



MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Date: Thursday, July 12, 2007

Purpose: Joint Project Development Team and Citizen Advisory Committee Meeting

Distribution: CAC Members, Project Development Team, public

From: Vicki Guarino, RVCOG

Prepared by: Pat Foley, RVCOG

PDT Attendees: Jeff Hunter, Dorothy Upton, Jim Raffenburg, Jerry Marmon, Tracy Rico and Jason Sheadel

PDT Absent: David Frasher, Jon Jordon, and Tanya Henderson

CAC Attendees: Rowdy Bates, Deanie Manning, Jim Rafferty, Bart Van Syoc and Ron Wright

CAC Absent: Irving Citron, Jay Eastwood, Alex Grossi, Suzanne Myers, Janine Law and Randy Repp

Project Team Attendees: Jayne Randleman, ODOT Project Leader
Gary Leaming, ODOT Public Information
Angela Findley, Parsons Brinckerhoff Consultant Project Manager
Vicki Guarino, RVCOG
Pat Foley, RVCOG

Other Attendees: Representing the City Working Group: Robert Bernstein
Tom Schauer, Planner, City of Grants Pass
12 members of the public

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

Vicki Guarino, RVCOG

Vicki called the meeting to order. She asked that attendees introduce themselves. She reviewed the agenda and asked if there were any changes to the June 6, 2007 minutes. There were no additions or changes to the minutes.

2. Meeting Objectives & Project Update

Jerry Marmon, ODOT Environmental Project Manager

Jerry started by thanking the committee members for attending the meeting.

Tonight's meeting objectives are to review and comment on the Working Group (WG) Alternative. There is a scheduled meeting where the WG is going to finalize their recommendation to the CAC and PDT. The WG will review input from tonight's meeting on the plan presented.

Jerry then went on to review the Working Group/City Council meetings and decision points.

- July 9th: City Council work session to bring the council up to date on the WG's alternative.
- July 12th: Joint CAC/PDT meeting
- July 18th: Formal City Council recommendation to the CAC/PDT on their alternative
- August: It is expected that there will be a CAC/PDT decision meeting to review the WG's alternative and decide whether further analysis should be conducted. The WG's alternative will be evaluated using the screening process used on other alternatives.

3. Grants Pass Working Group Report, Discussion

Robert Bernstein, Consulting Transportation Engineer/Planner
Jerry Marmon, ODOT

Rob said that the WG has also developed a forward thinking corridor plan (in addition to the current proposed project plan) that improves the project's long-range elements through highway reclassification, future accesses and improvements. These are things to consider in the future. He added that he believes that the City Council is scheduled to make their recommendation on August 1st rather than on July 18th. Until that vote happens there is not an official city recommendation.

Rob described the present WG concept. He said this is a concept that the majority of the people have agreed upon. The group has not spent a lot of time on the details. The details will be refined as they go along. Most of the work by the WG has concentrated on the Highway 199/Allen Creek Rd and Highway 199/Redwood Ave areas. This area has been named the West Y by the group. The main problem that the group faced was how to deal with five corridors coming into a very small area. He said there is no way to provide connectivity at-grade. Rob went on to explain the WG's concept.

The concept includes the following elements:

- Hwy 199 east of Dowell Rd should be a “Boulevard” type facility.
- The Expressway designation should be modified or changed.
- Widen Hwy 199 to three lanes in each direction.
- Extend turn lanes at Ringuette intersection.
- Retain full signalization at Fairgrounds Rd until mutually acceptable fairgrounds access/circulation improvements identified and built.
 - The City is providing money to do a circulation/access master plan which is to be complete by July, 2008.
 - After fairground’s access/circulation improvements are made, remove signal and retain right in/right out access only. *** The group felt that retaining the left-turn access from northbound onto westbound highway was important to retain because there is no other good access to westbound highway from the south side of the highway. Unfortunately, this signal does not meet warrants so it can’t be done.*
- Reconfigure/reconstruct the Redwood Ave-Hwy 199-Allen Creek Rd intersections.
 - Realign Allen Creek Rd to the east to connect to Pansy Ln at Redwood Ave and place on an overpass structure over Hwy 199. *When working on the final refinements the intersection at Redwood Ave will probably be shifted to the west to minimize the impact on the fairgrounds.*
 - Retain Redwood Ave in its existing right-of-way to the extent possible.
- Hwy 199 Connections
 - Retain/improve Redwood Ave/Hwy 199 at-grade signalized intersection.
 - Provide ramp from EB Hwy 199 to the Allen Creek Rd overpass for access from EB Hwy 199 to Redwood Ave and the fairgrounds.
- Local Connections
 - Provide street or ramp connections from WB Hwy 199 onto the Allen Creek Rd overpass (southbound) for access from WB Hwy 199 to the commercial areas on the south side of the highway.
 - Retain right in/right out access for Allen Creek Rd at WB Hwy 199 and EB Redwood Ave; close Allen Creek Rd at a point midway between Hwy 199 and Redwood Ave to prevent short-cutting.
- Proposed future elements
 - Signal at Ringuette St and Union Ave.
 - Extend Schutzwahl Rd west to connect to Dowell Rd, and construct a new connection between Schutzwahl Rd, Hwy 199, and Redwood Ave at or near McDonald Ln.
 - Construct EB Redwood Ave flyover ramp to EB Hwy 199.

Questions and Comments:

Rob answered questions on the operation and traffic flow of the proposed alternative.

Following are some of the questions, suggestions, concerns and comments:

Bart Van Syoc said this plan shows a slip-ramp off of Allen Creek Rd for eastbound traffic. This is one more cost and one more thing that is not needed if you keep the signal at the current location. Why not re-route all of traffic and get rid of the Allen Creek connection? Rob said that the ramp pulls some of the left turn traffic off of Redwood Ave.

Ron Wright asked if there are four lanes and a center divider proposed on Redwood Ave. Rob said yes but he does not know at this time how far west the four lanes will go. The lanes will extend as far as needed in order to channel the traffic onto Redwood Ave. The city has an improvement project which calls for five lanes. Ron said that the LID starts at Daisy Ln. The LID, which is already in process, is going to be one lane in each direction with a center turn lane. The WG's proposal will have a big footprint. This is a major concern.

Bart Van Syoc feels that one intersection sized to accommodate all of the traffic would be better. This would eliminate the need for the many lane changes, right and left turns and loops. Rob said that the various property owners in this area feel that they would not have good access with one intersection. Bart went on to ask how the property owners on the south side feel about this proposal and have they been contacted. If they have not been contacted we are sure to hear from them when they see this.

Ron Wright said he looking at this plan as someone who drives in this area every day. Traffic is backed up to the South Y. Even if you add a second lane you are shifting traffic from Ringuette St. to the new intersection. This plan does not change the traffic flow. Northbound or southbound traffic does not leave the facility. This is a major concern. Jason Sheadel said the city expects there is going to be a need for traffic volume to carry on to Redwood Avenue. At some time we will be hooking into this with what they are planning. Rob said this is the same as the other alternatives. Ron Wright said this plan does not match the city's plan to bring Park St up the back.

Tracy Rico asked if a driver exited Hwy 199 on Redwood Ave, would they be able to get to Albertsons? Rob said no and that the Albertsons property owners prefer that people would have one point to make a decision at Allen Creek Rd to get there rather than two points (Redwood Ave and Allen Creek Rd).

Tracy Rico asked what the grade was for the overpass. Rob said that it was 7%. Jim Rafferty asked if this grade was okay for school buses. Rowdy Bates said that 7% was fine.

Bart Van Syoc asked how a wheel chair bound person would get from Albertsons to the fairgrounds. Rob said that there will be an ADA ramp on the over crossing. This detail has not been laid out yet. Bart said he is familiar with the traffic flows at the Allen Creek Rd intersection. From his observation he feels that 75% of the traffic on Allen Creek Rd headed northbound desires to go westbound on the highway. Rob said that the traffic counts don't show that. We are designing for the future not what is there today. The future shows there will be significant growth in the corridor. If you leave the Allen Creek Rd intersection the way it is today, five/ten years from today it will fail. Bart is concerned that there are not adequate lanes (it comes down to one lane) for the northbound to westbound traffic. The one lane is in competition with the westbound traffic most of the time because of the control demand on the signal.

Bart Van Syoc asked if the Fair Board is opposed to giving up their parking lot. Rob said that the Fair Board is extremely concerned. We have discussed moving the Allen Creek Rd/Redwood Ave intersection to the west. By doing this the amount of property impacts

will be lessened. Whatever the final package is, it will include replacing the parking that is lost.

Rob was asked how phaseable is the plan. Rob said that the facilities in this area are a single piece and can be built whenever it is appropriate.

Jim Rafferty said that the fairground's property is going to be eaten up this plan. Rob said that he can guarantee that the Fair Board will be looking out for themselves. If they agree to what we have, then it is okay. Jim added that we are not just talking about the fairgrounds, we are talking about public access. Rob said we are in the process of addressing the access issue. The city also has to have the county on board. It is the city that is going to forward a concept to you for inclusion in the EA process. In other words, these concerns will be taken care of for you. You don't have to worry about them because if it is not okay with the Fair Board you are not likely to see it.

Bart Van Syoc asked (eastbound Hwy 199 to southbound Allen Creek Rd) if the off ramp (two lanes) is designed to accommodate traffic that wants to turn left to get back onto Redwood Ave. Rob said that we are revising this. Bart said he did not want to sacrifice a lane of travel to accommodate traffic getting off Hwy 199 to go south on Allen Creek Rd. Jason Sheadel and Dorothy Upton stated that sufficient lanes would be provided to meet the results of the traffic modeling. Bart also added that the Albertson's signal was timed to allow for the vehicles exiting the parking lot to mix with Allen Creek Rd traffic. Tom Schauer added that access to the properties in the SE quadrant of Hwy 199 and Allen Creek Rd was planned to connect at the Albertson's signal.

Ron Wright is concerned with the distance between signals.

Bart Van Syoc asked, if the whole alignment going to move to the west, would the impacts be less on the properties on the south side of Redwood Ave, i.e., the Dialysis Center. Right now those properties do not have access. Jerry Marmon said that technically this is an interchange. There will be no access there. Jason Sheadel said that the property owners are aware of this alternative. Regarding access to the properties on the south side of Hwy 199 (proposed hotel site and houses): Dorothy Upton said that access will be gained at the Albertson's signal.

Rob was asked if the WG had considered lowering Hwy 199 in order to bring down the grade of the overpass. Rob said that idea was studied and dropped because of the expense and drainage issues.

Rowdy Bates asked, what are the pros for the overpass verses Alternative C. Alternative C doesn't encroach on the fairgrounds and the surrounding properties as much as this proposal. Rob said that Alternatives A & C do not address the issue that there are five different corridors coming into a very small area. You can't do it at grade. It doesn't work now and it certainly isn't going to work in the future. All of the connections have eliminated left turn cross traffic. Once the intersection has been moved to the west the impacts to the fairgrounds will be limited. There will be better access to the highway than there is now. There is a lot of benefit all the way around. Jerry Marmon clarified Rob's statement that "the traffic cannot be handled at grade." Jerry stated that Alternatives A & C are both at grade and the analysis shows that they do function in the twenty year planning

period. This may be a difference of professional opinion. Rob replied by saying that the difference is that the numbers in the forecast indicate that quantitatively these things can work okay. The fact is, with the growth that is happening, intersections with high traffic volumes break down. This is a long range solution to this area.

Tracy Rico mentioned that the CAC had looked at an overpass option and were told that the costs were prohibitive. Will this option (overpass) have city-matched dollars? Rob said the key is that if everyone agrees this is the kind of improvement that is needed then it will be incumbent on ODOT, city and elected officials to find the money. We are not proposing this option because there is a blank check out there. This is a long range solution. This is not the last chance to get this right but it is a good chance and chances don't come along very often. It is important to get it on the books what you want for the future. If this is the right plan then money can be found for it on some kind of schedule.

Rob was asked if we are rolling the dice hoping that we get the funding. Is there a Plan B so that we can keep from crashing cars on Hwy 199 while we are trying to find funding for the overpass? Rob said that he doesn't know that Alternatives A or C are any different. Three lanes in each direction will go a long way to relieve the problem on the highway. As far as funding goes, it is not a matter of rolling the dice; it is a matter of determining what you want and making a case for it.

Ron Wright asked what is the estimated timeframe to procure funding to get this project rolling. Rob said that the timeframe for Alternatives A or C isn't that different. Jerry Marmon said that we need to get rough cost estimates and look at the comparative differences. The decision won't be based on costs alone.

Jeff Hunter asked if an overpass was considered eastbound on Redwood Ave connecting to Hwy 199. It seems that this is where the congestion is. Rob said this is a consideration in the long range recommendations. Jason Sheadel added that when this was considered in the past, there were problems at Allen Creek Rd. If Allen Creek was impacted this would cause having to lengthen the box culvert. Deanie Manning said the environmental impact to Allen Creek would be huge. She asked Rob if the proposed flyover is going to fly. Rob thinks that it would. The flyover is not something that is planned at this stage. Jerry Marmon said the environmental issue with Allen Creek is caused because it runs under the highway and the fairground parking lot in a culvert. It is a fish barrier. Oregon Statutes dictate that if we were to make a major modification to this culvert we would have to provide fish passage which would be a multi-million dollar endeavor.

Jim Rafferty asked for clarification of the process; The option must be approved by the city, county and the Fair Board. They all have to all be on the same page and sign off on it before we get it. Rob said the arrangement that was made is that the city council would forward a concept to ODOT to be incorporated into the EA. The city council isn't going to vote until August 1st. Tonight's plan is basically it with future modifications. If the WG decides they don't like it, then all bets are off. If nothing comes from the city to incorporate into the EA then you are in the spot you were in April.

Jim Raffenburg, JOCO County Commissioner, said that he or Rob Brandis, JOCO Public Works, have been attending the WG meetings. The city is paying Rob's salary so this is a city proposal that the county has participated in. Jerry Marmon said that it would be

helpful for the committees to know if the county is on board. He asked if the county's primarily concern is access and circulation to the fairgrounds. Jerry went on to say that that elements and how we address the county's concern is consistent with all three alternatives. ODOT has made a commitment not to remove the fairground's signal until there is a mutual agreement on access. Jim Raffenburg said that is correct. He spent an hour and a half with Art Anderson after the RVACT meeting discussing West Park St. improvements. Art will contact our engineers with the nuts and bolts of that. We want to make sure the Fair Board has a common acceptable plan to move forward.

Bart Van Syoc (regarding adding additional lanes on Redwood Ave) the expansion of lanes is going to consume part of the frontage of properties on both sides of Redwood Ave which will eliminate parking. Has this impact been addressed with those property owners? Are they on board with this plan? Rob said we don't have enough of a specific design to be able to address that yet. We could go around in circles trying to refine every single item. Ron Wright said that is what these committees had been doing for two years. Rob said you see what happens. Now we are all in the same boat. We want to get a concept that meets the needs of the community.

Bart Van Syoc said he noticed that Dowell Rd has curbs and sidewalks. He does not feel that two lanes can be put in there. Rob said we are not going there. Bart said we have to go there because we are talking about a twenty year plan. If we are putting all of our eggs in one basket at Redwood Ave, and think that people are going to be getting off of the highway there, traffic will choke up further down the road. Rob said that the issue you raise is a real issue but it doesn't affect this project any differently than it does with the other alternatives. Ron Wright disagreed.

There was a discussion on the cost of retaining walls verses a sloped configuration of the overpass. Jerry Marmon said ODOT will try to get cost estimates for the next meeting.

Break – 10 minutes

4. Grants Pass Working Group Report, Discussion (continued)

Robert Bernstein, Consulting Transportation Engineer/Planner

Jerry Marmon, ODOT

Tracy Rico is concerned about the accessibility of this piece of the plan because of the multiplying amount of seniors. She has been driving for years and feels that the plan is very confusing. Rob said that when you are driving on it, it won't be confusing. It is confusing now because you are looking at an engineering plan.

Bart Van Syoc said for the record, I would like to see the Redwood Ave/Allen Creek Rd intersection as a full service intersection for driver expectation. This highway is used by tourists. A traveler coming from town is going to think that here are two lanes going up to the signal on the overpass only to discover that they cannot make a left turn. They would be way out on Hwy 199 before they could successfully turn around in order to get back on the overpass to turn into the Allen Creek Rd area. Jason asked if Bart if he will be able to get friends and family from out of town to understand how to get to his house? Bart said he would never send anybody visiting this way.

Jason Sheadel said the message Rob can take back to the WG is that this group feels that handling all of these movements at the Redwood Ave/Allen Creek signal would be better than the loops. Rob said the WG does not have any more meetings scheduled. This is the concept that the city, subject to a final vote, is going to be forwarding to you. Every little piece of this plan has been thought through in terms of access. The specifics of design are not complete and there will be tweaking of the alignment and grade to minimize impacts. This is basically it. This group's comments are legitimate but it is not something that the city is going to go back and change. Some of issues will be addressed as ODOT does further design development. The other things will simply be characteristics of this option that will be up to this group to trade off against characteristics of the different alternatives.

Bart Van Syoc asked how long will it be before we will be able to see the details of impacts, access, the modeling flows, cost estimates, etc. Jerry Marmon said that if ODOT gets the alternative handed to us when we think it will be, then the CAC and PDT would have their standard meetings on August 9th and 10th.

Ron Wright has concerns with the ability of trucks being able to access his property, the Cedarwood Saloon and the nursery along Redwood Ave. These businesses have 50-53 foot rigs arriving all of the time. Rob said that part of the further design development will show how access works. Ron replied that is why he brought up this issue. He wants it on the record because access to these businesses by 53 foot trucks is a serious concern. Rob said we are planning to address this issue as a part of this process. We aren't to that level of detail yet.

Bart Van Syoc asked if these groups will be notified of when the city council will be voting on their recommendation. He hopes members of these committees will be specifically notified.

Jim Rafferty said he has copies of the WG's original plan. He offered copies to anybody who is interested

Jerry Marmon reviewed information needed by the CAC and PDT in order for them to make a decision at their next meetings:

- Footprint of WG concept
- Access issues relating to specific parcels
- Right-of-Way impacts
- Cost estimates
- Rough traffic numbers
- V-C ratios
- Queuing information
- Signal location(s)

Committee members added the following:

- Multi-modal elements
- Aesthetics

Jason Sheadel said the city is still strongly advocating a boulevard concept.

Jayne Randleman said that under this plan there is an element that should be discussed. This plan has an interchange which has access issues. Dorothy Upton went on to explain the need for an Interchange Area Management Plan (IAMP). When building a new interchange there is a plan that has to be implemented. ODOT has to work with the local jurisdictions on the area's land uses, how the area will be maintained and how the area will be controlled. The Oregon Transportation Commission has said that if we are going to put the investment into an interchange we want to work with the local jurisdictions to have a formal plan on how that area is supposed to function.

Tracy Rico asked if it matters if it is an interchange on a boulevard or on a highway. Dorothy said it applies to all interchanges. The definition of an interchange is: a facility that is grade separated with access to the main road.

Deanie Manning asked who pays for the maintenance. Dorothy explained that the IAMP is not necessarily the maintenance of the interchange. The IAMP would address issues such as the city changing the land use in the area or allowing development at a higher level than what they think it is. The city has to include the state in the process to make sure that everybody is on board with what needs to be done in the area.

Bart Van Syoc asked what portion of this interchange (off Hwy 199) would we reasonably expect ODOT to maintain. Rob Bernstein said that we have been making the argument that this is a just an over crossing of a city road. Dorothy responded by saying that as soon as you put the connections it becomes an interchange. If it was just Allen Creek Rd up and over and you didn't have the ramps and the other connections, then it would be just an over crossing. Rob said that if it is an interchange it is ODOT's job to maintain it. Jerry said that he doesn't want to speak for the District, but it is his hunch that ODOT would end up maintaining a majority of the facility.

Ron Wright asked, if the interchange activates an IAMP, how does it affect this project, i.e. length of time, cost, etc. Jerry Marmon said there are some time impacts with an IAMP that could extend the project up to a year. If you look at other IAMP's that have been completed around the state, the shortest one has been a year. This a non-traditional IAMP because it is not an interstate interchange. There may be an opportunity to do an "IAMP light". We will have these details for the next meeting.

Ron Wright wanted to make sure that everybody understands that it does force a delay in the process.

Tracy Rico wants to know when the committees will receive information in regard to reducing Hwy 199 from an expressway designation down to a boulevard status. Jerry Marmon said we will provide clarification on exactly which pieces are going to be included in the alternative. A lot of these things are long range future aspirations.

Bart Van Syoc said it would be helpful if we had a flow chart at our next meeting on what we could expect to see in the future process.

5. Next Steps

Angela Findley, Parsons Brinckerhoff Consultant Project Manager

Angela went over the flow chart showing the next steps.

The City's WG has held meetings and ODOT has given comments throughout the process. Tonight's meeting is number 15 for this group. The City's WG Alternative is scheduled to come back to this group for review to see if it should be considered as a part of the Hwy 199 process. Rob's work will be handed over to ODOT so that the design can be taken one step further by adding the traffic analysis and design standards so that the alternative is at the same level as the other alternatives. At the August meeting we will be asking you to evaluate the alternative using the criteria that was established earlier for this project with the Purpose and Need and the Goals and Objectives. We will use these criteria to compare the WG Alternative side by side with Alternatives A & C. The CAC will be asked to make a recommendation to the PDT on whether or not to continue studying this alternative. If forwarded the PDT will make a decision on whether to continue/or not continue studying this alternative in the EA. If the WG Alternative is forwarded for further analysis, we need to give the public an opportunity to comment on this alternative.

Bart Van Syoc said that in the past the CAC has made recommendations with conditions and or modifications. Will we be able to do this and give it back to the WG? Dorothy Upton pointed out that Rob said that right now there is no plan for bringing the WG back together. Rob responded by saying that the process that was set up in the beginning is that the city council would formally forward an alternative to ODOT to consider. We recognize that at the end of this process we could have political problems if the CAC and PDT decided to change the city's recommended alternative. So we have an understood feedback, depending on what you come or ODOT comes up with, we will need to feed that back through the WG process. Depending on what the changes are, we may have to another WG meeting. Jerry Marmon told the committees that they can suggest changes or modifications.

Angela added that comments can be given at the public hearing. All comments become a part of the EA. If possible we can make some tweaks to the alternative based on those comments. There are various feedback tools.

Angela said that the team will continue to email the CAC and PDT updates which will include information on WG or city council meetings as soon as we know about them.

Jerry Marmon said we will try as best as we can to get out information prior to that August meeting so that there is time to review new information.

Even though this meeting concentrated mainly on the West Y, Rob Bernstein said that a complete package for the entire corridor will be presented.

6. Public Comments

Vicki Guarino, RVCOG

Vicki asked if members of the public had comments.

Elaine Booth: Elaine is a member of the Fair Board and ACCESS. The WG has not seen the plan that was presented tonight. This plan was handed to us just before the city council meeting. This is not a plan that we reviewed. The plan that we reviewed was

substantially different. Elaine has a problem with the huge impact to the fairgrounds. The Fair Board is not accepting of this plan. The county commissioners (Jim Raffenburg) are not a part of this plan. We cannot take that much of the fairground's parking lot away and replace it with a high-rise parking structure. It is not acceptable. The plan puts in more lights instead of lessening them. The plan that the ACCESS group had presented was a much simpler plan. Our plan tried to address traffic by moving the traffic further out to what is being called McDonald. That was the whole ACCESS plan, to push the traffic out further, get it off of the Redwood Ave corridor. The present proposal gives the fairgrounds until July 2008 to come up with a new circulation plan. I am not quite sure where that date came from. It is totally unrealistic. How long have you folks been looking at these plans? You expect us to totally address access and circulation at the fairgrounds in less than a year. It is not going to happen. Jason Sheadel addressed the one year timeframe. ODOT said that was for planned development, not for constructing the improvements. Elaine doesn't feel this is possible because they will not be able to get started before September. She has a problem with this time element. Elaine has a problem with the justification(s) of why the light at the fairgrounds has to come out. We know that there are safety issues. These safety issues can be addressed and fixed. We have been told that the volume of traffic is not sufficient to keep the light. The light coming out of Albertson's shopping center is on a city street but how can that light be justified when the fairground light can't. She has been given four reasons why the fairgrounds light has to be removed. Basically you have heard the fact the Fair Board is unhappy with this plan.

Terry C: Terry is a member of the Fair Board. This plan is awkward. It could be cut back and simplified and be more financially realistic. The interchange could be moved onto city's land, not on county's land.

Randy Harris: Randy owns Fairgrounds Shell on Union Avenue. Taking out the fairground light impacts all of the businesses and hospital on the south side of Union Ave. They keep saying there is not enough stacking distance and there is not that much traffic. There is going to be more traffic. The hospital has added two more parking lots because there is not enough parking at the hospital. An adjustments needs to be made for people coming from the south side of the highway to the north side so that Hwy 199 doesn't become a barrier like the river. We have the Rogue River dividing us. Now it is also the Redwood Hwy. We need to figure out some other way besides using the Ringuette intersection which is not going to hold all of the traffic as it is already failing. We see accidents daily at Union Ave and Ringuette Rd. If you take out the fairground's signal you are going to double the traffic going down to that intersection because there is a lot of traffic that crosses Hwy 199 and goes westbound from Fairgrounds Rd.

Ron Wright asked Tammy Messerman (property owner next to Ron's business) how they feel about the plan. She said this plan came to them on Monday. It is considerably different from what we originally saw. They haven't had time to review it.

7. CAC & PDT Comfort Check

Vicki Guarino, RVCOG

Vicki asked the CAC and PDT members to let the Project Team know how they feel about the project.

Tracy Rico: I'm fine.

Dorothy Upton: We have our work cut out for us trying to get this done by August. We will see what we can get back to you so that we can keep process moving. It is frustrating on everyone's part.

Deanie Manning: I'm okay I guess.

Bart Van Syoc: I'm good. The process is working like the machine that it was built to be. It is a good process. We are learning to ask better questions. People are not taking it quite so personal anymore because their ideas are different. That is good.

Jerry Marmon: I'm great. I think the process is working. He thanked the CAC and PDT members for their participation in this process.

Jim Rafferty: I think this has been a long drawn out process but it is needed. You also have to remember to look at the citizens that we're trying to deal with as far as making this roadway as functional as possible. Personally I believe the original plan that the ACCESS group came up with is a very straight forward plan and is one that we really need to take a closer look at. It is a situation where simplicity is the key. Is it going to last for 20 years? Is any project going to last truly for twenty years? It really doesn't. It has to be modified at the 5 or 10 or 15 year mark. We can do something right now with the money that we have. We can then modify it when time comes up and as money becomes available. As a community member, as a business person, as someone who is really interested in the public opinion, I believe that this plan again is far better than what we have come up with on our own. If we were to have come up with this plan, I would be for it 100%. As of right now, I am not able to support A, C or this hybrid plan. It would need a lot of modifications for me to support it. It seems ludicrous to me that we want to impact the fairgrounds, our hub of activity in Grants Pass. I am opposed to A, C and the hybrid and I am not sure what is next on the list but we really need to do some soul searching. Maybe we should have a survey of what the people are talking about outside of this meeting.

Jeff Hunter: It has been a roller coaster ride. It is good to see that everybody is still sticking in. We all have the same concerns. We all live here. We all want to make it work. We do not want it to fail in five or ten years after it is built. We are moving in the right direction.

Tom Schauer: Ditto

Ron Wright: I am 100% on top of things. I like the way the process is moving. I can still voice my disapproval or disappointment in the city after they have been in on this from day one and now are rehashing everything over and over. It gets rather annoying and repetitive. We used the Purpose and Need, looked at safety factors and abided by the constraints that were set upon us when we started the process. Not having to follow these guides by anybody else is disappointing.

Rowdy Bates: I'm still perplexed as to what this new concept solves. But other than that I am okay.

Jason Sheadel: I'm okay. We have a busy month ahead.

Rob Bernstein: You have a very difficult situation and there are no easy solutions. I have brought all of the information and now you need to choose.

8. Adjourn