

ROADS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
January 28, 2009

MEMBERS PRESENT: John Anderson, Karen Bodner, George Goldstein, Jody Ogle, Jack Radabaugh

MEMBERS ABSENT: Rex Redmon

STAFF PRESENT: Marsha Miller, Bill Morgan, Mike Russell, Phil Fields, Eric Wurster, Shashi Bajracharya, Celia Barry,

OTHER: Jim Wilcox, Vonnie Rainwater, Ollie Snowden, John Goodson, Tom Poage, Leo Stapleton.

Anderson called the meeting to order at 5:45 p.m.

I. PUBLIC COMMENT – None.

II. COMMITTEE MEMBER UPDATES –

Tom Poage's 24 years was acknowledged by the group; Marsha presented Tom with a certificate and award.

III. ELECTION OF CHAIR & VICE CHAIR –

Motion: Ogle moved to nominate John Anderson as Chair; Radabaugh seconded. All present voted in favor. Motion carried.

Motion: Ogle moved to nominate Jack Radabaugh as Vice Chair; Goldstein seconded. All present voted in favor. Motion carried.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES –

Motion: Bodner moved to approve the minutes with two changes; Goldstein requested one change; all present voted in favor.

V. RELEASE OF 10-14 CIP DOCUMENT FOR PUBLIC CONSIDERATION –

Bajracharya reviewed the draft CIP proposal and supporting documents, which is smaller than last year and mostly preservation projects with no new projects added. Bajracharya stated we will have two upcoming public hearings. Bajracharya reviewed Senate Bill 994 and its impacts of funding and the surprise of SRS funding being approved means we need to look at projects to add back.

Bodner asked if we apply for grants very often. Barry answered not very often due to staff and resources needed along with the financial match that's required for most.

Barry went over SB994 funding and reminded the group we have to spend the money by 2010 and some of the projects have been moved around in order to balance timing of the Economic Stimulus preservation funded projects. General discussion ensued as Bajracharya continued reviewing the projects. Bajracharya asked permission to release the draft CIP for public review for Public Hearing at the next meeting.

Motion: Radabaugh moved to approve for release to the public; Ogle seconded. All present voted in favor. Motion carried.

VI. 2009 WORK PLAN & 2008 ACCOMPLISHMENTS –

Mosier reviewed the 2008 Work Plan and asked the group for input so the 2008 Accomplishments and 2009 Work Plan could be submitted. Mosier said she would email the draft to the committee for final approval.

VII. REPORT FROM TRANSPORTATION PLANNING –

Bajracharya discussed the Hayden Bridge Road project and stated they are collecting public comment and will have a community meeting on February 10th.

VIII. STATUS OF FUNDING REQUESTS –

Barry reviewed and updated the group on the Economic Stimulus Package, also known as the Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. Chickering explained ODOT is challenged with getting money out to local agencies because they don't have a process of how to handle this, and the legislative bills change every day leaving it difficult to communicate how allocations will work. Goldstein asked whether the criteria that excluded cities of less than 5,000 population from Surface Transportation Program funding was a federal or state requirement. Barry responded she will find out and let him know.

In response to additional questions, Barry said Lane County is putting some projects into the multi-jurisdictional United Front List, which is an effort to receive money from the Federal Reauthorization of the six-year Highway and Transit Bill. The two projects that were placed on that list were Territorial Highway and the Highway 126W study.

IX. NEXT MEETING – February 25, 2009

X. OTHER BUSINESS –

Goldstein asked if anyone read the Coburg Interchange Plan and that he didn't understand why a town with just 975 population would generate enormous traffic to need this work done. General discussion ensued. Chickering explained the project in more depth and that it's based on the businesses and growth surrounding the town.

Meeting Adjourned at 7:45

Christy Mosier
Transcribing Secretary

ROADS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
February 25, 2009

MEMBERS PRESENT: John Anderson, Karen Bodner, George Goldstein, Jody Ogle, Jim Wilcox

MEMBERS ABSENT: Jack Radabaugh

STAFF PRESENT: Marsha Miller, Bill Morgan, Phil Fields, Eric Wurster, Shashi Bajracharya, Celia Barry, Howard Schussler, Ed Chastain

OTHER: Sonny Chickering, Rex Redmon

Anderson called the meeting to order at 5:45 p.m.

- I. PUBLIC COMMENT – None.
- II. COMMITTEE MEMBER UPDATES –
Rex Redmon's 12 years was acknowledged by the group. The committee welcomed new member Jim Wilcox.
- III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES –
Motion: Ogle moved to approve the minutes; Goldstein seconded; all present voted in favor.
- IV. STRIPING OF HAYDEN BRIDGE WAY –
Traffic Engineer Ed Chastain introduced the pavement rehabilitation project and in order to get feedback before it's presented to the Board for a decision and direction to staff. Chastain stated the project is primarily a preservation project that goes from Pheasant to 19th street in Springfield in the area of the roundabout. Chastain reviewed the history and project scope along with the packet provided to the committee. Chastain said there are two alternatives; the first is to do nothing, and the second is eliminating parking along the sides of the road and build a turn lane. Chastain said an open house was held last month and shared the public's concerns regarding the project. Chastain will provide a map and plan before the Public Hearing next month.
- V. ECONOMIC STIMULUS UPDATE –
Barry distributed information about the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act (economic stimulus), with regard to transportation funding, and how this would influence allocations in the draft Capital Improvement Program. She distributed a list of priorities that was being taken to a public hearing at the Board on March 4. She indicated that the rapid movement of the legislation and project delivery requirements meant that highest priority projects were necessarily preservation projects. She said there would be changes to the CIP draft either in a future amendment process or in the draft that is sent to the Board. Changes may be incorporated to the draft prior to the next meeting if they are known by then.

Goldstein asserted that the Coast Guard Station Road project was 5th in priority because he recalled staff indicating last year that only Willamette Valley projects get funded. Barry indicated that was not the case, recalling that last year Goldstein had asked for additional plus marks to be added to the Coast Guard Station Road project, and staff had added the plus marks in response. She asked the committee if additional research into last year's discussion on this topic and a report back was desired. The committee declined to make the request.
- VI. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PACKET OVERVIEW –
Barry briefed the committee on the updated CIP packet, indicating the only changes were of a formatting nature and not substantive. The changes were made to make the draft easier to read and understand, especially with regard to SB 994 money.
- VII. 2008 ACCOMPLISHMENTS & 2009 WORK PLAN –

Mosier presented the draft documents for approval. The committee approved both documents as-is.

VIII. PUBLIC HEARING –

Anderson opened the public hearing at 7:00 p.m. and gave an overview of the process.

Bajracharya gave a PowerPoint presentation on the Capital Improvement Plan and reviewed the previous steps taken. Bajracharya covered the impacts of the unexpected funding and reviewed the list of projects for development should more funding come available in the future. Bajracharya explained that the Roads Advisory Committee is requesting the public's comments tonight so they can review and make a recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners. Barry shared the economic stimulus packet and explained the 1.7 million available for Lane Count Projects, the 1.26 million for the metro area, and how the timing requirements for which the money must be spent by limits which projects we can do and effects how we will use the other road fund dollars.

Chair Anderson requested comments:

PUBLIC COMMENT –

- **April Smith**; PO Box 1130 Fall Creek. Smith stated she is here to follow up on the email sent to Commissioner Faye Stewart and the committee regarding the need for guard rails along Jasper Lowell Road, mile post 2-3 since there is nothing there to protect cars from plummeting into the river and the deaths and accidents that continue to happen. Smith stated this has been a concern of the local residents for over 50 years now.
- **Joyce Foster**, 38100 Pengra Road. Said she is here in support of the guard rail request for Jasper Lowell Road. Foster stated it would only be a .5 mile stretch to be covered and this is the deepest area of the river. Arno Nelson responded to the request by investigating the site it and agreed guard rails were warranted. The request then went in for approval and Bill Morgan responded on behalf of Roads saying although it was warranted, there was no funding available in the budget. She is asking that we make this a higher priority and add it to the capital improvement plan.
- **Judy Jones**, Resident over 60 years. Jones is here to support the guard rail request and said she was a bus driver for many years and this stretch attracts a lot of people due to the Jasper Mountain Facility and the local schools.

Ogle asked if we have cost estimates for this project. Morgan responded we've been to the site and are getting the scope worked out – including the very narrow road, and the steep slope to the river. Morgan added we need to determine how we will meet the requirements to install a guard rail that could include construction of walls etc. Morgan will have an estimate and permitting info to the committee by next month's meeting.

Anderson closed the public hearing at 7:20 p.m.

IX. NEXT MEETING – March 25th @ 5:45 p.m. – Public Hearing will be first agenda item.

Christy Mosier
Transcribing Secretary

MEMBERS PRESENT: George Goldstein, Jody Ogle, Jim Wilcox, Karen Bodner, Jack Radabaugh

MEMBERS ABSENT: John Anderson

STAFF PRESENT: Marsha Miller, Bill Morgan, Phil Fields, Eric Wurster, Shashi Bajracharya, Celia Barry, Howard Schussler, Ed Chastain

Radabaugh opened the public hearing at 5:45 p.m. and gave an overview of the process.

I. PUBLIC HEARING – Harlow Road/Hayden Bridge Way Pavement Rehabilitation Project.

Chastain said he is here to review the project for those that may not have attended the previous public meeting. Chastain reviewed the striping component of the project, on Hayden Bridge way, between Shady Lane and 5th Street, showing three options for consideration and the negatives and positives of each, stating that Option 2 is preferred by the county – providing a continuous turn lane. Chastain asked the public and staff to take 15 minutes to review the three alternatives provided on the maps, and said a decision will be requested at next month's Roads Advisory Committee Meeting.

Vice Chair Radabaugh requested comments:

PUBLIC COMMENT –

1. Doyal Davis/207 Hayden Bridge Way/Opposed to county's preferred option. Davis provided a petition against the county's preferred option of removing the parking areas along the road. Davis said he does not believe there is a safety issue with only 13 accidents in seven years including one death. He said that's one accident per 2.9 million cars. He added a turn lane will make it more unsafe because with 3 lanes cars are facing each other Davis said the residents will allow a short turn lane on Castle and Third Streets since that's where the accidents happen.
2. Daphne Wingham/235 Hayden Bridge Way/Opposed to county's preferred option and stated it's a unique residential road with long-term residents of 40-50 years and residents won't be able to back into their driveways, and driving face in will mean it will be hard to get out by backing into a busy lane. Wingham stated there will be more accidents and deaths with this option. Residents have family that visit for holidays and by removing the parking means there would not be a place to park. Wingham added that she is concerned about how much money they will lose on property value once this is done.
3. Patricia Ray/189 Hayden Bridge Way/Opposed to county's preferred option because taking the strip away from the front of their homes won't give them space to back out of their driveways and also won't leave any room for families to park during holidays, as well as lowering their property values extensively. Ray added in her 40 years there, there have not been many accidents.
4. Judith Cross/196 Hayden Bridge Way/Opposed to county's preferred option. Cross stated she just bought her home in July and would not have done so had she known of these possible changes due to the property value going down extensively, and the extremely short driveways between Manor and Castle needing space for visitors to park, as well as the hazards and legal issues that are involved with backing into a turn lane to get out into the road.
5. Raleigh Williams/273 Hayden Bridge Way/Opposed to options 2 and 3. Opposes county's preferred option for the same reasons as mentioned so far tonight, as well as the street is

entirely residential, and 22 of the driveways are very narrow and those that are narrow may be more challenged with the trees and shrubs that obstruct the view. Williams expressed the parking lane plus the bike lane together provide a buffer as you exit your drive so you can see traffic coming to prevent more accidents. Plan three only leaves a road portion of five properties long unmodified, so it's not very different than the other plans. Williams added left turns only serve other residents nearby, and none of them are onto very active streets. Pioneer Parkway and Fifth Street move traffic very well, as well as Q Street and HWY 126 – providing other options of getting through town.

6. John Garland/184 Hayden Bridge Way/Opposed to county's preferred option for the same reasons cited by others here tonight. Garland lives at a location where an accident occurred and feels the accident happened because of the same issues that will arise from the county's preferred option. Garland said his former wife backed out into the street, just like we are proposing, instead of utilizing the parking and bike lane area as a buffer and had a collision with a bicycle rider resulting in a lawsuit. Garland said the turn lanes and the amount of space we are allocating for them is meant for large traffic areas, and that if we did go with option three, we have the ability to change ODOT's requirements to shorten the lengths.
7. Vernon Nichols/129 Hayden Bridge Way/Opposes county's preferred option. He's been there 50 years and has seen a lot of changes. When the road was changed a long time ago the property owners paid for curb-gutter-sidewalk-driveways and do not appreciate taking the parking away just to give all the outside people more room to drive faster. Nichols added it will make the street more unsafe, including LTD buses that have six bus stops on that street, leaving no room for them to get out of traffic, as well as Sani-Pac, Postal Service vehicles etc. Nichols said the LTD buses do not have room to make right hand turns onto Fifth Street.

Radabaugh closed the public hearing at 6:40 p.m.

Meeting called back to order at 6:45 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES –

Goldstein asked for comments to be modified in the minutes to reflect Barry's comments regarding Florence obtaining funding of their own for Coast Guard Road. Goldstein asked for clarification around any possible policies that require cities go and procure funding on their own for county roads projects. Barry clarified what she had tried to explain last month regarding this item. She said the city had received its own economic stimulus allocation and had the option to use it for Coast Guard Station Road. She did not say they were required to use their own money. Since last month, she learned they did not use their allocation for Coast Guard Station Road. Goldstein said it sounded to him like the county was waiving any responsibility for that county road because the city had an obligation to find a funding source. Barry said this was not accurate as we tried to work with the city to get other, new economic stimulus funding that became available after last month's meeting– which wasn't successful. Barry added that we have been and continue to be supportive of possible future funding of the project. Barry clarified further that to this point, we have not seen it as being a higher priority than other projects, as we have reviewed in meetings and CIP discussions, and the Roads Advisory Committee has also not found it to be a higher priority than the other listed projects. Group discussion ensued regarding how to clarify the understanding in the minutes. Ogle suggested we add this as a discussion in this meeting's minutes and not modify last months since there isn't anything contradictory in the minutes. Goldstein agreed with this.

Motion: Ogle moved to approve the minutes; Goldstein seconded; all present voted in favor.

III. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN –

Barry summarized the CIP process that has taken place so far and referred the group to the materials. She said that as mentioned last month would occur, the projects had been moved around as to which funding source would be used due to AARA funding and time lines associated with each pot of funds, including SB 994 monies. MPC allocated \$382,000 to the Hayden-Harlow project, which is in the CIP, and since last month we down-scaled the project to meet the federal funding requirements. Barry said the changes include the cost to the Road Fund for Hayden-Harlow is now

\$337,000 vs. \$889,000. Freeing up \$552,000 made it possible to recommend the Jasper-Lowell Guard Rail Project on which the RAC heard testimony at the CIP hearing. Barry handed out a 30% Design Report for the project. Additionally, we increased the amount of the school zone flashers by \$100,000 to be \$300,000. Chastain said it will still probably cost less than \$300,000 because we are looking at solar power installations etc. Bodner asked about the cost benefit savings of solar power. Chastain explained install options and the differences in costs. Bodner asked if we know what the cost savings are in operating the solar powered flashers. Chastain responded every five years the battery must be replaced. Bodner received negative feedback from some cities that they didn't work very well. Chastain said Springfield used it in all of these schools and their only problem was the panels were undersized and not collecting enough solar power. Goldstein added Florence has had no problems with theirs. Barry continued and said that since last month the Maintenance Division identified repairs needed on the Goodpasture Bridge, so \$100,000 has been added to the CIP for "structures". All of these changes result in a net addition of \$48,000 to road fund expenses, with the difference showing up on page 1 of 6 on the Annual CIP line item. Barry said one more change includes deleting \$726,000 from the revenue listing for the Hayden Harlow project as it was in error. She explained that on page 3 of 6 in the Tables, under Preservation/Rehabilitation, this project's costs are only listed at \$337,000, the cost to the Road Fund, with the full cost of \$1.4 million only explained in the footnote. So, the revenue coming in is not offset by the corresponding expense in the tables, and had to be deleted to avoid double counting. Additionally, we moved the Five Rivers Culvert project into fiscal year 10/11.

Bodner said there is language that says "the Maintenance Division plans to repaint all Lane County covered bridges" but Lowell was just recently done. Morgan responded the intent of that text is that Maintenance has plans over a period of time is to paint bridges on a routine, periodic basis. Bodner asked how many years the paint will last. Morgan said about five to seven years.

Barry said tonight we are looking for a recommendation on the CIP.

Motion: Ogle moved to approve CIP as-is; Goldstein seconded; all present voted in favor.

IV. AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009 (ARRA) UPDATE –

Barry stated that at the last RAC meeting she distributed a packet showing Board-adopted priorities, or which two projects were funded - Clear Lake Road and Marcola Road - with the \$1.7 million allocated to Lane County based upon population. Barry distributed materials showing information she was aware of about ARRA funding overall in Lane County. More than \$20 million in transportation project funding has come into Lane County. Barry directed the group to the line items showing Cottage Grove, Florence, and Junction City funding and the projects they had chosen. She noted Florence decided to fund the 12th Street Bicycle-Pedestrian path, and a new street in the city industrial park with the \$201,437 they will receive. Barry said Coast Guard road is a county road, so it makes sense they would not fund it themselves, but her point from last week's discussion is that there is nothing that would prevent them from doing so. Barry said after last month's meeting we received new information that there was new money available, as the Oregon Transportation Commission decided not to give ODOT their entire allocation –holding back \$68 million to make available to local governments and ODOT to compete for, and provided a short timeframe of everyone needing project applications into them by Monday of the next week. Lane County submitted the EWEB bike path and Coast Guard Station Road after Florence stepped forward and filled out the necessary information and then Lane County submitted the application because it is a county road. However, it did not get funded. Barry said she thought it might not have gotten funded due to its "readiness", because on the second pot of money, the project has to go to bid by June 17th of this year – which limits what can be funded. This means a project must have no environmental issues or right-of-way acquisitions etc. Florence said to Celia that they didn't believe it could make that timeline but wanted to submit it anyway. Goldstein said he heard from the Mayor that the Coast Guard didn't want to do it because it would come out of their funds; Goldstein got a hold of the Coast Guard contact responsible for properties and they had never heard of such a thing and said no one had ever inquired. Goldstein said he then made a formal inquiry since he was able to do it on behalf of the citizens and has been asking for our cooperation. Barry indicated she was interested in hearing more about the Mayor's assertion and this was the first she had heard of it. There was further discussion about the county and

private road portions of the road. After additional requests about how to get the project funded, Barry stated that as a policy decision, the Roads Advisory Committee – at one of its CIP processes – has to recommend the project as one of the priorities for funding and we have to have capital project funding, which we no longer have as we move into a maintenance budget in the CIP. General group discussion ensued.

V. NEXT MEETING – April 22, 2009.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

Barry – said the next meeting packet will include information on an open house ODOT will hold on the same night as the RAC meeting, in the Goodson Room, regarding all I-5 bridges that are being raised because their height is substandard. They will hold an open house during our next RAC meeting, from 3:30-6p.m..

Hayden-Harlow Road:

The RAC asked for time to discuss the public hearing so staff could report back on some of their questions. Chastain opened the discussion by saying a lot of the feedback is that “doing this project will create a freeway and cause people to drive faster”. Chastain said we’ve done a lot of these types of striping projects before and studies of areas similar to this one over periods of years indicate there haven’t been significant changes in driver behavior to support this concern.

Group discussion ensued. Barry summarized the committee’s requests stemming from the discussion and said the following will be completed by next month’s meeting:

1. Verify rates of accident per ADT
2. Qualify of accidents
3. ODOT standards – are they necessary
4. Length of turnouts, queue lengths
5. Safety issues associated with egress/ingress, and discussion of AASHTO standards
6. One-sided parking/bike lane option
7. Land value questions

Meeting adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

Christy Mosier
Transcribing Secretary