



MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Date: Friday, February 1, 2008

Purpose: Project Development Team Meeting

Distribution: CAC Members, Project Development Team, public

From: Vicki Guarino, RVCOG

Prepared by: Pat Foley, RVCOG

PDT Attendees: David Frasher, Jim Raffenburg, Jon Jordan, Tanya Henderson, Jeff Hunter, Tracy Rico, Dorothy Upton, Jerry Marmon and Jason Sheadel

PDT Absent: None

Project Team Attendees: Jayne Randleman, ODOT Project Leader
Gary Leaming, ODOT Public Information
John Vial, ODOT District 8 Manager
Art Anderson, ODOT Rogue Valley Area Manager
Dan Dorrell, ODOT
James Burford, ODOT
Nick Fortey, FWHA
Angela Findley, Parsons Brinckerhoff Consultant Project Manager
Vicki Guarino, RVCOG
Pat Foley, RVCOG

Other Attendees: Rowdy Bates, CAC Chair
Robert Bernstein, Consultant
Duane Schultz, Attorney representing ACCESS
14 members of the public

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

Vicki Guarino, RVCOG

Vicki called the meeting to order. The CAC met last night and does have a recommendation for the PDT. Vicki went on to review the agenda and purpose of the meeting. The purpose of the meeting is to review all comments, data results and to make a decision on the preferred alternative. The yellow tags on the name cards show who voting members of the PDT are. She then asked if there were any changes to the August 10, 2007 PDT minutes. There were no additions or changes to the minutes. The minutes will be a part of the record as written. Vicki reminded members of the audience that there will be a time allotted for public comment. This time will be for comments as opposed to questions.

Rowdy Bates, CAC Chair, gave a report on the CAC meeting. There were a lot of comments from the public. Those comments ranged from dissatisfaction with the barrier in the west and removing the light at the fairgrounds. There were a large amount of folks supporting the WG Alt. The CAC discussed a lot of issues. The CAC selected a preferred alternative on their first vote. Back in 2005 the CAC forwarded an option to the PDT that resembled the WG Alt. A couple of the differences included an added light and extra weaving. The PDT voted down this option. The reason Rowdy mentioned this is that we had a lot of support and now it is behind us as far as the CAC is concerned. There was a lot of support for Alt. C. He hopes the PDT will hear that support because he thinks it is a good mixture of all of the ideas. It is not what we are the most excited about, it is what has the least of evils.

2. Project Update

Jayne Randleman, Project Manager

Jayne thanked the members of the Project Development Team for the work and dedication they have given to the project over the last three years. Each member was presented with a Certification of Appreciation recognizing their time and participation for the project.

She then went on to review what has happened since the last time the committee met.

- August 10 – PDT added Working Group (WG) Alternative to range of alternatives studied in the EA
- September/November – ODOT and Parsons Brinkerhoff prepared a Supplemental Environmental Assessment (SEA)
- December 6 – SEA released, beginning public comment period
- December 19 - SEA public hearing / open house
- January 7 – End of SEA public comment period
- January – ODOT prepared responses to the public comments
- January 31 – Highway 199 CAC meeting
- February 1 – Highway 199 PDT meeting

Jayne reported that the west portion of the project (RCC to Midway Ave) will be built. The project will go out for bid in May and will be constructed by the end of this year. We think this is a good project and will support whatever alternative is selected.

3. Review and Discuss Alternatives Design Features

Angela Findley, Parsons Brinkerhoff

Using PowerPoint maps Angela reviewed the design features of the alternatives;

- Alternative A
 1. Segment from Midway Ave to Dowell Rd will remain a four travel lane section with a median barrier. The higher median will be added from Midway Ave to Rogue Community College. The median then transitions to a raised curb island. Driveways in this section will be right-in/right-out accesses. There is a separated bicycle/pedestrian path on the north side of the highway between Hubbard Ln and Dowell Rd. This is in addition to the multi-use path on the south side of the highway from Rogue Community College into town.
 2. Segment starting at Dowell Rd (to Fairgrounds Rd) will transition into six travel lanes, three in each direction. There is a raised curb island for this segment. The Allen Creek Rd intersection remains signalized and will have additional improvements – additional turn lanes. On westbound Hwy 199 the slip ramp onto Redwood Ave is retained and realigned to the north with a new signalized intersection at Redwood Ave and Allen Creek Rd. There is a new local street that connects Daisy Ln to Redwood Circle. A small access road at Pansy Ln will allow access to the YMCA and fairgrounds. The current signals at Redwood Ave/Hwy 199 and Fairgrounds Rd/Hwy 199 will be removed. There will be bike lane/sidewalk improvements as well as landscaping added.
 3. Segment from Fairgrounds Rd to Tussey Ln will have six lanes with a raised curb island. The intersection at Ringuette St/Hwy 199 will be reconfigured with additional turn lanes. There will be bike lanes/sidewalks and aesthetic treatments.
- Alternative C
 1. Segment from Midway Ave to Dowell Rd same as Alt A.
 2. Segment starting at Dowell Rd (to Fairgrounds Rd) will transition into six travel lanes, three in each direction. There is a raised curb island for this segment. The Allen Creek Rd intersection remains signalized and will have additional improvements. There is no slip ramp from westbound Hwy 199 onto Redwood Ave. Traffic is funneled through the Allen Creek Rd/Hwy 199 intersection. There is a turn lane at this intersection that turns into a dual right turn lane prior to the Allen Creek Intersection. There is a signal at the reconfigured Allen Creek Rd/Redwood Ave. This is a three legged intersection that includes Pansy Ln. There are bike lanes/sidewalks and landscaping treatments. The signals at Redwood Ave/Hwy 199 and Fairgrounds Rd/Hwy 199 will be removed.
 3. Segment from Fairgrounds Rd to Tussey Ln is the same as Alt A and WG Alt.
- Working Group Alternative (WG Alt.)
 1. Segment from Midway Ave to Dowell Rd same as Alts A and C.
 2. Dowell Rd to Allen Creek Rd has four travel lanes. Six travel lanes (travelling east) start near Allen Creek Rd. There are raised curb islands on

Hwy 199 and Redwood Ave. The raised curb island on Redwood Ave extends from the Highway to just west of Daisy Ln. Connector Road between Daisy Ln and Flower Ln. The signal at Hwy 199/Allen Creek Rd would require vehicles travelling southbound on Allen Creek Rd, who want to turn east, to continue east on Redwood Ave and use the signal at Hwy 199/Redwood Ave. Bike lanes/sidewalks and aesthetic treatments are a part of this section (similar to Alts A and C). Pedestrians will be able to cross at the signalized intersection at Redwood Ave/Hwy 199.

3. Segment from Fairgrounds Rd to Tussey Ln is the same as Alts A and C.

4. Responses to Public Comments

Angela Findley, Parsons Brinkerhoff

Two documents were prepared for public review: (1) Environmental Assessment, technical analysis on Alts A and C and the No Build Alternative; and (2) Supplemental Environmental Assessment, technical review on WG Alt which compared this alternative to Alts A, C and the No Build.

There were a total of (85) eighty-five comments received during the comment period in January – February 2007 for the Environmental Assessment.

A total of (37) thirty-seven comments were received during the comment period in December 2007 – January 2008 for the Supplemental Environment Assessment.

Comments were received by:

- Comment forms from public hearings
- Oral testimony at public hearings
- Letters
- E-mails

The comments were broken into (7) seven topics and responses were prepared for each topic:

- Alts A, C and WG Alt
- Environment
- Environmental Assessment Process
- Josephine County Fairgrounds
- Right of Way Acquisition and Access Management
- Safety
- Traffic Analysis

Exception: the letter from the city of Grants Pass (January 2008) was responded to point by point for each topic.

Some of the main comments and questions received referred to:

Expressway Designation – can it be changed?

- All alternatives considered were evaluated based on the current expressway designation for Hwy 199
- All build alternatives design represent a compromise to meeting expressway standards

- If the OTC changes the designation in the future ODOT is committed to reevaluating alternatives that meet the standards for the future designation

Aesthetics/Landscaping – prefer a better “look” for the Hwy 199 corridor

- Landscaping is part of Alts A, C and WG
- Treatment include trees, shrubs, architectural lighting, stamped concrete
- City of Grants Pass and ODOT working together on this treatment
Visuals of conceptual treatments were viewed.

Integration with South Y Study – should ODOT delay Hwy 199 improvements?

- South Y improvements currently have no planning or construction funding, so any improvements would not occur for many years
- There is a current need for safety and congestion improvements for Hwy 199
- Alts A, C and WG improvements proposed for east section will be integrated with the South Y Study as much as possible

Phase 2 Improvements – impacts are not clearly stated in the EA

- ODOT agrees
- All Phase 2 improvements are dependent on the South Y study
- ODOT has removed all Phase 2 improvements from Alts A & C in the SEA
- Further consideration of Phase 2 or similar concepts may be considered in the South Y Study

Comment: Nick Fortey pointed out that this project still has independent utility. There is a requirement that this project in of itself has to be able to function and pass the environmental test. Even if you take out Phase 2 and the South Y considerations you still have value in this project. Nick asked Angela if there was still value in this project. Angela responded this project absolutely has value. We concentrated on the east/west movements that are related to congestion and safety. We looked at the South Y to make sure that it was independent from the corridor project.

Funding & Phasing – how will the project be funded?

- ODOT has funds to construct most of the west segment improvements
- Alternatives were selected that enabled improvements to be built in phases that match incremental future funding
- Each phase built provides incremental benefits to the overall system

Josephine County Fairgrounds – minimize impacts to fairgrounds

- Fairground Rd signal removal would redirect traffic currently making left turns into/out of the fairgrounds
- ODOT will not remove the Fairgrounds Rd signal until alternate access is identified
- All alternatives impact the BMX track. BMX track would be relocated under Alts A and WG; potentially reconfigured on same location under Alt C

Questions/Comments: Nick Fortey asked at what point will the impacts to the BMX track be determined and whether you can work with the BMX folks to reconfigure the track. I assume it will be during the final design. Dorothy replied that it is a little of both. It has to do with what is determined in the local circulation for all of the properties that the fairgrounds has.

David Frasher asked if the BMX track is located on county property. Are you talking about right of way negotiations with the lease holder group? Response: No the negotiations will be with the county. David said since the county commission weighed in on their preferred alternative, I am wondering why this is such a big a part of the analysis. I know you have to have comment but it seems like the comment would go through the property owners.

Angela said that ODOT is committed to working with the owner of the property. We also

need to acknowledge that 20% of our comments were from BMX users. They were helpful in clarifying what their concerns are.

Jim Raffenburg commented that as we are going through this process we need to be aware that in this point in time the board of county commissioners is opposed to Alts A and C. We have taken a formal vote on this. Not to cast any dispersion on all of the good people that participated on the CAC or anybody on this team. I am wondering how ODOT plans to proceed in the face of determined opposition from the two governing bodies if the PDT decides to move forward with Alts A or C. Jerry Marmon replied that he thinks we should cross that bridge when we come to it. Jim disagreed with Jerry. He thinks it is a material part of the discussion on how this team votes. You can compartmentalize anything down to where you can force things to the way you want it. I think it is part of this discussion. Dorothy said that she understands where he is at and I think that can be part of it when get to the discussion. Angela continued with the presentation on the different impacts.

- Right of way acquisition from the fairgrounds property has been minimized under the current configurations

Relocations – minimize relocations

- Alternatives were developed to minimize relocations to the extent possible, while balancing traffic operations and impacts to environment
- All right of way acquisition and relocation comply with federal and state regulations, including relocation assistance and compensation as appropriate
- One-on-one negotiations with property owners occurs during final design phase of the project

U-Turns – are they safe?

- U-turns start in a dedicated, protected left turn lane
- Vehicles often have a signal that stops other traffic so U-turn is safe
- Some U-turns can occur at unsignalized intersections. Must wait for gap in only one direction of traffic compared to both directions when making current left turns

5. Alternatives Comparison Discussion

Angela Findley, Parsons Brinkerhoff

Environmental disciplines were looked at in both the EA and the SEA. Each alternative studied would have the same or similar impacts to most of these disciplines.

Comment: David Frasher asked if on the Socio-Economic / Environmental Justice component how was that determination made because the economic impacts are quite different between the alternatives. There is about a 100% difference between the alternatives. Angela responded that they differ on the relocation and right of way acquisitions. David asked if Angela really thinks that the socio-economic impacts are different to the businesses that are being affected not just the right of way acquisition. For further clarification David pointed out that there is a chart that shows 13 or 14 businesses that will be displaced by all but the WG Alt but that is inconsistent with the slide that says that the socio-economic impacts are similar. Angela said it is not meant to be an inconsistency. It is where we documented the impacts in the EA and SEA. We look at all of these disciplines and we characterize them but we also recognize that there is a lot of integration. Jerry added that it is not a numbers game. Just because the SEA discloses three businesses are impacted that doesn't mean that you have substantially higher socio-economic impacts with one alternative.

Relocations & Right of Way Acquisitions

Potential relocations:

Residential: Alt. A - 5, Alt. C - 3 and WG Alt. - 3

Businesses: Alt. A - 8, Alt. C - 9 and WG Alt. - 4

The above represents acquisition of a full piece of property that has a structure. Not shown above is what happens when a part of a parcel is acquired.

Right of Way Acquisitions:

New Right of Way (acres): Alt. A – 12.4, Alt. C - 11.5 and WG Alt. - 9.5

Right of Way Cost (\$) Alt. A - \$17.1M, Alt. C - \$17.3M and WG Alt. - \$13.6M

The above figures include full and partial acquisitions.

2025 Volume/Capacity (v/c) Ratios

Volume to Capacity ratios is a metric used to look at congestion at intersections. The intersections east of Ringuette St and west of Allen Creek Rd were virtually identical. The intersections on Hwy 199 /Allen Creek Rd, Redwood Ave (east), Fairgrounds Rd and Ringuette St are where there are differences between alternatives.

- Highway Design Manual mobility standard for Hwy 199 (v/c = 0.70) has been exceeded at Hwy 199/Allen Creek Rd and Hwy 199/Ringuette St.
- Intersections improvements over the No Build: Hwy 199/Redwood Av. (east), WG Alt. 0.86 verses 0.67. Not applicable to Alt A and C. Unsignalized intersection at Fairgrounds Rd/Hwy 199 (westbound), Alt. A 0.60, Alt. C 0.60 and WG 0.60.

Lane Configurations (westbound Hwy 199)

A graphic was shown with the lane configurations for all three alternatives.

- Alternative A
 - *Travelling from east to west (if you don't make lane changes) you are able to stay in the same lane to past Allen Creek Rd.
 - *Right exits onto Redwood Ave at slip ramp and at Allen Creek Rd
- Alternative C
 - *Similar to Alt A except for right turns
 - *Right turn to access Redwood Ave can be made at Allen Creek Rd
- Working Group Alternative
 - *A foundation for this alternative was to address queuing in right lane throughout the eastern portion of the corridor. It was designed to allow for two lanes to exit from westbound Hwy 199 into Redwood Ave.
 - *If you are in the right-turn lane this lane becomes an exit only lane.
 - *You can also get onto Redwood Ave if you are in the center lane.
 - *The modeling for 2025 horizon shows there is a need to have three travel lanes throughout the corridor to just past Allen Creek Rd.
 - *In order to address the projected volumes there was a need to add another lane once the right lane is dropped at Redwood Ave.
 - *There is an added left lane that continues through the corridor to just past Allen Creek Rd.
 - *When you get to just past Allen Creek Rd westbound Hwy 199 transitions down to two travel lanes.
 - *The right lane at that point merges into the center lane. This is where it differs from Alts A and C.
 - *When you are at the Fairgrounds and progress through, if you are in the center lane at Fairgrounds Rd by the time you get to Allen Creek Rd you will be in the right lane. If you want to continue past Allen Creek Rd you need to merge over.

*Similarly if you are in the left lane, without making any lane changes, it becomes the center lane and then the right lane.

Questions/Comments

David Frasher asked if there was a hard right on Alt C even though the arrow is at angle like the slip ramp. Angela replied that you pull into a right turn lane and then you make the right turn. David asked if that is the same on Alt C and the WG Alt. Jason answered that the WG Alt is quite different because of the trap in the right lane.

David Frasher (regarding the WG Alt diagram) said that Jason drew this diagram to show the far right lane dropping off past Allen Creek Rd and his question is, is there any reason that lane couldn't be extended out another two or three tenths of a mile and merge over. Jason said that if we go back to the August 10th meeting and what was presented to the PDT for forwarding into the document, that third lane actually stopped between Redwood Ave and Allen Creek Rd. What we found during the modeling was that we needed that third lane to go through Allen Creek to get the v/c numbers to an acceptable level. That lane can go as far as it needs to go to provide the traffic flow. David said then there wouldn't be any reason why it couldn't be extended out further. Jason said no except for costs and right of way impacts. It is shown in Alts A and C to Dowell Rd.

Rob Bernstein (Addressing the lane configurations for WG Alt.) - said the only reason we are looking at this today is because all of the original concepts either overlooked or ignored the congestion problem in the right lanes. He is sure everyone who drives around this town is aware of it. If the traffic going to Redwood Ave, regardless of how much there is once it gets on Redwood Ave, all traffic has to get there from the right-most lane. People start getting into the right most lane whenever they can, it stacks up, especially through fairgrounds and Ringuette and even the 6th St intersections because those intersections can't handle all of the Redwood Ave traffic in one lane and add to that turns in and out of driveways and you have this congestion problem. The sole purpose of this configuration was to come up with a lane configuration that would allow traffic to get to Redwood Ave from either of the two right hand lanes at Ringuette, at 6th. If you are coming from the Parkway, downtown, or Rogue Hwy and you want to go onto Redwood Ave you can be in either one of two right hand lanes and you don't need to jamb up those lanes all of the way through. It is not about needing two lanes of capacity at the intersection, it is about making it possible to get there from either of two lanes. Now as you can see from the diagram there are trade-offs. There is a certain complexity there. In order to accomplish this we created some other weave movements. There are design fixes that can happen to make it better. The fact is that if you reject this basic concept because of the weave issues you have ignored what we believe to be a more serious problem with the right lane congestion because that has significant safety problems with the differentials of speed and the traffic poking along in the right hand lane and the higher speed in the free-flow lanes and people darting in and out or pushing their way in and out of the queue in the right hand lane. It will get worse as you widen the highway. Widening the highway to three lanes doesn't solve that problem. Everything that they have said about this configuration is correct. It is just that it is half of the story. That is one of the things that you need to take into consideration, how we deal with both of these problems, not just one or the other. Even though this was proposed as part of the WG Alt, the WG Alt, what the city really wants does not live and die with this. There is an interchangeability of design elements that can happen. James Burford asked to take that background a step further. In a lot of cities where this type of configuration has been done they have spent millions of dollars to take it out because what they are finding is that the congestion of the right turn being forced to get

into the fast lane when they didn't realize that it was a drop. This adds to more serious accidents and is confusing to the through traffic who are visitors. This is a highway that has a lot of holiday traffic. The confusions on how to get through the corridor and having to switch lanes adds to a lot of accidents.

Rob Bernstein added that you are correct about that but that doesn't resolve the other issue we are trying to resolve. An ODOT guy I met at a meeting once named James Burford told me don't tell me about what happens elsewhere. It is about what is happening here. James responded, I haven't seen in any FHWA training classes where they recommend this type of solution to any problem. Continuity on through lanes is an important safety feature. Rob replied that we are trying to balance the two safety issues, weaving and potential congestion in the right turn lane. Which safety feature do you want to deal with?

Tanya Henderson - her only comment is obviously we are not doing anything with the South Y now. If I am travelling down I-5 and I take exit 58 because I want to go to the coast, I get into the right lane across Caveman Bridge. I am automatically pushed into the right lane at the South Y. I have to fight the traffic to get into the left lane otherwise I am going to be shot down at Redwood Ave or I am going to get right to that intersection and decide oh-oh I need to go straight. This is a common feature. We already have these issues in right turn lanes only now. All of a sudden you get to the turn lane and realize you have to get over. Now you have a side impact crash and the whole highway shut down. That is my only concern with this section is forcing that right lane off without letting them go through for the travelling public because if you go through that intersection we drive this corridor right now there are so many signs between the South Y and Redwood Ave and unless you are from the area if you truly drive through and try and look at the signs for information you are lost. How many times do we stop vehicles that don't see the Safety Corridor sign that starts the safety corridor to where we can enforce it out there? They have no idea that the sign is there. I have taken people back and shown them the sign even though it has red flags and said this is where the corridor starts for the safety part. That is my only concern is the congestion through there. I guess that could be corrected through a lot of signage but it will take a lot of signage because you are going to warn people back on the Parkway. That is the only concern I have with that right lane having to be forced off of the highway.

Rob Bernstein said you have a similar problem with the other alternatives because when that right lane is backed up you have people doing the same kind of crazy things. That is what this is trying to address. Again this configuration or variation of could be plugged into any one of the alternatives.

David Frasher said that in my view this is the thing that is important. If we want to think in a box we could try to do that and say it has to be this way. He thinks that what Rob is suggesting is that we can modify these lane configurations to strike a balance between a concern you raised and a concern between James and Rob about which one of these trade-offs is the best. None of these are going to be perfect.

Tanya Henderson added, we can go back and reconfigure and start all over. We can change all of the plans. David Frasher said he is suggesting, if you can take the pieces of these various three alternatives that you like and you can modify and mitigate the concerns you have about the things that you don't like, You might have something that is a better solution for the whole community instead of trying to focus on one lane configuration.

Tracy Rico said we have heard repeatedly about design fixes and interchangeability, that is not a plan. A plan is Alt A, Alt C. It is already there. You put a foot-stone down and you walk on it. What you are proposing David is basically trying to say we can interchange this, we can make you happy with this, and no you can't because you want to change your

alternative to widen or to extend past Allen Creek. That is still going to eat up more acquisition lands that you have not claimed for yet. You haven't projected the possibility of acquiring more land. Interchangeability is great but that is like pansies verses daffodils. Not where lanes are going to be eating up more property because it doesn't fit the queuing criteria. We have spent three years on developing Alts A and C.

David Frasher said I understand that. You told me your mind was made up at the last meeting. I already know that. You are not open to these other ideas.

Tracy Rico replied that I was open. I sat down and studied my homework for quite awhile especially since the August meeting. I have been out there driving on that road trying to envision your vision on this paper. Being a tourist and being from out of town like Tanya was saying to have to travel a road where you are not sure where one lane ends and another begins, you are asking for tremendous accidents.

David Frasher explained that what you need to realize is that I did not draw this lane configuration and if you want to characterize from my comments what we just said was we believe these are interchangeable in the WG Alt. You weren't on that working group. You didn't develop the alternative so what makes you the expert on people's opinion on who did design this. We are here. We are telling that in our view it is interchangeable. If you say it is not interchangeable to you then it is not interchangeable.

Angela Findley said everybody is going to have to make a decision on whether they think these alternatives have potential for substantial revisions or whether they think these are pretty solid concepts. We are not going to come to agreement on folk's opinions on this. I want to make sure everybody has enough information to make their individual decision today. If we need to have more discussion on this to help us with that clarification we should have it. We have a lot more information to cover. I propose that we move on and respect everybody's time.

Jerry Marmon thinks it is important to realize that this is one piece of all three alternatives. There are several other components that all have pros and cons. Let's look at all of the other elements of all of the alternatives.

Jayne Randleman would also like to mention that we hear a lot about the community. The community is an important customer of ODOT. Another customer of ours is freight and mobility. Another customer of ours is the travelling public. As we are looking through these alternatives we have to look at what is the best alternative for all facets.

Lane Utilization and Queuing

Angela showed graphics shown in the SEA to illustrate queuing (lane utilization) for each alternative.

In Alternative A there is fairly balanced queuing. Alternative C provides the most balanced/even queuing. The WG Alt is less balanced.

Conflict Points

Using the graphic shown below, Angela explained the conflict points.

Safety: Conflict Points between Allen Creek Rd. & Tussey Ln.

| | No Build | Alt A | Alt C | WG Alt |
|---|----------------------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Conflict Point Type | Number of Conflict Points | | | |
| Driveways & Stop-Controlled Intersections | 50 | 25 | 24 | 24 |
| Signalized Intersections | 90 | 80 | 80 | 90 |

| | | | | |
|--------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Total | 140 | 105 | 104 | 114 |
|--------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|

Conflict points are where vehicle paths could cross one another: driveways, intersecting roadways. For each alternative, including the No Build Alt., this was calculated. All three alternatives are an improvement over the No Build Alt. The three alternatives are similar. The WG Alt is a little higher due to the added signal.

Safety: Location and Spacing of signalized Intersection

Using a graphic display Angela reviewed the spacing of signalized intersections. She explained that the minimum signal spacing standard for this type of roadway is one-half mile. The No Build Alt does not meet the minimum spacing between Ringuette St/Fairgrounds Rd – Fairgrounds Rd/Redwood Ave – Redwood Ave/Allen Creek Rd. The WG Alt does not meet standards between Ringuette St/Redwood Ave – Redwood Ave/Allen Creek Rd. Alts A & C meet signal spacing standards.

Safety: Number of Stops per Vehicle

Using the graphic shown below Angela explained the number of stops per vehicle.

Number of Stops per Vehicle

| | No Build | Alt A | Alt C | WG Alt |
|---|-----------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Number of Stopped Vehicles Along Highway 199 ¹ | 12,600 | 6,490 | 6,340 | 6,110 |
| % Decrease | -- | 48% | 50% | 52% |
| Number of Stops per Vehicle In Study Area ² | 4.1 | 3.4 | 3.1 | 3.8 |
| % Decrease | -- | 17% | 24% | 7% |

¹ Total vehicle stops during Year 2025 PM peak hour.

² Measures the number of times an average vehicle must completely stop for queued traffic approaching a traffic signal on its trip in the simulation model during year 2025 PM peak hour.

Every time a vehicle slows or comes to a stop there is the potential for crashes to occur. The percent of decrease for all three alternatives for the number of stopped vehicles along Hwy 199 achieve relatively the same improvement. There is a difference in the performance when you look at the larger transportation system.

Questions/Comments

David Frasher said I have heard a couple of members say that they want to just vote. That makes me wonder if we should see if the group wants to take these public comment or vote. I think that some of them feel like they have been studying this for three years and they have seen all they need to see. I just wanted to know if you guys want to take public comment and then vote or do you want to see any more.

Jon Jordon said he thinks we should go through all of the input and vote at the end.

Safety: Weaving & Merging Movements of Working Group Alternative

A graphic was shown to depict the weave and merge points of the WG Alt. using the same lane configurations discussed previously. The weave and merge points shown are not a part of Alts A and C. Drawing #1: In the WG Alt. if you are in the far right lane at Fairgrounds Rd and you want to move all of the way through the corridor you need to get out of that

right lane before it becomes the exit only lane at Redwood Ave. You can move through until you need to merge when the highway goes down to two lanes at that point. Drawing #2: If you are in the center lane at Fairgrounds Rd. and you want to move all of the way through the corridor, it is about the same but you do not need to get out of the exit only lane. Drawing #3: If you are in the left lane at Fairground Rd. and you want to go southbound on Allen Creek Rd. (Albertsons) you need to get into the added left lane before you can get into the left turn lane. Also, if you are on Allen Creek Rd. /Redwood Ave. and want to go eastbound on Hwy 199 you stay on Redwood Ave. and go through the signal at Redwood Ave. /Hwy 199 because left turns are going to be prohibited under this alternative if you are on southbound Allen Creek Rd.

Questions/Comments

Jeff Hunter asked if there is a reason why weaving and merging movements on the other two alternatives weren't shown. Response: There is no weaving or merging. Jason added that the only one that would be connected between the three alternatives is the right lane westbound from Allen Creek Rd because even though in this alternative it is ending right after Allen Creek Rd in Alts A and C it becomes a trap lane at Dowell Rd. There is a weave issue there for all three alternatives.

Out of Direction Travel

Angela explained the differences of out of direction travel for each alternative. Alt. A out of direction travel was described for the triangle area. There is right-in/right-out access to the property where the Redwood Market used to be located. Alt. C does not have out of direction travel. WG Alt. has out of direction travel when trying to access property in the triangle area and the property located west of Allen Creek Rd between Hwy 199 and Redwood Ave.

Potential Future Access Points to Fairgrounds

A graphic was shown depicting a potential concept of access to the fairgrounds. There will be an ongoing independent process to deal with a circulation plan with the fairgrounds. ODOT is committed to working with fairgrounds in the future once this plan is shown. Jim Raffenburg: That is almost accurate. ODOT, something that has changed is committed to not working with us after we figure it out but is committed to work with us to figure it out. The major distinction there is to whether or not ODOT is going to be a participant in that or whether they will sit back and tell us, well you figure it out and then we will work with you if we can. I thought we had a commitment to a potential partnership. Has anything changed? Jason said that is my understanding too. That is why we didn't ask you to put a bunch of effort into something and then put us in a position to have to say it doesn't work.

NB Allen Creek Rd. Queues

A graphic was shown which showed the queues for each alternative. The queues shown represent 2025 conditions. What is depicted is how filled up the queues are on Allen Creek Rd. between the Highway and Redwood Ave. Alt. A: the left turn lane backs up about two-thirds of the actual capacity. Alt. C: the capacity is almost completely filled up. WG Alt.: the capacity is filled up and doesn't allow much of a transition zone. Angela said that the importance of the graphics is to think about future growth and which of the alternatives can handle future growth. Alt. C and the WG Alt. do not have much flexibility. Jason added that a point that wasn't discussed last night was that Alt C, the queuing of the

eastbound movement on Redwood Ave, there is not a bar shown on the graphic, there is an arrow with the distance. That distance is past the connector that goes back to Pansy Ln and the fairgrounds. In 2025 the traffic would be queued past the future signal trying to get onto or across the highway.

No Build Alternative

The No Build Alternative will be included on the voting ballot. The No Build Alternative is an alternative that is required to be carried through regardless of whether it meets the Purpose and Need.

- If this alternative is selected as preferred:
 1. Safety issues persist in the corridor
 2. Congestion continues to worsen as growth occurs along the corridor
 3. Funding is left for RVACT consideration

Angela asked if there were any further questions regarding the comparison of the alternatives.

Break

6. CAC Recommendation

Vicki Guarino, RVCOG

Vicki reported on the CAC recommendation to the PDT on the preferred alternative. A majority (6 votes) was reached after the first ballot. The vote results are:

Alt C 6 votes Alt A 2 votes WG Alt 3 votes

Comments on reason for alternative selection:

Alternative C

- 2 people – this was best for long term mobility
- The best traffic flow overall
 1. There seems to be less confusion on lane changes
 2. (2 people) This alternative moves traffic closer to destinations on the highway
- Safest for the public
- Less out of direction travel
- 60% fewer stops
- Fewer conflict points
- Alt C is better in comparison to WG Alt because of concern that the WG Alt would require design exceptions
- Best on average considering all data
- Fewer property displacements than Alt A

Working Group Alternative

- Best for all
- Best represents community needs
- Retains the signal at Redwood Ave/Hwy 199. That provides a place for pedestrian to cross Hwy 199. The ½ mile signal spacing is too great for an urban area.
- Lower costs
- Better cost-benefit balance. The cost is still great for the result of moving people through the area 5 minutes faster during rush hour.

- Concern for the BMX track, the kids, the location. The track is a good location for the kids to be

Alternative A

- Is safest
- Like the idea of eliminating signals?)on Redwood Hwy
- Best choice based on traffic data

Questions/Comments

- Nick Fortey asked for clarification on the comment: Alt C is better in comparison to WG Alt because of concern that the WG Alt would require design exceptions. What is the design exception?

Vicki read the ballot which said, an exception must be given by the state for WG Alt. Jason said that probably refers to the signal spacing on Allen Creek between Redwood Ave and the highway. That would be with the trap right turn between the fairgrounds and the slip.

Dorothy said there was a discussion about needing a design exception with the WG Alt from out Fairgrounds Rd and the substandard distance.

Jason added a dual right with the outside right to be a no lane change. This extends out past the fairgrounds so the people coming out of the fairgrounds, legally there is a solid line.

Dan Dorrell added it also takes an exception for blocking that southbound left turn on Allen Creek Rd for the state traffic engineer to approve that signal, a non-standard configuration.

John Vial asked if there are no design exceptions with Alts A and C.

Jason said that both A and C would require exceptions for the v/c ratios on the Highway that are greater than 0.70.

7. City Comment

Rob Bernstein

My comments have been modified based on the experience last night. I appreciate you taking the time to listen to us and it was our alternative that was being analyzed. One thing I think you should know is that we understand completely what it is like to work on something for a long time and then have another idea come in. Those of us in the profession are used to it and we tell ourselves the whole idea is to get the best solution regardless of how it happens. I know you won't feel sorry for me but I have been through it twice because when I got started a year ago the ACCESS group already had an alternative that they liked. It took a significant amount of time and effort to get through the process of modifying that to come up with what we eventually presented to you so that you can consider it hopefully in the same vein. Before I talk about the alternative specifically I want to make a comment about the analysis that has been done and how it has been used. In my experience the way the technical information has been used in this project is inconsistent in a way that is beyond my experience. Let me explain why in terms of the level of detail and how it is applied. You have seen some incredibly detailed information and it is useful and is great stuff. For example, year 2025 pm peak hour queue length by lane is pretty detailed. However, we pointed out the fact that the model used to produce those numbers, buried in it has a factor that's erroneous at best with a significant effect on the results. The saturation flow rate for cars moving through the intersection and the

saturation flow rate for cars making a left turn are the same. In the real world they are vastly different. Saturation flow rates for left turns are 33 to 50% less than for through movements. That has a significant effect on the model results. The response when we made that comment was in effect that is how we do it. That is fine but there is an inconsistency in the level of detail there. We had another discussion about turning movements and dual left turn lanes. We made the point that at Ringuette St for eastbound Hwy 199 that a dual left into that short stub of Ringuette in the real world doesn't work. It is a safety problem and in addition the dual left turn lanes wouldn't be used equally as was assumed in the model. The response was well we need to put that dual left turn lane in there because the v/c ratio coming out of the model demanded that it be there for capacity purposes. Fast forward to last night in discussing the WG Alt and the closely spaced intersections on the highway the analytical results coming from the model showed that those intersections work at an adequate level of service yet Mr. Vial stands up and says that the concept is fatally flawed because he doesn't believe, I understand and agree with the concern, that these things just don't work real well in the real world which is kind of true generically but I disagree that it is true in this particular location and circumstances. But inconsistency lies in the fact that that the numbers produced for this study indicates that is not going to be a problem. The way those things are applied are totally different in Ringuette and the west situations. There was significant attention paid to the travel time on the corridor. Again there is no complaint with that. It is good information. The amount of delay at intersections, what the average speeds were for travel time, yet when we bring up the point that local traffic also is affected and there is information in the model about delays for local traffic, traffic moving from Allen Creek Rd onto Redwood Ave, traffic moving to and from Redwood Ave onto and off of the highway, that information was not provided and has been ignored. The WG Alt is significantly better in terms of the amount of delay imposed on local Grants Pass traffic trying to pass into, out of and across the highway. It is of concern when technical information is put under a microscope and used in some instances and then ignored in others and then passed off as not being important in others. I think it is important to understand what our bottom line is and what the WG Alt really is in its essence. The WG Alt is basically to retain the signal at Redwood Ave, retain the direct connection of Redwood Ave onto and off of the highway and to retain Redwood Ave on its existing alignment. Anything that you want to do to lane configurations or signal timing or whatever within that context is fine. We believe that the analysis that ODOT has performed on this alternative has indicated that the WG Alt as I have stated it, that that connection and leaving the alignment on Redwood Ave, according to the analysis functions just as well or better than the other alternatives and that it is just as safe as the other alternatives based on the information provided. Actually I think I will go a step further to say that we believe that the concept of retaining the two signals is more safe than the other alternatives for a couple of reasons. Number one, the analysis shows that the number of stops on the highway is less for the WG Alt than they are for others. That reduces rear end collisions. The number of conflicting movements, the number of left turns across the highway, the number of through movements across the highway are exactly the same for the other alternatives however with the WG Alt many of those crossing movements are moved over to Redwood Ave as compared to the other alternatives which means that those conflicts are happening on an urban section where the signals are closely spaced. The real safety problem with Alts A and C is that many of those movements, including the entire flow from Redwood Ave onto the eastbound highway to get into town, occur at Allen Creek with the approaching traffic is coming off the wide open section to the east. It is the first signal you come to after a long gap in signals. Dorothy said that Allen

Creek is not the first signal. Rob said I didn't say the first signal. I said the first signal in a long stretch as compared to the other side. Speeds pick up and it is a proven safety problem especially in area like this where the open state highway has been urbanized around it and signals are being introduced. Take a look at US 26 through Sandy. It is similar. To accommodate those same conflicting movements in a different location is better. We also believe that with the two intersections there is a significant improvement of the system to accommodate the traffic simply because we are talking about the same vehicles and the same flows and by accommodating in two points you don't force all that traffic through a single point which in universal professional experience in Oregon and elsewhere is always a significant problem as well. It is not just that too closely spaced signals are the problem. Yes it can be but also trying to concentrate too much traffic at one intersection is the recipe for disaster that many jurisdictions across the state and the nation have been confronted with. Again the bottom line is that we believe that the analysis that was done by the book shows that the WG Alt, leaving the signal in at Redwood Ave and leaving Redwood Ave on its existing alignment meets all of the requirements and is not the demonstratively worse than the other alternatives and that because of its benefits and improvements for local circulation and access and because of the fact that it doesn't take out significant properties in a key location on the north side of Redwood Ave that there is every reason for you to be able to select a preferred alternative and we don't care what you call it. The preferred alternative that includes the two signals and leaving Redwood Ave on its existing alignment and make whatever kind of design tweaks that need to be made for lane configurations for safety, I know that is going to happen anyway in design. That is basically where we are coming from. The basis of this concept has these key benefits and this is why we proposed them in the first place and we don't believe that there is any reason not to go with them.

Duane Schultz said he the attorney for the ACCESS group. I also was actively involved with the WG that put the WG Alt before you. I am going to focus on some of the familiar issues that have already been posed here and focus on them from the standpoint of the crux of what I believe this is all about here today. I am not going to focus on the technical issues as Rob did. I am going to try and focus on broader overall prospective on the entire process and the entire matter of issues that relate to both the community and ODOT. I have prepared written comments in anticipation of getting through this as quickly as I can. I don't want to take up more time than I need to. There are other folks that want to speak. First of all I do want to thank you and ODOT for allowing us to move our WG Alt forward. That was a big step in allowing the community access to the process that to a certain extent we did not have prior to your decision. I can tell you that in doing so, and evaluating that alternative and all the work in the WG committee, the time and energy required to develop that alternative made us all appreciate very much the energy and time that you all have invested in what you have done for the last three years. Without meaning to be patronizing we sincerely do appreciate and respect the effort you all have made. Now that we have three alternatives it is fair to say that the WG Alt is not a radical departure from Alts A or C but actually very similar in many respects. In fact ODOT's own analysis in the SEA concludes that all three are very close and that they are in fact aspects of the WG Alt that are actually better as Rob pointed out. Those of you who were here last night I want to also say that I modified my notes from last night to a certain extent to incorporate not only what occurred last night but also some of the comments this morning. Clearly there are some very beneficial and positive advantages and benefits to the WG Alt that don't appear in the other alternatives. We would like to believe, and the reason that we favor the WG

Alt is that it incorporates much of what is good about Alts A and C but also includes more community based elements. It is for that reason, among others, that the city, county, ACCESS and our elected representatives all support the WG Alt. In fact this broad based communitywide consensus represents a coalition of support rarely seen or experienced before in this community. Not only are the three options very close but many of their design elements are interchangeable. I hope you all won't unfairly dismiss this interchangeability element because I believe it is very significant. This interchangeability factor was not only pointed out in the city's and the ACCESS's responses in the SEA but has been recognized by ODOT in its Attachment B to the responses you have before you to the city's SEA letter on Section 2, page 26. That section is headed, Interchangeability of Design Elements. Wherein, ODOT in discussing lane configurations concluded that although that was a complex issue, this final evaluation of interchangeability can occur in the final design stage once the preferred alternative with its key components is selected. In all respect to those members who are talking about being locked in and interchangeability not being something we should consider ODOT itself in its responses have lent significant credibility to the interchangeability option. Please also remember that ODOT representatives, all of whom are in this room today, have publically and privately stated that they will not build a project without city and county support. I believe also that the Federal Highway Administration regulations also require local government support for any project. And of course the city council that you all know has publically adopted a unanimous resolution rejecting A and C and endorsing the WG Alt. The county commissioners have also endorsed and supported that alternative publically. When all of the foregoing is considered together several observations and a clear course of action emerges. First, we all recognize that we have serious safety and congestion issues that need to be addressed but there is clearly more at stake here than construction dollars and safety and congestion issues. We submit that one of the primary reasons for such broad based community interest and support for the WG Alt is that the continuing vitality, character and identity of our community is also clearly at stake. These issues range from preserving the viability of the county fairgrounds and local businesses to creating a boulevard entrance to our community and to preserving connectivity with the adjoining community. We believe that the WG Alt best addresses these issues by retaining a few lights thereby slowing traffic, preserving the Redwood Ave connection to preserve community connectivity and minimizing impacts on adjoining business without imposing a disconnected highway blur upon one of the major arteries into the heart of our community. In all respect to Ms Randleman and her comments about using community words and talking about through users and having the traffic move through, I believe the record indicates very clearly that the use in this segment of our community is 80% local and only 20% through users. That tells me that we need to put our focus and our priorities on local issues rather than pass through issues. Before I conclude I want to make a comment about John Vial's comments last night. I respect Mr. Vial professionally. I like him personally but I have to say that to a certain extent I believe that he was out of line in his comments trying to influence the CAC last night. I believe that he blatantly tried to discredit the WG Alt by using such trigger words as fatal flaws. That simply is not fair. It is not proper and it is not appropriate. When we concluded our WG Alt one of the last things we did is we expressly asked Jason and Jerry if there was anything that they saw that basically was not workable with this alternative. Their answer was clearly no there is nothing that is not workable or cannot be worked out. Secondly, Rob our consultant, has made it very clear that there is nothing fatal in the WG Alt and in fact there are many good aspects of it. In addition the SEA in many respects equates the WG of all of the other options and finds in

many respects that it is preferable and more advantageous to the other options. I really believe that Mr. Vial's comments were ill-advised and misplaced and I hope that they won't in anyway unduly influence the process here this morning. Having said all of that choosing either A or C not only will result in negative economic and aesthetic impacts on our community, and now I am going address some pretty significant issue here and this was raised by Commissioner Raffenburg earlier, not only choosing A and C will create significant economic and aesthetic impacts on our community but will also create an inevitable confrontation with the preference expressed by local citizenry and local governments. Not only would such a confrontation generate significant animosity and adversity but would threaten the very existence of this project. In order to avoid such a destructive outcome a clear course of action emerged. Your decision could be the selection of a community based and local government supported WG Alt with direction to both ODOT and local governments to work together to interchange and refine in the final design phase those design elements necessary to best balance the project with community preferences and ODOT technical concerns. This then would truly result in a win-win solution for everyone.

David Frasher said there is a difference today between my roll last night. Last night I was here participating not as a member of the panel that is going to be voting so to be fairly accorded with my other voting members I am going to defer any comments I have until our deliberation period.

8. Public Comment

Vicki Guarino, RVCOG

Vicki invited members of the public to give comments.

Dwight Ellis, Josephine County Commissioner: I haven't attended a lot of these meetings but I think I have a scope of what has been happening. It seems to me that there is some turf battles that are going on. I have seen that in the past with the reconstruction of 6th and 7th Street where there were turf battles between the city business owners, city staff and ODOT and the entire team that was assembled. After everything was said and done and some compromises were made I think that we ended up with a best of all worlds.

Originally ODOT had come through with an expressway idea going through downtown Grants Pass in that they wanted to create an extra lane and take the parking off of one side of 6th St. The business owners are in business to make a living and the heart of Grants Pass is viable today because some people were willing to listen to each other and do some compromises and not stick to it has to be A, it has got to be C, it has to be the WG Alt. I like the interchangeability that Attorney Schultz brought up. I think that is going to be key to coming up with a viable project. One of the things that bother me is that I haven't heard a whole lot of discussion around the fairgrounds and the flow. Any decision that is going to be made is going to affect that flow in the fairgrounds. That is major piece of property that the county is concerned with. I wish that the Fair Board had been more inclusive in these discussions. That being said I like the WG Alt. I think it is the best of worlds. One thing that bothers me is what was brought up in the diagrams that we were given. I think this can be alleviated somewhat by extending the center lane out to Dowell Rd so that people have more time to make those movements. The other thing is that if we are just looking at specific section of Redwood Hwy, I like Alt A and maybe we can insert that in just that section only. There are some compromises that can be made and some interchangeability that should be discussed.

Dave Toler, Josephine County Commissioner: I want to say I appreciate the difficult position that the PDT is in. Making difficult decisions is not easy and I appreciate your efforts in doing that. Those are decisions that aren't easy to make all of the time. It is difficult to come to an absolute consensus on a complex issue like this. I want to step out of the box for a second to say I don't really understand how we can do this part of Redwood Hwy without knowing what we are going to do at the South Y. That to me is a great concern because it all starts at the South Y from one end. We all know the South Y is a problem but we are fixing a section of what feeds into or exits from that without really looking at the South Y. That is kind of confusing to me. I don't really understand that and it seems that whatever decision you arrive at is going to box in the potential solutions for the South Y. Again I am not sure why you don't start out with the South Y and work out. Getting back to this issue on specific element on the economic analysis as I heard it today didn't seem to take into account what the impact is going to be on the businesses in terms of their everyday revenue. I heard about right of ways and line property, etc. What the impact are going to literally be on their acreage, I didn't hear anything about impact on their businesses. From what I heard as a county commissioner that has been one of the biggest concerns of the businesses in this area is, whatever alternative is picked, how is it going to affect my business? So when you say the socio-economic analysis shows that they are the same for all three alternatives, how is it that the business folks, regardless of what the decision is, whether they are for Alts A, C or the WG Alt, it seems pretty consistent that they all seem to think that the different alternatives have a big difference in terms of impacts to their businesses. I didn't see data or any talk about that in terms of socio-economic analysis. The biggest concern I have about this process and the potential product that we are working towards here is what I see as a real lack of broad support for any particular alternative. Last night there was a six to five vote. That is six out of eleven. The majority was six; the minority was for alternatives other than the majority chosen was five. However you want to play that it is basically six out of eleven that were for Alt C. That is a long ways from broad support. That is as narrow a majority as you can mathematically have for that alternative. I don't understand the secret balloting. In eleven years of being in public office and working on dozens of community citizens advisory committees with volunteer citizens, whether they are paid public officials, I have never seen a process that allows for secret balloting and I think that it indicates a lack of broad support within your own group as well as the entities around this organization. We are moving ahead, as Commissioner Raffenburg said, knowing full well that the county government that represents all of these citizens is in support of an alternative that from the sound of it is not one that is really going to be voted on here today. The city of Grant Pass' government has said that they support the WG Alt. We have both governing entities with jurisdictions over this site that is for the WG Alt. Yet it seems like things are moving independent of that. Those are the indicators as I am watching here that says there is a serious lack of broad support for any particular alternative at this point. That concerns me because I would think that ODOT would want to have an alternative, I am not talking about actual consensus here, that is unrealistic, but there should be somewhere 2/3rd to 3/4th supports for a given alternative. I think from what I am hearing the way to get there is interchangeability. You take the positive elements from the different alternatives and you make an alternative better so that you can gain that broad support, that wider support which is apparently not what you have at this time. I would strongly suggest that the PDT consider gaining wider support, gaining support from the two governmental entities that have a voice in this project. With that I appreciate your time. I do appreciate your efforts.

Tim Cummings, Grants Pass City Councilor: I got involved about a year ago after an outcry of people, property and business owners, and even though I have not been here for three years on the project I probably have been to at least 10 or 12 meetings and a number of calls and time. I would like to see us look at the WG Alt a little bit more. I don't think a No Build is an acceptable choice of all of it. There is one choice that I don't think is a very good choice and that is Alt C. I would like to see a combination of the two. I appreciate you even looking at this alternative by the Working Group. The other thing is that Dave mentioned the South Y and again I mentioned last night it seems like planning should be looking, we are looking 25 years into the future that there is no mention of the fourth bridge. It seems like that would be something that at least identified a corridor and again I haven't heard a whole lot in regards. I don't think we go up to 2025 to have a fourth bridge. I would think that would be something that they would incorporate into the plan too.

Donna Jean Wendell, Grants Pass City Councilor, and SE Ward: I really do appreciate the fact that you allowed us to make this presentation that as you have heard has been unanimously as far as the city council has been concerned. I am voicing my opinion as a councilor for the entire council of Grants Pass. But, taking it apart from that, I am so happy that ODOT and the state have decided to address the major issue which is the safety. I don't want us to lose focus. Members of the council and others in this community know that I lost two people that were very close to me in two separate accidents out on the highway very close to this spot. Addressing this is my utmost concern. But as a city councilor I am very much in support of retaining and expanding our businesses in this area as well as knowing that we that we have some major infractions to the west and not everybody is going to necessarily initially want to be in Grants Pass but we want it to be attractive enough so that they will want to stop and not just be scooted from one destination to the next. I thank you very much for your consideration and hope that you all move on and find something that we can back as a community.

Curt Ramme: I appreciate a lot of the comments. I think of myself as being on a jury. I heard some people comment that we have been on this for three years. Last year I came out here one night and the meeting was cancelled but the big rush was that ODOT was going to lose this money if we didn't have a decision that night and it was cancelled. Here we are again, it is like a jury, and ODOT needs to hear all of the evidence before making a decision. Are they going to make decisions based on what they want and then it turns out not to be any good just like the Crater Lake exit in Medford. They did it and then they then they redone it again. Before you make any choices let's make sure it is the right choice so that it doesn't cause the tax payers more money again in the future plus the South Y thing is an issue. If we do develop something with these three programs what is going to happen at the South Y goes in, if it does, are they going to have to tear up something that was already done because of now? We need to hear all the evidence just like a jury has to do, what are the concerns of the county, the city and all the residents of Josephine County not just the ODOT ones.

Rosie Burroughs owns Bear Distributors: Like I said at the last meeting in August Alts A and C will wipe me off completely. With the WG Alt I at least have a fighting chance. I have talked to Jason and he has indicated to me on the map that if the extension going from Allen Creek to Pansy if it is eschewed just a little bit more it could save both the BMX as well as my company. All that I am asking is we know we have the South Y issues, we know that have the fourth bridge going at Willow or Hubbard as has been discussed so we are putting a band aid on this section. Right now you want to destroy businesses within that band aid. If the other projects go through we can't put the bandage

back on. The businesses have been taken out with A or C. I am asking that as you work hopefully you will go with the WG Alt because when you take that bandage off it doesn't leave a bit of damage to the wound.

Dean Wendell, Board Chair Rogue Community College: The RCC Board never did take a position on this issue. We are not speaking for the Board. All the Board did was to appoint a senior staff member to serve on the CAC. I was concerned as Dave Toler mentioned, I also serve on the State Student Assistance Commission, and I have never seen a board or commission where people use secret ballots. I don't know how that developed with this particular organization. I have been to several of the meetings we have had here and I do know the background on what goes on here and I know that several of the CAC members spoke their piece on where they stood during the discussion. But the ballot issue does bother me, how they came about that without us knowing how people stand on issues. I know this is not a question and answer period but it doesn't seem right to me as a citizen. Businesses in this area that we are talking about are small owner operated businesses. They are not chains. When you put them out of business, and they are in businesses where they have a cash flow and operations are set where they are but relocating is not a possibility of some of these businesses. This A and C make a major disruption of a lot of family owned businesses that are making a living here. I think you should take a hard look at how you do this and look the alternative that retains many of businesses. This area is going to grow in the future and help it become a good economic area where people can have businesses and make living at it.

Ron Wright: I am on the CAC. Dean Wendell just brought up about Bear Creek potentially losing their business. If the WG Alt goes through I lose my business so it goes both ways. It is not specific to one group. The difference is that I actually own my property. Somebody brought up the key location on the north side property being taken out and that is what the Working Group was trying to avoid. You have four businesses currently operating there at the moment, the Loss Liner, the game shop, Auto Wheel and then you get to where Bear Distributors and Hardwood Plus are. They are already on county leased property. The county owns that land. The two Loss Liner the game store already know that they are tenants because the guy that owns that, Ron Nunn, has already built a new place down the street. They know they are only there temporally. The only one who is exempt would be Auto Wheel. The WG Alt takes out the front of my place, the front of Ed's place and the Cowboy Corral. It takes out the whole front of the street there. There is good and bad with every plan. The CAC originally voted not to forward the WG Alt because we didn't like the way it was presented at that point. We voted again last night, a majority of 2 to 1, however you wish to word it Mr. Commissioner, but it was six for project C and only 3 for the next one which was the WG Alt. In a presidential race which is the least scary option moving forward. Rowdy Bates added that any of those folks would love to have the majority that this has. Ron continued by saying that the concerns I have are the safety of, the movements and merging with the WG Alt. That is a serious hazard. It is bad enough that we are going to have to get exceptions before that can even move forward with the state to have the merger to come out to move into the highway. That has to be done before anything can move forward. Then you are going to try and shift people over one or two lanes in such a short period of time without running it out to Dowell Rd where there is actually room to merge in to where people will have a comfort level instead of trying to squeeze in. We don't know the status of the state. They have to apply for the exceptions and then see what happens. In the WG Alt there is more than one exception. The amount of businesses affects and impacts is not as big a displacement as what is on the table because those businesses are already gone or the buildings are empty.

These businesses were put into the numbers because there was a building there and it was a potential business. Just so everybody understands that, you are not going to displace fourteen businesses no matter which plan we chose but there could be fourteen buildings or fourteen pieces or properties impacted. Alt C has 66 to 68% less safety stops than the WG Alt which means less potential for accidents. Merging inbound on Redwood Ave in the WG Alt is almost impossible to merge and turn left. It really restricts and you are going to do a lot of back to get around. Referring to map he showed that the city has a right of way area that was signed off when that was converted to a business by the city because a road was going through there. That same thing exists on the other side of the street where Spring Village and Spring Point are. Driving down Redwood Ave you will see that the fence has a big curb on it because that right of way was signed off by the city to move the road in that direction. That was the city's plan so that already pre-exists. For Mr. Bernstein, concentrating too much traffic at a single intersection is a serious conflict. We are going to try and put two lanes of traffic onto Redwood Ave. Redwood Ave should be a city street not a highway. If you are going to run two lanes off and you are going to merge between Allen Creek and Redwood Circle two lanes of traffic down to there and the Messman's have a beer truck or I have a big 53' that pulls in, where is our conflict going to be. It is going to back up through that light and intersection. It is going to back out to the highway. If a truck has to sit there and wait like they do now for 5 or 6 minutes that is a serious conflict point. The fourth bridge and the South Y were discussed initially when we started this process. They are not in the prevue of what the CAC and PDT are here to discuss. They are future projects. We all know we need them. We all know they need to be evaluated. One thing that I took exception to and I heard it a couple of times tonight through the Working Group implying that the CAC was not a community based group. They are saying that the Working Group is the community based group. The CAC and PDT is a complete group of different people, yes you have ODOT, the city, the county, the Chamber of Commerce and then you have everybody on the CAC who came from completely different backgrounds. How is that not a community group? There is no bias there. There was a comment about Mr. Vial stating his opinion last night at the CAC. He was not the only one. We had Mr. Schultz and Mr. Bernstein representing the Working Group and Mr. Frasher. Mr. Frasher came up and said, it is not going to be word for word but you can pull it off of the record, that the city council has voted, the county has voted, if you don't vote the way we want then it is not a democratic vote. Mr. Frasher said that was absolutely not what he said. Ron replied, I paraphrased and that is very close to what you said. Mr. Frasher said that was not close at all. Ron added that it was said that it was not a democratic vote if we didn't vote the way the Working Group wanted. Basically Mr. Vial stated an opinion of which plan he would want. Mr. Frasher from the PDT representing the Working Group voiced his opinion with which plan he wanted. So they are complaining about him trying to influence which way to vote and the same thing happened on that side. That is a conflict in my book. That should not have happened. You have a representative that should have handled all of that. But to have a PDT member actually come up and try and influence the decision, I think was wrong. We know there has to be a decision made. We know we all want to move forward and there are going to be changes. Something has to be done. The county's biggest thing is they don't want to cut off the fairgrounds and there should be an access road for people to get in and out and it is not there now. That needs to happen. Jim Rafferty said the main point of discussions last night and today so far has been community. What is best for the community? I think that we need to find that common ground. Businesses for sure because businesses keep the community alive and also we need to work with the alternatives that we had on the table because those are the

alternatives that have come up through the process. Of course most of you know what my alternative would be, the WG Alt. only because I am a business owner and am looking at business and the safety factors and also looking at everything else. I am for the group, the PDT who is a voting group in this process. I know that it has to go up to Salem for final approval probably is to take into great consideration that we have worked real hard and long on this whole process to come to a marginal agreement.

John Vial said my comments are going to be similar to what they were last night; I apologize for saying something I said. I did start this process. About four years ago we were having a fatality rate on Redwood Hwy that rose to one of the highest fatality rates of any facility in the entire state. It was a facility that was performing very poorly. Art and I and Paul Mather said we need to get a project down here. We need to get something going to get a solution. This is not acceptable. We got going. In the last few years that is what this group has been doing. Struggling with this and I want to thank you for your efforts and all of the work that you have done. This is a critically important project for this community. It needs to be built. The safety and congestion needs to be addressed. Thank you for all of your time. I am sure if you had known what this was going to be when you first signed up for it you might have changed your mind. Thank you. One of the challenges to this whole process is Redwood Hwy is the only facility to Josephine County that is designated as a highway of statewide significance. The Oregon Transportation Commission, my boss and Art's boss, has designated this facility of statewide significance and as an expressway. When that designation is made you set up an inherent conflict with local business owners and the needs for the local business. I think what I just recognized is that that conflict does exist. It does in a lot of what the struggle through out that process is, are you finding the right balance by serving the statewide component, the through traffic component, the statewide significant component with the local businesses and the community. Obviously there is not an agreement that that a balance has been struck. All of the options are compromises. There are things that I don't care for in Alts A and C and the WG. All of them have things that I would just as soon as not see. Personally I thought the frontage roads in terms of managing a highway accomplished the most good. It was a compromise. Those frontage roads had too many impacts to the businesses and they needed to be taken out. So we took them out. Now we have some accesses along the highway. That is not the ideal solution but it is a compromise. All of these have compromises. Mr. Bernstein brought up questions about the modeling and the design. It was pretty clear that there is not complete agreement with the engineers on some of these outcomes and outputs. There is not complete agreement on the data within the model. That puts you guys in a difficult position. You have dueling engineers. Engineers don't agree. They are professional people that provide you with advice and don't agree necessarily on what the solution should be or what the impacts are. What I recommend that you do is focus on the purpose and need of the project as you defined when this group started. The first exercise this group did was to define the purpose and need of the project and the associated goals and objectives from that. The purpose and need was to address safety and congestion, access management and have an alternative that provides for future growth. I was very clear last night that I was speaking my opinion; some of these alternatives don't treat those four factors equally. Those four factors are not treated equally amongst all of them. I have serious concerns and I will have to note, Mr. Schultz I think my comment last night of the use of the term fatal flaws was a poor choice of words. I will acknowledge that. But I do have serious concerns with a couple of the options and most notably the WG Alt. The signal spacing on the WG Alt likely will present problems. I ask all of you, is your experience, when you drive down a highway with signals spaced very

closely, does that operate as efficiently as a highway that has signals placed further apart. If you think it works just as great when they are spaced close, I am wrong. Use your own judgment. Use your judgment as drivers and the experiences that you have had on what works better. I have serious concerns with the trap lanes. The trap lanes going onto Redwood Ave I believe are a real concern. If you pull out of the fairgrounds access, which is a fairly busy access, you have 200 feet to make a lane change before heading onto Redwood Ave. You don't have a choice once you go there. I believe that trap lane is a real concern. Finally I think that some of these alternatives don't treat the potential for future growth the same. The queues in the WG Alt back up a fairly long distance. Those queues are based on current zoning and land uses. If land use changes are made those queues will get longer if you develop to a higher density. These are my concerns. This is my opinion. I am not a voting member. I would ask you to use your best judgment and look at the purpose and need, the goals and objectives of the project and decide what you believe is best for this facility and then vote accordingly. Again thank you for your time and effort. This has been a difficult process and we appreciate all of the time you spent.

Art Anderson would like ditto what John said. I am not here to tell you what alternative I think is the best. I would like to give you a few inputs on some observations about some of the comments that I have heard. Most of you here at this table have been working on this for three years and you have looked at numerous alternatives. The interesting thing that I hear a lot is that we have Alts. A and C which are ODOT's alternatives and we have the WG Alt. I don't think that you should minimize your input in this. Out of the 20 people who make up the CAC and the PDT there are only three ODOT members. These are not ODOT alternatives. These are community based alternatives. The members on this team were selected across a wide variety of representatives that included the jurisdictions, the county and city. They also include other people that look at these things from different perspectives. Why is that, because the NEPA process is intended to get us in that direction? Otherwise it would be fairly simple for us to just say city, county how do you want this project done? It has to be broader because all environmental issues have to be considered equally in this process. You have done that. You have done that through a process, I don't know how many alternatives you started out with. You have whittled them down and you were willing to listen and include the WG Alt for further discussion. I have some concern over a comment that I heard Mr. Schultz make about the possibility of confrontation between the jurisdictions and ODOT based on the way a certain decision may be made here. I would ask that you leave that comment at the door when you are considering your vote. The fact of how we actually implement this or even if it does get implemented should be totally independent of how you consider this project in terms of the best fix for the corridor. You need to take yourselves from the South Y in an imaginary vehicle heading west and say which is the best alternative in my mind that is going to work based the information that we have heard about all of the alternatives. That is the only fair way to evaluate it. Any other issues involved with actually implementing the project are not part of your prevue. It was never part of your purpose and need and your goals and objectives. I ask that you keep that in mind. Last but not least, because I mentioned you were made up from the community I feel that you are responsible for making a community wide decision from that team point of view, trying to keep out as much bias and emotion in the final decision as possible.

Buck Baker said was born and raised here. I grew up on Allen Creek Rd. I am a property owner in the area. I would like to say that all of you have a long term investment with all of the time and effort you put into this but I would like you to step back a couple of steps and look at the real statistics that you have seen here about all three of the options. If you

had just come here for the first time today and neither one of them had broad based community support and support for a lot of reasons that you can't see if you are not a business or property owner you don't see it as clearly as the people that have worked hard on this WG Alt. Trust that there is a lot of effort that has been put in to that. I disagree with Mr. Anderson where maybe you shouldn't worry about the confrontation but you should say hey there are three options that come up almost equally in all ways. Some had a little better here, a little bit there but one has had broad community and government support for very good reasons. If you are just coming here the first day and didn't have this investment in it you would say yes since they are almost equal we are going to go with the one our community supports because you are all a part of that community.

Rowdy Bates said there was some discussion about Mr. Vial's comments last night. I would like to balance the weight of his comments that he was being criticized on with the votes of last night. He had also, for those of you who weren't there, endorsed one of the options and that was the option that CAC voted the least for. If you look at what the CAC wrote as reasons for their votes and from talking to the ones that I spoke to there is a fundamental difference of opinion. I don't know which is right and what is wrong, but the fundamental difference of opinion within the CAC and between the CAC and particularly with the WG Alt is the lights. If you look at the ones that voted for A or C you will find that they were talking about less lights and traffic flow and stuff like that. Randy Harris said a lot of businesses have a basic business plan just like you are doing to your plan right now, it is going to 2025. In the mid 1990's DEQ tells us we need to get out there and upgrade our tanks and make the investment. All of a sudden I am investing \$300K to upgrade my tanks. It is something that I am investing in. I had to see if I could make it work. I went to the Master Plan meetings to try and see where we were at. They wanted to take the signal out at the fairgrounds. I lobbied against that, along with others and we got it voted in. We want to keep that fairgrounds light on the highway. I invested \$300K to upgrade my tanks. There are other service stations. They know what it takes to upgrade tanks to make a DEQ approved that we could stay in business. Part of that is keeping that fairgrounds light. I have my business plan to keep me in business. I have to make a certain amount and keep a certain amount of customers to stay in business. At this point all of the plans say take the fairgrounds light out. In the Master Plan we were keeping the light and somewhere in between that changed, nobody knows how it happened or what happened, it never came to my knowledge until we got to these meetings. All of a sudden the fairgrounds light were signed off by whoever with ODOT. One of the biggest problem that I see is still there. We talk about a circulation plan for the fairgrounds and then take the light out. We have not come up with a circulation plan for the south side of the river. I meant the south side of the highway. I keep thinking it is the river because we need a bridge to get across. We have not come out with a south side plan for Union Ave. They say run it down to Ringuette. People will go out and around. Service stations are about access. It is not just my service station. There are a lot of businesses down Union Ave. It is growing, it is getting larger, we have the hospital, and you need to make some kind of plan. I am not saying leave the light there forever. You still haven't made a plan to get people in and out of my business without going five blocks out of their way. Most people will not go five blocks out of their way to get the same price of gas that they can get across the street by making a simple stop.

Janine Law wants it on record that her vote wasn't a secret. I voted for Alt C. It clearly met our purpose and need. It moves traffic safely for the longest term possible. All three of the options that we looked at displaced businesses. You can minimize how many businesses or how expensive the businesses are but somebody is going to move. They are

going to have to move. You don't have to lose your business or close your doors. You move buildings; you get money and buy another building. It is just the best alternative all around.

9. PDT Discussion

Angela Findley

David Frasher would like to clarify something that one of our CAC commented about. I don't think there is anything wrong with CAC members coming here and standing up during public comment period and giving additional comment in addition to position they made previously. Nor do I think there is anything wrong with a PDT member coming to a CAC meeting and doing the same. To me it is the same thing. I also think that it is important that what I said about the democratic process was partly that I didn't realize how, other than being defined as my position as City Manager, I wasn't elected to come here. I was appointed. I think that all of us here are with the exception of Commissioner Raffenburg, who is elected [to represent] 82,000 county residents, he is probably the only one here who isn't an employee, I mean four of us are either state employees, I am a city employee and we have one citizen who I think is not an employee, all of the rest were paid to be here, so my point is that when you look at the democratic process, I don't think it is appropriate to simply discount the unanimous decisions of the county commissioners or the city council. I also don't think though, as Tanya was mentioning, we feel sort of boxed in if we don't pick the one they want. If you are a city council member there are two ways of looking at that. It kind of depends on what side of the fence you are on because if you are an elected person you are looking at that saying, we are elected to represent these people and we are hearing from them in mass at council meetings asking us to do something as a local government to uphold the rights of business owners, the majority of them. So it just depends on which angle you looking at. If you are a city council member you are saying that if we don't do what ODOT says through the PDT that who appointed the PDT, ODOT? It wasn't the city council. The city council has one voice here and I am it. If you just look at the purely democratic process of elected officials representing a community I think that it is important not to discount the commissioner's and the city council's unanimous vote because they are truly the elected officials of this county. That is why it is so important not because there is a fight, that is an issue that I think that we have to be concerned with but I think it is more important to think about these are duly elected authorized representatives of our democracy and I think their voices should matter in an important way. I also think that Commissioner Toler really said it best when he suggested that we select a WG Alt with the condition that ODOT design its own most safe lane configurations. Because frankly if you look at the WG Alt one of its goals, besides meeting the purpose and need of Alts. A and C, which it does, is to minimize the impacts on business. The way you do that is simply to keep the Redwood signal on the alignment on Redwood Ave as it is. With those two caveats I think the Working Group is saying pick your lane configurations that is interchangeable. To us we don't care as long as those footprints are maintained and those businesses can continue to operate. Lastly, to me, we have heard comments this morning about the presidential race and some of the politics. I know it is all over the news and all of the polls are showing that the economy, it is the economy, it is going to be the economy and not Iraq and we are concerned about that and there is a significant additional business displacement of some of these alternatives over the WG Alt. It doesn't matter, all of us have, I think most all of us are employed and we are all pretty safe. But if it is your business I don't think that you can discount that. This is really

a source of anxiety for these people. Some of these business owners have been to virtually every single, not just these meetings, but all of the meeting we have had at city hall, council meetings, and they are really worried. It is a genuine heartfelt concern that they have. I think you should take, you are looking at technical stuff too, and you have to be guided by that. But to me, if you are going to pick something that displaces businesses and costs nearly \$4M additional tax payer money to construct, shouldn't we be getting something very compelling for that investment. We are going to cause a significant impact and if we are cause that impact, I would want to be certain that A or C is going to get us something for that because we have these higher constructions, harsher impacts on local businesses and if we are going to make those impacts we need to make sure that these aren't close in the way they perform. To me, I actually took a few notes and it seems like C is slightly better and has the fewest conflict points. The WG Alt is slightly better in the number of stopped vehicles. Alt A has a slightly better queuing distance performance. Overall all three of these meet the purpose and need. They all do. One has significant controversies, significant impacts, actually two of them do, and the other one doesn't. I think that this math is a concern. It is a concern to me. I don't really like this. I think that what we are compelled to do, I am just trying to tell you how I am going to vote and why, I am going to vote for the WG Alt but not with the strings or limitations on ODOTs staff that they can't go in and reconfigure those lanes to make them as safe and effective as possible. That would be my suggestion because I think that is the only way that is the best solution I think. It is a hybrid essentially of all of these alternatives and I think we all have to be careful, we are grading our own homework, me included. So that is my suggestion to our group. I thank you again.

Tanya Henderson proposed that we vote open. I don't think that any of us who have been doing this for three years, if we can't stand up and say this our vote, this is our opinion, and there are no rules against it so I think we should do it. I want to thank the CAC members who are here. They have worked very hard. They are like our big brother. They truly are because they are an extension of us and we don't ignore what they say. Regarding our people on this committee. We were asked. We weren't told you are going to be on this committee. We were asked and we did agree to it. Yes I do work for the state of Oregon but I was asked. I could have turned it down and moved it on to somebody else. The only comment I have about all of the alternatives is that I am to the point where I don't care. I want to apologize to Shannon Repp because if you knock on the door in the middle of the night and tell them that their kid is dead that is an issue. Safety is an issue and that is why we are here. I don't care what we do with the east. The east is the debate. We have had one fatality in the east section. That is where the guy was drunk, lost it and rolled it over in the South Y. We have had seven in the west. I am tired of knocking on doors. It is not fun. If it comes down to it, I say build the west. We will debate for the next two years on what to do with east. We will start a new committee. Pick different community members and start over. Let's build where we are killing people. Let's at least get something said. We all agree on the west. Let's just get going on the west. Vote for C, vote for WG, I think A is out of it. I think the big debate is between Alts. C and WG. You can go from there. Safety is our key. I don't want any more people killed on the highway.

Jon Jordan had a couple of comments for Dave Toler. Talking about the South Y, do you agree to this congestion on the Redwood Hwy part? (yes). I have driven through there, especially during the summer when there are tourists, and they are sitting there waiting and it is hot and idling and if you fix the Y and don't fix Redwood Hwy first, the Y is going to be pumping and funneling people into an area that is already congested. I think that is why we need to fix that before you fix the Y. Mentioning that we don't need to scoot people on,

well we aren't now. All of those people aren't just going to businesses, a lot of those people have worked hard all day and they want to get home and lot of them are tourists and travelers and they want to get to the coast. Yes we need to protect business but we need to think about those people who use the road too. About the secret ballot, isn't that how we American's vote at the polls. I don't think having the secret ballot is a bad thing since that is how we do it. Tanya, if we start this whole process over again on the east side there may not be any money in two years. If our population doubles as they have been talking in the next twenty years, if we leave it like it is, we are in trouble now, we are really going to be in trouble in the future. I think we need to move ahead.

Tracy Rico would like to clear the air about a couple of things. As Tanya stated I was not appointed to this. I was actually ridiculous enough to apply for this position. However, I would do this all over again if asked too. I think this is a process of the ultimate democratic society. We have our opinions. We can vote. We make it known one way or the other. Personally, open up the votes. I don't care. Closed votes are okay with me too. If you want to ask me later how I voted I will be happy to tell you. I was not appointed; I actually did volunteer to do it. Accountability, when we have three separate entities trying to converge and get one solution, the three entities being the city, county and ODOT, and it's kind of an us against them, and that is not how we started this process. We wanted to incorporate everybody. We had announcements going out in the newspaper. That is how I found out that this was going to transpire. People just kind of went and said that is not going to affect me. Or oh wait now it is going to affect me and then get on the band wagon and try to correct something that was already proposed. I think that we lost sight of what was most important, safety. And like what Tanya was saying, I work for somebody who lost two people on this highway. I am tired of her grieving. And I am tired of people having to be told that somebody else died. Now can we all sit in the sand box and play without throwing sand at each other. Well I am hoping so because that was one of the reasons I came on board, to make sure that the county and the city and ODOT can have a fair playing field. Well they kind of took that fair playing field away when they started threatening me with if you don't vote for this alternative we are pulling out and you are not getting anything. To me that is not democratic. That is bullying. That is being the bully on the playing field. Right now I feel rather cornered and I don't like it.

Jim Raffenburg said we are here because the Oregon Transportation Commission made a decision to turn this part of our community into an expressway. That is a problem in of itself. I wasn't a commissioner when they did that. I don't remember the process or whether or not anybody locally was asked what their opinions were. I am sure there were, as they say there is always the opportunity for people that watch what ODOT does like a hawk to know that they could have made a comment somewhere up in Salem but I don't remember, I haven't seen that the governing body in this county was never invited to participate in that other than through the formal email notification that we get from ODOT. That kind of sets the stage for me. It kind of sets the tone for the way this entire process has been handled by ODOT. Individually I like everybody here at ODOT. I don't have a problem with any of you at this table. My problem is with the process that your organization uses as it was forward through the communities. You ran into a buzz saw over at the Fern Valley Interchange because you didn't involve the people. You have a process on paper that says you involved the people like you have with the CAC here. But you didn't involve the people through the governing bodies in a way that actually does involve the people because you have three commissioners right now that have talked to you today. Everybody knows that Dave Toler and Dwight Ellis and I don't agree on everything. It is very common knowledge. You have a long history with the city and the

county arguing, not agreeing on a lot of things. You are very remiss in not involving all of us as entities from the beginning because what you have seen is that you have these individual commissioners and the two individual governing bodies don't agree on a lot we are telling you in locked step as representatives of the people that your process is flawed and your Alts A and C don't work for this community. It is not a threat to us to tell you that, those are the facts. When Art tells you to ignore the facts, I don't know how you can justify doing that. That escapes me. I think it goes back to the mind set you have as an organization. You know what you want. You create an environment to move it forward because you want to get your job done. That is a professional need that I understand but you are not operating in a vacuum. Let me ask the CAC members; were any of you experts on this before you started listening to ODOT data? ODOT created the data, controlled how you received the data, is it possible that the way that the data was presented to you could have been selected and given to you in a way that would reach a conclusion that ODOT wanted. I think that is natural in working in a process like this.

Jerry Marmon asked, "What is the option Jim? Not to have a citizen advisory committee. Not to have to go out to the public and give them the data that we have. Just to come to you and say what should we build? What is the option? That is how you engage public. Do you have a better option?"

Jim Raffenburg said I am going to take a moment to regain my thoughts. I think that you are out of line to interrupt me.

David Frasher wanted to try and address Jerry's question. I think it is a fair point. That is partly why the city decided to hire its own consultant because we wanted to analyze the data. There is pretty significant presence here of voting ODOT staff who probably have an attachment to its own homework and I understand that too. That is partly why we wanted to have our own representative to come forward and analyze the data and work with you guys. It is also why we wanted you folks on the Working Group with us, day by day, meeting by meeting, participating to make sure we had as much exposure of the information and that we were comparing apples to apples in the same way. If you remember when Rob made his initial comments that we don't really believe that in all respects the data was used the same way to evaluate the alternatives. So there were some subtle differences there. But in the end they meet the threshold so I think that is what is important.

Jim Raffenburg said his comments go to process and the way that it was done, not that ODOT doesn't have a responsibility to crunch the numbers and to present the information. I am just trying to show that ODOT controlled the process with the CAC from start to finish and controlled it with the PDT from start to midway. The data was presented in a way that is going to make it easier for you. You handled it in way that makes it harder for all of us. I encourage you to review your processes and to open them up in a way that when you go into a community to involve the governing bodies. Don't just put an ad in the paper and say we want people to come and sit on a CAC. When the Board of Commissioners creates advisory bodies we call the people that are the stakeholders and help them fill the seats and let them appoint the people. The WG Alt, as the gentleman from the Shell station pointed out, doesn't solve all of the problems at the fairgrounds light. There are county issues that happen there as well as other business issues. One would hope that in the process the gentleman who owns the Shell station and other property owners on the south side are damaged economically they will be compensated economically. Obviously they need to be compensated if they are impacted, so does the county. The reason that I am opposed to Alts A and C, partly because I have to represent the whole interest of this county and one of those big interests is the economic viability of our

fairgrounds. The WG Alt is the only alternative that offers a hope of our being able to utilize the fairgrounds and allow it to remain economically viable if we can solve the problems at the fairgrounds light. Alts A and C do not offer us those opportunities. That is one of my big reasons, on top of all of the other reasons we talked about on safety issues, where I think all three alternatives adequately mitigate safety with some tweaking that needs to be done. I think the ACCESS plan has the best chance of meeting the county's needs. It addresses the needs of the people of this community as expressed to their elected representatives and with some minor tweaking on the lane issues will serve the safety needs, the freight movement and the traffic movement that ODOT needs. I encouraged fellow PDT members to adopt the plan that allows for something real to happen from all of this rather than to put us into a situation where it is going to be very difficult to move forward.

Jon Jordan said at all of our first meetings the city and county were here. They were sitting on our group. I have never, and I think I am pretty good to feel sensitive to the people, but I have never felt that the ODOT folks were pressing us to do anything. I have really felt the other way. I have never felt that. About data, I try to read it... I can't speak for Tanya. I have been a paramedic for twenty seven years and have driven on these roads for twenty years as a paramedic here in Grants Pass and on the Redwood Hwy. I try to step back from all of the data and look at the big picture and what is really best for all of these things in our purpose and need. That is where I come from. The numbers haven't eschewed what I am thinking. I am trying to think about the best for all of the community. Taking the individual needs of people but at the same time what is best for the community. What is best for us in twenty years? That is a hard decision but we are going to have to make it.

Jeff Hunter, regarding the WG Alt asked what is the purpose of the light at Redwood Ave/Allen Creek Rd. What is the thought process there? Rob Bernstein replied by saying that when we went through the process of developing the WG Alt we went through a process just like this where we looked at everything and narrowed it down. One of the things that we started off with for this West Y area, I think that may be our main contribution to this is that we coined the term West Y was that you have multiple corridors coming together in a small area and ultimately you just can't do that all at grade. Those corridors are Hwy 199, Redwood Ave extending back through the city and out into the county west and Allen Creek heading to the south. All three are important corridors and how they connect is important. What we ended up here with this basic concept, unlike Alts A and C which basically focuses everything at one point, at one intersection on Hwy 199. The idea was to spread it out and retain the triangle and signalize the connection points. There are three signalized intersections but each one of them has less traffic than the one single intersection in the middle. Basically that is one of the three primary connection points in this West Y area. Jeff said he just sees an additional light where we are trying to reduce lights in intersections. You have two lanes coming off here and flowing into a dead red light. Dorothy said that the biggest thing here is the fact that with all of the people wanting to do access from the north side into the signal, people coming from Allen Creek up, but it does not function without a signal there so that everybody can have their turn so that this doesn't block everything else off. It does give the side movements a controlled opportunity to get out. Jason said this is the problem that Allen Creek has today. Rob said that the other part of our discussions where we had a hard time with this as well is to get beyond the generic intersection spacing and the number of intersections question and yes closely spaced intersections are not good. Multiple intersections are not good generally but we are not dealing generally we are dealing with specific location with its specific needs

and the conclusion that we came to, doing traffic analysis and impact analysis, was that in this particular case the three signalized intersections in the triangle actually works better for access and safety and that is why we proposed it that way.

Jeff Hunter wanted to reiterate what Jon said. I feel that everybody thinks that these plans are ODOT plans. I like to think that it was the whole team coming up with these ideas over the last three years and the hundreds of different ideas and playing tinker toys with every different possibility and I take offense that ODOT had pressure on me. I have never had contact with an ODOT person outside of these meetings. Nobody has called me. Nobody has sent an email and said this is what we want you to think, this is what want you to see. They have answered all of the questions I have had. Every meeting that I have come to I have said we need information on this; we need information on that, help us out. That is one thing. The whole reason we are here is to decide what needs to be done to improve the highway. I think the deaths, safety are foremost. I like to think that it wasn't OTCs decision to designate this as an expressway that caused those deaths. We have to keep that in mind.

Jayne Randleman heard that these are ODOT numbers. She wants to remind everybody that we too hired our consultant. We hired Parsons Brinkerhoff and together we came up with the data. If you look the dollars that have been invested a No Build would be a terrible waste.

Jim Raffenburg said that Jeff's comments are good remembering that we are here about the deaths. The deaths that took place down the road. That needs to be fixed as soon as possible. I think the folks recognize that. I hope that everybody else recognizes the utility of the community and what the community wants as far as access to community activity is being balanced with the safety issues.

Jeff Hunter asked if we have the option of moving forward with the west end and tabling the east end?

Jerry Marmon answered; at this point the project limits are set. We have had discussions with Federal Highway Administration in the past on whether or not we should break those out because it was more difficult to resolve that issue. At this point the decision is that we keep them together. Make a decision on the entire project.

10. Vote for Preferred Alternative

Angela Findley, Parsons Brinkerhoff

Vicki Guarino, RVCOC

Angela said we are going to use ballots. That does not preclude folks, after the vote, to express how you voted you certainly have the opportunity to do that.

Vicki said this will be done the same as with the CAC. We are looking for a majority of voting members. The majority of voting members for the PDT to agree on one of the alternatives. The majority for the PDT is 5 votes. If an alternative does receive the 5 votes the first time around we will eliminate the alternative with the least number of votes and then have a second round of voting. Also as always we are looking for your reasons for your votes.

David Frasher We are voting on three alternatives and the No Build. Are we clear that the WG Alt is not necessarily as it is drawn and presented here in ODOTs diagram and that it could be the WG Alt with modifications?

Dorothy Upton has a concern with that because all of the numbers that are in the SEA are based on a design and not a tweak. I have a problem with that. It is still fluid. I understand that some parts of it can be but the basic concepts on this, the number that I analyzed, had had specific lane configurations in it. If that was not what the city had wanted hopefully they would have approached us sooner. This option and the numbers that are reported show that all three of them work, they are all about the same, is based on some certain assumptions. I have a problem to say that that is going to be modified later on. Rob Bernstein said that is not how the environmental process is allowed to work. The way the environmental process is that you guys can vote whatever alternative you want if it is enough different in its impacts that what has been analyzed to this point then there will have to go back and make some changes.

Dorothy Upton: Rob no numbers have been reported for your basic concept which is leave the signal, leave everything where it is. Those numbers are not what was reported. What numbers were reported had the dual lane off. That does affect the numbers reported. In the environment assessment that is a difference. That is what I am trying to say, the numbers reported in this document are based on something that you keep wanting to try and change. That is what I have a problem with.

Rob Bernstein replied but if that is the selected alternative, if this group and ODOT decides that the alternative they want is something different than what the numbers showed then the document will have to be updated. The fact that the numbers have been run on a specific thing is by no means a limitation on what the selected preferred alternative can be.

Dorothy Upton answered if that is the deciding point between the alternatives, to me it does matter. My personal opinion on my vote.

Angela said that is where we are going to have to leave it. Everybody has their votes and can interpret the data and make the assumptions that they feel comfortable with. If you are making assumptions that factor into your vote we encourage you to include that in your written reasons.

Results/Wrap Up

Vicki Guarino

Vicki reported the vote results for the first ballot:

Alt A 4 votes Alt C 2 votes WG Alt 3 votes No Build 0 votes

Reasons given:

Alt A

1. Best meets Purpose and Need (2 comments)
2. Safest (2 comments)
3. Most expandable in the future (3 comments)
4. Doesn't box highway in
5. Improves safety and congestion
6. Meets driver expectations
7. Alt. A can be made to leave the gateway feel into the community

8. Less conflict points
9. Less out of direction problems
10. Longer distance for stacking on Ave and Allen Creek
11. Redwood Ave, no light moves traffic
12. Slip lane allows more traffic to get off highway
13. Less lane changes

WG Alt

1. Greatest improvement is number of stopped vehicles
2. Congestion and safety improvements meet Purpose and Need
3. Far less negative impacts on local economy, businesses, pedestrian safety, community values and fairgrounds
4. Costs nearly \$4M less
5. Is only alternative with any support whatsoever from county and elected officials
6. The only alternative that addresses all of the wants, needs and concerns of the people of this county.
7. Addresses safety, connectivity, business and traffic flow of the parties.
8. Will allow the use of the main fairground's parking lot in a way that Alt. C does not.
9. An alternative must move forward to reduce the deaths and safety congestion.
10. Two alternatives have no support no support from the two largest governing bodies.
11. This vote must be accompanied with assurance that lane weaving and other points of conflict concerns are addressed.

Alt C

- | | |
|---|---------|
| 1. Less conflict points | 2 votes |
| 2. Less out of direction travel | 2 votes |
| 3. Less conflicts to BMX | |
| 4. Removal o lights – to correct spacing distance | |
| 5. Support CAC's involvement and participation | 2 votes |
| 6. Safest | 2 votes |
| 7. Less weaving movements | |
| 8. Weighs the needs of the majority which includes visitors and shipping. | |

Since a majority on any alternative was reached, a second vote will be conducted. For the second ballot Alt C and the No Build were dropped. The vote was between Alt A and the WG Alt.

Alt A 6 votes WG Alt 3 votes

Alternative A received the majority vote and is the preferred alternative.

Angela said that we did have request from the CAC yesterday, what if they have comments on the process. Please send us any of your comments on the process. I think that ODOT is very open to looking for other options if there are ways to improve the process. Feel free to send those emails to Vicki, myself or Jayne.

Question: There are nine people voting. Why does ODOT get a third of those votes?
 Vicki said the set up for the PDT was made at the beginning of the project in consultation

with ODOT standards as well as with the county and city. I can't speak to the details about.

Rowdy Bates said the CAC was doing this for three years and did not have votes on the PDT.

David Frasher: Maybe what she is asking is what is the statutory authority to give our group jurisdictions to make the decision. Maybe that is what she is after. I actually don't know that. When our city forms a committee we have an ordinance that authorizes it. Is there an administrative rule? Jerry replied that technically this is a recommendation to the OTC which is why we can do closed ballot. Technically this is not a decision making body. This is a recommendation to the OTC. David asked, does it go from here to the OTC. Jerry said that ultimately it needs to be approved by the OTC which is why we got DOJ approval on the ballot issue. David asked when will it go to the OTC? Jerry said that will happen after the REA. David asked if these people and the public be notified when that happens. Jerry said absolutely. Vicki, Gary you did some checking with the DOJ on the standards. There was something that came from the DOJ, a written statement that maybe should be posted on the website that would explain. Gary said that this body makes the decision to ODOT management. The ultimate public body is the OTC and they have to gavel down on whether this project is approved or not with this recommendation as I understand it.

John Vial, as a point of order: I think that the right answer to this is the OTC delegates project development authority to the field. This is not going to be presented to them to approve it. That never occurs. They delegate this down to the field. This is done. It doesn't go to the OTC for approval. It is kind of defacto because they have delegated it. We have our authority through them.

David Frasher asked if that is how they also picked the composition of the PDT, that is what the lady's question is, how is it that ODOT has such a strong presence on the PDT. Is that because they also delegate to you the authority to structure the PDT with whatever membership you think is appropriate to get diversity.

John Vial answered that is kind of a hybrid process between what we do and what Federal Highway asks for the NEPA process. The NEPA process asks you to have citizen input. There is not a rule that says you shall do this. It is more practice than a rule. Dorothy added that the second part of it is some of that is idea of the recommendation about all of the commissioners and all of the council members, you start getting a decision body that starts getting to be 15 – 25 – 30, and so part of trying to come to a team like this is not necessarily to have all the council members or county commissioners on because it gets to be such a big body. Response, then if that is the reason then there should be only one ODOT member on this board, not three. Rob Bernstein, who exactly made the decision as to the composition of this particular PDT? Did you do it personally, did your office do it or is it ODOT, and does Salem's mandated guidelines say one person from ODOT traffic, one person from ODOT design? John Vial said it was a process. Art was involved with it and the project leader Eryca McCartin. If you go back as recent as five or six years ago, a lot of these teams were only ODOT. Nobody else was involved. It has been a big shift to bring the public into the process. It was a local decision about the makeup of this team. Rob said he was not questioning it, it is just that I have been asked the question myself. Jerry said that when we make up the teams there are a few rules that we look at. We never have a majority of ODOT votes. We have good representation. There are three primary areas within ODOT, traffic, engineering and environmental. Jon Jordan, then you have city,

county, trucking, law enforcement, chamber, to me at the beginning it seemed like a good composition.

Jim Raffenburg, the problem that came in here is what ODOT tried to represent the county. Before you shout me down, can you show me a document where the Board of County Commissioners actually appointed Steve Hodge to represent the county or did he just kind of show up and you said okay you represent the county. Gary Leaming said the city and the county were both asked who they wanted to have represent them. We always leave that up to the jurisdictions. The city chose Laurel Samson and the county chose Steve Hodge. Jim asked, can you provide me with a document. The COG who administers this, will probably have to look through their records. Jim I would appreciate that because we don't have it. Art Anderson said I can guarantee you that is the way that is done is fully above board.

Jerry thanked everybody for their participation.

11. Adjourn