



## MEETING MINUTES

**Meeting Date:** October 4, 2006

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

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

**From:** Sue Casavan, RVCOG

**Date Prepared:** October 2006

**CAC Attendees:** Bob Korfhage, Terry Helfrich, Joan Haukom, Dack Doggett, Pauly Hinesly, Lee Carrau, Harry Page, Lenny Neimark, Tani Wouters, Mark Gibson, David Lewin, David Lowry and Madison Taylor

**CAC Absent:** None

**Project Team Attendees:** Jerry Marmon, ODOT Environmental Project Manager  
Debbie Timms, ODOT Project Manager  
Gary Leaming, ODOT Project information  
Brian Sheadel, ODOT Senior Designer  
Christina Fera-Thomas, ODOT  
Peter Schuytema, ODOT  
Art Anderson, ODOT  
Nancy Reynolds, URS Project Manager  
Vicki Guarino, RVCOG  
Sue Casavan, RVCOG

**Other Attendees:** 41 members of the public signed in (sign-in sheet in file)

**PDT Attendees:** Jerry Marmon, Brian Sheadel, Christina Fera-Thomas, Peter Schuytema, ODOT; Jim Wear, Phoenix; Dale Petrasek, Jackson County; Nick Fortey, FHWA; Dan Moore, RVMPO/RVCOG; Murray LaHue, Phoenix City Council

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

Vicki Guarino, RVCOG Facilitator

Guarino began the meeting at 6:45 and explained that this was a joint meeting with the CAC (Citizen's Advisory Committee) and the PDT (Project Development Team). There was a pre-meeting from 6:00-6:45 p.m. to review project alternative maps. The committee started with introductions and reviewed the agenda for tonight's meeting. She asked committee members to review the CAC and PDT minutes for changes or corrections. Minutes were approved as presented.

## **2. Project Update**

Debbie Timms, ODOT

Debbie T. said at the last meeting the committee discussed the possibility of having an East Side resident sit on the CAC as a member. Joan H. has volunteered to be the voice for those people so their concerns can be forwarded to Joan H. and she will distribute them to the rest of the committee. She said tonight the committee will narrow down the 17 alternatives. Another issue brought up was bike/ped facilities and Debbie T. informed the public this will not be discussed at tonight's meeting. She said the committee will address those issues when it is determined which alternatives get forwarded into the EA document. A bike/ped sign up sheet was available and information on those issues will be distributed at the appropriate time. Vicki G. presented the voting ballot to the committee. She explained how the ballot functions and where the 17 alternatives originated.

## **3. Option Review and Discussion**

Debbie Timms, ODOT

Debbie T. referred the committee to the Interchange Option spreadsheet for reference. She asked the committee to review and discuss the options. Committee members were individually addressed and asked for their comments.

### **6 Lane Diamond w/SE Loop**

Joan H. – Does not make a huge impact

Madison T. – I like it, you can phase in the loop over time, it uses the existing footprint

Terry H. – Huge impact on Bear Creek and the gas station business

Dack D. – Least amount of impact overall, the best choice

Mark G. – Defer

Pauly H. – Takes less space and fewer properties

David Lewin – Viable option

Bob K. – Pass

Harry P. – Pass

David Lowry – Cost is similar to the SPUI

Lee C. – Viable option as good as any, I like it.

Lenny N. – I like it, it utilizes the existing footprint of our community.

Tani W. – I like that you can phase in the loop, in the existing footprint, found the cost interesting.

Debbie T. said cost difference is explained that when looking at a SPUI you are looking at high construction cost, when looking at a diamond you are looking at added ROW costs.

### **8 Lane Diamond**

Joan H. – Pass

Madison T. – No Comment

Terry H. – Pass

Dack D. – Pass

Mark G. – Pass

Pauly H. – I think 6 lanes are plenty

David Lewin – Want to know if anyone sees anything on the 8-lane that is good, I want to know what it is because I have missed it

Bob K. – Don't like it, see no reason for it

Harry P. – Asked further questions on the impacts

David Lowry – Doesn't fit

Lee C. – Don't like it all

Lenny N. – No Comment

Tani W. – No Comment

### **SPUI North**

Joan H. – I feel favorable towards this one

Madison T. – Too great of a change

Terry H. – It's tighter, it fits well in the area and could handle more traffic in the future

Dack D. – Divides the east and west side, does not line up with anything, basically tearing the town apart

Mark G. – No Comment

Pauly H. – Takes far too much property, we really do not need to do at this point

David Lewin – I believe it is a viable option

Bob K. – Think it could work for a variety of reasons and I think it is a viable option

Harry P. – Would not consider, too many impacts

David Lowry – SPUIs in contrast with the 8-lane, offer from 7-15 years more capacity for additional investment of 2 million dollars on a 45 million dollar project and to me that is an awfully good investment. I strongly favor the SPUI.

Lee C. – Splits the city

Lenny N. – I find the dollar numbers questionable, I feel this is the wrong choice for this community.

Tani W. – Concerned about the throw-away, impact on surrounding areas, challenge the cost of a SPUI for 47 million dollars.

### **SPUI South**

Joan H. – No difference

Madison T. – Same

Terry H. – No difference

Dack D. – Same

Mark G. – Same

Pauly H. – Same

David Lewin – Same  
Bob K. – Same  
Harry P. – Same  
David Lowry – Same  
Lee C. – Same  
Lenny N. – Same  
Tani W. – Moves the actual traffic closer to the residential areas, I don't like this one.

### **PBA West**

Joan H. – Has more major impacts than some of the others, not in favor.  
Madison T. – Overall it provides a safer entrance into and out of the mobile home park, think it deals with the traffic issues.  
Terry H. – I don't understand the traffic flow, I just don't get it.  
Dack D. – Least impact, there are ways to control the Ray's parking lot issues, don't see anything getting hurt.  
Mark G. – I agree with Dack for the most part, concerned about the corner of Bolz off of Hwy 99 it is a pretty tight corner.  
Pauly H. – Ray's can take care of the issues, I think this is a good deal.  
David Lewin – Viable option, certainly a comfortable option for 10-20 years.  
Bob K. – I thought our primary objective of this project was transportation now and in the future and I think any option that dead ends into Ray's Market will not meet the needs of the future for transportation, bottleneck. Too much chaos to provide a smooth flow of traffic, don't like it.  
Harry P. – My concern is the school bus, eliminates safety problems, I'm happy with it

David Lowry – asked if we decide on a SPUI does this design work with the SPUI?  
Debbie T. answered that it shows on the sheet working with 6 lane, 8 lane, and the SPUI North, all options will be built to last a minimum of 20 years.

David Lewin – asked if you limit the growth on the west side, where the SPUI has the potential to handle much more growth, is it problematic for the west side?  
Peter S. replied if it never gets improved on the west side to increase capacity to match the SPUI capacity the extra SPUI capacity will be technically wasted. It could potentially limit growth on the east side more than the impact on the west side because the west side is on the lowest common denominator, the interchange will not be the problem anymore, it will be the west side. If additional east growth is desired, the west side would have to be improved.

David Lowry asked if we had this SPUI and this west side plan, in 20 years could this plan be improved at that time. Peter S. responded that yes it could.  
David Lowry - Taking that into account over the 20 years and that it can evolve in the future, I like the access and one Bear Creek crossing.

Lee C. – In general, OK needs to be detailed.

Lenny N. – This is the plan devised by the people that work and live in this corridor every single day. I think it has tremendous amount of strength and the growth issues do not go away with anything we are looking at.

Tani W. – I agree with Lenny. I have driven many over-developed areas where I have gotten off the freeway and the intersection is right at a shopping center. I don't think that is the largest concern, the primary goal is to protect existing businesses. I like this one.

### **TPAU West**

Joan H. – I don't like the two crossings at Bear Creek.

Madison T. – I agree.

Terry H. – I agree, don't like the two crossing at Bear Creek; do like the connectivity from Bolz Rd to Rose Street.

Dack D. – I agree, the extra bridge is negative.

Mark G. – I agree.

Pauly H. – Look where the second bridge comes out cannot see gaining anything.

David Lewin – I prefer the PBA West.

Bob K. – Pass

Harry P. – I agree.

David Lowry – Don't like the double crossing at Bear Creek. There are probably lower cost options available.

Lee C. – I agree, pass.

Lenny N. – Two problems I have with this, the second Bear Creek crossing and it makes the downtown triangle center area less cohesive.

Tani W. – No Comment.

### **EB / WB Couplet**

Joan H. – I think this is the intersection that will make people bypass Phoenix.

Madison T. – inaudible

Terry H. – I'm going to let this one go.

Dack D. – Same, confusing

Mark G. – Same

Pauly H. – Same

David Lewin – Same

Bob K. – Pass

Harry P. – Pass

David Lowry – Pass

Lee C. – Same

Lenny N. – Same

Tani W. – Would like to see the modeling on this in the computer program.

### **TPAU West (w/Luman Rd Undercrossing)**

Joan H. – No Comment

Madison T. – Inaudible

Terry H. – Same

Dack D. – Agree

Mark G. – Agree

Pauly H. – When we first did this I thought it was a good idea, but it is not.  
David Lewin – He asked about traffic movements and if he understood them correctly  
Bob K. – I pass  
Harry P. – Pass  
David Lowry – I'll pass  
Lee C. – No Comment  
Lenny N. – No Comment  
Tani W. – No Comment

### **Original Table One West**

Joan H. – The two Bear Creek crossings are an issue.  
Madison T. – This is the one that brought me to this project. You can get into the mobile park but never get out, I think it is ridiculous.  
Terry H. – Two creek crossings are an issue, Bolz Road south, look at the impact it is brutal.  
Dack D. – I agree, not viable.  
Mark G. – I agree.  
Pauly H. – I agree.

Discussion: David Lewin said he was confused. He said this looked like what the committee had in January and thought this option for Hwy 99 should look like all the other options in terms of width to make them all on a level playing field.

Bob K. added that when you look at this option the way it is drawn it deals with the impacts to businesses but in the other options it does not show potential impacts.

David Lewin said he felt some folks were reacting to what they were seeing on Hwy 99. He wanted to know if the width of Hwy 99 on this option was going to be the same as the other options or does this option had to be wider than the others. He added that this option has a couple favorable things the others don't have. In the traffic analysis for 2030 this option will get you there in considerably less time 50% less time. It is not an issue now but it will be in the future, the way it is portrayed by destroying all the businesses I feel is unfair. He commented that no one is going to vote for it when it looks like it is taking half the town.

Committee discussed that all alternatives should be presented as consistent with the impacts.

Bob K. – I do like this, I like the way it treats the traffic and a long-range look at how you move traffic through.

Harry P. – It is difficult for buses to get in and out, two bridges going across Bear Creek.

David Lowry – Think it has potential but requires considerable work, the second bridge on Bear Creek seems bizarre.

Lee C. – No Comment

Lenny N. – Made no sense in January, makes no sense now. The real issue here is how much compromise are we willing to make and there will be other options down the road that can and will address the problems we can't address in this process

Tani W. – I agree with Lenny, this is the answer to east side growth, if you look at the entire corridor of Hwy 99 you can see areas that have been protected. Everyone has had to compromise to work together and survive that needs to be the goal. I am not willing to give

up my business for that and I don't think anyone else is either. We need to look at the opportunity to work together. I did not like it in January and do not like it now.

Brian S. commented after research that the cross-section is wider on this option.

David Lewin wanted clarification that with this option Hwy 99 is going to have to be wider and have more impact.

Brian S. said yes it would.

### **Original Lowry West**

Joan H. – Two bridges over Bear Creek, think the discussion will be the same

Madison T. – Everything is a right/in right/out.

Terry H. – Same discussion, don't like the rear entrance into Ray's on Cheryl.

Dack D. – Doesn't do anything good for the town or businesses, don't see anything positive.

Mark G. – Same as Table 1 option.

Pauly H. – I agree.

David Lewin – Same question about crossing Bear Creek .

Bob K. – Pass

Harry P. – Too many negatives.

David Lowry – Don't like.

Lee C. – No

Lenny N. – Same as previous.

Tani W. – No Comment.

### **North Phoenix Thru / East Side**

Joan H. – I am in favor of this.

Madison T. – Cutting off Phoenix entirely

Terry H. – Mostly aligned with N. Phoenix Rd, like the alignment for future growth, makes more sense.

Dack D. – Seems to only match up with the N. SPUI, divides the town, not in favor and hard to get around.

Mark G. –No Comment .

Pauly H. – What happens to businesses until you get the growth, not in favor of the SPUI.

David Lewin – Had the same reaction 18 months ago splitting east / west, but as Terry says if you think 20 years down the road with future growth it is not splitting the community very much it moves it more to the center. Truck movements are acceptable, think this is a viable alternative.

Bob K. – I agree, I like that it has the minimal amount of queue length on S. Phoenix Road compared to the other options. It handles additional growth and we need to take a hard look at growth whether we agree with it or not, it may bring the town together.

Harry P. – Not acceptable, think it does split the town

David Lowry – The one east side option that will match with the SPUI that also matches with PBA West and Original Table 1 West, think this should be an option that should be seriously considered. The intersection with abrupt turn could be straightened out.

Lee C. – I agree with Harry, splits the town.

Lenny N. – I feel differently than a number of other people do. I think if we build this we build a new South Medford interchange, out of context and out of scale. Everyone must pass through one single point, complicates emergency vehicles and school bus access flow from the east to west.

Tani W. – I agree with Lenny, I have a problem with everyone going through the intersection at N. Phoenix Road and Fern Valley.

Peter S. commented on a couple technical points. He said the travel time with this alternative from Hwy 99 to Phoenix Hills Subdivision is two minutes faster even without out-of-direction travel. The intersection at South Phoenix would have less delay on the west side, two minutes every time you go through adds up.

Tani W. asked if he factored in alternate transportation and other alternate routes. Nobody knows what will happen in 20 years and we need to look at the whole picture.

Peter S. added in 2030 according to the comp plan there will be substantial east side growth and growth throughout the valley.

### **Lowry / TPAU East**

Joan H. – Takes some of the traffic away from the intersection of North and South Phoenix crossing Fern Valley, moving the majority of the traffic North is a positive.

Madison T. – No Comment.

Terry H. – I like moving the intersection further away from Phoenix Hills, don't see the gas station taken out, this one is good.

Dack D. – More favorable than the previous

Mark G. – No Comment.

Pauly H. – No Comment.

David Lewin – Second what Joan said, removes traffic further north from the subdivision, think it is a viable option.

Bob K. – I think it is an option we should look at.

Harry P. – Preferable for the east, accessible, keeps the city together and I like it.

David Lowry – If this alignment was changed a little I think it makes it viable, revisit the question if it could come across the existing overpass. This entertains a Phoenix interchange as opposed to a South Medford interchange.

Lee C. – This is better than the other one.

Lenny N. – I agree, think this is a potentially viable alternative. I like that it can hook up with the existing overpass, point out that anything that moves trucks away from existing footprint forces them to the north, this would in fact take out the gas station it would be at the end of a cul-de-sac and I think it would close their business.

Tani W. – Asked if there would have to be exception between the signalized intersections.

Christina Fera-Thomas explained the traffic movements and intersections, no exception needed.

### **PBA East**

Joan H. – Intersection too close to subdivision.

Madison T. – Good, I like it.

Terry H. – Intersection too close to subdivision.

Dack D. – Trucks only go through intersection once, does not divide the city, least cost.

Mark G. – No Comment.

Pauly H. – Trucks only go through once, a plus for the east side.

David Lewin – Don't favor this option, all traffic intersects at the edge of the neighborhood.

Bob K. – I agree there would be a traffic flow problem, another problem is the trucks don't necessarily stop they have a tendency to roll through the intersection.

Harry P. – Undesirable.

David Lowry – Works with the 6-lane diamond.

Lee C. – I am with Harry on this one.

Lenny N. – Very viable solution using the existing footprint.

Tani W. – I agree with that.

#### **4. Public Comment**

Vicki Guarino, RVCOG Facilitator

Edgar Hee prepared a written testimony in favor of bicycle facilities on all options. He discussed different transportation plans mentioned in the testimony. He gave 20 copies to Debbie T. of ODOT for distribution to committee.

Man from audience- I want to thank the CAC committee for their time and the people from ODOT as well. Although I congratulate you on your diligence to the duty you have been assigned, I have a criticism. Sometimes we profess to adhere to doctrine written by other people who are not familiar with what is going on here. Federal regulations sometimes are wrong; we should have pooled our thoughts and petitioned the agencies in control. The South Stage interchange should have been built before an interchange in Phoenix.

Muriel Johnson commented that it is a matter of perception, the 1200 feet you are talking about that would go up to Home Depot is less than a quarter of a mile, the distance of Breckenridge.

Albert Reynoso - The PBA East sounds like the logical way to go, self-sufficient based on these numbers as far as real estate and homes back up against the truck entrance. We need the South Stage interchange, you are preparing for Medford not Phoenix.

Lorraine Sexton wanted the committee to consider that we need only one bridge across Bear Creek, whatever is decided keep the east and west connected.

Mark Kellembach talked about the Meadowview petition signed by residents strongly favoring the North SPUI. It would keep east/west traffic from Medford out of the residential area.

Karen Jones commented that the road has been remodeled many times to the detriment of the subdivision and if the intersection was moved further north it would be to our benefit.

## **5. Initial Options Screening**

Vicki Guarino, RVCOG Facilitator

Vicki G. explained the ballot to committee members. They needed to pick a first, second, and third choice. Debbie T. said that what she was hoping for is that options will be dropped that don't make sense to people. The committee asked technical questions about option refinement and possible scenarios.

## **6. Next Steps**

Debbie Timms, ODOT

- Take ballots and tally them for the PDT meeting tomorrow
- PDT meeting tomorrow, they will have a ballot and be asked what their thoughts on the top 3 are
- Come back to the committee next month and decide what can be dropped and what can move forward
- What information you need from us

## **7. Public Comment**

Vicki Guarino, RVCOG Facilitator

Rosalie Lindvig wanted to know sequence of events, tomorrow you will count the ballots of the CAC members, tell PDT members what the CAC recommended and then PDT will vote. You will go over both votes, will we know at the meeting tomorrow what the PDT voted on? Debbie T. responded yes.

Glen Archambault wanted to report on road system and felt that things have improved considerably. People are working with each other better. And as we look into the future technology will change and things will be cleaned up. It is not quite the catastrophe we think it is. The future is not as bad as you all think.

Lisa Sandrock said she lived on the east side and she thinks the City of Phoenix needs to take a serious look at where they are going regarding growth.

## **8. Comfort Check**

Vicki Guarino, RVCOG Facilitator

Joan H. – Feel we have been productive and moving forward

Terry H. – Went through the 2 ½ years of information we have been given. Tonight we are voting on the best alternatives and tonight I have a strong level of comfort.

Dack D. – Appreciate everyone's hard work on this.

Mark G. – Feel positive and more sense of accomplishment than I have in a long time.

Pauly H. – I feel the same as Terry, I have done the same thing, phase 1,2, 3 and we are right on as time goes, I am very pleased.

David Lewin – I second what everyone else has said, getting closer and closer, feel like we are making progress, have not felt that for awhile.

Bob K. – I appreciate the fact that everyone was able to speak their mind. We all learn as everyone speaks their mind, looking forward to moving beyond our position points and find a good solution.

Harry P. – It was a good controlled meeting.

Madison T. – I want to thank you for preparing all the information you have sent to us, gave us an opportunity for study before we got here, you should all be commended for getting this out to us.

David Lowry – I will second that, the colored handouts, sensitivity analysis, the way the whole meeting was done was excellent, helped us to take this step and make some decisions.

Lee C. – Seems we have gone well beyond what I expected, good organized meeting and thank you very much.

Lenny N. – I think it went extremely well tonight, thank you.

Tani W. – I agree with that, this process is by no means over, we have to survive the aftermath of it, thank you.

## **9. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

Next meeting:     Wednesday, December 6, 2006 from 6:30-8:30 p.m.  
                          Phoenix High School Commons  
                          Phoenix, Oregon