

# MONROE STREET NEIGHBORHOOD GREENWAY CONCEPT DESIGN PROJECT

## NEEDS AND OPPORTUNITIES MEMO

### PMT COMMENT RESPONSE SUMMARY

ID	Reviewer	Page	Comment	Response
1	COM	Cover	Reword title to say "Constraints, Opportunities" (keep these in the order they are presented in the memo)	Reworded to say "Needs and Opportunities Memorandum"
2	COM	TOC	Should this be "Potential Tools," to be consistent with the others? Why the difference?	Revision made
3	ODOT	1	Please add a project study area map that includes King and Harmony as borders for context. If you do not have such a map, use what you have. Perhaps the yellow, vicinity aerialpage 10.	Traffic analysis memo will include map that includes study area intersections.
4	ODOT	1	Reword to state "....creating a <u>two-mile</u> east-west corridor."	Revision made
5	COM	2	Note: The installation of this particular rack was controversial at our City Council (some of them really didn't like it), but in the spirit of being a little more unabashed about the value of bike & ped improvements, I think it is fine since it shows existing infrastructure and can be taken as a fact. But this gives you a sense of the local political environment.	N/A
6	ODOT	3	Add year to November 19 or remove last sentence. Not needed. Adoption date is always helpful.	Revision made
7	COM	3	This is one example of a desire to have some parallel consistency in references to bikes & peds. Might make for easiest reading to decide which to put first and then keep related references, especially in the same sentence, parallel.	Revision made
8	ODOT	4	Spell-out TSP, add that it is a 20-year plan; and add abid. otnote to give TSP website again.	Revision made
9	ODOT	4	Reword to state ".....well-designed <u>transportation system including</u> a bicycle....."	Revision made
10	ODOT	4	Add that neighborhood greenways in addition to the light rail system are key strategies for the city to meet its 47-50% non-SOV target. Figure 4.3 of TSP.	Revision made
11	ODOT	4	change language to remove that odot will develop plan. Plan will be developed in coordination with odot. the city is responsible not odot.	Revision made
12	ODOT	4	Remove plan will be focused on MV and F mobility and instead say to address "to identify mobility targets which will likely include strategies to better manage congestion and reduce single-occupant vehicle (SOV) trips. The Monroe Greenway, when implemented has the potential to help reduce congestion and reduce SOV trips."	Revision made
13	COM	4	Where are these (projects) referenced in the TSP? I took a quick look at our list but did not see them.	Project references removed
14	ODOT	5	Can you please add section 1.4 titled something like: "Active Transportation" is a Key Strategy to Improve Public Health? And then bullet facts pertinent to Portland area. I will send a summary I had an intern put together from the region ATP (sorry about the specific source references). Plushe Jim Sallis presentation material. Should take about 10 minutes.	Added section

15	COM	5	But you note above that traffic volumes are high, at least higher than desirable. And you don't really say why slowing/diversion are difficult in the discussion above.	Clarifying language has been added in this section
16	ODOT	7	Per the scope requirement address here traffic volume distribution" (3rd paragraph, first sentence of 2.4). This part of has a a very poor arterial and collector system. It gets worse south and east. The city can not simply remove a collector. There needs to be consideration for the impacts on the other collectors and arterials. I appears there is no technical /modeling analysis but the topic needs to be more fully addressed. In particular, impacts to King, Linwood and Harmony. To this end, discuss the issue and include the RTFP target for collector and arterial spacing plus see the city TSP finding on this topic. Help the city understand their responsibility to improve the area collectors and arterials despite this project and in part because. Talk also about if changes are needed to King. It appears to have excess capacity. Does it? Is so, say so. The city has not been serious about creating a street network that meets the RTFP 1/2 mile spacing standard to the region's loss. Also, help explain that	Language has been added that describe the existing state of the transportation network in Milwaukee and the ramifications that downgrading Monroe Street could have on future traffic conditions on nearby arterials and collectors. A brief description is included of segments and intersections identified in the TSP as problem areas such as Linwood/Harmony and Linwood/King. Further traffic analysis work contingent on additional funding.
17	ODOT	7	Please provide the median average for the corridor address the 2015 forecast condition here and when discussing collector and arterial system. The current condition is helpful by mostly irrelevant. It is the forecast condition we care about when modifying the TSP which this project will do.	See response #16
18	ODOT	7	If you have a better source, like NACTO, please use it. I suspect the WA CO finding was based on some semi-official document. This reference is weak.	Revision made
19	ODOT	8	TSP has a generalized, 16% forecast increase in vehicle volumes 2010-2035 pg. 4-6 of TSP. Please add this as a footnote or otherwise.	Revision made
20	ODOT	8	Add that with findings and review approval posted speed may be 10 mph lower or higher than the 85%.	Revision made
21	COM	8	But only King Road has bike lanes, so this is a bit of a confusing reference.	Changed language to note that Harrison Street has planned bicycle lanes
22	ODOT	9	Stormwater treatments overlooked? Please add.	Several stormwater treatment options are mentioned within the section breakdowns however an overview of Low-impact type stormwater treatment options has been provided in the Corridor-wide section of the memo.
23	COM	9	It is not clear here why this is a good thing. Is it because it is better to have the bike farther from the shoulder?	Yes, that is correct in order to avoid unsafe passing and other hazards. Clarifying language added.
24	COM	9	It's the sharrows that are intermittent (only 3-4 out there), while the signage is actually more prevalent. There probably are opportunities to install more signage, but I believe we have actually installed all of the signs recommended in our Bikeway Signage Plan. Is it worth making more of a distinction, that the route is actually fairly consistently signed, but it does not have consistent sharrows or other pavement markings?	Revision made
25	COM	11	I would use the same order here that you do in the text below--Needs, Constraints, Opportunities, and Tools.	Revision made

<b>26</b>	COM	11	Where are these figures? Will they be inserted into this section as full pages, or will they be near the appendices? If in this section, would it make sense to call them Figures 3-1 and 3-2, to indicate they live in this section, maybe call them 3-1 and 3-2? And then maybe the Tables should be handled the same way, as Table 1-1 and 2-1, to indicate where they live, rather than just their numerical order within the whole report?	Renumbered figures
<b>27</b>	COM	11	Why not Oak St, since that is where the break-line appears to be for this section?	The break originally was at Oak, however the wayfinding challenges are a key part of the challenges through the railroad area and so we determined it made more sense to set the limit at Campbell so we could cover the discussion regarding all the jogs in one section as opposed to having it overlap between multiple sections.
<b>28</b>	COM	11	This seems awkward here. I would either move this into Appendix E as some introductory text or bump it to below the next paragraph, as some examples of tools that you'll see in Appendix E. As is, it seems like a premature summary of what is needed on the corridor, instead of letting us read through the NCOTs that you are about to discuss.	Text moved below the following paragraph and clarifying language added.
<b>29</b>	COM	12	I think this is the way to present the street names (no SE prefix), but you have several other photo captions and other references in the text that put SE in front. Should be consistent, and I vote for no SE.	Revision made
<b>30</b>	COM	14	In general throughout the document, the Opportunities sections bleed over too much into presenting Potential Tools. In this case, for example, 3.1.3.1 and 3.1.3.3 seem like appropriate opportunities. But the first part of 3.1.3.2 talks about constraints and then what should be done (widen, put in new handrail). The sidewalks in need of replacement do present an opportunity, as does the wider cross-section, but this particular subsection could be cleaned up to just present the opportunities and move the constraints and tools items to those subsections.	Text has been modified to remove recommendations from this section.
<b>31</b>	COM	14	without losing on-street parking? (If so, can we note that?)	Revision made
<b>32</b>	COM	14	I would keep this and any other references to the PAC meeting consistent--just "the Sept 2014 PAC meeting" or however you choose to first describe it (like on page 12).	Revision made
<b>33</b>	COM	14	As noted in the Table of Contents, why is this not "Potential Tools"? Is there something about Section A that provides more certainty in the suggestion? Seems incongruous without more explanation.	Revision made
<b>34</b>	COM	14	just need to fix a spacing issue here (extra space in the word)	Revision made
<b>35</b>	COM	14	You mean, "when unoccupied," right? We have been saying that on-street parking helps keep the	OK, revision made.
<b>36</b>	COM	15	But it is a pain for cyclists since there is no loop detector or activation button. And you still can feel pretty exposed on a bike waiting at this large intersection with cars queuing up behind you with no green box or other protection.	These points have been incorporated into the memo.
<b>37</b>	COM	15	Add a note here about land uses in this section, as you have for several of the others.	Revision made
<b>38</b>	ODOT	12	Isn't 85% more relevant? If you have that, please provide it.	Revision made
<b>39</b>	ODOT	12	I think the title should be "Need for Updated Sidewalks" or "Better Ped. Infrastructure Access often pertains to the flip side of mobility, so is not the best word choice.	OK, revision made.

40	COM		Here's one place where I got thrown off because the first reference to "wayfinding" was on page 9 in the context of signage only. Can there be an explanation of what "wayfinding" is somewhere in the doc (not sure where is the right spot)?	Clarifying language has been added at the beginning of the Tools section.
41	COM	16	Here, you mean wayfinding in the form of pavement markings, right, since there is already signage there?	Revision made
42	COM	16	suggested? I don't think anyone knows this for a fact, it is an assumption or supposition based on anecdotes. Fine to mention the possibility here but it should be more framed as a possible explanation, not a fact.	Revision made
43	COM	16	I think the opportunities here are more appropriate and more distinct from Potential Tools.	N/A
44	ODOT	13	Add what we know about the row width. Is there a lack of row. Also, if sidewalks are redone should they be made wider? Please clarify.	Revision made
45	ODOT	13	Should read: " <u>...project effectively, narrows the roadway at the tracks crossing.</u> "	Revision made
46	COM	17	Again, how do we know this for sure? Can we either confirm (do we need to do a field demonstration?) or at least re-word to be more speculative?	Revision made
47	COM	17	Yes, and would that mean we might narrow the Monroe Street sides of the intersection, and/or get right-turn lanes instead?  Also, what happens with the traffic that wanted to go left at Monroe Street? Is it worth mentioning that those movements could be accommodated by going straight through the intersection and then turning as necessary to get to Oak St (from whichever direction needed)?	Clarifying language has been added to the memo.
48	COM	17	I'm all for refuge islands in general, but why would you want/need them at an intersection like this, where it is already signalized and you really shouldn't be stopping out there in the middle of Hwy 224? Or are you talking about refuge islands on Monroe Street itself? It is not clear . . .	They are for individuals who may not be able to cross the entire width of OR 224 in one light cycle. It's useful to provide that haven in the middle of the roadway where they are somewhat protected from fast moving traffic.
49	COM	17	Add a note about the land uses in this section. There's the "commercial intersection" reference but nothing more descriptive.	Revision made
50	ODOT	14	Add city standard for sidewalk so we know how wide it will be when replaced.	Revision made
51	ODOT	14	Typo: "both sides"	Revision made
52	COM	18	This is a tricky part of the route, since the route runs more diagonally than north-south-east-west. But this is confusing, since you talk about pedestrians heading south on Oak St but then traffic heading east. Would this be a place to go with "southwest" and "northeast" to be more clear?	Revision made
53	ODOT	15	should read: "...photo on page 14."	Revision made
54	ODOT	15	Add why it is a barrier. E.g.: due to the wide crossing distance, high traffic volumes and turning movements.	Revision made
55	ODOT	15	Rewrite the last sentence to make clear the project proposals and recommendation from this project are actively being reviewed and commented on by ODOT. Say something like: "Odot's review comments of proposed changes will be reviewed and reflected in the project reports. Maintaining mobility while also addressing pedestrian/bicyclist crossing needs be a factor."	Revision made

<b>56</b>	COM	19	Small punctuation suggestions here to make this sentence more clear.	Revision made
<b>57</b>	ODOT	16	How long? Within guidelines?	Added pedestrian and vehicular signal cycle lengths to memo. Not aware of ODOT guidelines on pedestrian delay at signals.
<b>58</b>	ODOT	16	Good finding. Thank you.	N/A
<b>59</b>	ODOT	16	Define what a safe crossing is b/c odot thinks we provide safe crossings. maybe you want to say with enhanced safety features such as.....	Revision made
<b>60</b>	COM	20	the T-intersection at (This is just a confusing part of the route with so many streets coming together, so adding a descriptive phrase might help. I was confused and had to read this several times to be sure about what was being referred to.)	Clarifying language has been added.
<b>61</b>	COM	20	I don't understand what you mean here, how it wouldn't help. Seems like a path on the north side of Campbell St would let a westbound bicyclist avoid the Oak St intersection, though it's true it would not help with the T-intersection at Railroad/Monroe. If that's what you mean, can you say it a little more clearly, that it would not help with the one particular intersection? This makes it seem like both . . .	Clarifying language and diagram have been added.
<b>62</b>	COM	21	But is there enough room for this here? Or, how much additional right-of-way would have to be acquired? And with such a vehicle volume, would a roundabout really help pedestrians get across?	Additional language about roundabout caveats have been added.
<b>63</b>	COM	21	Do you mean "landscape strip"? A parking strip sounds like a place for parking. I think we usually use the term "landscape strip" when we're talking about this with developers.	Correct, text has been changed to reflect comment.
<b>64</b>	COM	22	This sounds more like a potential tool than a need. Maybe we could say, "Reducing vehicle speeds would create more comfortable and safe conditions for cyclists."	Revision made
<b>65</b>	COM	22	But isn't it flat by the time you get to the 4-way stop?	Reference to 42nd Avenue has been removed.
<b>66</b>	COM	22	Which is the street side? Do you mean one side or the other?	Towards the street. Clarifying language has been added.
<b>67</b>	COM	22	But what about on-street parking? If it could be preserved in many locations, even with a new sidewalk, that would be another opportunity to note.	Clarifying language has been added with regard to potentially preserving on-street parking.
<b>68</b>	ODOT	19	the volumes of vehicles crossing this section? Define what volumes.	Revision made
<b>69</b>	ODOT	19	Please add what the ped benefit would be if there is one.	Revision made
<b>70</b>	ODOT	19	Please know Tony Coleman, is the odot R1 rail coordinator that is assigned to this project. I have asked him for the forecast condition - ie anticipated volumes. I believe the numbers is going to increase significantly. I should shouldt on know o3 when we meet internally.	N/A
<b>71</b>	ODOT	19	Change last sentence to say that coordination is occurring as part of this project.	Revision made
<b>72</b>	ODOT	19	Should this be Railroad Avenue/Oak intersection rather than Monroe?	It's the T-intersection just east of the railroad tracks. This has been clarified in the text.
<b>73</b>	ODOT	19	How do you know this? Are you sure? Per the TSP or what? There may be opportunity for consideration. Typically, there are "don't block the tracks" signage.	have revised based on information received since the Draft Memo. Now states the potential to block business accesses.
<b>74</b>	ODOT	19	add "and lacks curb ramps." to be consistent with the subtitle of this section. Add that curb ramps are necessary to be in compliance with federal ADA requirements. Also, are the 5-6 foot sidewalks too narrow? Say so, if so.	OK, revision made.

<b>75</b>	COM	23	Would these meet the necessary warrants?	Reference has been removed in light of opportunity to place diverter at that intersection.
<b>76</b>	COM	23	It is unclear what exactly is being suggested here, with respect to the photo/diagram. Maybe it would help to note that this would make Monroe Street NOT a through street at 37th Ave. This would be a big deal, but the way it is written, it somehow doesn't seem that way.	Clarifying language has been added.
<b>77</b>	COM	23	The diagram appears to show pedestrian refuges, not curb extensions.	Revision made
<b>78</b>	ODOT	20	Please add something like: "...Street is 37 feet wide with one travel lane in each direction and on-street parking, allowing space to widen....."	Revision made
<b>79</b>	ODOT	20	Should-read "A sidewalk should also be added to the north..."	Revision made
<b>80</b>	ODOT	21	to what destination? How about a diagonal trail through the future, development site? See city of Portland zoning code chapter 33.293, super block provision.	Revision made
<b>81</b>	COM	25	Shouldn't this be in the Opportunity section, as "connectivity"? (Similar to the mention of the 40th/Harvey route on page 22.)	Thanks for catching this. Revision made.
<b>82</b>	ODOT	21	Should-read "An existing 5-foot...."	Revision made
<b>83</b>	COM	26	I would add an opportunity note about the intersection at Home Ave, in particular, as there is the convenience store on the SE corner that has a parking area blending into the intersection. There is an opportunity to better define that particular private property and establish some boundaries to reduce the wide-open access there that creates a safety problem right now.	Clarifying language has been added.
<b>84</b>	COM	26	Not clear how permeable shoulder pavement, bioswales, and other green features are pedestrian accommodations. Maybe this just wants a little more explanation of how the green features benefit the pedestrian environment. I was reading it as, "If we can't get sidewalks right away, we could do a separated path, OR at least a permeable shoulder, OR perhaps a curb extension, OR a bioswale (?), etc. I think the phasing reference in the previous sentence set me up for some confusion here.	Have added more information about stormwater treatments would be provided in the Corridor Overview section as well as expanded the text to provide clarity to existing description.
<b>85</b>	COM	26	Seems important to refer back to the Needs note on page 25 that flooding is a big problem, and this presents an opportunity to resolve that problem.	Revision made
<b>86</b>	ODOT	22	building walls or garden walls?	Clarified to refer to property fences.
<b>87</b>	ODOT	23	Can the city do a mini-traffic impact analysis to make some findings about the result of removing the signs? At a minimum, the city engineer should review and comment on stop-sign removal - don't you think?	See response to comment 16
<b>88</b>	ODOT	23	Say, see illustration to right.	OK, revision made.
<b>89</b>	COM	27	I don't recall any previous mention of trees and vegetation as needs. In fact, there was description in the intro to Section E (and even in the paragraph above) that yards and vegetation encroach into the right-of-way. So why would we need more vegetation? This needs more explanation.	have noted in Stormwater discussion that landscaping swales and curb extensions with trees and shrubs is aesthetically appealing.
<b>90</b>	COM	28	And has poorly defined boundaries on the SE corner where the convenience store is.	Clarifying language has been added.
<b>91</b>	ODOT	25	Help us understand if this intersection is forecasted to fail. Say something like a traffic signal will be added when traffic warrants are met and funding is available. Confirm with Scott H, county TAC rep.	See response to comment 16

92	ODOT	26	Remove reference to "high-cost". It is not true. Sidewalks are relatively inexpensive. It is the stormwater to address street storm run off and property cost that increase costs. I believe Brett said the row exists for the majority of the corridor Onhis point please address right of way needs in this section since acacquiringa cost factor. Also, state that the greenway is already programmed with a dollar amount. Tell us what that amount is (from TSP) and plus look up or ask Brett for the TSP forecast funding to make it real. Also, remove "high-impact" or define what you mean. Do you mean have multiple benefits (access, safety, improved health?)	Have revised to clarify that sidewalks are more costly than asphalt especially when factoring in related work such as curb and gutter and storm systems. Although the project is listed in the TSP with a funding source, it is not clear that the full funding necessary to build the project is specifically available. the amounts listed in the TSP are the preliminary estimates not the actual funding
93	ODOT	27	Once again, this project is already programmed. Don't confuse the public. See appendix C of TSP.	Although the project is listed in the TSP with a funding source, it is not clear that the full funding necessary to build the project is specifically available. the amounts listed in the TSP are the preliminary estimates not the actual funding
94	ODOT	27	Remove "high-cost" and "high-impact" per above. Talk about what is programmed and the multiple benefits.	Revision made
95	ODOT	28	If you can, please add where the monitoring will be needed. This will help us understand where the impacts are expected to occur.	See response to comment 16
96	ODOT	31	Please rewrite or add to the conclusion to do two things: 1) say this work implements the city TSP mentioning what is already programmed. 2) specifically state with bullets the specific topics that need further refinement.	Revision made