

# Fern Valley Interchange

## MEETING MINUTES

**Meeting Date:** March 5, 2008

**Purpose:** Fern Valley Interchange Project  
Citizen Advisory Committee, Project Development Team  
Meeting

**Distribution:** CAC Members, Project Development Team, FV IAMP CAC  
Members, Public

**From:** Sue Casavan, RVCOG

**Date Prepared:** March 2008

**CAC Attendees:** Bruce Sophie, Mike McKey, Lenny Neimark, Bob Lewis, Tani  
Wouters, Daek Doggett, Terry Helfrich, Vicki Guarino, Pauly  
Hinesly, David Lewin

**FV IAMP CAC Attendees:** Lisa Sandrock, Mark Kellenbeck

**Project Team Attendees:** Dick Leever, ODOT Project Manager  
Ron Hughes, ODOT Access Management Engineer  
John McDonald, ODOT  
Jerry Marmon, ODOT Environmental Project Manager  
Brian Sheadel, ODOT Senior Designer  
Christina Fera-Thomas, ODOT  
Peter Schuytema, ODOT  
Nancy Reynolds, URS Project Manager  
Kate Lyman, URS  
John Cullerton, URS  
Howard Roll, URS  
Pat Foley, RVCOG  
Sue Casavan, RVCOG

**Other Attendees:** 36 members of the public signed in (sign-in sheet in file)

**PDT Attendees:** Jerry Marmon, Brian Sheadel, Christina Fera-Thomas, Peter  
Schuytema, ODOT; Bruce Sophie and Bob Lewis, Phoenix;  
Vicki Guarino, RVMPO

## **1. Introductions, Review Agenda, Approve Minutes**

Pat Foley, RVCOG Facilitator

Pat Foley began the meeting at 6:37 and announced to members that this was the twentieth meeting of the Fern Valley CAC and PDT committees. She said the last meeting for this group was held on January 9, 2008.

She informed the committee that the purpose of the meeting tonight was to review and discuss 1) Transportation System Management and Transportation Demand Management Measures for the IAMP and 2) Fern Valley Access Management Strategies.

She said this was a working committee meeting and in order to cover the agenda items in the scheduled time members of the public were asked to make their comments in the time allotted on the agenda.

She asked if there were any additions or corrections to the minutes. Some committee members said they were unsure if they had received the minutes as there were numerous email attachments and that if they found something they would comment later.

On a motion by Bob Lewis and seconded by Bruce Sophie the minutes were approved as presented.

## **2. Project Update**

Dick Leever, ODOT

Dick L. thanked everyone for their attendance. He reported that ODOT had worked on the interchange traffic signals and changed the lighting left to a lead left at double time and hoped that had helped the situation.

He said the teams were still working on the technical reports for the Environmental Analysis (EA) and the IAMP.

- Draft EA out in April or May
- Comment period in June
- Identify preferred alternative in June / July timeframe
- Revised EA in October

He reported that Tech Memos 1, 2, and 3 were completed for the IAMP. Tech Memo 4, potential land use actions and traffic operations analysis, will be completed at the end of April. The IAMP should be completed in the fall of this year.

## **3. Transportation System Management / Transportation Demand Management Measures for the IAMP**

Howard Roll, URS

Howard R. explained that the purpose of the presentation was to obtain feedback from the Citizens Advisory Committee and Project Decision Team on which measures to evaluate further for possible inclusion in the interchange area management plan (IAMP). He further explained the measures and evaluation methods.

<b><i>Transportation System Management Measures</i></b>			
<b>Description</b>	<b>Evaluate for Possible Inclusion in IAMP</b>		
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Reason Not</b>
Traffic control, lane striping, and signing		X	Project already includes traffic control, lane striping, and signing.
Acquire right-of-way for future bus pull-outs on N. Phoenix Rd.	X		
Bus bypass lanes		X	Insufficient bus ridership and frequency of service to warrant.
Timed transit transfers (coordinated schedules for different bus routes to reduce delay between transfers)		X	
Parking fees		X	Infeasible given free parking elsewhere in region.
Park-and-ride lots		X	The interchange area is too close to Medford employment areas for a park-and-ride lot to be attractive to commuters. <sup>1</sup>
Reversible, high-occupancy vehicle or high-occupancy transit lanes		X	Unwarranted on Fern Valley Rd. or N. Phoenix Rd. due to existing and projected levels of traffic.
Motorist information systems (e.g., variable message signs diverting traffic to alternative routes)		X	Lack of suitable alternative routes to N. Phoenix Rd.
Signs directing traffic to a preferred, less-congested route		X	
One-way streets		X	Already part of project on west side; unwarranted on east side.
Ramp metering	X		
Signal synchronization	X		
Truck traffic restrictions		X	Truck traffic role in congestion on Fern Valley Rd. and N. Phoenix Rd. does not warrant restrictions.

David Lewin observed that during rush hour on Hwy 99 when buses stop, traffic is backed up 2-3 blocks and he wondered if there were any plans for bus pull-outs on Hwy 99.

Howard R. said that ROW would be required on Hwy 99. The committee thought it would be critical for the description on the left of the table to say ROW for future bus pull-outs on North Phoenix Road and consider potential locations throughout the project area.

Mike M. commented that perhaps a rise in transit ridership should be considered with the change in gas prices. Howard R. replied that current conditions are not addressed and the measures are looking out 10-20 years but as the area developed he thought it could change the thinking of some of the measures.

Mike M. said he thought it was the state's intention to encourage other modes of travel and reduce SOV. Howard R. responded that the intention was to develop and present choices that do not exist.

David Lewin remarked that it was not unusual for trucks to have gotten lost or confused with the signage on Fern Valley and they have ended up in the residential district on the east side.

<sup>1</sup> Even if park-and-ride lots are not part of the IAMP, one or more lots could be established using surplus right-of-way acquired for the Fern Valley Interchange project.

Howard R. said he would add the verbiage ‘improve signage to and from where the trucks are trying to get to’.

Lisa S. added that trucks did have a tendency to get lost and she also thought it was due to signage.

Terry H. commented that he liked the idea of the bus pull-outs on North Phoenix Road but he questioned the park and ride lots. He said with most jobs being in industrial White City and with future residential areas taken into consideration he thought the lots could work for the South Valley and wondered if it should be considered.

John C. explained that one of the goals of the IAMP was to limit the amount of growth and traffic in the interchange area and the rationale was that park and rides would attract additional traffic into the interchange area. He noted that staff could certainly rethink it based on the desire of the committee.

<b><i>Transportation Demand Management Measures</i></b>			
<b>Description</b>	<b>Evaluate for Possible Inclusion in IAMP</b>		
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Reason Not</b>
Enhanced bus service		X	Beyond the scope of authority of the IAMP (RV Transit would provide).
Bicycle facilities		X	Project design already includes these.
Pedestrian facilities		X	
Limit parking supply to encourage use of alternatives to single-occupancy vehicles	X		
Require new development to:			
provide bicycle-supportive facilities	X		
provide pedestrian-supportive facilities	X		
provide employees transit passes or subsidize fares	X		
support employee telecommuting	X		
allow flexible employee work schedules and staggered or compressed employee work hours		X	Insufficient non-retail employment for appreciable benefit (store hours dictate retail work hours) and many non-retail employers already allow flexible or compressed work hours.
encourage employee carpooling and vanpooling	X		
pay additional development fees linked to trip generation (more than is already the case in Phoenix)	X		

Tani W. mentioned that in the past when talking with staff about bike/ped areas, there was an opportunity to further enhance the design to keep connectivity from east to west and she thought making the design accessible and safe should be something to consider.

Bruce S. commented on the additional development fees and informed staff that additional fees for development would not sit well with the City of Phoenix.

Lenny N. asked if development fees were the only funding mechanism for TSM and TDM and Howard R. said it was just one piece of the funding. Vicki G. added that there could be a trip generation fee where it would be possible to have a system where an applicant could take steps to mitigate impacts and have a reduced fee.

#### 4. Fern Valley Access Management Strategy (FVIAMSrat)

John C. introduced the access management strategy for Fern Valley.

- Access Management is balancing access to developed land while ensuring movement of traffic in a safe and efficient manner, keep traffic moving but still provide adequate access
  - Improve safety
  - Reduce congestion choke points
  - Improve traffic flow
  - Avoid unsafe backups onto the freeway system
  - Extend life of the existing facility

##### Access Spacing Standards

- Adopted state and local access spacing Standards
  - Based on roadway classification/speed
  - Public streets
  - Private driveways/accesses

##### Local Access Spacing Standards – City of Phoenix

###### General Driveway/Intersection Spacing Standards

Street Classification	Minimum Driveway Spacing	Minimum Driveway Separation from Public Street Intersection
Arterial	400	400
Collector	150	150
Local Street	N/A	75

- City Arterials: Fern Valley Road (I-5 to Phoenix Road), E Bolz Road
- City Collectors: Rose St, Cheryl Lane, Luman Road, N Phoenix Road & S Phoenix Road

##### ODOT Access Spacing Standards

- **ODOT** Standards apply to:
  - Freeway interchange spacing
  - Ramp terminus to nearest intersection
  - Unsignalized accesses on State highways
  - Special Transportation Areas (STA)-more highly congested and developed areas, typically a downtown environment where different standards apply

**Access Management Spacing Standards for Private and Public Approaches on Statewide Highways – examples from Oregon Highway Plan**

Posted Speed	Rural Expressway	Rural	Urban Expressway	Urban
>55	5280	1320	2460	1320
50	5280	1100	2640	1100
40-45	5280	990	2640	990
30-35		770		770
<25		550		550

- ODOT Standards apply to:
  - Freeway interchange spacing
  - Ramp terminus to nearest intersection
  - Unsignalized accesses on State highways
  - Special Transportation Areas (STA)

John C. said the spacing standards took effect in April 2000 and typically applies to new development or change in use such as highway improvement projects. He explained classifications for accesses on the highway system.

1. Permit accesses - accesses where the property owner has gone through a process with ODOT and acquired a permit that is active and on-file
2. Grandfathered access - access in place and in use prior to 1949

**What is an “Access Management Strategy”? (AMStrat)**

- AMStrat defines how access management is addressed in an improvement project. AMStrat measures:
  - Are limited to highway right-of-way
  - Are limited to actions within ODOT authority
  - Meet or move toward applicable access spacing Standards, acknowledgement that standard cannot be met in every case but move in the direction, optimal distances for everything to work well
- **Goals:**
  - Enhance safety and efficiency
  - Safe access to businesses and residences
  - Efficient access for emergency vehicles
  - Support movement of goods, community livability, planned development
  - Recognize needs of all modes
- **Objectives:**
  - Compile access inventory
  - *Meet, or at least move in the direction of*, applicable access spacing Standards on:
    - Fern Valley Road
    - OR 99 – Rogue Valley Highway
    - N. Phoenix Road

- Combine and consolidate existing accesses where practical – if needed to meet Standards

Howard R. informed the committee that the next slides would deal with what is on the ground today in the study area. He said the access management strategy covers a smaller area than the project area and extends from Breckinridge to Hwy 99 along Fern Valley and then along Hwy 99 from Rose up north and to the south at the start of the couplet. He presented a map of the IAMP area.

### **FVI AMStrat Inventory of Existing Accesses**

- FVI AMStrat inventory coverage:
  - *West of I-5:* Fern Valley Road, OR 99 from Rose to start of couplet, E. Bolz Road, W. Bolz Road, Cheryl Lane, Luman Road
  - *East of I-5:* Fern Valley Road to Breckinridge Drive, Pear Tree Lane, N. Phoenix Road to IAMP Boundary
- FVI AMStrat inventory coverage:
  - *West of I-5:* Fern Valley Road, OR 99 from Rose to start of couplet, E. Bolz Road, W. Bolz Road, Cheryl Lane, Luman Road
  - *East of I-5:* Fern Valley Road to Breckinridge Drive, Pear Tree Lane, N. Phoenix Road to IAMP Boundary

### **OR 99 Access Standards and Existing Access Spacing**

- *45 mph segment* North of Cheryl Lane to Rose Street
  - 14 accesses in 1,000 ft - average spacing 70 feet
  - 3 permitted accesses
- *30 mph segment* Cheryl Lane to AMStrat boundary
  - 17 accesses in 1,560 ft - average spacing 90 feet
  - 6 permitted accesses

Pauly H. said there were some businesses that had two accesses and she asked if businesses would be allowed only one access. Howard R. replied that consolidating access points was one thing that could be done to improve access management but added that access is driven more by the use of the property rather than the amount of existing frontage.

Ron H. discussed the ODOT review process. He explained that ODOT reviews what is on-site at the time; they look for proper on-site circulation for the type and variety of traffic that is anticipated at the location as well as making sure that all maneuvers on the property and on the highway are as reasonably safe as they can get them.

Tani W. asked if affecting business access and its accompanying impacts would fall under the category of socioeconomic impacts in the EA process. Ron H. said they try to consider impacts the best they can and accommodate what is there now and if properties redevelop it will be revisited.

### **Existing Accesses** - maps with existing accesses were presented AMStrat OR 99 Segment

- OR 99: Rose St to Cheryl Lane – 14 accesses

- 10 accesses allow all turns; 3 are in-only; 1 is out-only
- OR 99: Cheryl Lane to 6th St (AMStrat boundary) – 22 accesses
- 18 accesses allow all turns; 4 are right-in/right-out only
- Existing accesses with active ODOT Access Permit

**Fern Valley Interchange Area Access Spacing Standards** – maps were presented showing the existing Fern Valley Road access spacing at I-5

Howard R. commented that Pear Tree Lane is under ODOT control and could be closed. David Lewin said he thought that Petro had an agreement that Pear Tree Lane would be available to them. Howard R. said he would have to research that further with ODOT.

**N Phoenix Road - City Access Standards & Existing Spacing**

- N Phoenix Road is a *City Collector* within City limits
- Minimum access spacing = 150 feet

**N Phoenix Road Standards and Existing Accesses**

- 660 ft from Fern Valley Road to first driveway
- 0.53 mi from Fern Valley Road to Home Depot signal
- N Phoenix Road: 16 accesses from Fern Valley Road to UGB
- Either alternative would result in major changes for N Phoenix Road

Map of existing accesses on North Phoenix Road was presented.

**“Toolbox” of Access Management Techniques**

- Increase spacing between signals
- Consolidate access points
- Convert access to in-only or out-only
- Center median treatments – two-way turn lanes, raised center medians
- Access from side streets or frontage roads
- Exclusive turn lanes
- Land use policies

**Impact of Alternatives on Existing Accesses**

- *West of I-5* both alternatives identical
  - Fern Valley: 1-way WB east of Bolz
    - 4 closed, 2 consolidated, 1 relocated to OR 99 (mobile home park)
  - E Bolz: 1-way EB from OR 99 to FV
    - 1 closed, 1 relocated to OR 99 (motel)
  - OR 99: Center median extended
    - 1 relocated, 4 right-in/right-out

**Impact of Alternatives on West Accesses** – west accesses map presented

- Both alternatives identical from Luman Road west
- E Bolz Road, Fern Valley become 1-way Bolz to OR 99
- Center median on OR 99 extended from Fern Valley to E Bolz
- Increased access control on OR 99, E Bolz, Fern Valley

### **Impact of Alternatives on Existing Accesses**

- Substantial differences *east of I-5*
- Fern Valley Alt realigns Fern Valley Road
  - All FV accesses closed/rerouted
  - All N Phoenix accesses relocated
  - Pear Tree Lane likely closed
  - Main truck stop access via S Phoenix

Ron H. explained that this was where the existing Fern Valley would become an access road for the existing properties and would not necessarily connect with the interchange area.

### **Impact of Fern Valley Alt. on Existing Accesses** – existing accesses map shown

- Fern Valley Road and Furry Road primary local accesses for truck stop
- Future access to land between existing Fern Valley Road and realignment via existing road
- Existing Fern Valley Road ends east of Pear Tree Lane and at S Phoenix Road
- Realigned Fern Valley Road returns to existing alignment at Breckinridge Drive
- Differences *east of I-5*
- N Phoenix Alt closes Fern Valley Rd at I-5
  - FV truck stop accesses remain
  - Higher speed vs out-of-direction travel
  - Existing N Phoenix accesses relocated
  - Pear Tree Lane likely closed

Tani W. commented that when discussing the difference between the two interchange types the word relocated was used and she believed it should be described as a realignment. Lisa S. asked if the City of Phoenix would have jurisdiction over the speed limit. Ron H. explained that speed was typically set by the state and ODOT would retain jurisdiction in the area within the influence of the interchange. He further added that if it was on a state facility the state would be responsible for traffic control devices and that cities would have more latitude. Lisa S. asked if for the Fern Valley Thru option if access off of Fern Valley would be closed. Lenny N. commented that he thought this was an incomplete choice of wording and staff might want to add South Phoenix and Fern Valley Road to make that clear. Lisa S. thought it was misleading and indicated to her that access would be closed off of Fern Valley.

### **Impact of N Phoenix Alt. on Existing Accesses** – map was shown of existing accesses

- Fern Valley Road ends at Pear Tree Lane
- Access changes for existing uses served by Fern Valley Road
- Access changes for NE and SE interchange quadrants

### **Common Effects of Access Management on Business**

- Before/after studies various locations

- Demand for services remains
- Market coverage may grow from:
  - Positive customer reaction
  - Delay and travel speed attractive compared to other locations
- Land values similar or slightly higher
- Delivery/truck traffic routes change
- Increased potential for multiple stops by customers
- Visual and access enhancements
  - New driveways
  - Interconnected parking areas
  - Landscaped median strip

In reference to phrase ‘Demand for services remains’, Tani W. thought it really depended on the type of business, some are location-specific and some are not, businesses are driven by different variables.

Ron H. said the committee had discussed some of the multi-modal aspects of the project and good access management promotes multi-modal activity by making it safer and reducing the number of conflict points. Howard R. informed the committee that he had some handouts available from Federal Highway discussing the benefits of access management.

John Cullerton presented the next steps.

**FVI Access Management Strategy: Next Steps**

- Complete and distribute draft FVIAMStrat report for review
- Summarize FVIAMStrat in the Fern Valley Interchange Area Management Plan (FVIAMP)
- Coordinate AMStrat recommendations with ODOT designers/local agency staff
- Incorporate pertinent elements of the AMStrat into the Environmental Assessment for public review

David Lewin commented that the committee had discussed the effects of access management on businesses and asked if discussion will take place on impacts for residential areas. Howard R. said that people living on the east side will find a different way of getting to and from their homes.

## **5. Next Steps for the IAMP**

John McDonald, ODOT

John M. presented the next steps for the IAMP.

- TPAU is finishing the modeling for the basic land use scenario and the sensitivity analysis
- TPAU is developing transportation models that should be done next month
- Data will be given to John Kelly at URS who examine it and come up with some ideas of how to make the transportation system work better
- Come back in May with questions and input from the committee

Tani W. asked if the committee could get the modeling in a pdf or in the format of the crossing diamond demonstration.

## 6. Next Steps for the FVI EA

Jerry Marmon, ODOT; Nancy Reynolds, URS

Jerry M. said the EA was scheduled to be completed in April but staff needed to slow it down so the IAMP could be incorporated into the EA document.

He noted that additional turn lanes were mentioned at the last meeting and that discussion with the committee will take place at the next meeting. He added that the v/c ratio at Fern Valley and Hwy 99 exceeds ODOT standards and staff needed to identify mitigation measures. He told the committee that what they would see is that the turn lanes would be discussed in the mitigation section of the EA but would not be part of the preferred alternative.

John M. emphasized to the committee that the EA was about what is happening now and the IAMP was more of a what-if future scenario. He asked the committee to keep them separate in their minds because at certain points it will be important to distinguish between the two.

Nancy R. said she just wanted to add that John M. was correct in saying that the EA looks at what is here now but potential future impacts are also addressed in the EA.

## 7. Public Comment

Pat Foley, RVCOG Facilitator

Bob Ruth – He emphasized that there is a problem now, he counted traffic for half hour at 11:30 a.m. going east on Fern Valley and said there were 102 cars and 11 trucks and 4 trucks could not make the turn. The light changes and the cars coming from Fern Valley to Hwy 99 cannot go through. He said there was no way the trucks could back up because there were cars behind them. Same thing happens on Hwy 99, cars going south back up behind trucks that cannot make the turn. He thought there could be an easy solution at no cost. Back up the lines 15 feet that are coming up to the light so the trucks can make the turns. He felt this needed to be done now.

Don Mitchell - He said he appreciated what ODOT was trying do but people also have to live in the community while this is happening. He suggested an off-ramp at the entrance to the City of Phoenix coming in from the south where trucks could turn into the truck stop. City officials say Phoenix needed the taxes from the business and that base should not be disrupted. He added that in reference to the west side and the east side, the interchange would separate the two sides of the city. He said when the trucks come out of Pear Tree they drive by a wall right next to the residents and asked if staff had considered relocating the wall to vacant land. He suggested thinking about an off-ramp for trucks so they don't have to come up onto to the interchange. He asked how much surplus land would there be at the new interchange site and he thought the interchange shown tonight was different than at previous meetings. He thought some left turn lanes would certainly help and he thought something could be done with the space where the sidewalks were closed on both sides. He said this is not a new suggestion and anything that will affect the economy of Phoenix the city officials will want some input.

Dr. Brian Lewis – He said on behalf of the Phoenix Hills Homeowners Association, he wanted to thanked everyone on the committee for all the hard work and effort they have

put into the interchange. He said there were a number of people, including himself, in the subdivision who have watched the trucks as they drive back and forth on Fern Valley up to Breckinridge. He said the following issues have come up at the Homeowners Association. The trucks make U-turns where not allowed at North/South Phoenix Road where it interfaces with Fern Valley. Trucks entering the subdivision end up having to drive through the subdivision and go out the other end to get on South Phoenix Road and they see, on average, one or two a week. At the light of South/North Phoenix Road on Fern Valley, the first truck will pull out and the rest of the trucks lined up behind want to get through the light so they increase speed and the exhaust comes right out along the homes. He said regarding the issue of livability, there needed to be some balance to the economy of businesses and the economy to the residences that are effective for Fern Valley Road. The interchange has to meet the needs of all, looking for a solution for the entire community.

Albert Reynoso – He said everything the group presented was great but he wondered how much interaction they had with ODOT, the CAC, and the Phoenix City Council. He added that ODOT has performed extensive research and traffic studies and have also approved and denied some of the accesses shown. He said he understood that they were presenting a standard or something that was becoming a standard called access management and wondered if it was something new and something that ODOT knows of. He commented that what he saw made him think communication was not going on between the groups. He said there were various different maps and studies shown and suggested that staff gets together and find out which maps are truly representative as there have been different maps circulating and they should make sure that everyone is seeing the same thing. He asked Dick L. about the timeline and about finishing this year in June and Dick L. said they would be finishing the EA in the fall and completing the IAMP. Dick L. commented that as far as the access management tonight, he believed this was the first time it had been presented and it was more of an informational presentation to the group as to what the laws and standards are. Albert R. said he had concerns about separating the east and west side with the interchange and how it could change the nature of the businesses.

Dan Seeman – Introduced himself and said he represented Petro. He thought there needed to be an understanding in terms of the relationship of the EA and the IAMP. He said they were large documents that do different things; they relate to each other, while the EA gains information about impacts of the alternatives considered and ultimately to select one, the management plan serves the future of how it is going to operate. He came tonight to discuss the EA and said that he had reviewed a number of draft documents in terms of the traffic analysis. He said he would like to comment, based on the review of the two alternatives; North Phoenix Thru and Fern Valley Thru. He observed that ODOT had basic criteria and wanted to build an interchange that would last a reasonable life, defined as 2030. They have established standards for v/c in the interchange area and both alternatives meet that standard. He said in his review of other environmental impacts there is not a clear distinction drawn between the two alternatives. He added that the one distinction he did see was the socioeconomic criteria, the impact on businesses and that Petro's business was critical between the two alternatives. One alternative renders a travel center as being inoperable from a marketing standpoint and the other will retain its operability and he felt this was an important consideration for the committee. He added

that another element of the traffic analysis that became apparent to him was part of the sensitivity analysis which drew the conclusion that the North Phoenix Thru alternative was superior from a travel time perspective with less congestion. He felt that was debatable because the v/c in 2030 will be 80 percent full. He wished all the streets he traveled would be 80 percent full and felt it was important to note that the travel time analysis presented considers peak hour time and does not consider the other hours out of the day when 90 percent of travel occurs. He asked the committee to consider his comments.

Jim Dulcich, Petro - He said with regard to Howard Roll's statement for demand for services, Howard R. said research shows demand for services won't change with access management. Jim D. said that is not true for a travel center where access is everything. He urged the staff to pay particular attention to the effect of existing businesses when finalizing the socioeconomic impact section. He said in reference to the Build or No Build alternative summary he thought there was an inaccurate statement on Page 28 where it says businesses will not likely close or move outside the area as an indirect result of the project, he felt Petro should have been consulted. He felt there was another inaccurate statement which was so subtle it gave the impression that it was unimportant and that was dealing with the reference to the impacts in the southeast quadrant. He said the distance of this quadrant would be longer with the North Phoenix Thru alternative and additional distance could impact truck access and business at the current location. He felt this was very critical and urged the team to pay special attention to existing businesses when choosing the preferred alternative.

Clark Rudy, Petro – He said last February Fern Valley Thru was a compromise between North Phoenix Thru and the existing Fern Valley Road. He noted that the Petro travel plaza serves both the professional driver as well as the traveling general public and both demand easy access and we try to give it to them. No easy access they don't come. He said they have about 100 employees at Petro and emphasized that North Phoenix Thru would be total devastation for the facility. He said with the Fern Valley Thru alternative they could possibly survive and commented that when the median was put in 5 years ago they lost 75 percent of their business at the store but have gained a little back. He explained that staff says the North Phoenix Thru alternative is faster but with development it will be longer and for drivers, time is money and we might as well shut the doors. He listed the Fern Valley Thru alternative advantages

- Less co-mingling with cars and trucks
- More direct route
- Does not divide the city of phoenix

He added that Fern Valley Thru was a compromise and North Phoenix Thru would be total devastation for Petro. He said Petro wanted to be good corporate citizens and try to be green, put in IdleAire help reduce emissions. He remarked that the bottom line is Petro would like to remain here.

Rich Lawrence, Petro/Director of Real Estate – He said what is happening with this interchange he has seen before across the country. He noted that their properties are almost always adjacent to interstates and they often have access issues. He informed the committee that he had a good sense of what the consequences would be for Petro and what a viable sight consists of. He said they sell convenience, with the North Phoenix

Thru the convenience is eliminated and if that alternative were put into place this would not be a viable travel center location or full service truck stop. He said he wanted to emphasize this because with one of the slides there was conversation and he got the sense that Petro might not happen but it would work out. He emphasized that from his experience he does not see Petro as viable with the North Phoenix Thru alternative.

Dan Yost, Peterbilt – He said Peterbilt has been a family-owned business for 62 years and the facility was built about 20 years ago providing 40 full-time family wage jobs. He added that they had planned and still plan to develop the 7 acres adjoining the Home Depot property. He noted that the North Phoenix Thru alternative would eliminate their ability to create more jobs, taxes, and businesses on the property. He asked the committee to carefully consider that, more businesses and jobs.

## **8. Comfort Check**

Pat Foley, RVCOG Facilitator

Bruce Sophie – I think we are progressing, listening to our citizen's businesses they have concerns that we need to keep in mind as we move forward. He suggested making the PowerPoint presentation available on the ODOT website along with the modeling so the committee could have further review.

Mike McKey – Good to hear comments from Peterbilt and Petro and Don Mitchell. Don has some good ideas, he has been around for a long time and as an old engineer myself we should think about his idea.

Lenny Neimark – Fine.

Bob Lewis – I'm good.

Tani Wouters – I think it is great to hear all the comments, it is really important that we put the future of Phoenix in the forefront. The connectivity keeping east and west will not make everyone happy but whatever decision is made we need to keep Phoenix's future in mind. We are not building an interchange for Medford, this is not an urban interchange.

Dack Doggett – I think I will feel a lot better when we get to a solution for the interchange part of it. I appreciate all the work on the access management so much needs to be gone through. Being involved in this for four years, I agree with Petro it would be total devastation with North Phoenix Thru. I want to move forward with this being a Phoenix solution.

Lisa Sandrock – I appreciate all the work and the input from the businesses and the residences. As a resident there are at least as many residences east past the subdivision as there are in the subdivision, these people do not get representation and will be affected also, consider this factor.

Vicki Guarino – I'm fine, thanks.

Pauly Hinesly – I think this is great and I was not aware of the access issues until tonight, not sure where we will go with Petro, we are looking at two totally different scenarios. It's very difficult to understand, there does not seem to be any choice but the two alternatives we are looking at. We can give our input if we have someone tell us what their problems are. Maybe Petro can talk to ODOT and see if there is anything they can do. She thanked the citizens for their input.

Mark Kellenbeck – It is not over, I encourage everyone to stay in the process with a common goal of finding the best solution for all of Phoenix. I think it will be difficult but I do think it is possible. You are doing a great job and obviously an important job and I applaud you for your efforts.

Terry Helfrich – Speaking of processes, Regional Problem Solving (RPS) process which was mentioned in the minutes of the last meeting that it could take a long time for the RPS process to be settled. However, it looks like it could be settled in the very near future possibly looking at a sign-off in June, and finalization in September. Once the RPS process is concluded Phoenix will start working on the comp plan.

David Lewin – I'm good.

Ron Hughes – From our perspective, speaking of the access management, there is a lot of work to be done. We will be directly involved with business and property owners trying to find a balance between the two no matter which alternative is chosen. I look forward to it.

Christina Fera-Thomas – I'm fine, thanks.

Peter Schuytema – I'm fine, thank you.

Jerry Marmon – I'm good. I want to thank the committee members for sticking through this process for this long. I want to thank the public for commenting, this process is half technical and half non-technical and your comments are important in this decision and we all know it will be a difficult decision.

John McDonald – Good. Coming into this project about a year ago there was a lot of conflict that I don't see now. As a group we have come so far to work well together, we can disagree but still go for a common goal, I think that is great.

Dick Leever – I want to thank everyone for their participation tonight. For those of you who have concerns about the design I would encourage you to contact me and talk to me directly, it is a lot easier one on one. I can assure you that a lot of the things that were brought up we have already looked at and discussed.

Howard Roll – In looking back at the work that has been done I was very impressed how much the design and concepts have changed in response to the input from the community and the stakeholders over the course of those years.

John Cullerton – I just wanted to clarify on the comment made on the apparent lack of coordination between ODOT and URS. I want to emphasize that we are highly coordinated and discuss things on a regular basis.

Kate Lyman – I'm fine, thanks.

Nancy Reynolds – Just wanted to add one thing and that is regarding the comment about folks who live outside of the area who definitely have an interest in the use of the facility, in fact you are all users we are interested in getting comments from. They may not be directly represented here but they are certainly welcome to discuss their issues with ODOT or the city. I would urge you to let folks know that they are welcome to give us a call, give Pat a call, get on the interested parties list and everyone has an opportunity to respond to the EA and if they have questions or issues they will be addressed as we go into the final document. I urge you to let them know that they are not left out of the process.

## **9. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:07 p.m.