

**US 97 Bend North Corridor Project – Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC)  
Meeting Minutes  
5/19/10**

---

**CAC Members in attendance:**

Dan Gilder  
Tim Larocco  
Neil Bryant

Wayne Schnur  
Jeff Speder

Stew Bennett  
Linda Perelli Wright

**ODOT & COIC Staff in attendance:**

Rex Holloway, ODOT  
Jon Heacock, ODOT

Amy Pfeiffer, ODOT  
Rick Williams, ODOT

Joel McCarroll, ODOT  
Andrew Spreadborough, COIC

**Others in Attendance:** Liz Dickson; Nick Arnis, City of Bend

**Welcome, Meeting Overview and Introductions**

Rex Holloway opened the meeting and introductions were made. Rex reviewed the agenda.

**Review and approval of last meeting minutes**

Linda Perelli Wright asked if anyone had comments or revisions to the March meeting minutes. No comments.

*Neil Bryant moved to approve the minutes, Stew Bennett seconded. The motion passed unanimously.*

Rex said that if we continue to approve previous meeting minutes at CAC meetings, then it will take over 2 months to post minutes. He proposed that in the future he will send the draft minutes out after the meeting, provide opportunity for comments from CAC members, run any changes by the CAC chair and co-chair, and then get the minutes posted to the project web site.

**Revisions to the Project's Purpose and Need Statement**

Rick Williams said that ODOT has heard comments from the public, steering team, CAC and ACC over the past several months that the full alternatives are too expensive, which has resulted in the current work to look at downscaled alternatives. He said that with this new focus on project cost, the Federal Highway Administration has recommended that the project Purpose and Need be modified to add language around fiscal constraint. The project will need to have cost-effective solutions, and be capable of being programmed into RTP. He said that this Purpose and Need addition doesn't change the project; it adds language about fiscal constraint. Rick said that he is working with the FHWA on specific language. He stressed that the addition will reflect the current discussion.

Neil Bryant asked how this change affects the technical analysis. Rick said that it does not affect traffic modeling or technical analysis, but would require a re-screening of the alternatives. He said that it would affect the funding. He said that fiscal constraint is a requirement of the FHWA since the project is located in a MPO area. Cost would be a screening tool.

Linda Perelli Wright asked for an example of the language that would be added. Rick said that the new language could be something like "The project must be cost effective, and able to be programmed into fiscally constrained RTP".

Neil Bryant said that Tyler Deke's written comments mentioned \$40 to \$42 million that could be available for the project within the MPO area based on modeling. He asked that if that is accurate, how is this factored into the screening criteria? Rick said that the MPO funding is a part of it, but that ODOT also looks at historic funding levels that would exceed the funding referenced by Tyler. So we would look at the Parkway construction costs and other big investments to come up with a historic funding range. Neil Bryant asked if the MPO is the entity that makes the determination of the range. Rick said that the MPO would only look at available funding levels, as opposed to historic levels of funding. Nick Arnis said that the MPO has Regional Transportation Plan that is fiscally constrained, which is where the \$40 million comes from, which reflects ODOT funding levels in the MPO area. Neil Bryant asked if we would then add federal contributions to that estimated amount. Rick replied affirmatively, and said that when we would look at historic levels we would include the federal contributions. Neil asked when the range would be determined. Rick said that the information is likely available already, and that the range would likely be identified within the Purpose and Need. Neil pointed out that to meet the Purpose and Need, the project needs to fall within the funding range, so pressed for a better indication of the range. Rick said that the \$400 million full alternative did not fall into that range; he estimated that the cap would be in the \$200 to \$300 million range, including all phases. He stressed that this is a generalized range based on estimates and the Region Manager is the only person who could comment accurately.

Wayne Schnur said that ODOT talked previously about a timeline of five years to groundbreaking and seven years to open. Now we are hearing 20 years. Jon Heacock said that the 20 years is the funding period; something would have to be given up to direct all that funding to the project over a short time period. Wayne said that businesses within the project area want to know more about timeline because they need to plan; he asked if there is any way to know phasing and the timeline. Jon said that they do not yet know the timeline because the funding is not secure yet; the project could be ready to proceed in 3-4 years, but they need the funding before moving forward. He said that phasing also affects the timeline. Rick said that we need to finish the NEPA process first before we can buy right-of-way. Jon said that once the NEPA is complete, the funding and timeline can better be determined. Rick talked about Record of Decision (ROD) process. Once the ROD is published, ODOT can spend money on buying right-of-way. He said that it is hard to add surety until ROD is complete. At that point the project is ready to go, and the project is open to new sources of funding. He said that it is common to not have 100% of funding secured when breaking ground.

Neil Bryant suggested that Tyler Deke be invited to the next CAC meeting to discuss the comments he submitted, and to provide an overview of the MPO. He said that ODOT will be responding to the MPO and City of Bend comments in writing, and that the CAC may be interested to hear the response. Jon Heacock said that he has been meeting with Nick Arnis and Tyler Deke to review and discuss the comments. He said that they are handling the response informally, though he has no objection to providing a written response. Neil Bryant said that the comments submitted by the city echo the CAC comments, so he is interested in hearing the response. Linda Perelli Wright asked if the July meeting agenda would be a good point to hear the ODOT response to the comments. Rex Holloway said that it is likely that more technical reports will be available for review in July, and many others in September. Linda said that it could be good to review the comments as we wait for technical studies. Jon Heacock said that it would be possible.

Rick Williams said that he has had discussions with the Department of Justice about how the CAC comments would be considered during the DEIS comment period. He said the initial DOJ response was that the CAC is part of ODOT, so it would not be appropriate for the CAC to comment at the hearing. He

stressed that he is still looking for clarification on this question, and noted that individual CAC members can submit comments.

Liz Dickson asked if CAC comments will be entered into DEIS. Rick said that CAC comments and feedback are included in the DEIS record, but that CAC comments are not envisioned during the formal hearing process. Liz Dickson asked if the CAC will have the ability to review the DEIS before it is made public. Rick Williams said that when the DEIS goes out to public, CAC members will have the opportunity to comment. Neil Bryant said that the CAC wants to be able to advise ODOT as the DEIS is developed. Jon Heacock said that ODOT is not looking for this function from the CAC as a group, and that CAC members will be able to comment on the DEIS as individuals. He said that they are not sure about the availability of a pre-draft version for CAC review.

### **Traffic Update**

Joel McCarroll provided an overview of traffic counts and modeling, including:

#### Explanation of volume to capacity ratio

- V/C ratio is the amount of traffic volume compared to the available capacity of the roadway.
- On most roads the capacity is controlled by intersections. (Stop signs, traffic signals or roundabouts)
- A signalized intersection has a capacity of 1,000 – 1,2000 vehicles per hour per lane on the mainline depending on turning movements, side street volumes and side street geometry.
- V/C ratio is the amount of traffic volume compared to the available capacity of the roadway.
- On most roads the capacity is controlled by intersections. (Stop signs, traffic signals or roundabouts)
- A signalized intersection has a capacity of 1,000 – 1,2000 vehicles per hour per lane on the mainline depending on turning movements, side street volumes and side street geometry.
- On freeways and expressways, V/C is calculated based on the segment.
- Unconstrained the Bend Parkway has capacity of 2,000 vehicles per hour per lane. Each direction would have a capacity of 4,000 vehicles per hour.
- As V/C ratio approaches 1.0, the facility operates under slow and go conditions. Any disruption has significant consequences to operations.
- When V/C ratio exceeds 1.0, stop and go and queuing develops. Traffic diverts to local streets and peak hour spreading occurs.

#### Traffic challenges

- Full scale Alternatives - tried to solve all of the traffic problems and resulted in large impacts and high costs (not fundable)
- Downscaled Alternatives – finding “right-sized” fundable projects that focused on US 97, recognizing that operations on US 20 and local system may be impacted

#### Performance standard

- ODOT - V/C of 0.75 for expressways
- City of Bend
  - One hour of 1.0 V/C for City signals and roundabouts
  - 50 seconds of delay for un-signalized intersections

- Deschutes County
  - Level of Service C for new intersections
  - LOS D for existing intersections

Neil Bryant asked who makes the determination of the V/C standards. Joel McCarroll said that they are identified within the Oregon Transportation Plan, and established by the Oregon Transportation Commission. Neil Bryant asked how exceptions to the standard are approved. Joel said that if the request is a component of a project, then approval would be through the exception process. If it is in regard to setting a different performance standard, then it is an OTC process. Neil Bryant asked if there is a change of V/C on this project, would the exception process be the course to gain approval. Jon Heacock said that he thought it would need to go to OTC if the project is not meeting the standard. Neil asked if exceptions have been approved in Oregon. Joel McCarroll said that exceptions have been approved in Portland, though they have different standards. Requests would likely need to go to the OTC for approval, though exceptions are rare.

What do East DS-1 and East DS-2 have in common? Year 2035 projections

- Within project area all the sections of US 97 operate at a V/C ratio of less than 1.0.
- Outside the project limits NB lanes exceed the performance standard and approach 1.0 south of Empire. This will happen with or without the project.
- Signal warrants are met at several intersections on the City of Bend street system.
- Most local street intersections operate within the City's performance standard with assumed improvements.
- The signalized intersections at US 20 and Cooley and Robal will approach V/C ratios of 1.0.
- The V/C ratio of the signal at Empire and O.B. Riley will exceed 1.0.
- US 20 and Empire will have a V/C ratio over 1.0 even with proposed capacity enhancements.
- During the Peak Hour, queuing and blocking issues exist at:
  - US 20/Cooley – WB Cooley queues extend beyond Scenic Drive
  - US 20/Empire – WB Empire queues extend beyond Industrial Park, and Sherman
  - 3rd/Cooley – SB 3rd queues extend beyond Clausen
  - 3rd/Robal – Queues extend beyond Cascade Village Driveway, Nels Anderson Drive and Target Driveway

How do East DS-1 and East DS-2 differ? Year 2035 projections.

- East DS-2 has slightly higher volumes on the extension of 3rd Street. However, it leads to more queuing and blocking.

Comparisons of build alternatives to no build

- US 20 at Cooley exceeds V/C ratio of 2.0 in the no-build alternative. It is just over 0.9 in the both build alternatives.
- US 20 at Robal is 1.03 in the no-build versus 1.0 in the build alternatives.
- US 20 at Empire is 1.78 in the no-build versus 1.1 (East DS-1) or 1.2 (East DS-2)
- 3rd and Cooley has a V/C ratio of 1.81 in the no-build to approximately 0.9 in the build alternatives
- 3rd and Robal has a V/C ratio of 1.2 in the build to 0.73 (East DS-1) and 0.81 (East DS-2)
- Cooley Road at Boyd Acres doesn't change from the no build to the build.
- O.B. Riley at Empire operates worse in the build alternatives than the no-build. Traffic diverts to O.B. Riley from other routes.

Jon explained that the traffic data will be better summarized in reports later in process. He referred to the handout documents and discussed how the lanes/traffic data is represented. Amy Pfeiffer displayed the Empire interchange area map and discussed lanes and signalized intersection locations. Jon referenced the data indices, and demonstrated how to determine 2035 projected traffic counts. Neil Bryant noted that DS 1 and DS 2 are similar in counts for the Empire and 3<sup>rd</sup> Street intersection. Amy discussed the need for two left turn lanes on 3<sup>rd</sup> Street southbound entering Empire, as well as the reverse direction. The CAC discussed speed limits for this area, but Joel stressed that for peak hours traffic will be slow due to volumes.

Wayne Schnur asked if a bridge or tunnel from eastbound Highway 20 to southbound Highway 97 should be looked at again. Jon said that they need to take another look at it. Wayne asked about a cost estimate to build this direct connection/flyover. Jon said that \$20 million would be a realistic estimate. Wayne noted that most people he talks to are surprised that this connection is not being planned.

The CAC reviewed the Cooley Road/3<sup>rd</sup> Street map and traffic count data, and discussed the intersection configuration. Neil asked if the intersection is at grade. Jon said that it is at grade. Wayne Schnur asked if the rail line will be elevated. Jon said that they are not sure yet, and noted the difficulty in accommodating railroad grade requirements. The group discussed various aspects and design options for the intersection maps displayed.

Rick Williams asked which map style is easier to understand, the fine scale lane maps or the high level project area map. The CAC discussed the value in the very fine scale maps that demonstrate clearly lanes and turn directions.

Tim Larocco referred to handout table 1-A, which includes comments about weaving on the main line segment. He asked if weaving is a concern still. Joel replied that more detailed analysis is needed, and that weaving is still problematic. Jon Heacock said that this data reflects two months of analysis since the last CAC meeting. He said that they would like to meet again with focus groups, and asked what can help make this information more helpful. Stew Bennett suggested that summaries are more valuable than the data. Rex said maybe they could put together an interactive map that connects the data to specific locations in the project area. Neil Bryant said that makes sense since many focus groups have not looked at the maps in a while. He suggested taking the fine scale intersection maps that are of specific interest to each of the groups. Linda suggested producing maps of the configuration, as opposed to just discussing locations.

Liz said it would be helpful to have examples or illustrations of what the V/C ratios mean to a specific intersection or highway segment. Joel said that for example at .8 V/C you travel at speed limit; as the V/C increases your speed slows down. As the V/C approach 1.0, the traffic flow becomes unstable.

Wayne Schnur asked if enough emergency lanes are being built. Joel said 8 foot shoulders are planned, which provides enough space to park a vehicle.

### **Sub-group update**

Amy Pfeiffer said that the project team will be initiating subgroups shortly. She said the emergency services group has already formed and are moving forward. She said that a bike/ped group will be formed and led by Dan Serpico. She said that anyone interested in participating on subgroups should contact Rex Holloway.

Amy Pfeiffer said that she will be leading a visual group that will look at colors and textures. Rex Holloway will be leading a group that will look at landscaping. Rex said that he has started to make contact with landscapers, and is hoping to convene the group in June. The sub-groups will follow a quarterly or semi annual meeting schedule. Amy said that she plans to kick off the visual team in June.

Jon Heacock said that the hope is that as project is put together, we will have renderings with visual images. Rick Williams said that a lot was learned on the Parkway development project in terms of visual design and landscaping. Rex said that the subgroup work will be brought to the CAC, and that he hopes that CAC members can assist with briefing.

### **Critique and adjourn**

Rex Holloway said that today was the first time technical information has been presented to the CAC, and that more will be coming in subsequent meetings. He asked for CAC comment on what worked and what didn't work in terms of presentation of this data. Neil Bryant asked for a list of technical study categories, so that the CAC can identify specific data areas of interest. Rex said that he will circulate the list and poll CAC members to determine which technical reports have the highest degree of interest.

Tim Larocco asked if the Purpose and Need revision will preclude some options. Rick Williams said that when the initial Purpose and Need was developed, they kept it general so not to pre-conceive outcomes. As we move along, we understand that there is a funding component to this. As we go into the DEIS, this modification will allow us to go back and focus on downscaled alternatives. So the Purpose and Need change catches up with the work that is under way. Jon Heacock clarified that the DOJ and FHWA have provided feedback that we need to go back to the Purpose and Need because we are applying this criteria, so the Purpose and Need must be consistent. Tim said he wants to ensure that this is not requirement placed on the team; rather, that this reflects the thinking and direction of the team.

Neil Bryant asked if Tyler Deke and Nick Arnis will be invited to the next CAC meeting to address the City and MPO comments, to discuss the MPO role specific to this project, and to discuss the MPO studies that affect this project. Jon invited the CAC members to send comments and questions prior to the meeting, so that he can provide direction to Tyler on what the CAC wants to discuss. The CAC discussed also inviting Bob Bryant to provide a broader context regarding funding. Stew Bennett asked how many projects of similar size are under development statewide. Rick said 4-5 statewide.

Next meeting date – July 14. Meeting adjourned at 7:50.



# ***US 97 Bend North Corridor***

Presentation to CAC

May 19, 2010



## ***Explanation of Volume to Capacity Ratio***

- V/C ratio is the amount of traffic volume compared to the available capacity of the roadway.
- On most roads the capacity is controlled by intersections. (Stop signs, traffic signals or roundabouts)
- A signalized intersection has a capacity of 1,000 – 1,200 vehicles per hour per lane on the mainline depending on turning movements, side street volumes and side street geometry.



## ***Explanation of Volume to Capacity Ratio (Continued)***

- On freeways and expressways,  $V/C$  is calculated based on the segment.
- Unconstrained the Bend Parkway has capacity of 2,000 vehicles per hour per lane. Each direction would have a capacity of 4,000 vehicles per hour.
- As  $V/C$  ratio approaches 1.0, the facility operates under slow and go conditions. Any disruption has significant consequences to operations.
- When  $V/C$  ratio exceeds 1.0, stop and go and queuing develops. Traffic diverts to local streets and peak hour spreading occurs.



## ***Traffic Challenges***

- Full scale Alternatives - tried to solve all of the traffic problems and resulted in large impacts and high costs (not fundable)
- Downscaled Alternatives – finding “right-sized” fundable projects that focused on US 97, recognizing that operations on US 20 and local system may be impacted



## ***Performance Standards***

- ODOT - V/C of 0.75 for expressways
- City of Bend
  - One hour of 1.0 V/C for City signals and roundabouts
  - 50 seconds of delay for un-signalized intersections
- Deschutes County
  - Level of Service C for new intersections
  - LOS D for existing intersections



## ***What Do East DS-1 and East DS-2 Have in Common?***

- Within project area all the sections of US 97 operate at a V/C ratio of less than 1.0.
- Outside the project limits NB lanes exceed the performance standard and approach 1.0 south of Empire. This will happen with or without the project.
- Signal warrants are met at several intersections on the City of Bend street system.
- Most local street intersections operate within the City's performance standard with assumed improvements.



## ***What Do East DS-1 and East DS-2 Have in Common?***

- The signalized intersections at US 20 and Cooley and Robal will approach V/C ratios of 1.0.
- The V/C ratio of the signal at Empire and O.B. Riley will exceed 1.0.
- US 20 and Empire will have a V/C ratio over 1.0 even with proposed capacity enhancements.



## ***What Do East DS-1 and East DS-2 Have in Common?***

- During the Peak Hour, queuing and blocking issues exist at:
  - US 20/Cooley – WB Cooley queues extend beyond Scenic Drive
  - US 20/Empire – WB Empire queues extend beyond Industrial Park, and Sherman
  - 3<sup>rd</sup>/Cooley – SB 3<sup>rd</sup> queues extend beyond Clausen
  - 3<sup>rd</sup>/Robal – Queues extend beyond Cascade Village Driveway, Nels Anderson Drive and Target Driveway



## ***How are East DS-1 and DS-2 different?***

- East DS-2 has slightly higher volumes on the extension of 3<sup>rd</sup> Street. However, it leads to more queuing and blocking.



## ***Comparison of Build Alternatives to No Build (US-20)***

- US 20 at Cooley exceeds V/C ratio of 2.0 in the no-build alternative. It is just over 0.9 in the both build alternatives.
- US 20 at Robal is 1.03 in the no-build versus 1.0 in the build alternatives.
- US 20 at Empire is 1.78 in the no-build versus 1.1 (East DS-1) or 1.2 (East DS-2)



## ***Comparison of Build Alternatives to No Build (City Street System)***

- 3<sup>rd</sup> and Cooley has a V/C ratio of 1.81 in the no-build to approximately 0.9 in the build alternatives
- 3<sup>rd</sup> and Robal has a V/C ratio of 1.2 in the build to 0.73 (East DS-1) and 0.81 (East DS-2)
- Cooley Road at Boyd Acres doesn't change from the no build to the build.
- O.B. Riley at Empire operates worse in the build alternatives than the no-build. Traffic diverts to O.B. Riley from other routes.