April 1999

Location: Jackson County Public Works Auditorium

Members Present: Joe Strahl, Lisa Owens, Mark Gallagher, Skip Knight, Brian Dunn, Greg Holthoff, Mark Ashby, Mike Burrill, Mark McQueen, Reeve Hennion, Julie Brown, Frank Stevens, Jim Oldland, Ivan Marrero, Dan Moore, Laurel Prairie-Kuntz.

Members Absent: Robin Marshall, Tim Murphy

Guests: Rick Wiliams, DLCD

Consultant Team Present: Dave Mayfield, URS Greiner, Jim Hanks, JRH Transportation Engineering; Gary Shaff, JRH Transportation Engineering; John Morrison, RVCOG.

1.0 Call to Order
Frank Stevens opened the meeting at 9:00 AM.

2.0 Approval of Minutes
Minutes from previous meeting were approved without correction.

3.0 Public Comment
None.

4.0 Citizens Advisory Committee Report
CAC Facilitator John Morrison presented the public feedback received at the March 18, 1999 NEPA Scoping Meeting. Citizens were asked to comment on their issues of concern, suggested solutions and what they saw as potential impacts of the South Medford Interchange project.

Among the issues of concern were:

Congestion, safety, the scope of the problem, public input and the environment.

Solutions suggested were:

Improve the interchange and the approaches to it, build a third Medford Interchange, relocate I-5, improve surface street connectivity and explore alternative transportation modes and demand management measures.
Possible impacts:

Worry about being short sighted, be aware to potential population growth, the possibility of opposition of South Gateway merchants to diversion of traffic to other routes, need for protecting business interests, what is done will impact the largest part of the community employment base, impact of air quality, construction traffic will impact overall traffic in the area.

Each member of the Solutions team received a complete transcript of all citizen comments received at the Scoping meeting.

5.0 Transportation Problem Definition
Jim Hanks discussed the work his firm has been doing to define the "Transportation Problem" He said two boundaries have been defined: a project boundary and a problem

area boundary. The Problem Area extends primarily east and west along Barnett Road and north and south along the Central/Riverside couplet. The Project area is much larger, extending from just north of McAndrews Road south to beyond South Stage Road, and from east of North Phoenix Road nearly to Columbus Avenue in the west.

Hanks indicated that work had been done identifying existing and future bikeways. He said the picture was not a good one. Bike ways in the vicinity of west Barnett are decidedly "not friendly," and those to the east of the freeway were hard for anyone to find not already familiar with them. He will continue to look at pedestrian and bike ways and how connectivity issues might be solved.

It was pointed out that people wee walking east to west on the south side of the Barnett Road overpass to get to the Hometown Buffet. There are inadequate provisions for pedestrians on that side of the overpass. The pedestrian area is on the north side of the overpass which is the long way around and people tend not to use it.

Joe Strahl said the Bear Creek Greenway needs to be considered as a part of the solution. The State has a commitment to its use for bicycle and pedestrian connectivity dating back many years. Hanks said using the Greenway for recreational connectivity could be good but doubted that it would be of much practical use for going to work.

Dan Moore said that an inventory of the sidewalks in the area is underway, but all ther ADA points have not yet been identified. Frank Stevens said the State has a data pool on ADA sidewalk locations. He also pointed out that in State use of the terminology, paths and sidewalks are not synonymous.

Jim Hanks pointed out that some of the largest employers in the I-5 corridor are in the area. This means that any solution must consider transit options,. He noted that Asante (RV Medical Center) has car pool and fixed rate paid transit available to its facility. He also noted that bus stops on Barnett Road are a problem in that with no pullouts, they back up traffic. Julie Brown noted that we need to consider carpooling and other TDM solutions such as flex scheduling and telecommuting .

Bus transit options were discussed. One proposal might be widening Barnett Road with re-striping for a bus stop. Jim Hanks said busses may be given priority at traffic signals in order that they can maintain headway and meet schedules. The technology exists so a bus can "notify" a signal that it is nearing so it will have a green light as it arrives. Hanks said the issue here is that any reduction in bus delay is an economic and service gain.

Jim Hanks they briefly discussed the traffic and congestion situation at the iterchange. Accidents, he said are not a major problem. Congestion as defined by level of service (LOS) is the major problem. The intersection of Barnett at Hwy 99 gets to levels F at times. Driveway on Barnett Road pose a high congestion access problem, with some accidents. The east side ramps of the overpass back up and block the west side ramps. South bound I-5 off-ramp backs up onto the freeway at time, but this has not yet become an accident problem. A trap lane on the west side of the Barnett Road overpass for traffic to go south on I-5 cause delays and some accidents due to abrupt land changes. The right turn only lane on Stewart which feeds this trap lane exacerbates the situation. Also the left turn lane at Alba is a congestion problem.

Mike Burrill asked about pedestrian crossing and whether they can disrupt the sequencing of the lights. Hanks said they can, and that the only answers are to 1) set the frequency for

pedestrians, 2) set frequency for no pedestrians, or 3) develop and intermediate scheme which requires more sophisticated sequencing of the lights.

Brian Dunn asked if there were geometric problems. The example cited was traveling westbound on Barnett, and as the driver is going over the crown, being forced to make a quick stop or lane change due to stopped traffic.

6.0 Project Goals Revision and Approval

Dave Mayfield led the Solution Team through a review of the Draft Goals as developed by the Solution Team at its March meeting. He also presented the CAC response to those draft goals. The Team was asked if they thought any changes were needed prior to adoption, particularly in light of the CAC input.

Mayfield led the Team through the draft goals, one-by one. Revisions, changes and in content and in some cases consolidations were made. The Solutions Team also took into consideration the CAC suggestions and responses and built those into the Goals where appropriate. Much of the discussion centered on how specific the Goals should be. It was decided that the goals should be more broad-based and general and specific definitions would be added when developing the evaluations criteria procedure. Mayfield outlined how evaluation criteria are developed and scored, an how that can determine which Goals are most important to the group. He noted that there can be several evaluation criteria to a Goal.

Once the list of goals was streamlined and revised to reflect the input from the CAC, they were adopted as revised by the Solutions Team.

7.0 Land Use Alternative Components

Gary Shaff made a presentation on Transportation System Plans and Comprehensive Land Use Plans. Shaff said each deals with a different set of issues, and the TSP compliments the Comprehensive plan. He said the hope is to arrive at a condition where all plans are consistent and complimentary.

Shaff said there is a hierarchy of planning jurisdictions, starting with federal, state, regional and local. South Medford interchange project is at the middle level, he said, and has to be concerned with the all the levels, and the NEPA process.

In looking at land use alternative components, Shaff said there are several working assumption: existing land use patterns will change, there will be a move toward greater diversity and alternate transportation modes will be serving a greater share of trips.

8.0 Meeting Critique

Frank Stevens asked each member of the Solutions Team to critique the meeting and to express their personal comfort level with the process. Reviews of the meeting were generally positive, with most Team members saying they were comfortable with the process and the progress being made.

Specific comments:
a. With these goals we have something the community will understand.
b. Glad we went into goals again to fine tune them
c. I'm disappointed we didn't get to evaluation criteria so we could send them out with the goals.
d. I liked taking the CAC input into consideration. Would like to have draft evaluation criteria to work with as a starting place.

e. Like having the Mission Statement posted. Would like to post Goals in the same way when done.
f. The goals changing was a good exercise.
g. For the sake of economy, if packets are sent out ahead of time we don't need them again at a meeting.
h. Consider using RVACT evaluation criteria as we develop ours.
i. It was good to clean up the goals
j. Goat a little bogged down in the goals.
k. Support materials were good, but would like to see a note on the agenda stating what we would like to get out of the meeting.

9.0 Next Meeting

Dave Mayfield reminded the group that the next meeting would be an all day session on Thursday, May 6. The morning will feature a bus tour of the area. The Afternoon will feature small group work with the Transportation Problem, focusing of initial development of solutions alternatives.