

US 97 Bend North Corridor Project – Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC)
Meeting Minutes
5/13/2009

CAC Members in attendance:

Wayne Schnur	Dan Gilder	Mike Schmidt
Jeanne Newton	Neil Bryant	Mike Lovely
Linda Perelli Wright		

ODOT & COIC Staff in attendance:

Amy Pfeiffer, ODOT	Rick Williams, ODOT	Peter Murphy, ODOT
Andrew Spreadborough, COIC		

Public in attendance:

Jeff Speder (substitute for Michel Bayard when he can not attend meetings)

Welcome, Meeting Overview and Introductions

Peter Murphy said that he plans to attend the next Citizen Advisory Committee meeting to film and photograph the committee at work.

Mike Schmidt opened the meeting, and introductions were made. Mike said that an “open session” item was added to the agenda to allow time for CAC members to voice concerns about the project, identify important issues, or to ask general questions.

Preview of May 19 Open House

Rick Williams went through the open house powerpoint presentation, and asked for comments from CAC members.

Slides:

- Why project needed.
- Working to find a balanced solution – purpose and need, outreach, process, impacts and benefits.
- What has happened since October - alternatives, interchange locations.
- 4 build alternatives matrix – West 1, East 1, East 2, East 3.

Rick said that they want to demonstrate the various options and the ability to mix and match between alternatives. Options can be analyzed separately, then assembled into an alternative. Linda Perelli Wright referenced the statement: “mix or match elements of one east alternative with another”. She asked if that means the West alternative can’t be mixed and matched. Rick said that some elements can be mixed with the West alternative; this needs to be clarified.

Mike Schmidt asked to have the matrix’s alternative descriptor added to the maps, so there is consistency between matrix and maps.

- East 1, with map and list of key features.

Rick reviewed key alternative features of East 1, such as 3rd Street serving as access road and the slip ramp.

Mike Schmidt suggested a more clear indication of what/where the slip ramp is located. Jeanne Newton suggested adding an arrow to indicate the slip ramp location. Dan Gilder suggested an additional slide with blow-up map that provides more detail on the slip ramp. Rick said that the slide would not show detail, but he will use the wall maps when discussing the ramp.

Wayne Schnur asked about the posted driving speed of the 3rd Street frontage road. Rick said that city street speeds are capped at 45 MPH, so with the transfer it will likely be re-signed to 45 MPH. Neil Bryant said that Rick should be prepared to use pointer to show on map where and what each bulleted feature is. Rick will considering adding a slide for each bullet detail.

Jeanne Newton asked if Rick will be explaining the “areas of potential impact”. Rick said that he will add an “Area of Potential Impact” map. Rick explained the API as areas where there may be construction or property impacts. Rick said that he may add the original API map for comparison, since the API size has been narrowed.

Neil Bryant suggested labeling major roads so the maps are more readable. Linda Perelli Wright requested a bullet be added about the US 97/US 20 connection points. She said that she wants to see the differences between the alternatives in regard to how the connection occurs. Rick said that he will point out the differences.

Jeff Speder asked what construction work would be taken on by ODOT, as opposed to the City and/or County. Rick said that level of detail isn’t planned until a preferred alternative is selected. Neil Bryant asked how the other street/road network improvements would be funded. Rick said it would likely be the City or County; this is part of the tradeoff and partnership. Neil asked if ODOT’s funding responsibility goes as far as interchange, then it is up to the City or County. Rick said that ODOT’s responsibility will be to fund the amount of work necessary to make the project functional. Amy Pfeiffer pointed out several areas on the map that show city considerations and potential footprints (i.e. the location of Hunnel realignment, roundabouts at intersections).

Neil Bryant asked about the status of goal exceptions. Rick said that all of the alternatives require at least one and up to four goal exceptions. Mike Schmidt suggested showing the geographic area (boundaries) for the environmental study.

- East 2 map and bullets
- East 3 map and bullets
- West 1 map and bullets

Neil Bryant asked if the Highway 20 interchange on the West alternative was previously planned as a signal light rather than grade separation. Rick said that the spacing standards require grade separation.

- Transition to next phase – detailed environmental study and updated cost estimates

Mike Schmidt suggested moving this slide earlier to set the context regarding the environmental study phase.

- Schedule - detailed study, draft Environmental impact statement, public hearing

Mike Schmidt suggested removing the “May 19 open house” bullet from the slide. Jeanne Newton suggested reversing the order to action item then timeframe, rather than timeframe then action item. Linda suggested re-labeling as “detailed environmental analysis”.

- Purpose of tonight’s meeting – review maps, attendees ID impacts, ask questions.

Mike suggested making this the first slide of the presentation.

- Visit website
- Q and A

Neil Bryant recommended that time be taken when reviewing the alternatives and options. Attendees will not be familiar with the alternatives, so this would reduce questions at the end of presentation. He suggested mentioning “no-build” alternative as well. Jeanne Newton asked how many unique attendees have participated in the open houses. Rick said that they have not looked at specific individuals, though the trends show a reduction of about 10% in attendance per meeting.

Amy Pfeiffer reviewed the **display boards** that will be set up around the room:

- Welcome board with the purpose of meeting
- Project overview
- Timeline with the ID of where we are in the process
- What has happened since October

Mike Schmidt suggested changing “connectivity” to “connections”.

- Four alternatives matrix
- What is the detailed study phase? – with flowchart showing steps in the study phase.

Rick said that a listing of environmental technical reports should be available. Jeanne Newton said that it could be a danger in the term “environmental” since attendees may not understand the scope of the studies. Rick said that he will need to explain it and have the list of reports on hand, and to stress that it includes the “built” environment along with the natural environment.

Wayne Schnur asked if the number of man hours per study is available. Rick replied that it varies by project; on this project there are no wetlands or air non-attainment, so those areas will be minimal.

- Key features on each alternative (4 posters)
- Noise station – technical expert on hand to answer questions.
- What is a noise study?
- Noise abatement criteria

Jeanne Newton asked if the CAC can get copies of posters – particularly the noise abatement. Rick said that they will be provided by email. Mike Lovely asked to have the revised versions be sent in black and white by email.

- Interchange Area Management Plan.

Rick said that the IAMP is unique to Oregon, and is separate from the environmental impact process. Neil Bryant asked if the IAMP can be assigned to the Metropolitan Planning Organization. Rick said that there are some areas of the project located outside of the MPO boundaries.

- Maps of IAMP study area.

Rick discussed the nature of the IAMP, stressing the need to analyze and reduce impacts on farm and forest land, which may impact the north end interchange.

- Right of way.

Mike Schmidt suggested more explanation on the term “right-of-way” so attendees know this refers to property acquisition, etc.

- Public comment.

Amy Pfeiffer suggested that the CAC review the alternative maps (posted on the wall) for feedback. Rick reviewed the road cross section map that demonstrated the elevation needed on the West alternative. Highway 97 would remain at grade, but Highway 20 would be taken over Highway 97, and then Cooley Road would cross over the top as well. He said that the elevation could be as high as 47 feet.

Linda Perelli Wright suggested creating a highlight color to show the urban growth boundary on the map; then the yellow and pink shaded areas would not be necessary. She suggested increasing the line weight for the UGB. Neil suggested showing the proposed UGB expansion area as well for comparison. The CAC discussed use of mylar overlays to show various boundaries and options.

Jeanne Newton asked if there were any outcomes of the Steering Team meeting held on April 28. Mike Schmidt said that it was a brief one hour meeting to review the maps.

Jeff Speder noted that the access road locations on the maps are much more detailed than at the last CAC meeting. He asked they are still in process, or if they are they fixed in location. Rick said that these road locations are fairly set, though the mix and match components may lead to changes.

Open Discussion

Mike Schmidt said that now that the process is at a point with four alternatives, he want to provide opportunity to get concerns, comments and feedback on the record. He asked Neil Bryant to lead this agenda item.

Neil said that CAC members have had suggestions and ideas that have gone through the screening process. The Purpose and Need, Goals and Objectives have been discussed in detail. Now that we are at the point in the process that the four alternatives and the no build alternative have been identified for further study, this is an opportunity to voice concerns. For instance, this can be an opportunity to comment on things that aren't addressed by any of the alternatives. He said that he wants to avoid the impression that CAC has “bought off” on alternatives, when CAC members may have additional/unresolved concerns. This level of feedback has more power if it is a group response.

Neil suggested that public safety access may be a concern of CAC members that has not yet been resolved. Another example could be the Empire Avenue interchange. He said that Stew Bennett mentioned previously that truck access and how they deliver goods in the project area is a concern. The

City and County have had concerns about taking jurisdiction of roads and the costs associated. The HUNS have concerns about the location of north interchange. He suggested developing bullet points that the CAC hopes will be resolved. He said that his hope is to have a brief letter that reflects the concerns of the CAC.

Mike Schmidt suggested that the CAC members think about these concerns between now and the next CAC meeting, and be prepared to discuss at the next meeting. Neil suggested that CAC members email their list ahead of time so that Mike can bring a draft list to the next meeting for review and discussion. Linda Perelli Wright recognized the work and responsiveness of ODOT. She said that it is a good idea that we are not yet endorsing anything yet because we don't know the impacts yet. She said that she will suggest pedestrian and bike access as a concern.

Mike Lovely said that this level of feedback will show the ODOT officials that CAC is active. Rick Williams stressed that City and County are project partners, so they are making their own comments and their concerns are on the record already. He said that he hopes that the CAC comments are shared and understood by all of the members, rather than an individual's own point.

Wrap-Up

Amy Pfeiffer asked for volunteers on to serve on a project bicycle/pedestrian committee. Linda Perelli Wright, Jeff Speder, and Mike Schmidt volunteered.

Wayne Schnur asked if there will be any project updates presented to the Oregon Transportation Commission. Rick said that none are planned. Neil Bryant said that he thinks the OTC is waiting for the City to determine how they will pay for the interim solution.

Linda Perelli Wright suggested providing information at the May 19 open house on traffic projections for no build option, including a map. Rick said the information was presented at the first open house, and that they can bring it back. Linda suggested a station for the no build.

Next Meeting

June 10 is the next scheduled meeting date. Mike Schmidt suggested inviting bike/pedestrian coordinator to participate.

Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 6:45 p.m.