



## MEETING MINUTES

**Meeting Date:** Thursday, October 13, 2005

**Purpose:** Citizen Advisory Committee Meeting

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

**From:** Vicki Guarino, RVCOG

**Prepared by:** Pat Foley, RVCOG

**CAC Attendees:** Rowdy Bates, Janine Law, Deanie Manning, Suzanne Myers, Jim Rafferty, Randy Repp, Bart Van Syoc and Ron Wright

**CAC Absent:** Irving Citron, Jay Eastwood and Alex Grossi

**Project Team Attendees:** Jerry Marmon, ODOT Environmental Project Manager  
Eryca McCartin, ODOT Project Manager  
Jason Sheadel, ODOT Roadway  
Dorothy Upton, ODOT TPAU  
Gary Leaming, ODOT Public Information  
Nick Forty, FHWA  
Angela Findley, Parsons Brinckerhoff Consultant Project Manager  
Connie Kratovil, Parsons Brinckerhoff  
Scott Smithline, Parsons Brinckerhoff  
Vicki Guarino, RVCOG  
Pat Foley, RVCOG

**Other Attendees:** 4 members of the public

## **1. Call to Order/Review Agenda/Approve Minutes**

Vicki Guarino, RVCOG

Vicki Guarino called the meeting to order at 6 p.m. She reviewed the agenda. The CAC was asked if there were any changes to the August 11<sup>th</sup> minutes. The CAC approved the minutes as written.

Eryca McCartin explained to the committee that tonight's meeting will be focused on narrowing down the concepts and then to forward recommendations to the Project Development Team.

## **2. Update on August 12, 2005, Project Development Team Meeting**

Rowdy Bates, CAC Chairperson

The PDT discussed many of the same agenda items as were discussed at the CAC meeting. The team looked at the recommendations from the CAC. They agreed with the CAC recommendations for dropping the West Park Connector and Fourth Bridge Concepts. Before dropping the West Park Connector concept, ODOT was asked if raising the speed limit would make enough of a difference to study it further. (ODOT completed analysis after the meeting and reported back to the PDT that a raised speed limit would not make a substantial difference in reducing the traffic on Highway 199.) The PDT agreed with the CAC on forwarding Additional Lane Concepts. The only CAC recommendation they disagreed with was forwarding the Union Slip Ramp Concept. Angela added, the reason the PDT voted to drop the Union Slip Ramp Concept is because they did not feel it met the Purpose and Need, which focuses on improving safety and reducing congestion on Hwy 199. She also stated the PDT felt that the Union slip ramp would add substantial traffic onto Union Ave and cause congestion at the Union Ave/Ringuette St and Union Ave/OR 238 intersections. While they feel the slip ramp is a good idea, it didn't add value for the cost. The dollars could be better spent elsewhere on the project.

## **3. Open House Review**

Gary Leaming, ODOT

Gary reported that the August 25<sup>th</sup> open house had more than 80 people in attendance. Using a PowerPoint presentation, Gary reviewed comments received. All comments are on file. The next open house will be in a public hearing format and will take place in either the spring or summer of 2006.

Angela Findley explained why there were five East Section Concept maps displayed at the Open House. After the open house, the East 4 Concept's main feature (additional lanes on Hwy 199) was added to the other East Section Concepts. East 4 was then dropped since it did not have any remaining unique components that were not already captured in other concepts.

## 4. East Section Recommendations

Project Management Team

### Design Review:

Connie Kratovil, Parsons Brinckerhoff

Aerial maps of five concepts were handed out to the CAC. Adding to what Angela said earlier, Connie explained the process for developing the remaining five concepts versus the ten that were shown at the CAC and PDT at the August meetings. The PDT considered the recommendations of the CAC before voting on the various design elements. All elements that the PDT voted to drop are not incorporated into the five remaining concepts. All of the features the PDT voted to forward, namely the continued study of additional lanes, frontage roads, and driveway connectors, have been made a part of the five remaining concepts. Using additional traffic analysis information the following design changes have been made: 1) Add Redwood Avenue slip ramp to East 1 and East 2 concepts, and 2) Design Highway 199 with 6 lanes from Tussey Lane to Allen Creek Road on Concepts East 1, East 2, East 5, East CAC 2 and East PDT 2. Other desirable components have been mixed and matched into the five remaining concepts.

### **East 1 Full Frontage Road, Redwood Slip Ramp, Additional Lanes**

Connie explained the difference between the August concept and the one being discussed tonight. A slip ramp at Redwood Avenue has been added. Connie was asked if there would be any driveway accesses on Allen Creek between Highway 199 and Redwood Avenue. Connie responded that if there were one, it would be a right-in/right-out. Some of these details still have to be worked out.

### **East 2 Partial Frontage Road, Redwood Slip Ramp, Additional Lanes, Tussey cul-de-sac**

The West Park Connector was dropped. The Redwood Avenue slip ramp and additional lane starting at the South Y and a cul-de-sac at Tussey Lane were added.

### **East 5 Full Frontage Road with small bridges, Additional Lanes**

The configuration of the full frontage road was changed. There are two bridges crossing over Ringuette and Allen Creek. This configuration would make the construction of a fourth bridge more challenging. Concern was raised regarding access to businesses around Redwood Avenue, Allen Creek and Riguette.

### **East CAC 2 Driveway Collectors, Additional Lanes, Skewed Intersection at Redwood Avenue/Allen Creek**

Concern was raised regarding access to businesses around Allen Creek and Redwood Avenue and to Horizon Village (senior housing facility). Rowdy Bates suggested that an additional frontage road be incorporated to allow access to businesses in this area. Ron Wright also pointed out that many of the businesses located in this area need to have a facility that would handle trucks. This is a major concern for businesses in this area.

## **East PDT 2      Partial Frontage Road, Additional Lanes**

This concept features a large bridge connecting Union Avenue to Redwood Avenue. This concept presents a challenge for access to hospital. The YMCA would be accessed via the frontage road. Access to the fairgrounds would be via the access road and a backage road.

### **Traffic Analysis**

Dorothy Upton, ODOT

A memo titled Scenario Refined Analysis for US 199 Expressway Upgrade prepared by Dorothy Upton and a discussion sheet were handed out to the committee. Dorothy reviewed this information. She explained the interaction of weave-merge distances, volume/capacity ratios and controls that improve safety. She explained that there can be a trade-off between safety and congestion. Based on the traffic analysis she reviewed her recommendations to forward Concepts East 1, 2, 5 and CAC 2. The recommendations showed: East 1 is best for safety, but has high v/c ratios; East 2 is not as good for safety, but has better v/c ratios; East 5 is good for safety and the vest v/c ratios, but has out of direction travel; East CAC 5 has good v/c ratios, but is not good for safety and has extensive out of direction travel.

Break was taken

### **Evaluation Matrix**

Jerry Marmon, ODOT

The CAC members were given an updated Evaluation Matrix for the East Concepts. Jerry reviewed the evaluation of the five concepts and explained the reasoning of each rating. He told the committee that they each had the option of doing their own evaluations.

After Jerry finished the reviewing the Evaluation matrix the CAC members were asked to make comments on the pros and cons of each concept.

#### **East 1**

##### **PROs**

- More business access
- Safe way to cross Redwood Avenue for pedestrians
- Redwood Avenue slip ramp – good
- Two access points to fairgrounds – good for emergency vehicles
- Keeps BiMart traffic away from residential area
- Access to Redwood Avenue locations
- Lower cost

##### **CONs**

- Challenge to provide businesses access at Ringuette
- Frontage road under-utilized between YMCA and Allen Creek
- Enormous footprint
- Expensive
- Complex

**East 2****PROs**

- Access to Redwood Avenue locations
- More business access
- Safe pedestrian crossing at Redwood
- Redwood Avenue slip ramp
- Two fairground access points

**CONs**

- BiMart traffic goes through residential areas
- Driveway collectors look like dead ends, concerned about impact on businesses
- All East 1 cons apply

**East 5****PROs**

- Connectivity
- Good for highway traffic

Neutral: Likely to cause land use changes

**CONs**

- Cost
- Major business displacements (relocation and cost) at Ringuette
- Land lock/ access concerns to businesses at Redwood Avenue
- Cut-thru traffic in neighborhoods (West Park area) to get onto frontage road
- Allen Creek loop not a straight shot

**East PDT 2****PROs**

- Safety
- Expressway function

**CONs**

- Too expensive
- Not phaseable/not fundable
- High business displacements
- Impacts to local streets
- Big structure – not visually appealing, doesn't promote community livability

**East CAC 2****PROs**

- Simple
- Lower costs
- Easier to adapt to future needs
- Western part

**CONs**

- Driveway collectors don't "fit" with businesses. Prefer a frontage road concept in these areas
- Land locks businesses at Allen Creek and Redwood Avenue
- Worst multi-modal
- Highway 199 won't function as an expressway. Not easy for drivers to know where to turn to access businesses and doesn't fully separate local from thru traffic
- Driveway collectors limited. No freight access
- Blocks pedestrian access to Pedestrian Bridge

Maps of the five alternatives were displayed on the wall. The committee was asked to go to each alternative map and vote on whether to keep for further study or drop. This was done by placing a sticker on the map: green sticker = study further, orange sticker = drop.

<b>Vote results:</b>	<b>Study Further</b>	<b>Drop</b>
East 1	5	3
East 2	1	7
East 5	5	3
East CAC 2	6	2
**note – Add Tussey cul-de-sac		
East PDT 2	0	8

Members of the committee felt that none of the alternatives solve all of the problems. In the final analysis they would like to see the best features incorporated into the selected alternative. The above recommendations will be presented to the PDT tomorrow.

## 5. West Section Update

Eryca McCartin, ODOT

Eryca reviewed the West Section Concept. She stated that the Project Team has been working with the ODOT state traffic engineer on the placement of a signal light at Hubbard Lane. At this time this intersection does not meet the required warrants. However, it is expected that with anticipated growth in the area, Hubbard traffic soon will increase to a point where a signal light could be installed. More discussion of the west section will be the focus of next month's meeting.

## 6. Next Steps

Angela Findley, Parsons Brinckerhoff

At the November meeting the committee will be working on refining the West Section Concept. No committee meetings will be held in December. This will allow the project staff to work on the detailed environmental analysis. Meetings will start again in January or February.

## 7. Public Comment

Vicki Guarino, RVCOG

Vicki asked if members of the public had comments.

Dick Sackett: Dick said he liked the CAC 2 concept. He also said he feels that a signal is needed at Willow Lane and not at Hubbard.

Del Robertson: Del said that he likes the idea of a slip ramp at Union Avenue.

## **8. CAC Comfort Check**

Vicki Guarino, RVCOG

Vicki said this is the time for each CAC member to let the project team know how they are feeling with the way things are going.

All of the members said they were satisfied with the progress being made. Several members expressed their disappointment at not having a signal at Hubbard Lane.

## **9. Wrap Up/Adjourn**

Vicki Guarino, RVCOG

The next Highway 199 Citizen Advisory Committee meeting will be 6-8:30 p.m., November 3, 2005. This meeting date is a change from the regular schedule. The change was made because the PDT meeting would have fallen on Veterans' Day. Meeting adjourned at 9:45 p.m.