms were available for each attendee to fill out. These forms were formatted to solicit specific feedback (e.g., like, dislike, or not sure) on the conceptual gateway and cross-section treatments. Attendees were given the option of filling the forms out at the meeting or returning them to Matilda at a later date. The forms that have been received to-date are attached to this summary.

### Demographics of Workshop Participants:

Twenty three community members attended the workshop. Some of the attendees included City of Canby staff, City Council and Planning Commission members, and other interested parties (e.g., the Chamber of Commerce, Canby Garden Club, and Hope Village staff members).

### **Public and Media Outreach**

Matilda Deas, Senior Planner for the City of Canby, managed the public and media outreach for the meeting by posting a meeting notice in The Canby Herald, the city's local newspaper. The 8 ½ x 11 notice was published in the January 4<sup>th</sup> edition of the newspaper. In addition, a flier was posted at the Canby Public Library, Hope Village Community Center, the Canby Planning Department, the Canby City Hall public notice bulletin board, and on the City of Canby's Web site two weeks prior to the meeting. Spanish Fliers were posted at the same locations. The fliers indicated that a Spanish speaking staff member would be available at the meeting. Invitations were also hand delivered to all businesses adjacent to 99E within the project boundaries (i.e., City limit to City limit).

# Open House Sign In Sheet 1.10.12

NAME	ORGANIZATION	PHONE	EMAIL
Roger Skoe			skoe@canby.com
BUZZ WEYGANDT			GARDEN HOME@CANBY.COM
Bob Kautzman	Hope Village		
Bert HERR	Hope Village		
Arlene HERR	Hope Village		
Arlene Peterson	Hope Village		
Bryan Brown	City of Canby		
Annie Tran	City of Canby		TRANAD@CI.CANBY.OR.US
CHUCK KOCHER	PLANNING COMM		
Shawn Handy			
Kandy Carson	City		
Walt Daniels	City		
Bryan Hulse	City		
Bev Poolittle	Chamber		
Tim DAVIS	City		

# Open House Sign In Sheet 1.10.12

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>PHONE</u>	<u>EMAIL</u>
Greg Park	City		
Renate Mergelberg	City	503 266 7001	mergelbergR@CityofCanby.com
Scott Dancy	Canby Garden Club	503 260 5025	
Sylvia Morrison	Canby Garden Club	971-409-6743	SylviaMorrison@Canby.com
Jeff Scott		503-266-2549	Canby.com
Traci Hensley	City		
Paul David Rippe	Hope Village	503 266 9666	
Kevin Bateman	Bike + Ped Adv. Comm. Hqr	651 3282	bateman@canby.com

**CANBY GATEWAY DESIGN PLAN  
COMMUNITY MEETING COMMENTS  
Otak Project #16010**

<b>BOARD TITLE</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>
<i>Corridor Plan Gateways</i>	No comments
<i>Corridor Plan Segments</i>	No comments
<i>Standard STA: Right-of-Way Impacts (DKS Poster)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prefer no bike lanes, no wide sidewalks (OR 99E is not downtown), no arch at Grant, no street trees (want 1<sup>st</sup> Ave to be visible)</li> </ul>
<i>Wide Sidewalks: Right-of-Way Impacts (DKS Poster)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why 14 feet on north side?</li> </ul>
<i>Buffered Bike Lanes: Right-of-Way Impacts (DKS Poster)</i>	No comments
<i>Logging Road Trail Bridge Gateway – Access Improvements</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to Fred Meyer is very important</li> </ul>
<i>Logging Road Trail Bridge Gateway – Design Options (1)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove blackberries from slope</li> <li>• New colors and flowers</li> <li>• Use LED lighting – there is not much existing lighting</li> <li>• Reduce the part under the word “Canby”</li> <li>• Like how it matches Canby’s theme</li> </ul>

**BOARD TITLE****COMMENTS**

*Logging Road Trail Bridge  
Gateway – Design Options (1)  
Cont.*

- Banners on logging road?
- Like the color of the concrete; make sure it's durable

*Logging Road Trail Bridge  
Gateway – Design Options (2)*

- Garden spot...of Oregon
- The second railing design example looks too weeded
- Use Irises
- Like the use of iron work – use a little on the sides combined with the theme
- Make the metal work new Canby/old Canby

*Logging Road Trail Bridge  
Gateway – Design Options (3)*

- Like lighting options
- Light the bridge to improve safety of the pedestrians using it
- Tree, shrub, and rose plantings?

*Downtown Gateway Option A*

- Please use durable materials

*Downtown Gateway Option B*

- Put bike lanes on 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue
- Bikes and pedestrians do not mix
- Prefer bike lanes that are not in the roadway; use wide sidewalks for bike and pedestrian use

*Downtown Gateway Option C*

- No bike lanes; bring them downtown
- No trees; block views of 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue businesses

BOARD TITLE	COMMENTS
<i>Downtown Gateway Option C Cont.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No arch; a little “too much” for our small town feel</li> <li>• Three arches, not one</li> </ul>
<i>Downtown Gateway Features</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Like the nice traffic signals (gateway arch and ornamental signal poles and mast arm)</li> </ul>
<i>Berg Parkway Gateway (1)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Love the plants used in the planted median example. Use something colorful that catches the eye</li> <li>• Maintenance is political will issue – allocation of funds</li> <li>• Zeroscaping</li> <li>• Would like a little extra effort to have plants and landscaping</li> <li>• Use the right plant in the right place; using the right plants will cut down on maintenance</li> <li>• Consider transporting water one day a week using a truck</li> <li>• Safety concern for landscape maintenance</li> <li>• If you don’t have landscaping, use pavers or something textured rather than ugly concrete</li> <li>• Are there ways to tie the different treatments together for consistent themes and features?</li> <li>• Pedestrian crossing for high schoolers going to Panda Express - possibly in center of landscaped media</li> <li>• Concerned for business especially vacant lot; would new business traffic have to travel through full parking lot?</li> </ul>



**BOARD TITLE****COMMENTS**

---

***Berg Parkway Gateway (1) Cont.***

- How to mirror both ends of town? Consistency of message
- How willing would ODOT be to give full access to new development?

***Berg Parkway Gateway (2)***



- The existing gateway is a great start to build on
- Would be nice to improve the traffic situation in the “goofy” area by the high school
- Like the additional treatments and how they enhance the current gateway – rendition looks really good
- Like the current gateway; additional improvements may be nice but not necessary
- A median may encourage high school students to be even more willing to cross than they already are
- Any discussion of overhead lines? Can they be moved to one side? This would be a huge visual benefit
- Landscaping looks ice but what about maintenance? Other cities seem to be taking out landscaping and putting in pavement
- Prefer stamped concrete rather than bricks (move around) especially for walkways and crosswalks to emphasize pedestrian crossings
- Ask the experts about roadway paving – those who install and repair. Ideas are good, but realize who the real experts are

# Preference Survey

## Canby OR 99E Corridor and Gateway Design Plan

Draft recommendations for improving OR 99E have been presented tonight. The improvements are based on coordination with ODOT and input from citizens, property owners, and City staff. Please consider these recommendations and let us know how you feel.


### 1. OR 99E Cross-Section Options Through Downtown (Elm to Locust)



Please let us know which of the following cross-section options you prefer and whether the remaining two options are acceptable or unacceptable. Feel free to provide additional comments.

#### Standard Special Transportation Area (STA)

Please circle one:




**Preferred / Acceptable / Unacceptable**

Comments:

*10' wide*

#### Wide Sidewalks for Pedestrians/Bikes

Please circle one:



**Preferred / Acceptable / Unacceptable**


Comments:

*14' wide*

*Best for bikes & trucks*

#### Buffered Bike Lanes

Please circle one:



**Preferred / Acceptable / Unacceptable**

Comments:

*14' wide*

*We'll never get the right-of-way. Bikes don't like busy on 99E anyway*

**2. OR 99E Cross-Sections (Outside of Downtown)**

Like

**Dislike**

Not Sure

Buffered bike lanes

**Comments and Other Considerations:**

Bikes avoid 99E! too dangerous. Don't create a right of way to dr.  
 2 Try me S 2nd + W 3/4th

**3. Berg Parkway Gateway**

Like

Dislike

Not Sure

Median and banners

Distinctive paving in the roadway

Additional landscaping for existing entry sign

**Comments and Other Considerations:**

**4. Downtown Gateway Streetscape Elements**

Like

Dislike

Not Sure

Grant Street arch

Ornamental signal poles and bollards

Distinctive intersection treatments

Distinctive sidewalk treatments

Street trees

**Comments and Other Considerations:**

**5. Molalla River Pathway Bridge**

Like

Dislike

Not Sure

Ornamental bridge fencing

Nighttime lighting for bridge

Distinctive paving in the roadway

**Comments and Other Considerations:**



Can you summarize your preferences into a vision for OR 99E as a community street for Canby?

# Preference Survey

## Canby OR 99E Corridor and Gateway Design Plan


Draft recommendations for improving OR 99E have been presented tonight. The improvements are based on coordination with ODOT and input from citizens, property owners, and City staff. Please consider these recommendations and let us know how you feel.

### 1. OR 99E Cross-Section Options Through Downtown (Elm to Locust)



Please let us know which of the following cross-section options you prefer and whether the remaining two options are acceptable or unacceptable. Feel free to provide additional comments.

#### Standard Special Transportation Area (STA)




Please circle one:

Preferred / ~~Acceptable~~ / Unacceptable

Comments:

no bike lanes  
bring them through downtown on 1<sup>st</sup> Ave

#### Wide Sidewalks for Pedestrians/Bikes




Please circle one:

Preferred / Acceptable / ~~Unacceptable~~

Comments:

#### Buffered Bike Lanes



Please circle one:

Preferred / Acceptable / ~~Unacceptable~~

Comments:

**2. OR 99E Cross-Sections (Outside of Downtown)**

	Like	Dislike	Not Sure
Buffered bike lanes			

*Comments and Other Considerations:*

**3. Berg Parkway Gateway**

	Like	Dislike	Not Sure
Median and banners	✓		
Distinctive paving in the roadway	✓		
Additional landscaping for existing entry sign		X	

*Comments and Other Considerations:*  
 LANDSCAPE REQUIRES MAINTENANCE

**4. Downtown Gateway Streetscape Elements**

	Like	Dislike	Not Sure
Grant Street arch		X	too much
Ornamental signal poles and bollards			
Distinctive intersection treatments			
Distinctive sidewalk treatments			
Street trees		X	

for our little town

*Comments and Other Considerations:*  
 NO TREES - they block the view of 1<sup>st</sup> Ave businesses

**5. Molalla River Pathway Bridge**

	Like	Dislike	Not Sure
Ornamental bridge fencing	✓		
Nighttime lighting for bridge	✓		
Distinctive paving in the roadway	✓		

*Comments and Other Considerations:*



Can you summarize your preferences into a vision for OR 99E as a community street for Canby?

# Preference Survey

## Canby OR 99E Corridor and Gateway Design Plan

Draft recommendations for improving OR 99E have been presented tonight. The improvements are based on coordination with ODOT and input from citizens, property owners, and City staff. Please consider these recommendations and let us know how you feel.


### 1. OR 99E Cross-Section Options Through Downtown (Elm to Locust)



Please let us know which of the following cross-section options you prefer and whether the remaining two options are acceptable or unacceptable. Feel free to provide additional comments.

#### Standard Special Transportation Area (STA)

Please circle one:




Preferred / **Acceptable** / Unacceptable

Comments:

#### Wide Sidewalks for Pedestrians/Bikes

Please circle one:




Preferred / **Acceptable** / Unacceptable

Comments:

#### Buffered Bike Lanes

Please circle one:



Preferred / **Acceptable** / Unacceptable

Comments:

**2. OR 99E Cross-Sections (Outside of Downtown)**

	Like	Dislike	Not Sure
Buffered bike lanes		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

*Comments and Other Considerations:*

We don't need bike lanes on 99

**3. Berg Parkway Gateway**

	Like	Dislike	Not Sure
Median and banners	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Distinctive paving in the roadway	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Additional landscaping for existing entry sign	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

*Comments and Other Considerations:*

**4. Downtown Gateway Streetscape Elements**

	Like	Dislike	Not Sure
Grant Street arch		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Ornamental signal poles and bollards	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Distinctive intersection treatments	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Distinctive sidewalk treatments	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Street trees		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

*Comments and Other Considerations:*

**5. Molalla River Pathway Bridge**

	Like	Dislike	Not Sure
Ornamental bridge fencing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Nighttime lighting for bridge	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Distinctive paving in the roadway	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

*Comments and Other Considerations:*



Can you summarize your preferences into a vision for OR 99E as a community street for Canby?

# Preference Survey

## Canby OR 99E Corridor and Gateway Design Plan


Draft recommendations for improving OR 99E have been presented tonight. The improvements are based on coordination with ODOT and input from citizens, property owners, and City staff. Please consider these recommendations and let us know how you feel.

### 1. OR 99E Cross-Section Options Through Downtown (Elm to Locust)



Please let us know which of the following cross-section options you prefer and whether the remaining two options are acceptable or unacceptable. Feel free to provide additional comments.

#### Standard Special Transportation Area (STA)




Please circle one:

Preferred /  Acceptable /  Unacceptable

Comments: - No bike lanes on 99E.

#### Wide Sidewalks for Pedestrians/Bikes




Please circle one:

Preferred /  Acceptable /  Unacceptable

Comments: - No bike lanes on 99E  
- 10'-12' on both sides

#### Buffered Bike Lanes



Please circle one:

Preferred /  Acceptable /  Unacceptable

Comments: - No bike lanes on 99E



**2. OR 99E Cross-Sections (Outside of Downtown)**

	Like	Dislike	Not Sure
Buffered bike lanes		X	

**Comments and Other Considerations:**  
*OR 99E IS NOT NOR WILL BE CONDUCTIVE TO BIKERS.*

**3. Berg Parkway Gateway**

	Like	Dislike	Not Sure
Median and banners	X		
Distinctive paving in the roadway	X		
Additional landscaping for existing entry sign	X		

**Comments and Other Considerations:**

**4. Downtown Gateway Streetscape Elements**

	Like	Dislike	Not Sure
Grant Street arch		X	
Ornamental signal poles and bollards	X		
Distinctive intersection treatments	X		
Distinctive sidewalk treatments		X	
Street trees			

**Comments and Other Considerations:**  
*INTERSECTION TREATMENTS SHOULD BE COLORED ALL THRU THE CONCRETE NOT PAINTED  
~~NO~~ NO PAVERS.*

**5. Molalla River Pathway Bridge**

	Like	Dislike	Not Sure
Ornamental bridge fencing			
Nighttime lighting for bridge	X		
Distinctive paving in the roadway	X		

**Comments and Other Considerations:**  
*PAVING SHOULD BE LIKE ABOVE, NO PAVERS NOT PAINTED.*



Can you summarize your preferences into a vision for OR 99E as a community street for Canby?

# Preference Survey

## Canby OR 99E Corridor and Gateway Design Plan


Draft recommendations for improving OR 99E have been presented tonight. The improvements are based on coordination with ODOT and input from citizens, property owners, and City staff. Please consider these recommendations and let us know how you feel.

### 1. OR 99E Cross-Section Options Through Downtown (Elm to Locust)




Please let us know which of the following cross-section options you prefer and whether the remaining two options are acceptable or unacceptable. Feel free to provide additional comments.

#### Standard Special Transportation Area (STA) *Please circle one:*




**Preferred** / Acceptable / Unacceptable  
 Comments:

#### Wide Sidewalks for Pedestrians/Bikes *Please circle one:*



**Preferred** / Acceptable / Unacceptable  
 Comments:

#### Buffered Bike Lanes *Please circle one:*



**Preferred** / Acceptable / Unacceptable  
 Comments:

**2. OR 99E Cross-Sections (Outside of Downtown)**

	Like	Dislike	Not Sure
Buffered bike lanes			X

*Comments and Other Considerations:*

**3. Berg Parkway Gateway**

	Like	Dislike	Not Sure
Median and banners	X		
Distinctive paving in the roadway	X		
Additional landscaping for existing entry sign	X		

*Comments and Other Considerations:*  
 → NO BRICKS

**4. Downtown Gateway Streetscape Elements**

	Like	Dislike	Not Sure
Grant Street arch		X	
Ornamental signal poles and bollards			X
Distinctive intersection treatments	X		
Distinctive sidewalk treatments			X
Street trees	X		

*Comments and Other Considerations:*

**5. Molalla River Pathway Bridge**

	Like	Dislike	Not Sure
Ornamental bridge fencing			X
Nighttime lighting for bridge	X		
Distinctive paving in the roadway		X	

*Comments and Other Considerations:*  
 → MAYBE SOME



Can you summarize your preferences into a vision for OR 99E as a community street for Canby?

# Preference Survey

## Canby OR 99E Corridor and Gateway Design Plan

Draft recommendations for improving OR 99E have been presented tonight. The improvements are based on coordination with ODOT and input from citizens, property owners, and City staff. Please consider these recommendations and let us know how you feel.


### 1. OR 99E Cross-Section Options Through Downtown (Elm to Locust)



Please let us know which of the following cross-section options you prefer and whether the remaining two options are acceptable or unacceptable. Feel free to provide additional comments.

#### Standard Special Transportation Area (STA)

Please circle one:




Preferred / Acceptable / Unacceptable

Comments:

#### Wide Sidewalks for Pedestrians/Bikes

Please circle one:




Preferred / Acceptable / Unacceptable

Comments:

Bikes rarely use 99 thru Canby  
re-route them off to 1st Ave  
Add trees to separate sidewalk users  
from roadway

#### Buffered Bike Lanes

Please circle one:



Preferred / Acceptable / Unacceptable

Comments:

**2. OR 99E Cross-Sections (Outside of Downtown)**

	Like	Dislike	Not Sure
Buffered bike lanes	Y		

**Comments and Other Considerations:**  
 Improve bike access, throughout town, Bike tourism is growing in Clackamas County

**3. Berg Parkway Gateway**

	Like	Dislike	Not Sure
Median and banners			Y
Distinctive paving in the roadway	Yes		
Additional landscaping for existing entry sign			Y

**Comments and Other Considerations:**

**4. Downtown Gateway Streetscape Elements**

	Like	Dislike	Not Sure
Grant Street arch			Y
Ornamental signal poles and bollards			Y
Distinctive intersection treatments	Y		
Distinctive sidewalk treatments	Y		
Street trees	Y		

**Comments and Other Considerations:**  
 Arch all 3 streets, what's so special about Grant St? It gets much more traffic!

**5. Molalla River Pathway Bridge**

	Like	Dislike	Not Sure
Ornamental bridge fencing	Yes		
Nighttime lighting for bridge	YES		
Distinctive paving in the roadway	yes		

**Comments and Other Considerations:**  
 Light the bridge to offer safe passage and invite people to use it, rather than deterring them

Can you summarize your preferences into a vision for OR 99E as a community street for Canby?



Kevin Batridge

# Preference Survey

## Canby OR 99E Corridor and Gateway Design Plan

Draft recommendations for improving OR 99E have been presented tonight. The improvements are based on coordination with ODOT and input from citizens, property owners, and City staff. Please consider these recommendations and let us know how you feel.


### 1. OR 99E Cross-Section Options Through Downtown (Elm to Locust)



Please let us know which of the following cross-section options you prefer and whether the remaining two options are acceptable or unacceptable. Feel free to provide additional comments.

#### Standard Special Transportation Area (STA)

*Please circle one:*




**Preferred / Acceptable / Unacceptable**

*Comments:*

#### Wide Sidewalks for Pedestrians/Bikes

*Please circle one:*




**Preferred / Acceptable / Unacceptable**

*Comments:*

#### Buffered Bike Lanes

*Please circle one:*



**Preferred / Acceptable / Unacceptable**

*Comments:*

**2. OR 99E Cross-Sections (Outside of Downtown)**

	Like	Dislike	Not Sure
Buffered bike lanes			

*Comments and Other Considerations:*

**3. Berg Parkway Gateway**

	Like	Dislike	Not Sure
Median and banners		✓	
Distinctive paving in the roadway			
Additional landscaping for existing entry sign			

*Comments and Other Considerations:*

**4. Downtown Gateway Streetscape Elements**

	Like	Dislike	Not Sure
Grant Street arch		✓	
Ornamental signal poles and bollards	✓		
Distinctive intersection treatments	✓		
Distinctive sidewalk treatments	✓		
Street trees			on first only

*Comments and Other Considerations:*

**5. Molalla River Pathway Bridge**

	Like	Dislike	Not Sure
Ornamental bridge fencing	simple ✓		
Nighttime lighting for bridge	✓		
Distinctive paving in the roadway			

*Comments and Other Considerations:*



Can you summarize your preferences into a vision for OR 99E as a community street for Canby?

# Preference Survey

## Canby OR 99E Corridor and Gateway Design Plan

Draft recommendations for improving OR 99E have been presented tonight. The improvements are based on coordination with ODOT and input from citizens, property owners, and City staff. Please consider these recommendations and let us know how you feel.


### 1. OR 99E Cross-Section Options Through Downtown (Elm to Locust)



Please let us know which of the following cross-section options you prefer and whether the remaining two options are acceptable or unacceptable. Feel free to provide additional comments.

#### Standard Special Transportation Area (STA)

Please circle one:




Preferred / Acceptable / Unacceptable

Comments:

NO Bike lane  
10-12 Sidewalk

#### Wide Sidewalks for Pedestrians/Bikes

Please circle one:




Preferred / Acceptable / Unacceptable

Comments:

#### Buffered Bike Lanes

Please circle one:



Preferred / Acceptable / Unacceptable

Comments:



**2. OR 99E Cross-Sections (Outside of Downtown)**

Like

**Dislike**

Not Sure

Buffered bike lanes		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
---------------------	--	-------------------------------------	--

*Comments and Other Considerations:*  
 NO BIKES ON 99E!!!

**3. Berg Parkway Gateway**

Like

Dislike

Not Sure

Median and banners		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Distinctive paving in the roadway		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Additional landscaping for existing entry sign	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

*Comments and Other Considerations:*

**4. Downtown Gateway Streetscape Elements**

Like

Dislike

Not Sure

Grant Street arch	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Ornamental signal poles and bollards	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Distinctive intersection treatments			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distinctive sidewalk treatments		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Street trees	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

*Comments and Other Considerations:*

**5. Molalla River Pathway Bridge**

Like

Dislike

Not Sure

Ornamental bridge fencing		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Nighttime lighting for bridge			
Distinctive paving in the roadway			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*Comments and Other Considerations:*

Can you summarize your preferences into a vision for OR 99E as a community street for Canby?

Bike path — ped/Bike —

What is vision of 99



send to all advisory - Outreach -

field of dreams →

## Preference Survey Canby OR 99E Corridor and Gateway Design Plan

Draft recommendations for improving OR 99E have been presented tonight. The improvements are based on coordination with ODOT and input from citizens, property owners, and City staff. Please consider these recommendations and let us know how you feel.


### 1. OR 99E Cross-Section Options Through Downtown (Elm to Locust)



Please let us know which of the following cross-section options you prefer and whether the remaining two options are acceptable or unacceptable. Feel free to provide additional comments.


#### Standard Special Transportation Area (STA)

*Please circle one:*  
**Preferred / Acceptable / Unacceptable**  
*Comments:*




#### Wide Sidewalks for Pedestrians/Bikes

*Please circle one:*  
**Preferred / Acceptable / Unacceptable**  
*Comments:*



#### Buffered Bike Lanes

*Please circle one:*  
**Preferred / Acceptable / Unacceptable**  
*Comments:*



**2. OR 99E Cross-Sections (Outside of Downtown)**

**Like                      Dislike                      Not Sure**

Buffered bike lanes
---------------------

<i>Comments and Other Considerations:</i>
---

**3. Berg Parkway Gateway**

**Like                      Dislike                      Not Sure**

Median and banners
--------------------

Distinctive paving in the roadway
-----------------------------------

Additional landscaping for existing entry sign
--

<i>Comments and Other Considerations:</i>
---

**4. Downtown Gateway Streetscape Elements**

**Like                      Dislike                      Not Sure**

Grant Street arch
-------------------

Ornamental signal poles and bollards
--------------------------------------

Distinctive intersection treatments
-------------------------------------

Distinctive sidewalk treatments
---------------------------------

Street trees
--------------

<i>Comments and Other Considerations:</i>
---

**5. Molalla River Pathway Bridge**

**Like                      Dislike                      Not Sure**

Ornamental bridge fencing
---------------------------

Nighttime lighting for bridge
-------------------------------

Distinctive paving in the roadway
-----------------------------------

<i>Comments and Other Considerations:</i>
---

*Can you summarize your preferences into a vision for OR 99E as a community street for Canby?*

**Canby OR 99E Corridor and Gateway Plan  
Gateway Plan Advisory Committee Meeting 3  
January 31, 2012 (2:30-4:00 p.m.)  
Hope Village Community Center (Canby, Oregon)**

**GPAC Members Present:** Liz Belz-Templeman (Bike and Pedestrian Advisory Committee); Loretta Kieffer (ODOT); Ryan Oliver (business owner); Steve Miller (business owner); Ron Yarbrough (Designs West/Chamber); Renate Mengelberg (City of Canby); Annie Tran (City of Canby Main Street); Julie Wehling (Canby Area Transit); John Proctor (City of Canby); Greg Parker (Canby City Councilor); Tom Scott (property owner)

**Other Participants:** Janice Chandler (MEC Northwest); Tina Wilson (Napa Auto Parts); Jeff Feller (Canby Ford); Dan Drentlaw (City of Canby); Dan McGlone (Total Car Care); Bryan Brown (City of Canby); Mary Laudon-Flores (Canby Shell Gas); Bev Doolittle (Canby Area Chamber of Commerce); Keith Galitz (Canby Telcom);

**Project Team Present:** Matilda Deas (City of Canby); Sonya Kazen (ODOT Region 1); Tom Litster (Otak); Chris Maciejewski (DKS)

**GPAC Members Absent:** Ryan Sexton (ODOT District 2B); Curt McLeod (Curran-McLeod); Francisco Cardenas (El Chilito); Debra Libel (Hulbert's Flowers); Darren Monen (Wild Hare); Gail Wilson (Napa Auto Parts); Zac Marcinkeiewicz (Marcinkeiewicz Co. ); James R. Frackowiak (Plan-it Financial); Brian Hodson (Starbucks) Derek Hill (Advanced Mortgage)

**Project Team Absent:** Avi Tayar (ODOT Region 1); Brad Coy (DKS)

**Purpose of this GPAC meeting:** to obtain GPAC input on the draft conceptual designs that have been prepared for the Corridor and Gateway treatments. This input will give the project team direction on developing the final recommended planning-level designs in preparation for completing the Recommended Canby OR 99E Corridor and Gateway Design Plan.

**Discussion Items**

- 1) Welcome
  - a) Matilda briefed everyone on ODOT's signal upgrade project
    - i) Can we work with them on signal/mast arm upgrades?

- (1) Yes, to a certain extent based on what is permitted, what the additional cost would be to the City, and maintenance agreements.
  - ii) Can we use this project to help push forward with the Quiet Zone?
    - (1) Our plan should endorse that [the Quiet Zone]
- 2) Material Overview – Clarification Questions
- a) Berg
    - i) Is it safe for vehicles to cross via the jug-handle instead of turn left?
      - (1) The movement would cross two traffic streams instead of one. Vehicles would be able to use the signal at Berg and access the development through the Walgreens site.
    - ii) Can pedestrians use the median as a crossing refuge?
      - (1) While you may not sign/stripe it for this use (due to the proximity of the signal), it would likely be used this way and provide a refuge island.
    - iii) Does Safeway still have adequate egress?
      - (1) Left-turns could still be made from the site, but it would be a full turn maneuver (not utilizing the two-way center turn lane for a 2-stage left turn). Safeway would still have its full egress to Berg Parkway.
  - b) Downtown
    - i) Did we consider power pole utility conflict on the north side?
      - (1) They would not be relocated and would be within or next to the sidewalk area.
    - ii) Can we do 3 arches? No arches?
      - (1) Any of those configurations are possible.
  - c) Cross Sections
    - i) Do we have to have bike lanes?
      - (1) Outside the STA - yes to comply with ODOT standards
    - ii) Are we impacting freight mobility in the STA?
      - (1) We have presented the information to the Oregon Freight Advisory Committee and received their approval, in addition to working with the ODOT Freight liaison.
    - iii) Can we take into account truck turning movement where truck routes intersect 99E?
      - (1) Call this out in the plan
- 3) Specific Design Comments
- a) Berg
    - i) Make sure it doesn't impact turn movements @ Berg
    - ii) Make sure banner is durable or replaceable
    - iii) Make sure median is sustainable (e.g., drainage treatments)

b) Overall

- i) Consider locations for freight turning movements
  - (1) Do we need something special at Elm? Consider increasing curb radii.
  - (2) Account for the three main industrial areas
  - (3) Do street trees impact their sight distance?
    - (a) Do we need code to require sight distance for truck driver eye height?

c) Downtown

- i) Mixed feeling on street trees → visibility to 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue
- ii) Consider no archway, but still include kiosk vertical elements at each street (Grant being the largest)
- iii) Make sure style matches 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue
- iv) Is there too much going on with mast arm, archway, railroad gates?
- v) Is 1<sup>st</sup> a better location for the arch?
- vi) Don't like the arch
  - (1) Too much visibility
  - (2) Spend money elsewhere
- vii) Does the railroad fence need to be integrated?
  - (1) Check with the Main Street Program

d) Logging Road

- i) Like the lighting options
  - (1) For use of trail and for beautification
- ii) Style should try to match Berg
- iii) Like combination of Dahlias (smaller – can be manufactured in Canby!) and the valley scene
- iv) Clear blackberries on the slopes up to the bridge
- v) Commission an artistic process to design the bridge (provide parameters)
- vi) Scale needs to match speed of drivers (so they can see the features while driving)
- vii) Home of the Cougars vs. The Garden Spot for a theme?

e) Cross Section

- i) Concern with property impacts due to additional buffered bike lane widths outside of the STA (between Locust and Pine)
- ii) STA
  - (1) Wide sidewalks is preferred
  - (2) Mention flexibility to Council/Commission with buffered bike lanes (e.g., ability to modify striping later and pursue something like on-street parking if desired).

# GPAC Sign In Sheet 1.31.12

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>PHONE</u>	<u>EMAIL</u>
Liz Belt-Templeman	B&P Adv. Com		
Janice Chandler	MEC Northwest	503-263-7303	jchandler@MECNORTHWEST.com
Loretta Kieffer	ODOT	971-673-6228	lorretta.l.kieffer@odot.state.or.us
RYAN OLIVER	BUSINESS OWNER		
Steve Miller	Business Owner	503-261-4086	Steve@HurryTimeFreight.com
Tara Wilson	Business owner	503-774-0596	tara@wilsonnapa.com
Ron YARBROUGH	DESIGNS WEST	971-322-7411	designswest@canby.com
Renate Mergelberg	City of Canby	503 266-7001	Rmergelberg@ci.canby.or.us
Jeff Keller	Canby Ford	266-2097	jkeller@canbyford.com
Sonyakara	ODOT RI	503 731 8282	Sonyakara.B.Karen@odot.state.or.us
Chris Maciejewski	DKS	503-243-3500	csn@dkassociates.com
Annie Tran	CITY OF CANBY MAIN STREET	503-266-7001	TRANA@ci.canby.or.us
Julie Wehling	CAT JWH Consulting, LLC	503.890.6260	wehlingj@ci.canby.or.us
Dan Drentlaw	City of Canby	266-7001	drentlawd@ci.canby.or.us
John Proctor	City of Canby	(w) 266 6333	



# GPAC Sign In Sheet 1.31.12

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>PHONE</u>	<u>EMAIL</u>
Dan McGlone	Total Car Care	503-266-2200	dann624@yahoo.com
Bryan Brown	City of Canby	503-266-1001	
TOM LISTER	Otek	503-212-3734	
MARY LAUDAN-FLORES	CANBY SHELL GAS	503-266-8595	
Ben Doolittle	Chamber		
GREG PARKER	City		
KEITH GALITZ	Canby Telecom	503-266-8200	kgalitz@canbytel.com
Tom Scott	Property owner	503.266.5488	



# DRAFT OR 99E Corridor and Gateway Conceptual Designs



City of Canby  
**OR 99E**

September 2011

## CORRIDOR PLAN OVERVIEW

Design concepts illustrated on the following pages illustrate opportunities to celebrate arrival into Canby and to present a unified and attractive streetscape concept for OR 99E. Distinctive gateways provide clear transition points from a largely rural highway into a thriving business district and the downtown core. The suggested concepts will enhance existing entry signage and reinforce the theme of Canby as “Oregon’s Garden Spot”.

The primary focus of the streetscape enhancements for OR 99E is to create visually attractive street edges and offer a more appealing pedestrian environment. In combination with design features of the gateways, the streetscape enhancements will help to reduce the sense of the highway as a barrier for pedestrians and bikes and a community dividing line between the downtown core and the businesses and residences south of the highway.

The design concepts grew directly from the Vision and Guiding Principles and the Corridor and Gateway Design Toolbox developed earlier in the planning process. The toolbox also contained useful information about comparative costs and the likely maintenance responsibilities of the City of Canby for the design features that were beyond the level of design details or materials typically associated with ODOT highway improvements.

## CORRIDOR STREETScape CONCEPTS

The plan identifies four distinctive segments of OR 99E within the Canby Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). A highway cross-section has been identified for each segment. Design features from the design toolbox have been applied, primarily within the sidewalk areas of the right-of-way. The most extensive application of sidewalk design features is between Elm Street and Ivy Street within the Special Transportation Area (STA). It proposes to widen the sidewalk on the north side of the highway by slightly narrowing the travel lanes (no additional right-of-way would be required). The sidewalk enhancement features are also an integral part of the Downtown Gateway concept.

An optional element of the streetscape plan would be to extend the widened sidewalk to Pine Street in order to reinforce the connection between downtown and the Logging Road Trail Bridge. The bridge is part of an important bike and pedestrian facility spanning the highway and is a significant multimodal gateway opportunity appreciated by bikes, pedestrians, and vehicles. Extending

the wider sidewalk is primarily a functional enhancement of that multimodal connection and would not necessarily include the Downtown Gateway elements, such as decorative sidewalk bollards, tree grates, and special sidewalk paving treatments. However, street trees should be included.

## ADDITIONAL DESIGN OPTIONS

The design toolbox includes the potential to add on-street parking for businesses fronting the highway and bus pull-outs at highway stop locations for Canby Area Transit (CAT). Both options would require approval by ODOT and obtaining additional right-of-way. Neither option has been included in the recommended corridor plan but they could be viable future improvements if a particular business wanted to provide parking and dedicated the necessary right-of-way, or if CAT submitted a formal transit plan and obtained the necessary right-of-way for bus pull-outs. The City of Canby should update their current development codes to address a formal CAT transit plan, stop locations, and future right-of-way dedications.

## ODOT DESIGN EXCEPTIONS REQUIRED

A design exception request to ODOT is in development. Approval will be required for not providing bike lanes on OR 99E in the Special Transportation Area (STA) segment. Providing bike lanes would require significant roadway widening and right-of-way acquisition. Streets parallel to OR 99E will be used for bicycle travel, consistent with the Transportation System Plan (TSP).

## GATEWAY DESIGN CONCEPTS

The plan includes concepts for Community Gateways at two locations and a Downtown Gateway that continues from Elm Street to Ivy Street. These gateways will become highway landmarks over time. The downtown gateway will also be a visual marker to reinforce the regional traveler’s awareness of downtown Canby.

## BERG PARKWAY COMMUNITY GATEWAY

A significant, landscaped Community Gateway exists on the south side of the highway, just outside the highway right-of-way. The suggested enhancements are intended to introduce highway opportunities for additional landscaping, banner poles, and paving as part of the gateway. The paving

element would be similar to paving treatments proposed for the Downtown Gateway and the Logging Road Trail Gateway.

[note: I think we need to add a few lines [to the design page](#) that acknowledges that potential issues that some people may wish with this concept. If it doesn’t win acceptance then the existing gateway is fine and no substantial enhancements are recommended.]

## DOWNTOWN GATEWAY

The gateway links the three primary street intersections connecting the downtown core to OR99E. The primary design features are a wider sidewalk on the north side, distinctive paving and street furnishings, pavement enhancements and ornamental street lights at intersections, and the potential to aesthetically upgrade the traffic signal poles and mast arms. This would be a very distinctive streetscape element that directly parallels the downtown area.

## LOGGING ROAD TRAIL BRIDGE COMMUNITY GATEWAY


The existing bridge overcrossing for the Logging Road Trail is an untapped and significant gateway opportunity. It is already a significant community recreational asset and is a visually dominant structure that spans the entire right-of-way. A plan to provide new pedestrian and bike access ramps is in development by the City. Design options include color through painting or applied materials, decorative railings, and nighttime lighting. Lighting could be limited to ‘architectural’ lighting to highlight the bridge and column structure or could include pedestrian-scale lighting for nighttime use.

## DESIGN COORDINATION WITH THE NW 1<sup>ST</sup> AVENUE PROJECT

It is likely the streetscape and parking improvements of the NW 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue Project will be completed before any project development for OR 99E improvements begins. Future design development for the proposed Downtown Gateway should look for opportunities to coordinate specific design details and features with those constructed on NW 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue. Design coordination might include intersection pavement treatments, sidewalk finish and materials, street tree selection, and design of the gateway arch over Grant Street.



# CORRIDOR PLAN GATEWAYS











- Legend
- (Section A) STA Enhanced Standard for 30 MPH
  - (Section B) Narrow Urban Standard for 35 MPH
  - (Section C) UBA Standard for 35 MPH (East Segment)
  - (Section D) Urban Standard for 45 MPH



EXISTING CONDITIONS







ENHANCEMENT OPTION

The proposed enhancements may raise concerns to be addressed before any implementation of new gateway features is considered. The addition of a raised median should not create freight mobility difficulties since it would not create a highway 'pinch point' more restrictive than a near-by raised median. The new median will alter the circulation and access to Panda Express for eastbound traffic but the property would remain fully accessible (see Gateway Circulation Plan). Landscaping added to the median would be a City maintenance responsibility, but the gateway already includes significant maintained landscaping. If these concerns cannot be satisfactorily addressed, then no changes to the existing gateway are recommended.



EXISTING GATEWAY






GATEWAY CIRCULATION PLAN



BANNER IN MEDIAN EXAMPLE




PLANTED MEDIAN EXAMPLE



PAVED MEDIAN EXAMPLE





PLAN VIEW OF OR 99E ENHANCEMENTS


\* Notes:

- Grant Street Gateway Arch Location and final concept to be determined.
- Proposed 12' sidewalk to be implemented over time with redevelopment
- Proposed 14' sidewalk implemented by narrowing travel lanes.





ILLUMINATED BOLLARD EXAMPLES



CROSS-SECTION OF OR 99E

Design features illustrated represent a level of design detail and construction costs beyond highway improvements typically implemented by ODOT. The City would likely be expected to find additional funding for the cost differential between 'standard' and 'enhanced' right-of-way elements in this context. There are state and federal funding and grant opportunities the City could explore to offset those costs. The City should also expect to assume maintenance responsibility for those features.



DISTINCTIVE GATEWAY PAVING EXAMPLE



ORNAMENTAL SIGNAL POLES AND MAST ARM EXAMPLE



GRANT STREET GATEWAY ARCH EXAMPLES





# LOGGING ROAD TRAIL BRIDGE GATEWAY – DESIGN OPTIONS



PAINTED BRIDGE COLOR TO MATCH EXISTING CANBY SIGN



PAINTED BRIDGE





RAILING DESIGN EXAMPLE




RAILING DESIGN EXAMPLE



RAILING DESIGN EXAMPLE





*SIDEWALK AND STREET ENHANCEMENTS  
WITH GATEWAY PAVING*

*ARCHITECTURAL OR  
PATHWAY ILLUMINATION*








POTENTIAL FUTURE ACCESS TO LOGGING ROAD TRAIL TO THE NORTH OF OR 99E

Note:  
 - This access to be planned and implemented in conjunction with Pine Street improvements and relocation of Depot Museum.



POTENTIAL FUTURE ACCESS TO LOGGING ROAD TRAIL TO THE SOUTH OF OR 99E




# CORRIDOR PLAN GATEWAYS





# CORRIDOR PLAN SEGMENTS





CORRIDOR SEGMENTS



NOTE: SPECIAL TRANSPORTATION AREA (STA) FROM ELM STREET TO LOCUST STREET



PROPOSED PEDESTRIAN REFUGE ISLAND AT LOCUST ROAD



# BERG PARKWAY GATEWAY



EXISTING GATEWAY




# BERG PARKWAY GATEWAY



GATEWAY CIRCULATION PLAN



BANNER IN MEDIAN EXAMPLE





PLANTED MEDIAN EXAMPLE



PAVED MEDIAN EXAMPLE





# DOWNTOWN GATEWAY - OPTION A



- \* Notes:
- Grant Street Gateway Arch Location and final concept to be determined.
  - Proposed 10' sidewalks on both sides narrow to approximately 7-8' at right-of-way pinch-points.



# DOWNTOWN GATEWAY - OPTION B



ILLUMINATED BOLLARD EXAMPLES

- \* Notes:
- Grant Street Gateway Arch Location and final concept to be determined.
  - Proposed sidewalks on both sides narrow to approximately 9-10' at right-of-way pinch-points.

# DOWNTOWN GATEWAY - OPTION C



- \* Notes:
- Grant Street Gateway Arch Location and final concept to be determined.
  - Proposed 8-10' sidewalks on both sides narrow to approximately 5-6' at right-of-way pinch-points.



DOWNTOWN GATEWAY FEATURES



GRANT STREET GATEWAY ARCH EXAMPLE




DISTINCTIVE GATEWAY PAVING EXAMPLE




ORNAMENTAL SIGNAL POLES AND MAST ARM EXAMPLE

# LOGGING ROAD TRAIL BRIDGE GATEWAY – DESIGN OPTIONS



PLAN VIEW OF OR 99E ENHANCEMENTS



RAILING DESIGN EXAMPLE

OR 99E Conceptual Design Plan



LOGGING ROAD TRAIL BRIDGE GATEWAY – DESIGN OPTIONS



RAILING DESIGN EXAMPLE




RAILING DESIGN EXAMPLE




RAILING DESIGN EXAMPLE

LOGGING ROAD TRAIL BRIDGE GATEWAY – DESIGN OPTIONS



*STREET ENHANCEMENTS WITH  
GATEWAY PAVING*

*ARCHITECTURAL OR  
PATHWAY ILLUMINATION*






# LOGGING ROAD TRAIL BRIDGE GATEWAY – ACCESS IMPROVEMENTS



POTENTIAL FUTURE ACCESS TO LOGGING ROAD TRAIL TO THE NORTH OF OR 99E

Note:

- This access to be planned and implemented in conjunction with Pine Street improvements and relocation of Depot Museum.



POTENTIAL FUTURE ACCESS TO LOGGING ROAD TRAIL TO THE SOUTH OF OR 99E




# STANDARD SPECIAL TRANSPORTATION AREA (STA) OR 99E RIGHT-OF-WAY IMPACTS

# OR 99E Corridor and Gateway Design Plan




Note: ROW impacts assumed in the figure to first impact adjacent landscaping and then be taken approximately evening from both sides of the road.

## Standard Special Transportation Area (STA)



\* Sidewalks on both sides narrow to approximately 7'-8' at right of way pinch-points.

## Limited Cross-Section at Primary Pinch-Points



Pinch-points are primary areas where fronting buildings, on-site circulation, and parking appear to be most impacted by the additional right-of-way that would be required for the full OR 99E cross-section. Therefore, a limited cross-section is recommended initially, with potential for widening if/when it becomes feasible.


# WIDE SIDEWALKS FOR PEDESTRIANS AND BICYCLES OR 99E RIGHT-OF-WAY IMPACTS

# OR 99E Corridor and Gateway Design Plan




Note: ROW impacts assumed in the figure to first impact adjacent landscaping and then be taken approximately evening from both sides of the road.

## Wide Sidewalks for Pedestrians/Bikes



\* Sidewalks on both sides narrow to approximately 9'-10' at right of way pinch-points.

## Limited Cross-Section at Primary Pinch-Points




Pinch-points are primary areas where fronting buildings, on-site circulation, and parking appear to be most impacted by the additional right-of-way that would be required for the full OR 99E cross-section. Therefore, a limited cross-section is recommended initially, with potential for widening if/when it becomes feasible.




# BUFFERED BIKE LANES OR 99E RIGHT-OF-WAY IMPACTS

# OR 99E Corridor and Gateway Design Plan




Note: ROW impacts assumed in the figure to first impact adjacent landscaping and then be taken approximately evening from both sides of the road.

## Buffered Bike Lanes



\* Sidewalks on both sides narrow to approximately 5'-6' at right of way pinch-points.

## Limited Cross-Section at Primary Pinch-Points



Pinch-points are primary areas where fronting buildings, on-site circulation, and parking appear to be most impacted by the additional right-of-way that would be required for the full OR 99E cross-section. Therefore, a limited cross-section is recommended initially, with potential for widening if/when it becomes feasible.