



HEARING SUMMARY

PLANNING OFFICERS REPORT

MOA Planning Officer Elizabeth Appleby Officer provided a summary of the previous Planning and Zoning Commission submittal and meeting, including the key features of the project. She noted the staff recommendation was for approval and included three conditions. Ms. Appleby noted that members of the project team have 10 minutes to speak to the Commission as there was no public hearing previously.

Commissioner Raun enquired whether plans-in-hand come back before this Commission? Ms. Appleby clarified that they do not, and they go before the Urban Design Commission.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Noah King introduced himself as the Project Manager and introduced Steve Noble as the Consultant Project Manager. Steve then provided a brief presentation, including a summary of the major comments at the open house.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Public Comment was then invited.

Dave Evans: introduced himself as a member of Rogers Park Community Council (RPCC) transportation committee (speaking in this capacity). He noted he was also a member of an advisory committee on the Midtown Congestion Relief PEL study. He noted he was a little surprised that proposed design, although included nice features like the Fireweed design, did not have a separated bikeway on 36th Avenue. He would like the project to comply with Non-Motorized Plan (Table 5.2) and provide a buffered bike lane or a protected bike lane along 36th Avenue. The project is currently providing a multi-use path, not a separated bike lane. He would like this to be included. He noted the staff report notes bike lane is a low priority but this should not be viewed as a project on its own. In particular, the bridge needs to be wide enough for a separated bike lane to go through.

Commissioner Questions in Response to Public Comment:

COMMISSIONER	QUESTION/COMMENT	RESPONSE (EVANS)
Spinelli	The commenter said west 36th. Does that section apply to this section?	Noted he didn't copy that section of table. Believes it goes from Arctic to MacInnes. maps also show separated bike lane.
Gardner	Asked for the page number	Table 5.2, pg 84.
Pulice	Sought clarification that this detail about the Non-Motorized Plan was in the Staff Report.	Not sure. E Appleby noted it was on Page 10 of the staff report.

Bob Butera: introduced himself and noted he is also with RPCC. Here to speak about speed limits. The RPCC has participated in project over the years in its various forms. His understanding is this project is being done to improve safety. One of drawbacks to neighborhoods around it is noise. One of easiest ways to improve safety and noise is to reduce speed. He noted his understanding is the speed would be 45mph on main road; 35mph on frontage road. This is not what was noted in the Planning and Zoning Commission Design Study Report, and there was no agreement reached that the speed should be changed from 50mph as noted in the table. He would like the error corrected. He also noted the effects of safety and noise are exponential. Reducing speed can make a huge difference, and he would like speeds lowered further through Midtown. He would like to see the table changed; would like to entertain context sensitive part of this being potentially lowering speed a further 5mph on main highway and frontage road.

No further testimony.

REBUTTAL

The Commission invited Rebuttal with the remaining petitioner time.

Steve Noble thanked Dave and Bob for their ongoing input and involvement and looking out for the best interests of community. With regard to a bikeway on 36th Avenue, where we are tying in, we have to match into the existing road. We agree that for the cross section between two signals that the bridge can be wide enough to accommodate space for a future bike lane. Steve further noted that putting in 1/4 mile of bike lane also doesn't make sense but leaving space does. The project team can potentially also look at shoulders that could be part of a future bikeway.

With regard to speeds, we have made it clear that in the future as freeway is extended north it is being designed as a 55mph highway. Frontage roads will be 35-40mph roads. For now however, roads are just ramps accessing highway, speed change location down to 45mph will not change as part of this project.

Commissioner Questions in Response to Rebuttal:

COMMISSIONER	QUESTION/COMMENT	RESPONSE (PETITIONER)
Krishna	Noted that she wanted to understand responses. In packet have supplemental item from DOT&OF to RPCC about speed. Is speed change part of project already?	Yes- not planning to change speed as part of this project. However, in the future a speed change may occur based on future projects (Midtown Congestion Relief and Seward Glenn Mobility).
Krishna	Also on separated bikeways. Understanding where there is ROW DOT&PF will separate as much as possible?	Yes- that is between the signals.
Strike	There has been a lot of conversation about noise levels. For the speed transition - where is it right now?	Between Dowling and Tudor is a speed change, then another between Tudor and 36th. There is also an intersection warning system as sight lines are not optimal. We are putting in an overpass and not wanting to change speeds.

COMMISSIONER	QUESTION/COMMENT	RESPONSE (PETITIONER)
Strike	Downshifting creates noise, so transitional speeds may actually exacerbate problem.	There are a lot of issues around noise, but interchange will separate. We are hesitant to provide answers about noise until we see results of noise analysis.
Raun	Asked Planning Officer Elizabeth Appleby to weigh in about whether there is a table that would benefit from update?	Ms. Appleby didn't see difference from existing speed, couldn't see where it needed to be corrected. Bob Butera offered up the report, specifically page 44 of DSR. Part of old DSR, Packet submittal. Ms. Appleby noted it didn't appear to need correcting. Steve Noble noted the 50mph is a typo and this was mentioned at the previous meeting, and no changes to the speed were proposed as part of this project.
Raun	sensing we have clarity. Would advisory comment be appropriate?	Ms Appleby noted an advisory comment could be sought.

MOTION TO APPROVE

Moved by Strike, seconded by Winchester.

Additional Advisory comment regarding speeds.

Strike: Noted that this process has been a challenge with different stakeholders. He complimented parties about this process as it has worked effectively. Compromises have been reached, and the process shows that stakeholders have come together effectively. He thanked all participants

Raun: concurred with Strikes comments. He noted that this is a positive representation of how the project interacts with the public. He noted he would like other thoughts on the bike lane. He has heard petitioners willingness to do what non-motorized plan is asking for in project area, invited other comments.

Spinelli: Noted he would like to support a further advisory comment that overpass be designed to accommodate future width for a bike lane. A bike lane now seems odd.

Krishna: noted she was supportive of advisory comment. She noted she bikes through the area but prefers a short section of bike lane over none.

Gardner: noted this additional advisory noted would require a motion to amend.

Raun: moved to add advisory comment regarding design consistent with the width of overpass to accommodate a future bike lane in the non-motorized plan on 36th Avenue.

Strike: seconded Strike

Vote: motion to amend. Passed 7/0

Amended main motion: Vote: Passed 7/0.