Access Management Stakeholder Committee
May 24, 2012 / 9:00a – 11:30a
ODOT – 4040 Fairview Industrial Drive – Columbia Conference Rm.
Salem, Oregon 97302

Members present:

Development/Business Interests
Bob Russell, Oregon Trucking Association russell@ortrucking.org
Other Participants
Craig Pope, Polk County Commission pope.craig@co.polk.or.us
Betsy Johnson, Senator Sen.BetsyJohnson@state.or.us
Bonnie Heitsch, DOJ bonnie.heitsch@doj.state.or.us
Oregon Department of Transportation
Bob Bryant*, Region 4 Manager robert.w.bryant@odot.state.or.us
Harold Lasley, Access Management Manager
harold.Lasley@odot.state.or.us
Guests
Patrick Brennan*, Committee Administrator
Patrick.h.brennan@state.or.us

(*participated by phone)

Members absent: Mark Whitlow, Del Huntington, Jamie Jeffrey, Jim Hanks, Don Forest

Meeting Agenda:

- Weaving Technical Guidance – 20 min
  -Discuss input from Task Force meeting and decide next steps.

- Problem Statements – 90 min
  -Review revisions to problem statements based on Task Force discussion. Agree major concerns of stakeholders are captured.
    - Unpermitted Approaches/Grandfathering
    - Project Development (incl. medians and access standards)
    - Interchange area access management

  - Work on options to solve unpermitted connections and grandfathering problems.
    - Review options discussed or suggested previously.
    - Identify pros and cons
    - Determine additional information needed

- Agenda build for July Stakeholder meeting -- 10 min

- Adjourn

Access Management Stakeholder Committee
May 24, 2012 / 9:00a – 11:30a
ODOT – 4040 Fairview Industrial Drive – Columbia Conference Rm.
Salem, Oregon 97302

Minutes:

Weaving Technical Guidance

Commissioner Pope recommended that Oversight Task Force Members need to see the Weaving/Queuing PowerPoint presentation, as well as any Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) members who have not seen it yet. ODOT will continue to work with members of the Stakeholder Advisory Committee on the technical guidance, and also work on creating a communication piece for permit applicants based on this presentation. The communication piece will be brought to the Task Force for review and input. It was decided that the SAC does not see the need to develop statutory provisions for weaving at this time. They would prefer to work with ODOT to develop guidance and communication that addresses their concerns.

Problem Statements

Some SAC members expressed concern about ODOT "disclaimers" on the problem statement documents. Bob Bryant explained that the purpose was not to distance ODOT from solving problems but to note that the problems are described from stakeholder perspective. Stakeholder perceptions of the problems sometimes differ from ODOT's, but ODOT is committed to working on the problem from stakeholder perspective.

It was also pointed out that Mark Whitlow's comments received by email prior to meeting were not yet incorporated in the problems statements. Bob said Mark's comments will be addressed and incorporated with copies of revised statements to the entire group.

Unpermitted Approaches/Grandfathering

The group suggested that a "tiered" approach be considered to address this issue. For example, farm use approaches and existing connections in rural areas with less than 5000 ADT and no written permission could fall under one tier where they would automatically be permitted.

There was also discussion about an amnesty program for these types of approaches, during which permits could be issued based on less stringent standards – such as the Change of Use "moving in the direction of" criteria. The responsibility to come in during a limited amnesty period would still be with the property owner. Bonnie said there needs to be statutory language to allow for an amnesty program. A second tier could include approaches within Urban Growth Boundaries (UGB). These approaches would be assumed grandfathered and it

was proposed that ODOT would have burden of proof under this tier to show that an existing connection is not legal. There was discussion and general consensus among the group to try and find a way to have permits be part of property deeds, to be easily transferred to new owners. This will be added to the parking lot list.

Project Development (incl. medians and access standards)
The issues discussed included increased public process and applying permitting standards to access during the project development phase. Bob Russell wants language in statute, not rules in regards to this topic. Bonnie Heitsch and Bob Bryant clarified that project development could have more stringent standards than access management permit applications because projects often involve a broader set of issues on a longer highway segment than an approach application. Projects are developed to accommodate demand for typically 20 years. Bob Russell shared concerns he has heard about use of medians in projects. He felt the impact to business could be mitigated by allowing more u-turns at medians similar to Las Vegas. There was a discussion about u-turns and why that concept was dropped included in SB 264. Bonnie added that project development this was not an access management permit issue, and should probably be considered in another part of the statute than permitting. Bob Russell felt the SAC was good place to get concepts and language developed for further use and would like a concept paper drafted on this issue.

Interest was expressed in better understanding of how ODOT develops access management strategies for projects. Since there is no public involvement process, it's not clear how decisions are made.

Interchange area access management (IAMP)
There was only a short time remaining in the meeting for discussion of this problem statement. Some comments focused on flexibility that would allow development at less than 1320' standard. Another comment was that IAMPS need to show how access will be provided to other roads for property around interchange so property can develop. Also suggestion about using "move in direction of" as criteria for existing approaches around interchanges. No comments or suggested revisions were made concerning the problem statement.