

DRAFT

FVI Project Development Team (PDT) Meeting #12 Draft Meeting Minutes

May 4, 2006, 9 a.m. to 12:00 a.m.

Jackson County Road and Parks Auditorium

PDT Members Present: Jerry Marmon (Environmental PM), Brian Sheadel (Roadway), Christina Fera-Thomas (TPAU), Jim Wear (City of Phoenix), Dale Petrasek (Jackson County Roads), Murray LaHue (City of Phoenix)

ODOT Present: Debbie Timms (Project Leader), Peter Schuytema (TPAU), David Pyles (Land Use), James Burford (ODOT Roadway), Susan Landis (ODOT)

Non-ODOT Present: Nick Fortey (FHWA), Vicki Guarino (RVCOG), Nancy Reynolds (URS), Tani Wouters (CAC), Lenny Neimark (CAC)

1. INTRODUCTIONS, REVIEW AGENDA, APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The PDT last met in January 5, 2006. The PDT approved the January minutes without changes. Much of the agenda for this May meeting will focus on addressing the Hwy 99 Business and Property Owners recommendations, and discussing new alternatives.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

Lenny Neimark said that he would like to discuss the Hwy 99 business letter. The guidelines recommended in this letter were created through the Phoenix Business Association to identify ways to improve communications between the CAC, the PDT and the general public. Some of the recommendations may be superseded by previous actions by the CAC and PDT to respond to issues raised by the Hwy 99 business group. A number of CAC and community members have requested changes to the PDT and CAC—requesting that a hybrid form of the existing committees be developed through combining the CAC and PDT. Lenny said that it is important that both the CAC and PDT come together to critically evaluate alternatives. In addition, there is considerable duplication occurring at the two meetings—and coming together more frequently would help to reduce duplication of efforts and address public concerns.

Jerry Marmon asked whether having joint meetings would cover most of these concerns, and Lenny indicated they would.

Vicki Guarino said that a number of the suggestions for the PDT had been made through the CAC actions to address the issues, and some of the suggestions would likely be combined.

3. PROJECT UPDATE

Debbie said that the last PDT meeting was held in January. At that time, the PDT voted to move the CAC Table 1 SPUI and the Lowry SPUI forward into the environmental document. Shortly afterward, the PDT and CAC heard from the Hwy 99 business owners opposing the substantial

DRAFT

impacts to Hwy 99 associated with either of these alternatives. In response, the process was slowed down, and Brian Sheadel worked with the Hwy 99 business owners to come up with an alternative that would minimize impacts to Hwy 99 properties. A meeting with the Hwy 99 business owners was held on March 1 to discuss their concerns. An open house was held on March 15 to provide information on how alternatives were developed, and to get suggestions on options that might be considered. It was determined that three vacancies on the CAC needed to be filled: development, small business, and environmental justice (EJ). At the March CAC meeting, two of the vacancies were filled: Tani Wouters for small business, and Lenny Neimark for developers. The EJ vacancy has not yet been filled.

4. REVIEW OF CAC AND PUBLIC MEETINGS/NEW MEMBER APPOINTMENTS

Vicki discussed the March 1 meeting with the Hwy 99 business owners, where their concerns regarding Hwy 99 impacts from the two build alternatives were discussed. Also, the second public open house on March 15 took the public through the entire project development and alternative development process to show how we got to where we are in the process. The alternatives were displayed, and a matrix describing the decisions on alternatives was provided. The members of the public were asked to present their ideas, and this led to new suggested alternatives that the PDT will see at this meeting.

Vicki indicated that the PDT members have copies of the CAC minutes. Gary Leaming and Vicki have met with some members of the public and Hwy 99 business owners. Their biggest concerns center on impacts associated with the widening of Hwy 99 and the placement of a median along portions of Hwy 99. Concern regarding traffic flow is still an issue.

Vicki reiterated that two of the CAC vacancies were filled; and both of these new members are present at this PDT meeting. The EJ position is yet to be filled, but there is an applicant.

There is now a lot of interest in bringing the CAC and PDT together. Some CAC members would like to see the formation of one committee—by combining the CAC and PDT. A number of CAC members would at least like to see joint meetings.

5. PROPOSAL FROM BUSINESS AND PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION

Debbie Timms led a discussion to address the proposal from the Hwy 99 business and property owners. A key focus is on more communication with public—there was a strong feeling that the public was not part of the process, and that communication regarding the project and alternatives was inadequate.

Many of the recommendations in the proposal will be addressed by actions for more joint meetings. The following discussion reflects the PDT discussion of the Hwy 99 business owners “Proposal for Process Improvements, Change of Venue for Meetings, and Other Guidelines & Changes.”

DRAFT

Discussion:

- The proposal indicates that PDT meetings should be scheduled no sooner than 2 weeks after the most recent CAC meetings. This recommendation is based on the feeling that the current schedule (the PDT occurring the morning after the CAC meeting) does not allow adequate time for review and public comment. There was also a recommendation that the PDT meeting be held in Phoenix to promote more public attendance and involvement at those meetings.
- Lenny said that he feels there would be better interaction and communication by having the CAC and PDT teams meeting together. He felt this could help accelerate the process, and would result in less duplication of information. He said this would also address the issue of having the PDT meeting in the affected community to help with public involvement. He thought a 6:00 p.m. meeting would help make it easier for the public to be involved.
- Jerry asked if there were any PDT members who would not be able to make the Wednesday evening meetings. Jerry said that some resource members may not be able to attend.
- Dale Petrasek indicated that he probably could not make most of these meetings. He said that the County does not generally have a direct responsibility regarding the project—that it is basically a City of Phoenix project. The County is at the PDT meetings to help be a part of the solution for the city. Their major responsibility focuses on the bridge. When the project proceeds, the County will turn jurisdiction of the bridge over to the city. Dale said he could consider sending a new County representative in his place. He said he could review the materials, and vote via proxy if he cannot find someone to take his place.
- Jim Wear asked if the County needs to be present at the meetings to vote. He wondered if the County could review the information, and then vote later. Jim is definitely in favor of having joint CAC/PDT meetings. He said the presentations at the CAC and PDT meetings are almost identical. He felt the repeat of information at the two meetings has been a waste of his time. He would like to only receive the information once.
- Debbie said that there is a County responsibility regarding N. Phoenix Road.
- Jerry suggested that there be some joint meetings, and that maybe Dale could send a County liaison. He also felt there could be the need for additional PDT meetings as well.
- Murray stated that he felt the PDT members should attend all of the CAC meetings—that the more we work together, the better. This will help citizens be more involved. He supported having the PDT meetings in Phoenix.
- Peter Schuytema said that he would rather have joint meetings than have to come down from Salem two weeks in a row. He supports joint meetings. His only major concern is the potential large size of the meetings. Because of the number of non-voting members who would be present, we would probably need to extend the meetings to three hours in length. He felt there is already too little time to do the key presentations. Also, he thought some of the technical detail may not be of interest to some CAC members and the public. He said that, if the PDT has joint meetings with the CAC, and if PDT members cannot attend, they need to send an assigned proxy.
- Nick Fortey felt there could be some logistical issues. There is a difference in the functions of the CAC and the PDT—and he wondered how joint meetings could be made to work. He said there is a lot of duplication—but, sometimes, there are different levels of detail that are addressed at the PDT meeting vs. the CAC meeting. He felt the large

DRAFT

size of a joint CAC/PDT meeting would be harder to manage. He would like the PDT to determine how the process will work.

- Debbie said that, logistically, there would have to be some flexibility for joint and/or separate meetings.
- James Burford said there will be more noise resulting from the number of people in attendance.
- Lenny and Tani reiterated the public's desire to combine the groups to better serve the public. The community wants to be involved.
- Jerry said that we will have to figure out how to manage the meetings. However, he said that the PDT voting structure must remain the same; we will not combine the roles of the CAC and PDT and do a majority vote. He said it is important that there not be a conflict of interest in the decision-making process. He said that as long as we are clear on the decision-making role of the PDT and the recommendation role of the CAC, he is comfortable with going forward with joint meetings.
- Tani said that some PDT committees have a citizen-at-large. Lenny asked why a CAC representative could not be on the PDT—however, he felt this is probably a moot point if we have joint meetings. If we have joint meetings, we are all hearing the same things at the same time.
- Jerry said that the NEPA guidance on CAC representation is general; it only requires that the public be involved in the decision-making process.
- Nick Fortey said that the public involvement required through NEPA is actually very minimal. ODOT could actually just get the public involved simply by reviewing the environmental document at the end of the process. In some projects, the technical detail is all done first, and the public reviews the alternatives after they have been forwarded into the environmental document. Having the high level of public involvement that is occurring on this project is helpful upfront, but does pose more logistical issues. Although useful, it does have the possibility of hamstringing the entire project.
- Lenny said that he felt ODOT is being responsive to the public concerns, and that he appreciates their efforts.
- Dale felt that it is probably a good idea to join the CAC and PDT groups together. He had some concerns that there are two different committee roles, and a joint committee could negate that difference.
- Jerry reiterated that the purpose of the PDT is more technical. The CAC makes recommendations, but the PDT is the decision-making team. He voiced some concern that CAC members may not be comfortable with the joint meetings.
- Debbie said that the next CAC meeting will be held June 7—jointly with the PDT.
- Regarding the meeting location, the PDT supported having the meeting in Phoenix. Murray said that we could consider using the school auditorium. There was concern that the cafeteria will not work during the summer months because of the sun shining on the screen.
- Dale said that he will try to get someone from the County to take his place when he is not available for the evening meetings.
- Nick reiterated that from an outside perspective, in keeping with the federal process, it is important to remember that the CAC and the public have a different lens through which to view the project and make recommendations. We do not want to lose the sense of reviewing the project alternatives through the lens of agency interests and technical

DRAFT

requirements. He said it was important to retain the value of technical review. FHWA is interested in retaining the clarity of the decision-making process.

- Nancy Reynolds said that it is important to remember that engineers have to stamp the plans—they have to be able to live with the decisions that are made.
- There was general agreement that having more than one meeting a month would result in too little time to respond to requests, complete the necessary staff work, and communicate with people who are not at the meeting. We will have as many meetings as needed to digest the information and make the needed decisions.
- Lenny indicated that the process is now engaging the community—and that is addressing a lot of the concerns that were raised.
- A question was raised as to whether any of the PDT members felt pressured to vote if they weren't ready. Jim Wear said that he felt pressured to vote, and that he has been uncomfortable on the PDT—in part this was because he was unsure of who he represented: the City Council or the CAC. He felt that by combining the CAC and PDT, we will have the best information available to help make the decisions.
- Debbie indicated that Murray is replacing Jeannell Wyntergreen on the PDT. She also said that we'll have to work more to address the resource issues that are likely to occur through combining the two meetings.
- Tani said that she appreciated the dialog pertaining to combining the meetings.

(Note: Having joint meetings addressed most of the recommendations made by the Hwy 99 business owners.)

Decision

The PDT and CAC will have joint meetings in Phoenix, but the roles will still remain the same. The CAC makes recommendations to the PDT; the PDT still holds the decision-making authority.

Discussion

- The proposal suggested that the PDT and CAC revisit and redefine the project's Purpose and Need to meet a more limited scope of the project.
- Jerry said that the Purpose and Need, as currently written, is in conjunction with FHWA. He did not see a reason to re-address the Purpose and Need at this time.
- Lenny indicated that he was comfortable with that perspective, but that eventually a joint CAC/PDT may need to again discuss the Purpose and Need.

6. REVIEW STATUS OF ALTERNATIVES AND OPTIONS/NEW DESIGN CONCEPTS

Two alternative concepts were discussed: TPAU Revised Diamond and the Hwy 99 Business (PBA) Diamond. Peter and Christina provided volume/capacity ratios, turn movement requirements, intersection conflict points, and crash history for the new alternatives.

TPAU Revised Diamond

Description

- The alignment of Fern Valley represents what was shown in the Lowry alternative.

DRAFT

- Old Fern Valley Road would remain open to serve Peterbilt.
- The N. Phoenix connection remains the same configuration as it is currently.
- There would be signals at the ramp terminals; a 6-lane bridge; and 2 through lanes in each direction.
- Past Luman Road, the connection to Hwy 99 would be a 2-lane couplet: Fern Valley would be for westbound traffic, and Bolz would accommodate eastbound traffic. There would be an opportunity for U-turns at Luman.
- Hwy 99 would have the existing lane configurations, except that a right-turn would be added from Hwy 99 to Bolz for northbound traffic traveling east onto Bolz. For southbound traffic on Hwy 99, there would be a left-turn lane from Cheryl to Bolz; this is needed to reduce the queue lengths. (The extended queue helps alleviate the problems associated with not having dual left-turn lanes.)

Discussion

- James Burford said that we need to be sure signing is clear that southbound vehicles cannot turn left from Hwy 99 onto Fern Valley Road. We will need to work with the State Traffic Engineer to determine what would be acceptable.
- Peter said that because we would be keeping the same cross-section on Hwy 99, we would need to be willing to accept less level of service on that roadway. These intersections will require design exceptions.
- James said that if you cannot have dual left turns, a single left would allow some turning protection.
- Christina Fera-Thomas indicated that the traffic numbers for the TPAU alternative are more clear at this time than the Hwy 99 Business Diamond. Additional work is needed to further refine the traffic numbers for the Business Diamond.
- Nancy and Jerry voiced concern regarding the existing bike/pedestrian issues along Hwy 99, and how to incorporate adequate bike/pedestrian facilities along Hwy 99 if the existing cross-section is retained.
- Brian said that Fern Valley (from N. Phoenix to Hwy 99) would accommodate bikes and pedestrians with 8-foot shoulders and crosswalks. The problem area is on Hwy 99 where the roadway would not be widened for bikes and pedestrians. However, the outside lane would be 14 feet wide, and would thus be wide enough to operate as a shared roadway/bike lane.
- Nick said that adding a shoulder would result in right of way requirements. He reiterated the importance of documenting the decision-making process—why decisions are made. If we're going to have a narrower right of way, we need to identify why the decision is being made not to meet standards—this type of decision would have impacts, and we need to be sure we indicate why we're scaling down the alternative.
- Peter said that the matrix will reflect the varying implications of alternative standards and impacts.
- Jerry indicated that when we developed the SPUI alternatives, we did so to meet all of the required standards—these alternatives reflect what would be needed to fully address all standards. However, these would be very expensive and would result in substantial impacts—and that is why we're developing scaled-down alternatives. .
- Lenny said that the new alternatives were developed to respond to public concerns and interests.

DRAFT

- Nick said to be sure that it is clear at what point we determined to scale back alternatives that met the standards.
- James said we will need to take any scaled-back alternative to the Traffic section to determine what exceptions ODOT can live with, and what engineering standards cannot be compromised.
- Peter said he will take the new alternatives to the Traffic section to see if he can get some readings from the State Traffic Engineer's office at this point to see if they might be willing to sign off on the scaled-back alternatives.
- Nick said we probably should look at and document incrementalism: What's standard vs. what's the minimal acceptable standard, vs. what might be acceptable in-between these requirements.
- James said it is important to see what we can do to reduce impacts to Hwy 99.
- Jerry asked what happens if we reduce standards on Hwy 99. He said it appears that it will be about 2016 when queuing begins to interfere with interchange operations. We need to see how we might be able to improve the design to extend the life of the facility.
- Peter said that the original Diamond Interchange was originally dropped because it would not adequately address Phoenix's planned future growth. The SPUI was originally developed to allow for the additional desired growth.
- Brian indicated that we still have issues to work out regarding the new alternatives (e.g., they do not incorporate vertical control issues). He also said that both freeway on-ramps will have to be improved—and that what improvements will be made will be heavily weighted on what the public will accept.
- Peter said that we may eventually need to consider ramp metering. We can anticipate that near the peak hours, we are likely to see long queues. James indicated that we need to clarify what percent of time, we anticipate gridlock, and what percent of time we anticipate the alternatives will operate efficiently. The Region Manager and Region Traffic Engineer will make recommendations to the State Traffic Engineer regarding what exceptions and volume/capacity ratios they feel are acceptable. The ultimate decision lies with the State Traffic Engineer.
- Nick asked if we have the ability through the traffic models to determine the percent of time that the alternatives will function. Peter said that we can add some volumes to help determine about when this would occur. Nick said that this would be valuable information. It is important to determine what the public will be getting based on this level of investment: How many hours of smooth traffic flow will we be buying? Maybe we can make some improvements; but we should look at the shoulder hours—Will we be able to do something to help address those issues?
- Peter said that the model is more of an approximation; it will look at trends. Brian said that it would be helpful to have this graphically depicted.
- Dale asked what makes the current TPAU Diamond operate more efficiently than the original TPAU Diamond. Jerry said that we were looking at trying to meet standards with the original Diamond. Brian indicated that the new TPAU Diamond would require a substantial number of design standards. There will be issues regarding the ramp terminal and signal spacing. We would be giving up overall capacity in comparison to previous Diamond Interchanges. James felt there may also be vertical/sight-distance issues. There may be major fill and retaining walls required. Peter indicated that the original Diamond was standard; the operational difference from the new TPAU Diamond would be about 5

DRAFT

to 7 years. James said that operationally the new TPAU Diamond will work, but some safety issues will need to be addressed.

- Jim asked if there would be sidewalks on Hwy 99 with the new TPAU Diamond. Brian said that if additional sidewalks would be added, it would require more right of way. He also indicated that there would be queuing issues at the freeway due to left-turn requirements.
- Jim said that this alternative only addresses the existing 20-year growth. RPS decisions may exacerbate traffic problems and increase the time that the interchange will be over-capacity. Left-turn movements from Hwy 99 southbound onto Bolz eastbound could be a problem. He wondered if dual left turns could be incorporated. Brian indicated that it would require more right of way. We could move the alignment over slightly, but the lanes must line up north and south of the intersection.
- Brian said that the TPAU Diamond would be to standards, except for the Hwy 99 segment.
- Dale asked if both of the buildings in the triangle would be displaced. Lenny indicated that he had talked to the property owner, and he was willing to work out development designs around the proposed alternative alignment.

Business (PBA) Diamond

Brian worked with the Hwy 99 Business and Property Owners Association to develop this alternative.

Description

- The PBA Diamond uses the existing Fern Valley alignment.
- Luman would stay essentially in the same location as it is currently; it would have full access and a signalized intersection. There would be a left turn into the factory stores.
- A couplet would use existing Bolz Road and Fern Valley Road west of Luman—both roads would be one way, 2-lane roads.
- A suggestion was made at the CAC to try to realign the entrances to Coleman Creek Estates. This alternative would include a new road access to Coleman Creek off of Hwy 99.
- The PBA Diamond has a left-turn bay at Ray's.
- A right-turn lane eastbound at Bolz would be accomplished by shifting the lanes slightly. If there would be widening on both sides, there would still be about 4 to 6 feet of off-set.
- There would be signals at N./S. Phoenix Roads.
- N. Phoenix would be relocated east of hill rather than west of Arrowhead Ranch. There is a good grade in that area as the road runs through a valley; this would allow a more traditional alignment.
- The N. Phoenix realignment would impact Home Depot site. The connection to Home Depot would have to be via a long road extension. This would also impact access to the Peterbuilt property. Access to the truck stop would be similar to the existing access.
- The northbound off-ramp would have dual right turns. There would be dual left-turn lanes for the on-ramps.
- There would be an exclusive right-turn lane to Pear Tree Lane. The right-turn lane continues past Pear Tree Lane and becomes a right-turn lane at S. Phoenix. The outside

DRAFT

lane would be a through lane. The inside through lane would also serve as a left-turn lane, creating a dual left turn.

- There would be dual right-turn lanes from N, Phoenix onto Fern Valley Road.
- Pear Tree Lane would be realigned between the Texaco station and the Petro property. The tire shop portion of Petro would be removed.
- We still need to determine if there is sufficient storage for the ramps.

Discussion

- There was some discussion at CAC regarding how the Fern Valley and Cheryl intersection would work. One of the challenges will be to determine how to make Cheryl function, yet also allow for queuing movements onto Bolz. Currently, Cheryl is right-in/right-out; we need to determine what is an acceptable allowed move out of Cheryl. If it is changed from the current configuration, it is going to impact the storage at Bolz. If more turning movements occur out of Cheryl, it would result in long queues on Hwy 99/
- Nancy indicated that there was discussion at the CAC meeting last night about having a signal at Cheryl and a signal at Fern Valley that operate in tandem as one signal. The group concurred that this is an unusual configuration and it will require additional study. Lenny asked if James had seen this type of configuration work. James indicated that he had seen “split signals” work, but not necessarily with a 5-leg intersection, which is the case here because there is also an intersection leg at Ray’s access. The 5-leg intersection would be difficult to address with this configuration.
- Lenny asked if we could restrict left turns out of Rays; evaluate left-in, right-in, and right-out—but no left-out. He wondered if that might be a possible arrangement. James said that we need to brainstorm this. He wondered if we could force the left turn out of Rays and channel it into the outside lane—then channelize the left-turn from Cheryl into the inside lane.
- Peter said that it looks like this intersection could result in a 5-phase signal. James indicated that we need to engage Doug Bish or Gary xxxxx to discuss the solutions for this intersection early in the process.
- Jerry asked if the business owners were adamant about a signal at Cheryl. Tani said that they were not adamant. She said they could go back and see if they could look at the technical information and find some solution that would work.
- Brian said that the interchange alternatives may have some interchangeable elements on the east side vs. west side.
- James indicated that there would be design exceptions with this alternative (e.g., for the distance from the interchange off-ramps to Pear Tree Lane).
- Although the existing N. Phoenix Road would no longer be used for through traffic, there may be some benefit to retaining it as a frontage road. Lenny suggested there may also be merit in using portions of the old N. Phoenix Road to serve as an alternate access to South Stage.
- Brian said that the first access to the truck stop would probably be near gas station. James felt that it may be a right-in only at that location, and then the trucks could return to Fern Valley Road to the east. Murray asked how trucks will get to the fueling islands if you restrict trucks to right-turn only; sometimes there are 3 or 4 trucks waiting to get into the access. Brian replied that the design does not take away the truck access. The Pear Tree Lane access would be more for the motel and gas station. Lenny said that Petro may be able to assist by looking at how to reduce queuing at the fuel lines.

DRAFT

- Dale pointed out that neither of these alternative alignments use N. Phoenix as the through movement.

7. MATRIX

The following discussion focused on information provided in the matrix that compares the CAC Lowry SPUI, CAC Table 1 SPUI, TPAU Diamond, and the Business (PBA) Diamond.

- The biggest difference between the TPAU and PBA alternatives is amount of growth that would be allowed. The southbound left at Bolz is the constraint—the more storage capacity that is accommodated, the more growth that can be addressed. We need to determine how we can gain more storage space. Lenny asked if two left-turn lanes could be aligned, and increase the capacity of the intersection. Brian indicated that it is important to align the lanes north and south of Bolz for operations and safety. He felt there may be space between Fern Valley and Bolz to align a turn lane. He'll see if that is a possibility. More left turns need to be evaluated in terms of how they would impact the freeway.
- Peter said we should evaluate how we can shorten some of the tapers, and that maybe that would help to minimize impacts to properties.
- James said there needs to be enough room for vehicles to line up **before** they get into an intersection; the tapers cannot occur in the intersection.
- Brian said that we cannot widen on only one side north of the Bolz and widen on the other side south of Bolz—it won't work because they wouldn't align.
- If we can resolve the queuing issues at Bolz, it would add more time to how long this will alternative would function.
- Through movements rather than left turns would provide more room for expanded development.
- Tani asked whether an overcrossing at South Stage would affect storage. It would provide another route. Peter said the left turn at Phoenix would still be an issue. If we can come up with way to mitigate the left-turn issue, it would really help the longevity of the alternative.
- Jerry asked if we could incorporate a N. Phoenix through alignment with the Diamond configuration. James said it could not be done without substantial right of way impacts. In order to maintain the bridge alignment, the N. Phoenix alignment would have to be retained.
- Peter suggested changing the connection to N. Phoenix slightly by rounding the east corner turning north. He said that if we could change the alternatives to get N. Phoenix as the through movement; this would allow more traffic and more growth.
- Lenny indicated that the property owner on east side is willing to donate that land for a realignment of N. Phoenix to the east of Arrowhead Ranch.

8. NEXT STEPS

- A joint CAC/PDT meeting will be scheduled on June 7.
- We still need to review the new Lewin alternative.
- Also, the matrix that's being developed needs to be discussed with the CAC and PDT.

DRAFT

9. PUBLICCOMMENT

- There was no public comment.

NEXT MEETING:

The next PDT meeting will be a joint meeting with the CAC on June 7 in Phoenix; it will be an evening meeting.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Agenda—Project Development Team Meeting
2. FVI Project Development Team Meeting #11, Draft Meeting Minutes
3. Hwy 99 Business and Property Owners Citizens Advisory Committee Proposal for Process Improvements, Guidelines & Changes; Project Development Team Proposal for Process Improvements, Change of Venue for Meetings, and Other Guidelines & Changes; Fern Valley Interchange Modeling Guidelines Proposal
4. Fern Valley Interchange Phase 2 Crash History Summary
5. Why is a Raised/Curbed Median Necessary? (conflict points at intersections)
6. Fern Valley Interchange – 2030 V/C Ratios and Queuing
7. Alternative Impact Matrix

(Note: CAC May agenda and April meeting minutes were also provided.)