



MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Date: Thursday, August 9, 2007

Purpose: Citizen Advisory Committee Meeting

Distribution: CAC Members, Project Development Team, public

From: Vicki Guarino, RVCOG

Prepared by: Pat Foley, RVCOG

CAC Attendees: Irving Citron, Jay Eastwood, Alex Grossi, Deanie Manning, Jim Rafferty, Bart Van Syoc and Ron Wright

CAC Absent: Rowdy Bates, Suzanne Myers, Janine Law and Randy Repp

Project Team Attendees: Jerry Marmon, ODOT Environmental Project Manager
Jayne Randleman, ODOT Project Leader
Jason Sheadel, ODOT Roadway
Dorothy Upton, ODOT TPAU
Gary Leaming, ODOT Public Information
Eryca McCartin, ODOT District 8 Manager
Art Anderson, ODOT Rogue Valley Area Manager
Bill Boyett, ODOT Construction Information
Angela Findley, Parsons Brinckerhoff Consultant Project Manager
Vicki Guarino, RVCOG
Pat Foley, RVCOG

Other Attendees: Robert Bernstein, Consultant
David Frasher, Grants Pass City Manager
12 members of the public

1. Call to Order/Introductions/Review Agenda/Approve Minutes

Vicki Guarino, RVCOG

Vicki called the meeting to order. She reviewed the agenda and asked if there were any changes to the July 12, 2007 joint CAC/PDT minutes. There were no additions or changes to the minutes. The minutes will be forwarded to the PDT for their approval.

2. Meeting Objectives & Project Update

Jerry Marmon, ODOT Environmental Project Manager

Jerry started by reviewing the meeting objectives. 1) To review the Working Group (WG) Alternative that was forwarded by the city of Grants Pass and 2) Vote on whether the WG Alternative should be forwarded for further analysis.

Jerry went on to say that a screening process has been used on all of the alternatives to decide which alternatives should be forwarded into the Environmental Assessment (EA) for full analysis. That same screening process will be applied to the WG Alternative. The task this evening is to objectively lay out the pros and cons, using the data collected to date, for this alternative. There will then be a vote on whether the WG Alternative should be forwarded into the EA. The vote will be done by ballot. You will be asked to provide reason for your vote. The reasons are just as important as your vote.

Jerry outlined the activities that have taken place since the July CAC/PDT meeting.

- July 19th: City submitted revised Working Group Alternative to ODOT.
- July 20th: ODOT began design refinements and traffic analysis on Working Group Alternative.
- August 1st: City Council approved resolution supporting Working Group Alternative and formally submitted the alternative to the CAC and PDT for consideration in the HWY 199 Expressway Upgrade Process

Jerry pointed out that the WG Alternative has been modified based on the traffic analysis recently done by ODOT. He then reviewed the decision-making process to date and the next steps.

3. Refinements Made to the Working Group Alternative

Jason Sheadel, ODOT

Dorothy Upton, ODOT

Jason referred to PowerPoint slides to describe the modifications made to the WG Alternative. Changes were based on traffic modeling which indicated queue lengths and necessary storage lane lengths. Modifications to Hwy 199 were made to improve through traffic. He referred to maps as he described modifications in detail. He compared the WG Alternative to Alternatives A and C.

Between Tussey Ln and Ringuette St:

- Hwy 199 has a single left turn lane to northbound Ringuette St.

Fairgrounds Rd to Redwood Ave:

- Retain signal at Hwy 199 and Redwood Ave.

- 2-lane slip ramp from westbound Hwy 199 to westbound Redwood Ave on existing Redwood Ave alignment with the right lane becoming a trapped right turn lane westbound. Center lane can turn right onto Redwood Ave. or continue west on Hwy 199.
- 3 lane section westbound on Hwy 199 tapers to 2 lanes between Redwood Ave and Allen Creek Rd, eastbound Hwy 199 expands from 2 to 3 lanes between Allen Creek Rd. and Redwood Ave.
- Dual left turn lanes from eastbound Redwood Ave to eastbound Hwy 199
- Exclusive right turn lane from eastbound Redwood Ave to westbound Hwy 199

Allen Creek Rd vicinity:

- Signal at Hwy 199 and Allen Creek Rd handles all through turning movements except → Left turns from southbound Allen Creek Rd to eastbound Hwy 199. The movement would be accommodated at the Redwood Ave/Hwy 199 intersection signal.
- Widening of Allen Creek Rd between Hwy 199 and Redwood Ave
- Widening of Redwood Ave with concrete median from Hwy 199 to Redwood Circle
- North extension of Allen Creek Rd to provide access to Flower Ln and Pansy Ln

Allen Creek Rd to Dowell Rd:

- Same as Alternatives A and C except there are two lanes on Hwy 199 in each direction instead of three.

West of Dowell Rd:

- Same as Alternatives A and C.

Summary of Concerns, Questions and Comments:

Bart Van Syoc: The drawings for Alternatives A and C do not show Tussey Ln. He thought that Tussey Ln had been closed off. Jason said that there is a right-in and right-out at Tussey Ln on all three alternatives. Also, he does not feel there is enough room for the city's improvements along Redwood Ave (curbs, gutters, sidewalks, center turn lane, etc.) It doesn't appear to be wide enough to accommodate all of the new features plus a bicycle path. Jason said he had heard that a bicycle lane will be included. Bart went on to say the WG Alternative map shows two lanes of travel in each direction. When looking at the businesses that are impacted by Alternatives A and C, the width of the WG Alternative will also impact those same businesses because there will be no place to park.

Ron Wright: He is concerned about how right of way will impact the Triple A RV and the other businesses along Hwy 199.

Jim Rafferty: He wants to make sure the signal at Fairgrounds Rd stays until the circulation plan is done.

Alex Grossi: He asked if the signal at Hwy 199 and Schutzwahl Rd had been pulled. Jerry Marmon said the WG Alternative originally had a large corridor plan. This alternative is a subset of that plan and does not include that intersection.

Dorothy Upton referred to PowerPoint slides. The first slide showed Volume/Capacity (v/c) ratios (year 2025) at project intersections for all alternatives which are compared to the No Build scenario. The standard is .70 along Hwy 199. There were no v/c ratio differences for all of the alternatives at Midway Ave, Hubbard Ln, Willow Ln, Henderson Ln, Tussey Ln and Hwy 99 (6th St). The v/c ratios are different at:

	<u>Alternative A</u>	<u>Alternative C</u>	<u>WG Alternative</u>
Dowell Rd	0.78	0.78	0.77
Allen Creek Rd	0.84	0.74	0.78
Redwood Ave	n/a	n/a	0.64
Fairgrounds Rd	0.48*	0.48*	0.48*
Ringuette St	0.71	0.71	0.82

*Unsignalized intersection

The modeling results show that all alternatives perform similarly at these intersections. Intersections with a v/c ratio above .70 would require a design exception. The WG Alternative handles traffic (Allen Creek Rd/Redwood Ave area) with two intersections. Alternative A handles all of the traffic at one intersection. Alternative C has one intersection but handles the major and minor traffic differently. The v/c ratio difference at Ringuette St (Alternatives A and C verses WG Alternative) is because the WG Alternative has a single left.

Questions:

Bart Van Syoc: He wanted to know what the justification is for having a single turn lane verses dual turn lanes at the Ringuette Rd intersection. Dorothy said that the dual turn lane reduces the v/c ratios but there are more business impacts with the dual turn lane.

Deanie Manning: She wanted clarification on v/c ratios. Do they measure how well the intersection will operate? If there is only one lane with the same volume of traffic, you might not get through it in one signal which would cause longer queues. Dorothy gave an example. If you needed to have 500' of storage, you can either have 500' in two lanes or one lane. With one lane you cannot progress through in one cycle. It can be done with one lane but it will not operate as efficiently or effectively.

Dorothy went on to explain that five to ten simulation runs were done at each intersection which generated the v/c ratios and length of queues. Because of the similar performance results, the analysis went on to look at how the alternatives compared across the system in the areas of signal progression and sensitivity to growth.

Ideally for the best traffic progression the signals should be spaced at least a half of mile apart (regular and consistent spacing). Dorothy used a PowerPoint graph to show the signal progression for each alternative. Alternatives A and C meet the half mile spacing requirement.

The modeling that has been done for all of the alternatives is based on a certain level of future networks and growth. This information, provided by the city three years ago when the model was built, determined the parameters for our analysis. If more recent information has not been adopted and changed in the city's Comprehensive Plan, it cannot

be formally added into the project design. In order to address concerns about changes that have occurred a 'Sensitivity Analysis' was performed. This analysis assumes that there will be an additional 10% traffic going through the intersections. The analysis went on to see how flexible each alternative was and how each would perform. The analysis showed that Alternative A could best accommodate the additional traffic. Alternative C failed but could be modified (without drastic changes) to accommodate additional traffic. The WG Alternative failed and cannot be modified without drastic changes. Dorothy went on to explain what would and wouldn't work in the future.

Summary of Concerns, Questions and Comments:

Deanie Manning: She wanted to know if the model that used information provided three years ago, could be reworked. Dorothy said the modeling parameters hold us to the current Comprehensive Plan. If we went back at this time we would only be looking at justifications of what is in the model. Rather than going back and regenerating all of the modeling numbers we did the 10% analysis (Sensitivity Analysis). Dorothy said that the existing model does take into account projected growth. The 10% is over and above what is projected in the city's Comprehensive Plan.

Ron Wright: He does not believe that the growth that has happened in the last three years has been taken into account in this model. Dorothy said that the model does grow over the twenty year life of the project. Some of this growth is already included in the model.

Bart Van Syoc: He is concerned that Alternatives A and C may be outdated if the city did not include annexations when they submitted the numbers to ODOT. Angela Findley said that the Comprehensive Plan process tries to look ahead into the future and anticipate growth. Dorothy's traffic model included this predicted growth. The Sensitivity Analysis is saying that if there is additional growth beyond what has been predicted, how flexible is the alternative(s) to handle the additional growth above and beyond what the city put into their Comprehensive Plan. That is what this analysis is trying to show. All of the modeling that has been done up until this point assumed a certain amount of growth that is based on land uses and historic development.

Rob Bernstein: He said that a lot has changed since the last meeting. The alternative which has been described tonight as the WG Alternative is really the Grants Pass City Council's Alternative. It was forwarded to ODOT with certain expectations that this is the alternative that they want analyzed. We are willing to live with whatever the results of that analysis are. The model covers all of Josephine County. Whether something is annexed or not is irrelevant. It is about is how much population there will be here in the future. This is all incorporated in the model and if the growth work hasn't changed over three years then the model needs to be updated at some point. We can't allow ourselves to be totally dictated by these specific numbers. They give us a good idea of what is going on in the future. That doesn't mean that we set aside common sense. Rob objects to the analysis procedure (Sensitivity Analysis) with growth at

10%. There is no particular basis for it. If you want to do a Sensitivity Analysis then go back into the model and pump up the population and employment by 10% and see what happens. That is what we did for the River District in Grants Pass. The problem with 10% across the board in every particular movement is that it may be a total of 10% but often times it is all in the northbound Allen Creek Rd volume and not in certain left turn volume that really cuts the capacity. We haven't had a chance to look at the analysis but we are skeptical of the concept.

Rob's design requests are (on behalf of the City):

- Single left turn lane at Ringuette St.
The basic reason for a single left turn lane is practicality. The clinical analysis of plugging in forecasted 2025 left turn volumes does not capture everything. You can address capacity issues as they become serious in the future. There are a number of different ways of addressing the issue: 1) Time the signals and extend the turn lane, and 2) Find ways of diverting the traffic away from that left turn. As a part of our overall plan, we called for a grade separation through there in the future.
- Right turn in and out added somewhere on the north side of Redwood Ave between Hwy 199 and Allen Creek Rd in order to have the connection to the fairgrounds area. The city is planning on doing a circulation plan for the fairgrounds. This is going to be done in time to have a recommendation prior to the removal of the fairgrounds signal. This is a key element of the city's recommendations.
- Take another look at the north extension of Allen Creek Rd over to Pansy Ln. See if there is a way that it can be aligned in order to save the buildings on the north. Dorothy asked if he was suggesting that the Redwood Ave/Allen Creek Rd signal be removed down to Pansy Ln. Rob suggested making a tighter curve.
- Request that a right in/right out be placed on northbound Allen Creek Rd.
There has to be some kind of internal connections. There are certain properties that have access cut off in main directions. The properties in the triangle have no way to get to westbound Redwood Ave without a lot of out of direction travel.
- Request full movement to be allowed from Daisy Ln with a center left turn lane.
The properties between Hwy 199 and Redwood Ave, west of Allen Creek Rd do not have access from the east or to westbound Redwood Avenue. This is a fatal flaw of the concept as it has been laid out. The north side has similar issues only in different directions. This is a reasonable tradeoff given the fact that there are safety problems and congestion. These congestion problems will get worse in the future and we have a long range suggestion on how to deal with that. Also there is not a problem 24 hours a day. Experience tells us that you create similar unpredictable safety problems elsewhere as people try to find how to get to where they want with out of direction travel.

Bart Van Syoc: He wanted to know (referring to the city's improvements on Redwood Ave) if there will be enough room on Redwood Ave to also include bicycle paths on both sides. Jason said there is currently sixty five to seventy feet of ROW. The facility will be approximately ninety feet wide.

Ron Wright: The current WG Alternative land locks his business.

Jim Rafferty: The WG Alternative has four lanes. He asked Rob what was the plan

prior to this. Rob said it was a grade-separated intersection. Jim asked what the plan was prior to the grade separated plan. Rob said the original ACCESS plan pulled out the segment on Allen Creek between Hwy 199 and Redwood Ave which we basically found to be unworkable and counter productive because it disconnects the city's arterial system even more than it is today. Jason added, with the No Build there is a single lane and the queue was over 1500'. There is only 1200' on Redwood Ave. between Allen Creek Road and Hwy 199. Traffic wanting to head eastbound on Hwy 199 would be backed up past the Allen Creek Rd/Redwood Ave. intersection. With this intersection being the key to the whole triangle, if traffic is backed clear through it, it can't function. Rob said that the five lanes on Redwood Ave will continue west to a point where you can safely merge it down to the planned three lane segment. Bart said he doesn't object to it being five lanes all the way out but it is just a matter of how much property we are going to have to buy as far as property along both sides of this segment. Rob said how much is this project and how much is something else. Bart said you have to be addressing that other project that is out there and not kill that one by what we plan today.

Rob Bernstein: We came up with a long range corridor plan from which appropriate pieces are being extracted to incorporate into this project. There will be other projects as part of the overall corridor plan. Our basic position is that there is just so much you can do at grade. At some point you need to do grade separation. This plan is what we would like to see in the interim. If that means that we need to start thinking about a grade separated facility to handle the traffic volumes in 2025 that would be an appropriate next step rather than trying to make this thing work in the peak hour as is.

Jerry Marmon: Recapped Rob's request by saying there are other minor questions but the major element that you are requesting is removal of the median on Redwood Ave. Rob replied by saying we are not expecting there to be left turns anywhere in there. We do want the opportunity for right in/right out on both sides of Redwood Ave.

Art Anderson: As a member of the public he commented (regarding the Sensitivity Analysis) 1) The analysis says that the WG Alternative at the Allen Creek intersection cannot be lengthened without modifying the ROW footprint, 2) All alternatives as modeled with future growth will be able to handle the traffic, 3) Alternatives A & C have flexibility to handle the additional growth and the WG Alternative does not. He asked is it really "no" for the WG Alternative or is it "yes" but there are things such as grade separation or more costly alternatives that would have to be looked at to make it work? Angela said we are looking for modifications that could be made that are minor.

Alex Grossi: We have to fix the problems with the money available.

David Frasher: Addressing Alex’s comment; When the council and WG started this process they didn’t start the process with the same financial restrictions you had. What they tried to do is look at what is going to work best for the community and worry about trying to find the money later. What you are doing is working with a project budget. Naturally if your project says you only have this much, you are looking at a much different scope of projects. We tried to look at what we need over the next 20 years that will work for our community. Grade separation was clearly the choice. You are not voting on the grade separation tonight. I just told Art we do have 20 years to go get additional money.

Alex Grossi: We don’t have time. We have a problem now. We have been delegated with the responsibility to make this situation work up until the 20 year period. The grade separated feature in 20 years is good. We need to fix the problem today. David Frasher said I don’t know if I am making myself clear. I am saying we knew that the grade separated facility would be expensive. We also knew we were looking for what was best for our community. If we need a congressional earmark or some other kind of funding, we have time. Grade separation is the long term alternative to our plan. ODOT staff says that Alternatives A & C have the flexibility to handle additional growth. We believe the WG Alternative has the most flexibility and the most capacity to handle future growth of any of the alternatives.

Bart Van Syoc: We are not voting against grade separation. We are here because people are getting killed the highway. Rather than forming a committee and coming up with a plan and then going to out to find the money, they said here is the money, let’s make it safer right now. I like a lot of your ideas, but right now our challenge is to stop killing people like we have been doing. That is our goal. David said we understand that. That is why we have short term recommendations and long term recommendations. I don’t think you guys had that same mission or that same flexibility when you started looking at the problem.

Break – 10 minutes

4. Comparison of Working Group Alternative to Alternatives A and C

Jerry Marmon, ODOT

Jerry referred to the Evaluation Matrix which was distributed at the meeting. He reviewed the criteria on elements that showed key differences between the WG Alternative and Alternatives A and C.

Key Differentiators:

Safety Minimize deviations from design standards
Signal Spacing – Removal of signals improves safety on the corridor.

Operation Maintain adequate local access
The WG Alternative provides the same local access as Alternatives A and C, except in Allen Creek Rd/Redwood Ave vicinity (a modification

to the original proposal). The turning movements for parcels or access roads onto/off Redwood Ave and Allen Creek Rd vary by alternative. Jerry went on to explain the differences shown on PowerPoint maps for each alternative. The median is an important and integral part of the WG Alternative because there are serious operation issues. ODOT feels strongly that in order to maintain the operation and address safety issues the median is required.

Freight

Accommodate freight access to commercial/industrial properties

→WG Alternative: Right in/right out on Redwood Ave and Allen Creek Rd increases out-or-direction travel for freight movement to local businesses.

→Alternatives A and C: Freight access is provided via old Redwood Ave.

Minimize traffic flow interruptions for large trucks on Hwy 199

→WG Alternative: An additional signal on Hwy 199 causes more interruptions to regional freight traffic flow.

Question from audience: Jerry was asked if the concept of taking the designation of Expressway and changing it to a Boulevard still being discussed and if it is how that relates to our mobility criteria within ODOT. Jerry explained that the Boulevard concept is basically a landscape treatment and is being considered on all alternatives. It includes planted medians, sidewalk buffer areas. That concept is consistent throughout all of the alternatives. In terms of mobility the numbers we see here will not be affected by the Boulevard concept.

Environmental: Relocation and Right of Way Acquisitions

Jerry referred to a chart showing four homes and seven businesses taken for Alternative A; two homes and eight businesses for Alternative C; and one home and four businesses for the WG Alternative. The total estimated costs for right of way acquisitions for Alternative A is \$15.2M (12.4 acres); Alternative C, \$15.4M (11.5 acres); and WG Alternative, \$11.9M (8.5 acres). Total estimated cost for Alternative A is \$35.4M; Alternative C is \$35.8M; and WG Alternative is \$28.9M.

Summary of Questions and Comments:

Ron Wright: He asked if the number of impacted businesses included businesses that are no longer in existence. Angela Findley said that the number of impacts for Alternatives A and C are the same as what was reported in the EA. As long as there is a building they may reopen.

Jim Rafferty: The WG Alternative shows his business and several other businesses as being impacted. They are not shown as such on Alternatives A and C. Jerry Marmon said there is a subtle difference between relocations which may mean actually impacting the building so that building may need to be relocated but it doesn't mean that the parcel needs to be acquired.

Alex Grossi: He is willing to bet that this will make the businesses that along Redwood Ave more viable. People now avoid this area because virtually every business in that section is right in/right out.

Deanie Manning: She asked what our budget is at this time. Jerry said the project is going to be phased starting with the west segment. At this time we have \$16M available.

Jim Rafferty: He took a survey (77 people) during the last week which showed participants alternative preference: Alternative A – 5 votes; Alternative C – 4 votes; WG Alternative 60 votes; and No Build Alternative – 8 votes. There were several comments included by the participants. Jim went on to say that he is in favor of the ‘Boulevard Concept’ with a 35 mph speed limit. He feels it will be safer.

Ron Wright: He asked if we should be evaluating Hwy 199 as an Expressway or as a city type street. Eryca McCartin answered by saying the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) is the group appointed by the governor to set policy statewide. They have designated several different facilities statewide that have significance above and beyond one community. It may be very important to the community but also forms a crucial function of moving traffic from one place to another. The OTC has designated Hwy 199 as an Expressway to be able to move people back and forth to the coast. The city, county or ODOT staff does not have the authority to change this designation. Only the OTC can do this. As staff, working for the OTC, we have been directed by them to consider this an Expressway. If the community prefers it to be changed they have the option to take it up with the OTC. Staff has inquired if we are on the right path and if you are about ready to change it tomorrow, could you let us know. Ron added, he doesn’t think that a boulevard concept is a bad idea but we have an expressway designation. We should be focusing on an expressway as part of our process because that is what the requirement is. Eryca thinks that the expressway designation in itself carries certain design standards and requirements. As Dorothy showed earlier many of those requirements or standards are not being met in any of the alternatives. We are going to have to get exceptions because there are other things that are more important. Some of the signals may or may not meet spacing standards. That is okay because you have an existing facility. It needs to move people to pick up their kids at day care and it needs to move people to the coast. Our local communities will always choose methods that generally slow traffic down. This causes increased congestion which stifles economic growth. All of the alternatives do not preclude landscaping. They all have significant landscaping. We are talking about millions of dollars for landscaping treatments.

Bart Van Syoc: Reviewed Hwy 199’s history. Forty years ago our highway to the coast was Redwood Ave. We built a new highway and turned the old highway into an avenue. Now we are looking at the new highway because it was rerouted to get it out of downtown. The downtown streets were a highway and we wanted to get them back to streets. They are streets now. The old highway is an avenue. The highway is too small

now so it is being made bigger. We are taking the highway and slowing it down. Where are we going? We keep making this same circle.

Jerry Marmon: He clarified the 35 mph speed limit. Speed limits cannot be arbitrarily changed. There are a series of studies that need to happen in order to change speed limits. Eryca said that another way to say it is, this section of the road needs to be a slower speed because people are driving too fast. The majority of people who travel on any road don't drive the speed they are driving because the white signs tell them what speed to travel. Most everybody drives as fast as they feel comfortable. It is very irresponsible and unsafe to set a speed so that you have those few of us who are obeying the speed limit traveling the signed speed, and everybody else is going by us faster. That creates a very dangerous situation.

Jim Rafferty: Expectation of speed is an important part of this project. If you have a boulevard facility and you come into this area you can automatically look and say this could be something that I want to slow down for. Eryca said Jason is incorporating into his design features that are for a lower speed facility where he can reasonably do that. Once the project is built you can do a speed zone study and see exactly how fast people are going. If they are going slower you can lower the speed limit. Jim also disagrees with the median on Redwood Avenue because it is going to impact businesses. He is not convinced that the median is needed. He would like to see a center turn lane. Jason said that a center turn lane would just be providing the public a space to make unsafe traffic movements. Jerry said that in ODOT's opinion the median is an integral part of the WG Alternative for both operational and safety perspective. This is what we are willing to endorse. Jim said that if we go with WG Alternative and we don't want the median, you are not going to endorse it. If you are not going to endorse it does that mean that the city and county are now not going to endorse Alternatives A and C.? They have already said that they are not going to endorse A and C according to the newspaper. That means that the letter from Art Anderson which said that if this stalls, we might as well forget about the whole thing and go to the No Build.

Art Anderson: Referring to the letter Jim Rafferty mentioned: What we were asking in that letter was if the CAC and PDT decided that they weren't going send the WG Alternative further analysis, did that mean there was going to be no support from the city for any of the other alternatives. It wasn't saying tell us now, this is it or isn't it. I was trying to get a feel for whether they would support the integrity of the CAC and PDT process regardless of what alternative was selected.

Ron Wright: He doesn't care either way, but for the record Rob said at the beginning of the meeting Rob this is our WG Group Plan and this is what the city expects and this is what we expect of you to do. It wasn't an option or a question. It was this is what we expect you to do. Then you have a

letter from ODOT referencing what Jim was saying. Whether it is right or wrong, I don't know, but there is an implication here that is bad. He does not feel the WG Alternative is an acceptable option (with median) for the businesses between Redwood Circle and Pansy Ln.

David Frasher: He said let's put the egos on hold. He doesn't think the council is saying do this or else. They are saying, we don't support Alternatives A and C. We spent \$100K in staff time to give you another alternative that we respectively ask you to study. Ron said that is not what they said and I have listened to the conversations tonight. David encouraged people to read the actual words of the resolution the council passed. It says we are dissatisfied with Alternatives A and C. What Art said in his letter, and I don't blame him for asking, he is trying to get a feel or a commitment from the council as to whether they will support whatever alternative that is selected. The council is not comfortable with that because they are members under political pressure to respond to the needs of their constituents. They said we are not comfortable with saying here is a blank check, yes do that. We don't want to say that before you have even seen or studied our alternative. I think they are right. I don't blame them and I don't think it is a question of who is right or who is wrong. The question is do you think that the alternative you are seeing tonight is worth studying. I believe it is worth studying not only as a resident but as the City Manager. I am here on behalf of everyone on the council. Regarding the median, we met with some of the working group folks this afternoon and we acknowledged that a median needs to be somewhere but maybe not all the way to Redwood Circle. Our working group got sucked into design details that sometimes made me want to scream. You are right; there are a lot of special interest groups and individuals. You guys all have an interest group. We all have an interest in this. I think we are just trying to put forward an alternative that we think is reasonable and asking for a fair review of it.

Alex Grossi: It makes him uneasy when the city councilors say that Alternatives A and C are not acceptable and go with our WG Alternative. We spent over two years studying every intersection. Now we have somebody, who really doesn't know anything about it because they have only been involved for six months say no we don't like it. That is kind of insulting especially when we are the ones who have had our nose on the grindstone. David asked if Alex has seen his latest letter to ODOT where he thanked the CAC for their years of dedication and hard work on this project. I don't want you to make a lot of assumptions about councilors. You guys have done a really good full job here. There is a lot of empathy on the council for what you what you guys went through on this and it doesn't necessarily show up in the sound bites in the newspaper. I think they are responding to some community distrust of ODOT. I don't know what all the history is and what caused that but I would like to see this mitigated over time. They said we have to bring in our own guy and have somebody else look at this because we don't trust ODOT. I also think that this process has created a new avenue by which

we can gain trust. To build trust between ODOT and the city staff which is probably going to be easier than building trust between ODOT and the city politicians. I am determined to work with Art and bridge that gap. I think that the landscaping features and things that these guys are talking about favor economic development opportunities too. ODOT and I have had discussions about ODOT's interest in moving traffic through safely and quickly and city's interest is to move traffic through quickly and safely after they spend all of their money here. We tried to come up with an alternative that is politically acceptable to the constituents and the community. I think it is a viable alternative and I would like to ask your support for at least passing it on to be studied.

5. Public Comment

Jerry Marmon, ODOT

Robert Bernstein: He said that on the technical side that we are not asking for anything unreasonable. Jason is right when he talks about the safety issues with the two other alternatives. However, what you folks haven't addressed is the safety issues associated with people wandering all over the place trying to get from point A to point B. The alternative we came up with is an appropriate and acceptable tradeoff. We ask that you include this alternative for analysis. We are not saying to do it. We want you to analyze it so that we can have the full analysis and set the alternatives up side by side technically and have a discussion again rather than making these decisions prematurely. The bottom line is that we are not asking for anything outrageous or illegal. It is not that anybody is right or wrong it is just that it is a difficult situation and we would like you to analyze the alternative as we requested.

Eryca McCartin: As many of you know I have worn many hats for this project, first as Project Leader and now as the District Manager. I am the person that gets the phone calls when somebody doesn't like sitting at a signal too long on a state highway, or when somebody is killed, somebody doesn't like where their driveway is, or somebody doesn't have left out access or because they want to change what used to be a dentist's office into a drive thru Dutch Brother's Coffee place. These are issues we talk about on a daily basis in this area, a community that I also live in. I have a lot of personal interest in it as well as knowing that my phone is going to ring for however long it takes to build this. I am not a traffic engineer. I don't know how to use Dorothy's model and I don't have all kinds of fancy charts and graphs. But what I do know is that even though the model says that this has the potential to operate satisfactorily the model doesn't show people using the one finger wave or people backing up through intersections. In our experience with signals placed this closely together tells us that this has serious operational problems. If you want some close by examples look at the South Y. A lot of the problems in that area are due to signals being placed closely together. There is not a magic solution. I think that we all want the same thing. We want a solution that doesn't impact anybody's business, that moves people

through at a fast enough pace for them to get to where they are going but at a slow enough pace so that they spend all of their money. That is the ultimate goal but we don't have one here. What we need to do is to determine, based on the money that we have left, what options are going to be analyzed and is this an alternative that you want to move forward. Speaking as a District Manager I can tell you that I have significant concerns with this alternative. I think that it could work in the short term. I don't think it will work in the long term.

David Frasher: He doesn't disagree with what Eryca said except when she said she has serious concerns for the long term. He agrees with the long term assessment. That is why we have grade separated both intersections in the long term solution. Eryca said that what she is trying to say is that the model says it will be okay in twenty years based on the information that was fed into the model. However, based on experience, we have seen similar situations. Signals placed this close together don't work when you approach capacity. I don't have a crystal ball to tell you when that will happen.

Jay Eastwood: If for some reason the WG Alternative doesn't get forwarded, are Alternatives A and C it or do we go back and have another year of this process? What are our options? I think that has a lot to do with some of the decisions that are being made. Jerry Marmon said he thinks that everybody here can say that we have exhausted all the options that fix this corridor. If it doesn't get forwarded, Alternatives A and C are still on the table. There is nothing else out there. I think that Rob would probably second that. It is time to pick something and move on.

Deanie Manning: The funds are not available for the improvements on Redwood Ave. Jerry said is it alright for us to look for solutions and document them and then go out and to seek additional funding. We have to do some level of planning before we can go out and seek money. Deanie said so we are seeking some level of planning in order to go out and get money. Perhaps we are wasting our time trying to look for possible funding for twenty years down the road. Why are we expending the time and energy on that if we don't have money for this project? Jerry said he doesn't think we are saying that the funding is twenty years down the road. Deanie replied that was what Mr. Frasher said. Jerry said we are trying to find a twenty year solution regardless of which alternative we are talking about. We have roughly half of the money which will go into the west section. We are going to seek additional money. Having a plan that has been approved gets us along way in seeking additional funding. Deanie asked if the added time is eating into this project.

Bart Van Syoc: Part of our task to was to design an alternative that was phaseable so with the money available. The plan was to get started on part of the project and then raise funds to do the next phases. Angela said the other thing to keep in mind is that the No Build isn't going to work 20 years out. This is another reason we are for a phase improvement system. If

you don't do anything the four lane highway with intersections and the signal spacing you have now is going to fail a lot sooner than the 20 year horizon. There is definitely value in the time you have spent to come up with a solution that can be implemented and start phasing in improvements. Deanie I agree that we need to do something. I think that is pretty obvious. How did we get all of the signals that are too close together? Jason said the speeds were reduced within the last five years because of the highway deaths.

Irv Citron: Irv is a representative for the rural area. Tonight he heard comments from some about not wanting a barrier. He suggested that those people should try and cross the highway near his home. He does not like the barrier because he will have to travel further but it has to be done. Regarding lowering the speed limit on Hwy 199 to 35 mph; if you stood by the 50 mph sign, trucks, commercial traffic and people going home are traveling 60 mph or more. People want to move to the next place as soon as they can. We have to recognize that. U-turns are a problem. We have taken the \$10M to create some protection against these cars having accidents in the rural section. We have forgotten about that and moved down to developing a nice city which is fine. It should be done, but it should be done separately.

6. CAC Recommendation on Further Analysis

Jerry Marmon, ODOT

Jerry asked the CAC members to fill in their ballots. The ballot asked: Should additional analysis be performed on the City of Grants Pass Working Group Alternative: 1) Yes, additional analysis should be done so that this alternative can receive further consideration or 2) No, additional analysis is not warranted, and this alternative should be withdrawn from further consideration. Members were asked to provide their reason(s) for their vote.

Vote: 3 - Yes 4 - No

7. Next Steps

Angela Findley, Parsons Brinckerhoff

Angela referred to the flow chart to explain where in the process the committee is and the next steps. The CAC's recommendation will be forwarded to the PDT. Additional technical analysis will be done on the WG Alternative if it is forwarded into the EA for further study. At the next CAC and PDT meetings the teams will be voting on the Preferred Alternative. Until the PDT makes their decision tomorrow on the WG Alternative we won't know how many alternatives there are. If additional analysis is required for the WG Alternative there is a need to provide the public an opportunity to comment on the WG Alternative as well (public hearing). The next step is to prepare the revised EA.

8. Adjourn