



## DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

**Meeting Date:** Thursday, May 12, 2005

**Purpose:** Citizen Advisory Committee Meeting

**Distribution:** CAC Members, Project Development Team

**From:** Vicki Guarino, RVCOG

**Prepared by:** Pat Foley, RVCOG

**Date Prepared:** May 16, 2005

**CAC Attendees:** Rowdy Bates, Irving Citron, Jay Eastwood, Alex Grossi, Janine Law, Deanie Manning, Suzanne Myers, Jim Rafferty, Randy Repp, Bart Van Syoc, Ron Wright (part of meeting)

**CAC Absent:** None

**Project Team Attendees:** Jerry Marmon, ODOT Environmental Project Manager  
Eryca McCartin, ODOT Project Manager  
Jason Sheadel, ODOT Roadway  
Brian Sheadel, ODOT Roadway  
Dorothy Upton, ODOT TPAU  
John Vial, ODOT District 8 Manager  
Angela Findley, Parsons Brinckerhoff Consultant Project Manager  
Connie Kratovil, Parsons Brinckerhoff  
Vicki Guarino, RVCOG  
Pat Foley, RVCOG

**Other Attendees:** 2 members of the public

## **1. Call to Order/Review Agenda/Approve Minutes**

Vicki Guarino

Vicki Guarino called the meeting to order at 6 p.m. She reviewed the agenda. The meeting objectives were:

- Recommendation on Purpose and Need
- Recommendation on Goals and Objectives
- Introduction to Conceptual Alternatives

The CAC approved the April 14, 2005 draft CAC minutes as written.

Vicki handed out two additional information pieces: 1) Newspaper article regarding funding for additional sheriff patrol along Highway 199 and 2) Survey developed by Jim Rafferty.

## **2. Update on April 15, 2005 PDT Meeting**

Rowdy Bates

The April PDT meeting had the same agenda as the CAC. Once the PDT finished developing their goals and objectives, the goals and objectives that the CAC had developed the night before were shown to them. Almost all of the ideas from the two groups were the same. That in itself shows that we are all on the same track.

Rowdy had considered sending an e-mail update to the CAC. Instead of sending an e-mail, he feels that it is better for interested CAC members to telephone him for an update. In this manner he can address individual queries.

## **3. Review Purpose and Need, Goals and Objectives**

Angela Findley

Angela referred to documents e-mailed to the CAC. The revised Purpose and Need Statement includes more details and statistics regarding accident history. At the April PDT meeting, a request was made to make changes describing the types of accesses along the corridor. These changes were incorporated into the document. A discussion ensued regarding the cause of accidents. Dorothy Upton responded by stating that the data does not show any particular trends. The memo prepared by Dorothy will be e-mailed to the CAC. Angela asked for a decision from the CAC as to whether to forward a recommendation to the PDT for adoption. By a show of hands, the CAC unanimously recommended forwarding the Purpose and Need Statement to the PDT.

Two Goals and Objectives documents were e-mailed to the CAC. The first document shows recommendations made by the CAC and PDT. The second document combines the suggestions of the two groups. This is the document that the CAC will be asked to forward to the PDT as a recommendation for adoption. After discussion, the CAC unanimously recommended forwarding the Goals and Objectives to the PDT for adoption.

## **4. Introduction to Conceptual Alternatives**

Connie Kratovil

Connie started her PowerPoint presentation by explaining to the CAC that the mapped conceptual alternatives presented tonight were developed at a meeting by the Project Team several weeks ago. These “concepts” are ideas for solutions to get the process started. The Team came up with five concepts each for the western and eastern sections of the corridor. She stressed that at this point we are just brainstorming overall concepts, not details such as sidewalks, bike paths, etc. After reviewing the Team’s concepts the CAC will be asked to divide into small groups to develop their ideas for conceptual alternatives. All conceptual alternatives that have been developed will be tested. Dorothy Upton will test them for traffic operations; Connie will see if the alternatives fit geometrically and meet ODOT design standards.

Connie continued her presentation by showing different access control techniques. She discussed with the group the pros/cons and functions of different forms of left turn movements; U-turns, mini-couplet, jug-handles, and frontage roads.

Connie then presented the five mapped alternative concepts for the western portion of the project. This section covers the corridor from Dowell Road to Midway Avenue. After that the five mapped alternative concepts for the eastern portion, Tussey Lane to Dowell Road, were reviewed. Eryca discussed the design concept that was developed to support the project getting funded. It is the basis for the East 1 concept that is still one of several concepts being considered.

The CAC broke into two work groups to brainstorm design concepts for the western portion of the project for twenty-five minutes. Each group had a map of the area in which they could draw their ideas. Each group, through their appointed spokespersons, Jay Eastwood and Bart Van Syoc, presented their alternatives concepts to the whole group. The same procedure occurred for the eastern portion of the project. The discussed ideas were recorded and the maps were collected. The Project Team will review the ideas and will prepare alternative concept maps for use at the next meeting.

## **5. Evaluation Criteria / Next Steps**

Jerry Marmon, Angela Findley

Angela explained that the Evaluation Criteria worksheet (Comparison of Preliminary Concepts handout) has taken the Highway 199 Goals and Objectives and turned them into evaluation criteria. She invited the CAC to start ranking (high, medium or low) the alternative concepts shown on the worksheet and bring them to the next meeting. At this time the alternative concepts developed by the CAC tonight are not listed.

Referring to the revised six-month schedule, Angela said the goal for the June meeting is to finalize the Evaluation Criteria and start narrowing down the number of alternatives. Realizing that the schedule is optimistic and aggressive, an open house is “tentatively” scheduled for the end of June. At that time, a reduced range of alternatives will be presented to the public. If the Open House is not held in June, there will be one in July. If there is an open house in June, the July CAC meeting will include learning what the

public's comments were on the alternatives and then will start the process of recommending which alternatives should be forwarded to be studied in the EA. Depending on how quickly the CAC and PDT move through the alternatives screening process in June and July, meetings may not be held in August and September. Angela asked that these dates be kept reserved on people's schedules. Angela explained that when the CAC is not meeting, the Project Team will be refining the designs for the environmental assessment and the environmental impact analysis.

## 6. **Public Comment**

Vicki Guarino

There were no comments from the public.

## 7. **CAC Comfort Check**

Vicki Guarino, RVCOG

Vicki said this is the time for each CAC member to let the project team know how they are feeling with the way things are going, and to ask questions.

Janine Law: It is good that everybody is getting to look at the various options. I am starting to see the agenda that people come in with. There is a lot of work to do. I am not going to plan anything else for August.

Bart Van Syoc: I am good. I have my ideas and I know I don't always get my way.

Suzanne Meyers: I feel compelled to get out there to drive and walk around and look more closely at the area. I think we are going to see big impacts to individual situations.

Alex Grossi: It is refreshing to see that so many people have the same basic philosophy. There were all sorts of things that I had not given a great thought to which were brought up tonight. This is a very positive situation.

Deanie Manning: It is overwhelming. There are so many different things to think about.

Irv Citron: I am more comfortable than I was. However, I spent some time talking to neighbors and I am firmly convinced the public is only interested in what affects them personally.

Jim Rafferty: I am fine. Things are going real well. There are a lot of good ideas. I am just waiting for the model.

Randy Repp: Everything is great. We are moving in the right direction. I am glad there is a reasonable probability of a signal at Hubbard.

Rowdy Bates: A lot of good ideas. I want to know if there is anything important that this group would like me to share with the PDT tomorrow. Let me know before tomorrow morning.

- Irv commented that some of the people who live near him cannot understand why the wide divider section on Highway 199 has to end at the west gate of the college. They would feel better if the divider was extended beyond that section of the highway.

Jay Eastwood: When we first started we had an area including Redwood Highway and a portion of Redwood Avenue. I feel that if we are going to install a light at Hubbard we need to consider improvements from Redwood Avenue to Hubbard because this is a rural road with a very narrow right-of-way. We may want to expand our area of study to include that portion of Redwood Avenue because, if we have a light, and a lot of drivers use this portion of Redwood Avenue without improvements, we will still see accidents and conflicts.

## **8. Wrap Up/Adjourn**

Vicki Guarino

Vickie asked Jim Rafferty to explain the survey he did. Jim provided a handout that summarized his survey results.

The focus of his effort was to let as many outside people know what is going on and to give them an opportunity to have input. This survey covered individuals residing or working between Cave Junction to Grants Pass. Jim was thanked for his effort. This information will be included as public input.

Next meeting will be on Thursday, June 9, 2005 from 6:00 to 8:30 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned.