



Meeting Date: Friday, April 15, 2005

Purpose: Project Development Team Meeting 3

Distribution: Project Development Team Members, public

From: Vicki Guarino, Rogue Valley Council of Governments

Date Prepared: April 15, 2005

PDT Attendees: Laurel Samson, Steve Hodge, Lt. Tanya Henderson, Jeff Hunter, Dorothy Upton, Jerry Marmon, Tracy Rico, Eryca McCartin, Angela Findley, Vicki Guarino, Bob Sechler (for Ray Lapke), Jason Sheadel, Rowdy Bates, Jon Jordan.

PDT Absent: None.

Other Attendees: Del Robertson, James Burford.

1. Call to Order/Review Agenda/Approve Minutes

Vicki Guarino, RVCOG Facilitator

Vicki Guarino called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. She reviewed the agenda and noted a change to the agenda, moving discussion of the purpose and need statement to after work on the goals and objectives. She asked for changes to the minutes of the previous PDT meeting. The PDT approved the minutes of March 11, 2005, as presented.

2. CAC Update

Rowdy Bates, CAC chair

Bates gave an update of the April 14, 2005, CAC meeting. He said the CAC agreed that PDT members would be welcome to attend their meetings, responding to a request from the PDT. He said the CAC was curious about what is discussed at the PDT meetings, and interested in knowing about coordination between the two committees.

4. Integration of South Y and Hwy. 199 Expressway Schedule

Eryca McCartin, ODOT

McCartin said ODOT representatives met with county officials, as they had city officials, to give them ODOT's overall picture of plans for the area, especially Hwy. 199 and the South Y. She handed out an estimated, optimistic schedule, showing the soonest it might be possible to start work on the South Y. The original start schedule was 2010, based on funding. By borrowing and obtaining

other funding, the soonest that it may be possible to start the South Y planning process would be 2007, roughly a year after the Hwy. 199 project concludes. The South Y most likely would require an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) because the area is more complicated. The EIS is a longer process. McCartin said the schedule represents a goal for ODOT.

6. Develop Goals and Objectives

Angela Findley, Parsons/Brinckerhoff

The committee received a goals instruction sheet, and was asked to spend about 10 minutes reviewing goals turned in as homework, which were posted on posters on the wall. Findley explained the purpose of goals, and how they will be used. She said that 3-4 goals are needed for each category.

Committee members broke into small groups the work on two categories, and then reported back to full group. Goals developed, by category:

- Environmental:
 1. Enhance beauty of highway; and
 2. Minimize impacts to fish, wildlife and wetlands;
- Safety:
 1. Reduce congestion;
 2. Reduce turning movement; and
 3. Improve safety of access.

In group discussion, Tanya Henderson said there is a need to educate drivers, to open peoples' eyes to some of their hazardous driving practices. Jon Jordan said that public awareness may not happen. The group also discussed ways to let drivers know of alternate routes. Rowdy Bates noted that alternatives are difficult to find.

- Freight:
 1. Continue to accommodate industrial access to highway; and
 2. Minimize stops for trucks.

The committee agreed to clarify No. 1 to include commercial access.

- Other:
 1. Minimize economic impacts, such as displacement;
 2. Define a project that can be built with available funding, even if phased;
 3. Encourage use of all roads to their correct function, increasing compliance with standards; and
 4. Minimize visual impacts from rural to urban.

In discussion regarding No. 2 and available funding, the committee agreed to change goal to read: "Consider solutions that can be built with available funding, or can be phased."

In discussion regarding the intent of No. 4, the committee talked about visual cues to let drivers know they're moving from rural to urban, so actually the wording should be "maximize visual impacts." Samson said drivers need to know they are come into city, but the road shouldn't be filled with distractions either. The committee agreed to the following change

4. Enhance visual clues from rural to urban; and added
 5. Minimize visual clutter.
- Transportation
 1. Address all user types;
 2. Consider appropriateness of access control along expressway;
 3. Accommodate local access;
 4. Consider ITS, including cameras to identify violators
 5. Consider off system impacts; and
 6. Accommodate growth projections

In discussion it was noted that cameras would not be popular, but there is a need to reduce speeds to give turn traffic a chance. Henderson noted that state law restricts use of cameras, so the law would have to be changed. There was discussion about the amount of safety gained by reducing speeds, and the difficulty of reducing speed.

- Multimodal
 1. Consider bike/pedestrian access and connectivity;
 2. Consider bike/pedestrian facilities off expressway; and
 3. Minimize risk to bike/pedestrian users.

The committee discussed ways to strengthen the language, especially regarding access and connectivity. Rowdy noted that the CAC didn't want facilities that would make people go out of their way. The committee agreed to change No. 1 to "Improve access and connectivity across the highway." This change would accommodate the need to provide safe crossings, such as crossings at traffic lights. The group added:

4. Improve bike/pedestrian access along corridor.

Staff posted CAC goals for PDT to review. Findley said staff would create one combined list for the committees to review in May.

(10 minute break)

5. Review Purpose and Need

Angela Findley, Parsons/Brinckerhoff

Findley reviewed an updated version, which was handed out at meeting. She said it contains new traffic data to support the statement. Also, she said the CAC had some editing changes to the safety sections that staff will make to reduce confusion. In these changes, staff will use one data set. Also, there will be some changes to the access section. She asked the PDT for other comments, because they will be asked to approve the purpose and need statement next month.

Samson said the access section seems too focused on eliminating/reducing access. Findley said the issues are number of access points and their spacing. Samson said the problem also is in design. Bates said the choice seems to be either making the road more like expressway with fewer intersections, or a local road with more intersections. The CAC wants to move toward expressway. McCartin suggested adding a section that would address improving intersections, by perhaps adding

lights, or improving geometry. The group agreed to add this section to show a balanced approach to addressing intersections. Marmon cautioned against presupposing solutions, but said language could be added about improving intersections. Steve Hodge questioned whether the traffic volume problem was too many lights, or that all traffic has to go on Hwy. 199 to move south because there are no alternative routes.

7. Introduction to Evaluation Criteria

Jerry Marmon, ODOT

Marmon said that next month, the committees will start to see some alternative highway concepts, so the project needs to start working on the filtering process to evaluate concepts. Evaluation criteria are part of the process, as is the CAC. He handed out three sheets illustrating one evaluation method. Basically, there are qualitative and quantitative approaches. The analytical quantitative approach is time consuming and puts too much emphasis on numbers. The handouts show an alternative method, and Marmon worked through examples from the handouts. He said this process has worked well in other projects, and recommends that it be used here. He asked the group if they have questions, concerns, or other ideas for evaluation. Each member will work in their own chart, with the project management team's recommendations. Then members may make their changes. The committee as a whole also may make changes. Samson said she would like a blank form first, to see how she would agree with others. Other PDT members agreed, so committee members will be sent a blank evaluation sheet electronically ahead of the meeting. Marmon said there probably will be about 10 alternatives from the project management team to start, and the committees may come up with more. PDT members agreed that the evaluation format presented is a good one.

Responding to a question, staff said the split between rural and urban on the Highway is drawn at Dowell Road

8. Next Steps

Angela Findley, Parsons Brinckerhoff

Findley referred to the meeting schedule distributed to committees at the start of the project. She said the committee will be asked to approve the purpose and need statement next month. Also, they will receive synthesized goals and objects, and be asked to approve then. Most of meeting will be spent reviewing and providing feedback on maps and drawings of alternative concepts from the project management team.

Steve Hodge asked about modeling, and was told that modeling results would not be ready next month but would come out before the committee starts its evaluation.

9. Public Comment

Del Robertson referred to the access section in the purpose and need statement, and said Hubbard Lane is not rural, especially in the future as the region grows, so maybe this should be change. Samson agreed that he raised good point. It was noted that the distinction can be subjective, that the appearance of the road and the location of the urban growth boundary play a part in the urban/rural distinction. Samson said the project needs to recognize areas that are in transition to urban.

10. PDT Comfort Check

Vicki Guarino, RVCOG

Guarino asked each PDT member to comment on the meeting and how they are feeling about the process – if they're comfortable with what has gone on, or if they have concerns.

Tracy Rico: OK

Jeff Hunter: OK

Tanya Henderson: OK

Laurel Samson: OK

Steve Hodge: OK, and appreciated the session with McCartin and Marmon.

Jerry Marmon: OK, feels as though the committees are making good progress.

Dorothy Upton: Is interested to see how the interests of the CAC and PDT track.

Bob Sechler: A good process, liked seeing how both committees worked.

Angela Findley: Thought the discussions had been fruitful, and appreciated efforts of both committees.

Eryca McCartin: Agreed that the discussions and been fruitful.

Rowdy Bates: OK

James Burford: He will be attending project meetings, taking Mike Arneson's place. He said he liked the team organization.

Jason Sheadel: Thought the committees were working well.

13. Wrap Up

Vicki Guarino, RVCOG

Guarino said the next meeting of the project development team will be 9-11:30 a.m., May 13, in the Rogue Community College board room. The meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m.