

September 1999

From: John Morrison

Date: September 2, 1999

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

Re: South Medford Interchange Solutions Team Meeting Minutes for September 1, 1999.

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

Guests: Scott Chancey, RVTD; Pam Barlow Lind, Jackson County Planning; Martie Hanson, citizen; Bon Dysart, citizen; Rich Oliviera, citizen.

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

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

Frank Stevens called the meeting to order at 9:07 AM.

2.0 APPROVAL OF AUGUST MINUTES

Minutes of the August 4, 1999, Solution Team meeting were unanimously approved with one correction. Under item 6.0, RVTD presentation on transportation demand management, a reference to a "Transportation Management Association" was amended to read "a group of employers."

PUBLIC COMMENT

Guest Bon Dysart asked for a clarification of modeling procedures, and how many options would be modeled. Dave Mayfield responded that the group would cover modeling later in the meeting. He asked Dan Moore of RVCOG for a brief update of the modeling update project, who said the South Medford Interchange Project options were among 13 option scenarios from several projects to be modeled as soon as the model is operational.

Guest Rich Oliviera said his purpose for attending the meeting because he is not happy about any alternative which would go through the Groveland-Ellendale area. He said he and his neighbors don't want a thoroughfare going through their neighborhood. The options going through this neighborhood should not be on the agenda. Guest Martie Hanson said she had no comment at this time.

FEEDBACK FROM CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

John Morrison reported that about 20 citizens had appeared at the August 18, 1999 CAC meeting. Draft minutes of the meeting were included in the Solution Team packets. Morrison said that the guests at the CAC meeting had been primarily interested in expressing their opposition to any alternative that would go through the Groveland/Ellendale neighborhood. He said they had indicated that this was one of Medford's most established and historic neighborhood and should not be subjected to through traffic. A key concept expressed was the fear of the destruction of quality of life in the area. he said, was that to have a property "maimed" was almost worse than having it

"killed". What this meant, Morrison explained is that residents feel its worse to have your yard taken away in a street widening project and have your house left sitting just a few feet from a busy thoroughfare than it is to have the property taken away entirely. Mark Gallagher suggested it might help the residents to know who makes the decisions, and what role the city might play in this. Frank Stevens told the groups that the Solutions Team makes the decisions, The responsibility of the Project Consultant is to bring as much information as possible to the table in order for the Team to make an informed decision. Joe Strahl suggested it might be helpful for citizens to understand where the conceptual alternatives originated. The concepts originated at a May Workshop attended by Solution Team and CAC members. The dozen or so concept alternatives developed at that meeting have subsequently been refined down to the seven currently under consideration. He said that each alternative has always been considered only as an option, and has always been viewed with respect to its impact on the community.

5.0 EVALUATION CRITERIA

Dave Mayfield led the group through a continued refinement of the Project Evaluation Criteria. He opened with a brief statement of how the Evaluation Process will work. He explained that the Solution Team will use a quantitative measuring process by which various options can be assessed, and referred the Team to the memo "Multi-attribute Decision Process for South Medford Interchange Alternatives Analysis" in their agenda packets. He said that at the end of the evaluation process, each alternative will have a single score representing how well it performed at meeting the project's evaluation criteria. He noted that by going through this process, the Team will better understand each other's point of view. The decision process is all out front. Member Skip Knight asked what would happen if the group comes up with several ties or options which are performing closely. Mayfield said we'll be lucky if we do have number of number of viable solutions, but we won't know until we complete the evaluation process. Frank Stevens noted that the goal is at this point to narrow down the options to a few for further study and public comment. Mayfield asked the Team if it would like to review the Social goals at this time, given the input from the CAC. Member Reeve Henion said yes, but not so much from a property value perspective as quality of life.

Mayfield started the discussion by reviewing two previously proposed criteria: a) the number of individual properties "taken" for right of way and b) a noise measure that might be determined, for example, if the distance from the house to the road is cut in half. Hennion proposed a third criterion: the % increase in the amount of traffic in the neighborhood as compared to "normal" projected increases. The Team then discussed the proposals. Joe Strahl said he preferred a measure that would consider increase in traffic as opposed to noise. He said he has had to deal with noise in the past, and it is highly subjective and difficult to use as a measure. Frank Stevens said the Team might need to distinguish between types or degree of "takes", for instance taking 1 foot vs 10 feet off property. The group felt some combination of volume and right of way impacts might produce an accurate measure and discussed how the criteria might be worded. There was some concern that the Team might be trying to impose a too precise level of detail at this time, but it was decided that measures should be added. The Team decided to include to include two criteria a) Count right of way "takes" where the distance from the edge of the travel way to the house is reduced 20% or more, and b) a measure of increase in traffic over what would normally be projected. (this might be measured by the number of street segments where volume has changed). It was also felt that the criteria would need to be refined, possibly to include speed and possible benefits as well as negative impacts. Frank Stevens suggested that a test run be done on the evaluation criteria before they are finalized.

The Team then discussed the criteria for Goals #14, #15 and #16. Goal #14, Parks and Recreation was left unchanged.

Goal #15, Minimizing Impacts to Natural Resources and the Environment, was revised as follows: Add the words "locally significant to wetlands in criteria (a); replace the distance measure in criteria (b) with two measures, 15 and 90 meters; adding criteria (f) air quality as measured by increases in VMT as well as the number of intersections with congestion (Volume over Capacity) that could increase air pollution; and (g) the number of recorded Hazardous materials sites.

Goal #16, Historic Resources was revised to reflect two criteria: a) The number of locally or regionally historically significant properties impacted, and b) number of published archeological sites potentially impacted.

Dave Mayfield will produce a revised draft of the Evaluation Criteria for the October meeting.

6.0 RVTD PRESENTATION ON MULTIMODAL CONCEPTS AND COORDINATION WITH TRANSIT ORIENTED DESIGN

Scott Chancey of the Rogue Valley Transportation District presented maps of draft bus routes designed to reflect the concept alternatives developed to date. He indicated that the maps were preliminary concepts based on routes that would be a) quickest, b) serve points reachable by other modes of transportation, and c) serve areas where people could walk to points of embark/debark.

Dave Mayfield said the goal was to receive active proposals on the multimodal options from the Team, and to evaluate the options for how they fit in with the alternatives.

7.0 MEETING CRITIQUE

Frank Stevens reminded the group that this process in which a citizen-based group is the decision making group is unique to ODOT. He then asked each member and guest how comfortable they were with the meeting. Among the comments were:

"Looking forward to putting value and weight to the Evaluation Criteria."

"Pleased with the discussion of the Social Criteria."

"Happy that RVTD is dovetailing its efforts with the project."

"I want the message to get to the CAC and citizens that the Solution Team does care about their concerns."

"The Evaluation Criteria is important to the process and it is good to have the input from the CAC."

"I am satisfied that the group is looking at and measuring many things. I am concerned that projects can change the nature of a neighborhood. The idea is to come up the best solution."

"I appreciate the new information and the way it is presented. I can now go over it with family and friends. This way we know what to expect; we feel we have some power and it is not so much of a 'them vs. us'. We can look for a the best solution for the community."

8.0 MEETING ADJOURNED

Next meeting will be an all day session, 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM on October 6, 1999, at the ODOT Conference Room, 200 Antelope Road, White City.