August 1999

From: John Morrison

Date: August 9, 1999

Attendees: Solutions Team members present: Frank Stevens, Ivan Marrero, Mark Ashby, Mark McQueen, Brian Dunn, Joe Strahl, Michael Burrill, Dan Moore, Reeve Hennion, Cory Crebbin (for Lisa Owen), Skip Knight, Mark Gallagher, Julie Brown.
Solutions Team members absent: Greg Holthoff, Laurel Prairie-Kuntz, Jim Oldland, Robin Marshall, Lisa Owen.

Re: Minutes of the August 4, 1999, meeting of the South Medford Interchange Solutions Team.

Location: ODOT Conference Room B&C, 200 Antelope Rd., White City.

Guests: Mathew Barnes, RVTD; Scott Chancey, RVTD; Martie Hanson, citizen.

Consultant Team Present: David Mayfield, URS; John Morrison, RVCOG.

1.0 CALL TO ORDER
Frank Stevens called the meeting to order at 9:05 AM. He introduced guest Martie Hanson, a resident of south Medford who is interested in learning more about the South Medford Interchange Solution Project.

2.0 Approval of Minutes from Previous Meeting
Minutes of the July 7, 1999, Solution Team meeting were unanimously approved without change.

3.0 Public Comment
Guest Martie Hanson said she had no comment at this time. Frank Stevens said her opportunity for comment could be reserved for the end of the meeting. Hanson agreed.

4.0 Feedback from Public Outreach
John Morrison presented an overview of the public response to the stories on the South Medford Project that appeared Friday, July 9 and Sunday, July 11 in the Medford Mail Tribune. He gave each Solution Team member copies of the two stories that appeared, and a compilation of comments received to date. Morrison told the group he has received comments and inquiries from about 25 persons, some through e-mail and some through telephone conversations. Morrison said that while some persons called to voice opposition to specific alternative concepts as presented in the stories, some had suggestion for additional concepts. Most were pleased to have been made aware of the process and the progress thus far. Most objections focused on the Garfield/Ellendale extension alternative. A number of citizens living in or near the Ellendale area expressed concerns and objections to any plan that would bring additional traffic to the area. They were primarily concerned for the integrity of the neighborhood's historic character, and that any change could adversely affect property values. Cory Crebbin said the City of Medford had received a number of calls from south Medford residents who reported they had seen someone in the area who looked to be doing street surveying or something to that effect. No one on the Solutions Team or Consultant Team was aware of any activity in the area. Crebbin asked that if any activity were to take place, that the City be notified so staff could be prepared to answer any calls that come in.

5.0 EVALUATION CRITERIA

Dave Mayfield walked the group through a continued refinement of the Project Evaluation Criteria. Results of the refinement can be found in the attached Evaluation Criteria dated 8/5/99.

At the July meeting, the Team revised the criteria for goals #1 through #4. Mayfield briefly ran through those changes to make sure they were as the Team had expected. The Team OK'd the first four Goals. Later in the meeting, the Team returned to Goals #3 and #4 to discuss VMT and V/C criteria. It was decided to include a reference to both measures in both Goals #3 and Goal #4. Goal #5 – This goal prompted considerable discussion. The word "for" was inserted into the goal between Provide and alternative to read "Provide for alternative…." Criteria (a) (c) and (d) were revised as shown in the Evaluation Criteria.

Criteria (b), "Number of new connections between modes." was deleted.

Goal #6 – Criteria (b) "Residences" is defined as "dwelling units." Criteria (c): deleted reference to "1) large businesses and 2) small businesses". Additional criteria were added (see Evaluation Criteria).

Goal #7 – The Solution Team added reference "See Goal #5(a).

Goal #8 – The goal was changed to read "Maximize value of project investment" (rather than *public/private* investment). Discussion here centered on how to measure the cost/benefit of the project. Cory Crebbin said what really we really are addressing here is the system capacity to support the general land use plan. Mayfield responded that the the cost/benefit was not just economic but involved all the goals and that the alternatives analysis process would provide measures of the benefits. It was decided to change Goal #8 to read: "Maximize value of project investment."

Goal #9 – The Team deleted criteria (a), "Percent length of new arterials and interchange features that facilitate safe and efficient truck movements" because they felt that it did not effectively measure the goal. Measures for Goal #9 became the same measures as other goals as shown on the Evaluation Criteria.
At this point, the Team decided that there was not enough time to cover the remaining criteria. They will be covered in the September meeting.

6.0 RVTD PRESENTATION ON TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT

Scott Chancey and Julie Brown of the Rogue Valley Transportation District gave a presentation on what the District is doing to help reduce transportation demand in the area. A voluntary Transportation Management Association has been formed in which members, mostly local employers attempt to reduce VMTs through self –imposed measures. Efforts now focus on carpooling and group passes for transit riders. Bear Creek and RCC now have group pass programs. Brown also discussed Transportation Management Districts, which are formed by legislation (are mandatory).

Staggered work hours (flextime) and telecommuting are also being considered. Employers get tax benefits from participating in programs. It was also mentioned that companies can get employee health benefits from employees who walk or bike to work.

Chancey was asked if businesses ever try to reduce empoyee parking as a way of encouraging employees to use alternative transportation modes. Chancey said very seldom, mostly because employees consider parking as a "free benefit" and resist changed commuting behavior. A question came up on how to reach RVTD for carpooling information.

Chancey said they current signs carry a number that does not directly connect people with RVTD main offices. They are working on getting a direct in line for better customer service.

7.0 MEETING CRITIQUE

Frank Stevens led the group through the meeting critique, asking each member and guest how comfortable they were with the meeting. Most expressed approval for the meeting, characterizing it as "very productive" and were pleased to be getting "down to tangibles." Skip Knight felt the group is getting a little too involved in technicalities at this time. He feels that we will be covering these issues down the line. Joe Strahl asked that at the next meeting, an overview of the project and process be presented. He wondered are we where we should be. Dave Mayfield will do this at next meeting, saying he would do a better job of "setting the stage." Guest Martie Hanson called the meeting very informative. She said she came away with the realization that there's more to the issue than she thought…it's very complex, and worth taking the time to consider all aspects of an issue since the public is made up of many individuals who have differing views and needs. She said she was very pleased to be able to come, but that ordinarily she would not be able to attend a daytime meeting, and asked if the group would ever meet in the evening. Frank Stevens said that because of scheduling it was unlikely that the group would change its schedule but noted a number of other opportunities for public oversight, including occasional TV broadcasting of the meetings. John Morrison mentioned that Citizen Advisory Committee meetings are open to the public and are held the third Wednesday of each month.

8.0 MEETING ADJOURNED

Next meeting will be held on September 1, 1999, from 9:00 AM to 11:30 AM at the ODOT Conference Room, 200 Antelope road, White City.