



MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Date: June 7, 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: June 2006

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

CAC Absent: No members were absent.

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
Vicki Guarino, 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, ODOT;
Jim Wear, Phoenix; Dale Petrsek, Jackson County; Murray LaHue, Phoenix City Council; Nick Fortey, FHWA

1. Introductions, Review Agenda, Approve Minutes

Vicki Guarino, RVCOG Facilitator

Guarino began the meeting at 6:35 and asked everyone to please sign-in and if they wanted to be on the mailing list to include their zip code on the sign-in sheet. She explained that this

was a joint meeting with the CAC (Citizen's Advisory Committee) and the PDT (Project Development Team) and that it was the first meeting that the committees have come together. The committees started with introductions and reviewed the agenda for tonight's meeting. Guarino said this was an informational session and that no decisions would be made this evening. She asked committee members to review the CAC and PDT minutes for changes or corrections. David Lewin said on page 2, number 4 should be David Lewin and not David Lowry for the CAC minutes. On the PDT minutes Murray LaHue was confused as to page 6 top line of the page about Old Fern Valley Road. It was determined by staff that the sentence should read "Old Fern Valley Road would remain open to serve Petro" (not Peterbilt). Minutes were approved with corrections as stated.

2. Public Comments

Vicki Guarino, RVCOG Facilitator

Ken Hanks: It seems to be reverting back to the old plans even though we have new plans we need to negotiate something for existing businesses that will serve the community. The elaborate plans need to be altered to serve the community. Keep also in mind that citizens are forcibly removed by law and we do not want to go there as a community. We have more adequate traffic flow currently than most big cities have. The only place the city will grow is on the east side, the west side is already fully grown to capacity. We must keep the current infrastructure and change it on the east side when the time comes. Need to keep it down to reality of what our town is and what it will become. We have an agenda to protect the city first and the plans will not be as elaborate as everyone thinks they should be for traffic flow.

Peter Buckley: I want to offer a quick comment of encouragement. I can't tell you what it means to the colleagues I speak to about how this process has been a very challenging process but everyone has responded in a way that makes our state proud. The community adjusting to the process of Phoenix has come together in a wonderful way and I am really impressed with what the Phoenix Business Association has done by sending representatives to Salem to find out exactly what the need is and what the region as a whole needs. It shows the highest quality of citizenship in my opinion. My appreciation for the process and the willingness to adapt and my encouragement in the next step to please stick together to make the interchange work, but most of all making sure the City of Phoenix gets what the City of Phoenix wants to be.

Woman in audience: The unemployment rate is now 9% and the government is trying to make it 50% by closing all businesses.

Man in audience: Can anyone here say growth is not inevitable, that is my question, growth is not inevitable, thank you.

Rosalie Lindvig: I want to read a letter in behalf of Alan and Derek DeBoer: We want to express our support for the Phoenix Business Association alternative for the new overpass project; we regret we are not able to attend this meeting. After reviewing the alternatives we believe the PBA proposal is the one that meets the ultimate goals with the least amount of negative impact and in the most effective manner.

3. Project Update

Debbie Timms, ODOT

Incorporated with other agenda items.

4. CAC Resident/Low Income Neighborhoods Appointment

Vicki Guarino, RVCOG Facilitator

Guarino explained that there was an opening on the CAC particularly with Low Income Neighborhoods. She said the members should still have Madison Taylor's application who lives in Coleman Creek Estates and would be replacing Wendy Nichols. Guarino asked if anybody had any questions for Madison. Pauly H. asked Madison T. how long she has lived in Coleman Creek Estates. Madison T. responded that it had been 8 years and Pauly H. further questioned if she had often talked to Wendy N. about this project. Madison T. said she was actually not aware of this project until January of this year, knew the project was in the works but was not familiar with the details of it. Joan H. asked why she wanted to serve on the committee. Madison T. responded that there were a lot of people who are not represented, primarily the Hispanic minorities at Coleman Creek and the residents have had difficulty getting out of the park and getting to work. Guarino told the committee that they could agree to appoint Madison T. to take Wendy's place on the CAC and that they could do so tonight.

The CAC Committee unanimously voted Madison Taylor to the CAC position representing Resident / Low Income Neighborhoods.

5. David Lewin New Option

David Lewin, CAC

David Lewin explained that this option is a work in progress and that the idea is currently being run by the traffic engineers to see if it is feasible. He said basically he took a totally different approach and interestingly enough it was very close to the Phoenix Business Association option. He added that until the traffic engineers felt comfortable with it working he felt there was no point in taking up time. He wanted to thank Sandy Christianson who helped with the idea and he appreciated the help of the Phoenix Business Association for their comments.

6. Phoenix Association Alternative

Lenny Neimark and Tani Wouters, CAC

Brian Sheadel and Christina Fera-Thomas, ODOT

Lenny N. presented the Phoenix Association Alternative. He began by saying that he was chosen to represent a diverse group of voices of which many do not agree and with a lot of different agendas. He said this alternative is the product of a lot of people working together that have come up with an alternative that has a lot of potential to solve issues that can do the

most good and cause the least harm. He and Tani drove to Salem to try to figure out what would work for the most people possible while providing for the growth needs of the community. He stated that this is a work in progress and has not officially gone to the Phoenix Business Association.

- West side-ramps lengthened, 6 lanes
- Two lanes of travel to the west, incorporating one left turn lane
- Two lanes going to the east, one left turn lane
- Moving to the west 2 lanes widen to 3
- Expanded bridge across Bear Creek
- Proposing new connection out the back of Coleman Creek

Highway 99 connection:

- Give and take from both sides to accommodate numbers and capacity required
- Two southbound lanes as well as 2 left turn lanes allow turn on Bolz Road
- Two northbound lanes

Harry P. asked how school buses would get in and out of Coleman Creek Estates with right turn only. Lenny N. said they could come in the back access way and circle around.

Bob K. asked if on existing Highway 99 if the widths allowed for sidewalks and bicycle lanes. Lenny N. said sidewalks allowed and bike lanes shared. Bob K. suggested that when bikes and vehicle share an access lane it should be clearly marked as a shared lane. He called it a Sharows Lane and thinks it is used in Portland and Eugene and will get more information for the committee. Pauly H. added that people on the east side that have motorized vehicles (handicap) to get over to Ray's that they would be able to use that lane over the freeway.

Terry H. asked Christina F. if there had been any discussion on the lights with the two intersections of lights being so close together and would it be a problem. Fera-Thomas responded that the two signals are coordinated but the left turns are always full, need to consider. Joan H. wanted to know if there was enough distance between the signals on Fern Valley and Luman Road to get across to Coleman Creek Estates. Lenny N. said that more options needed to be explored. Dack D. asked Sheadel what footage would be taken from Ray's parking lot. Sheadel answered it would be 12-14 feet about three-quarters of a length of a parking spot. Marmon asked Madison T. if the circulation in the proposal is functional for the Coleman Creek facility. Madison T. answered it would be if you go to 99 and turn in. Joan H. wanted to know if there was a mandatory width for sidewalks or if it was flexible. Sheadel said it is a 4-5 foot bare minimum and 7 foot standard. Joan H. commented that she would like to see them as wide as possible along 99 so citizens do not feel they are walking along side the highway. Lenny N. added that it was his understanding is that there would be enough room for the 7foot standard. Jim W. said the city plans to get wider sidewalks from 8-12 feet wide.

Man from audience commented that he had a job constructing wheel chair ramps and if there was a 7 foot sidewalk on Highway 99 and ADA compliant access it would be a lot safer and people would use it a lot more and it would be a vast improvement for the citizens of Phoenix.

East Side Fern Valley:

- Moving across northbound, 2 right turn lanes to capture trucks going to Petro
- 2 through lanes

- Coming from south- one through lane and 2 dedicated right turn lanes

David Lewin asked if all truck traffic was going down the revised Pear Tree Lane or all truck traffic in both directions going down South Phoenix Road. Lenny N. responded that the bulk of truck traffic will go down the lane to the service area and continue out to Furry Road to make a left turn out to the freeway.

North Phoenix Road: Lenny N. explained they took a look at the topography and followed a path that goes through Arrowhead Ranch whose owners have agreed to easements. The existing road would become a service road. David Lowry commented that he was most affected by this plan. He said the way it loops out seems like the long way around; where you planned the road is feasible from an engineer standpoint and makes business access easier. He added that he has a 35-acre commercial block and taking this piece and breaking it into four sections with questionable access would be a waste of a resource and an expensive land proposition for ODOT. Marmon asked if there was any current discussion of land-use implications in terms of going outside the UGB and areas that would require goal exceptions. Tani W. said they did discuss that the county would have to do goal exceptions. She said there would be larger development in the Southeast Medford area and the idea is that this proposal would help to alleviate traffic congestion for future growth. Terry H. added that there had been discussion between Phoenix and Medford property owners that going along I-5 and connecting into the future South Stage would play really well for connectivity.

Peterbilt Representative comment: Ted said the main goal for them is to have room for trucks to make the corner in and out of the facility, it appears to be wide open and I would sign up for this plan.

Marmon explained that when you start talking about goal exceptions and making a case for an alignment it will be very difficult. This is an issue he wanted to bring up so the teams could be aware of it. He further added that unless the city extends the UGB to incorporate that land, we would need to stay with the existing zoning and it is important to have these conversations up front. David Lowry asked if you could have a SPUI interchange and still have all the access shown -- from the shopping center and west into Phoenix. Sheadel said the design shows a connection to the SPUI with dual left turns to the freeway.

Lenny N. handed out a matrix comparing the SPUI to the Phoenix Business Alternative. He said you would be spending twice as much money on the SPUI at the expense of business and property owners for five years worth of growth, and at an additional cost of \$45-\$50 million dollars. David Lowry asked if these were ODOT cost numbers; Sheadel responded that \$20-\$25 million is more realistic. Lenny N. responded that cost estimates can change, and we do not have to solve every problem right now. He added that this alternative would have significantly less impact with a real opportunity to connect the east side neighborhoods to the west side neighborhoods using the existing roadways.

David Lowry said the CAC and PDT followed a federally dictated procedure for determining the project purpose, goals and objectives and have spent a great deal of time on that. He added that members determined what the ratings should be for various plans and felt that this was not a result of this process; his understanding was that a lot of these things were opinions of individuals and do not reflect the product of the federally dictated process that the

committee has gone through. Tani W. congratulated the committee on what they have done in the past 18 months, and said we (the business association and concerned citizens) have done in five months what the committees have been unable to do in 18, and have pulled the community together. She said they feel they have met the goals and the purpose and need. She said they have worked closely with ODOT and that ODOT has modeled the numbers. She said they have come up with an alternative that does not need to include a SPUI. David Lowry said his concern is choosing an alternative that will meet the future traffic requirements of Phoenix and the surrounding area. He added that there were a lot of good things about the proposed alternative that make a lot of sense. Marmon said the project needs to stay consistent, using the same criteria to evaluate every alternative. The project owes it to the teams to go through that same evaluation process with the Phoenix Business Alternative, using the goals and objectives the teams have developed.

Lenny N. quoted from numerous sources that there was not enough funding for a SPUI and that the committee should carefully consider this. He said there are a lot of people who are anxious to move on and he and Tani believe they have brought to the table an alternative with a great deal of potential. David Lowry said the committee has not been talking about numbers up to this point and wanted to know more about the funding. Tani W. added that she thought this has been a great process and that the Phoenix Business Association does not want to delay the project, but work together to find a workable solution.

7. Alternatives Discussion

Brian Sheadel and Christina Fera-Thomas, ODOT

No discussion at this meeting due to time restraints.

8. Next Steps

Debbie Timms, ODOT

Timms said the committee needed to take the information from the matrix handed out tonight and discuss it in more detail. Marmon said there will be two meetings that will take place before the next CAC and PDT meeting to discuss design exceptions and fatal flaws in the alternatives and see if ODOT traffic engineers are comfortable with them. He added that it is important to look at the pros and cons of all the alternatives.

David Lowry said the cost issue is significant and if a SPUI is not feasible maybe the committee should not even look at it and that ODOT could give them guidance.

Bob K. suggested that before members look at the pros and cons, they should look at the rules for the project. He said it looked like the Phoenix Business committee played by different rules and he wanted to see everything on the same playing field. He added that if this committee had the same flexibility as the business committee, the CAC would have come up with some different options and it is only fair to look at the alternatives with all rules on the table. Marmon said the difference was that this committee looked at alternatives that did not require exceptions to state guidelines. Bob K. said he didn't think the committee should get to the point of comparing alternatives before all the alternatives conform to the

same rules and guidelines. He said the committees were told they could not bend the rules. If the rules can be changed we need to know that so when we compare alternatives or evaluate for recommendations we need to know what is acceptable and what is not.

9. Public Comment

Vicki Guarino, RVCOG Facilitator

Murray LaHue: The decision to have joint meetings was the correct decision. I think as a decision maker it has been a great help to listen to the CAC instead of just being told what their recommendations are. I think we should continue the joint meetings. I recall conversation that decisions the CAC would make would apply to alternatives without exceptions. All Alternatives should play by the same rules, and perhaps others should be brought back. I have a lot of respect for the people on this committee and I think they have listened attentively and acted accordingly and I want to congratulate them on their efforts.

Jim Wear: For the schedule we were on at the beginning, it appears we kind of started over and are we in danger of losing any of the funding that we would have had?

Timms: No loss of funding

Lorie Sexton: Before you go forward I would like you to go back and study the diamonds a little more or it is not a legal process.

Muriel Johnson: Seems like things have shifted, one of the things I have seen in this process over the last few years is that you were honoring the residents of the East Side and trying to move the interchange a little farther away from us. Tonight I feel Phoenix is even more divided because what you have taken through the process for the last many months was not fair to us. Marmon added that the alternative of moving Fern Valley Road to the north is still on the table.

Stan Bartell: I appreciate the work you do. The parameters that we are working with now, as this goes along, will work for everyone. I think we can come up with a great plan.

Al Bordeaux: The rules can be worked around. This project will affect the community. I want to see more cooperation and see this project move forward. I know we cannot make everyone in the whole community on both sides of the highway happy. It's too bad we are on both sides of the highway and I think we need to make a bigger effort to get both sides together as a community. The best thing that could happen is to put I-5 underground.

10. Comfort Check

Vicki Guarino, RVCOG Facilitator

CAC

Terry Helfrich: When we first started meeting just a few of us were here. I like to see all the community input. I think we are making progress and we can do it right.

Bob Korfhage: Regardless of where we come from I think we are in a good place now. As we work through this together we need to remind ourselves when we disagree that we are on the same team and we are working towards the same goal.

Lenny Neimark: A big thank you to Christina and Peter for being with us on this project, Jerry, I think you need to take a look at these statements I read about the money for the SPUI's and tell us whether it is true or not and that will determine a whole lot about how we proceed.

Tani Wouters: I think the way you set it up was nice, appreciate the effort in listening and helping us to work together and I appreciate it.

David Lewin: Thank you.

Joan Haukom: I want to thank the Phoenix Business Association for all their hard work and I would like to see our meetings stick with the agenda as far as time goes.

Mark Gibson: I want to echo what David said I think if we would have had more flexibility from the beginning we would have been in a different place about 6 months ago.

Harry Page: More work to be done, let's get all the facts and get the job done.

Dack Doggett: Appreciate all the work, we do need to look at the process. I personally was going to make a motion to drop the SPUI tonight. Timms responded that the CAC makes recommendations to the PDT and the PDT votes. The Business Association can make recommendations to the CAC.

Pauly Hinesly: I am enjoying this evening.

Madison Taylor: This has been educational and informative for me and I'm glad to see everyone working together toward a common goal. I can see the unfairness of the exceptions and I think it happened because of the vocal nature of the PBA, I think it is a good democratic process.

David Lowry: I want to thank Lenny, Tani, Christina, and Brian. Basically we are all on the same page and I think we are just gradually learning that. Newcomers are learning the things we had as constraints, I think what we would be promoting would be a lot different than what you saw had we the same opportunity to have flexibility and work one on one. We just didn't feel we had it.

Lee Carrau: I coached Murray for a week and he didn't miss a cue

PDT

Brian Sheadel: Ready to go home.

Christina Fera-Thomas: I am fine right now.

Jerry Marmon: I understand the concerns about the rules changing. I hope to have more clarity on this issue, and the exception issue next month. We are at a good spot as a team and moving forward.

Nick Fortey: I think this is a good meeting. We have to make sure all the alternatives are recorded the same for the NEPA process. Start out with what is the purpose and need of the project and that is how we develop the evaluation criteria. There is nothing that says things can't change along the way. Process is designed to encourage development of alternatives and evaluations just making sure that it is done in a consistent manner. Move these alternatives through with some type of notation system. The Phoenix Business Association needs to be very careful about easements, and cannot use the acquisition of right of way to prejudice an alternative. You have to be very careful as you move through the process that it doesn't disparage other alternatives. Impacts get weighted through the federal process. The money issue is important, but the whole process is designed to look at what is the ideal alternative, realizing that some alternatives may be really expensive. Look at what is cost beneficial; the budget issue should not drive the entire decision process. Think about what actions the agency needs to take for additional revenue if this is the alternative that moves forward.

Jim Wear: I like the idea that this group is moving forward thinking about keeping what this city has and accommodating growth. That is how we need to look at this, as a whole not as one against another.

Murray LaHue: I am pleased to be here. We are all going in the same direction. These committees serve a very good purpose and I welcome aboard the lady from Coleman Creek.

11. Agenda Build for Next CAC Meeting & Next Steps

Vicki Guarino, RVCOG Facilitator

Agenda item not discussed due to time restraints.

12. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

Next meeting – Thursday, July 6, 2006 from 6:30-8:30 p.m.

Phoenix High School Commons

Phoenix, Oregon