

## ROADS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

January 27, 2010

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** John Anderson, Kent Fleming, Jody Ogle, George Goldstein, Jack Radabaugh, Sean Barrett  
**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Jim Wilcox  
**STAFF & OTHER PRESENT:** Marsha Miller, Christy Mosier, Bill Morgan, Celia Barry, Shashi Bajracharya.

Anderson called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

- I. PUBLIC COMMENT – None.
- II. ELECTION OF CHAIR & VICE CHAIR  
Motion: Ogle nominated Anderson as Committee Chair; Fleming seconded; all present voted in favor.  
  
Motion: Anderson nominated Fleming as Committee Vice Chair; Ogle seconded; all present voted in favor.
- III. APPROVAL OF DECEMBER 2, 2009 MINUTES:  
Motion: Ogle moved to approve the minutes as-is; Barrett seconded; all present voted in favor.
- IV. WELCOME NEW MEMBER SEAN BARRETT  
The group welcomed Barrett and did brief introductions.
- V. DEFINE 2009 ACCOMPLISHMENTS & DEVELOP 2010 WORK PLAN TO BE FILED WITH THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OFFICE  
The group reviewed the 2009 work plan in order to identify accomplishments for the past year and prepared their 2010 work plan. General discussion ensued.  
  
Motion: Fleming moved to approve the 2010 Work Plan; Ogle seconded; all present voted in favor.  
  
Motion: Fleming moved to approve the 2009 Accomplishments; Ogle seconded; all present voted in favor.
- VI. FISCAL YEAR 2011-2015 DRAFT CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTN PROGRAM  
Bajracharya summarized the draft CIP provided to the group and said he is seeking the committee's approval to release this document to the public. General discussion ensued. Bajracharya clarified some items under Projects and Structures by stating Sweet Creek is externally funded by the Forest Highway Program, Goodpasture Covered Bridge has been carried over from last year and has a structural issue, and Layng covered bridge is a rehabilitation project. Group discussion ensued. Bajracharya said February 24 will be our standard CIP Public Hearing during our committee meeting  
  
Motion: Ogle moved to approve the CIP document be released to the public with the one adjustment Bajracharya agreed to make; Barrett seconded; all present voted in favor.

VII. 2012-2105 STIP PROJECT ELEGIBILITY CRITERIA AND PRIORITIZATION FACTORS

Barry reviewed the STIP process and said this is presently at the stage of developing eligibility criteria and prioritization factors for the State, and it is a unique step because this stage welcomes comments beyond modernization projects and includes comments for all transportation. The Roads Advisory Committee has this opportunity to make comments specifically for this stage. Barry added usually they don't change much from cycle to cycle, but due to concerns about climate change and greenhouse gas emissions, and passage of House Bill 2001, the eligibility criteria have changed to address these issues. Barry referred the group to Attachment one, page seven that explains this in depth.

Barry explained that the timing of when we receive materials from ODOT and our local processes means that there has not been an opportunity to review and discuss this document with others, or conduct analysis of the document, so it is difficult to give the RAC any guidance in commenting at this time. Fleming commented that Commissioner Handy asked why we don't get opportunity to comment sooner. Barry explained we didn't receive the draft early enough from ODOT, having only received it at the end of December. Barry said comments are due February 19. Anderson said in the past there has been opportunity to make suggestions and prioritize items that we thought were eligible for the STIP. Barry said we will have the opportunity to do that at a later stage in the STIP process. Currently we are just at the step of commenting on eligibility criteria and prioritization factors. Goldstein interjected that he wants the committee to help ensure the whole focus of this is not on central urban transportation. Radabaugh mentioned two non-transportation issues related to climate change that could have devastating results. He thinks failure to address these non-transportation issues is a problem. Radabaugh said they include warming of the ocean and ocean acidification. Anderson said he understands Radabaugh's point of being good stewards. Barry said it's estimated that a third of carbon emissions are from statewide transportation with about 50 percent being estimated to be transportation here in the local area— which is why there is an emphasis on transportation in state legislation. Radabaugh said his objection to reports like these is that they don't go as far as they can in looking at what they're trying to solve. Barrett asked if there is anything that stands out to Barry that the committee may want to comment on. Barry referred the group to attachment two, second column, second row which emphasizes looking at transportation solutions that involve local facilities, and not only state facilities. Barry explained this is a transition to a system wide approach that she thinks should be supported. Group discussion ensued regarding the STIP document. Barry offered to pass on comments that are due in by February 19<sup>th</sup>. The RAC elected not to comment but asked to hear what the Board said about the document.

Anderson asked if anyone had any items they would like to mention. Hearing no comments, Anderson recommended this go to the Board and MPO.

VIII. REPORT ON 1<sup>ST</sup> FORUM ON AN AREA COMMISSION ON TRANSPORTATION FOR LANE COUNTY (FACT-LC)

Barry summarized by stating Lane County is required by new legislation to form an ACT and the Board hired Rob Zako, who met with us at the last RAC meeting. Zako held the first meeting, called a Forum on Area Commission on Transportation (FACT) and it was a well attended meeting with good discussion. Action taken at this meeting included formation of a sub-committee to develop the charter purpose and mission statement, as well as discussion around voting structure and concerns.

Barry said questions on behalf of Mr. Zako,

1. **Will one of our committee members attend the February 10<sup>th</sup> meeting?**
2. **Does the RAC want to comment on their opinion whether a commissioner is the appropriate representative or someone else be a better choice for the unrepresented 126 East Corridor?**

Ogle suggested ensuring someone from the McKenzie River area is involved such as local associations like Home Owners Association that can speak for that group and have first hand knowledge of their issues. Radabaugh said he corresponded with Zako about bringing neighborhood associations and entities on board too. Barry said there is public comment period during each of these meetings and they are trying to get notices out to everyone with the next meeting being February 10<sup>th</sup> at 5:30 p.m. Barry asked if the committee thinks there are stakeholders that should be represented on the ACT, that the upcoming meeting is the opportunity to do so. Anderson stated it seems since we are advisors to the Board and represent the Board, it would be a duplication by having the RAC participate on this committee. Barry asked about the previous comment regarding HWY 126. Ogle clarified that yes, she thinks we should contact Blue River and McKenzie River community groups and associations. Barry asked whether the commissioner is the appropriate representative for the corridor, or whether a citizen or other entity would be more appropriate. Group consensus reached that users of the corridor (Blue River Community) will be better as the representative. Barry said there seem to be two schools of thought that seem to be moving ahead at the FACT – one is “let’s stick to the State program”, and the other is “Let’s bring other things to the table”.

Anderson will attend the February 10<sup>th</sup> FACT meeting and will report back.

- IX. OTHER BUSINESS – None.
- X. NEXT MEETING – February 24, 2010

Meeting adjourned @ 7:30 p.m.

---

Christy Mosier, Transcribing Secretary

DRAFT

## ROADS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

February 24, 2010

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** John Anderson, Kent Fleming, Jody Ogle, George Goldstein, Jim Wilcox  
Sean Barrett

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Jack Radabaugh

**STAFF & OTHER PRESENT:** Marsha Miller, Christy Mosier, Bill Morgan, Celia Barry, Shashi  
Bajracharya, Mike Russell, and Guest Lisa Arkin.

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

### I. PUBLIC COMMENT –

#### 1. **Peggy Funkhauser/727 Elm Drive, Eugene/541-688-2749.**

Peggy stated she is interested in Grove Street between Maxwell and Howard, about a block and a half in distance. Peggy said we resurfaced it last summer but there was nothing done for the west side to accommodate pedestrians – leaving kids in the street with the traffic and in the puddles. Peggy said ideally she'd like to see us pave and stripe that section to provide a safety zone. Peggy added she didn't realize the CIP public hearing tonight would have been the ideal place to bring this up because she believed this project was just an oversight on our part by not finishing the remainder of Grove.

Chair Anderson said there can be several reasons why staff didn't do specific treatments to this section of the road. Fleming asked County Engineer Bill Morgan if he could share information on the project. Morgan responded this project was a slurry seal – which is just preventative maintenance that is funded by the section in our budget for preservation of existing roadways. Common preventative maintenance items include slurry seals, chip seals, and overlays. Morgan explained about 3-4 years ago we had some of the Capital Improvement Budget slated for bike and pedestrian improvements such as Peggy's suggestion of Grove Street. With the deficit in the road fund budget, that category went away. Typically when we preserve an existing roadway, we don't put work into evaluating and realigning the road, and therefore, tonight's meeting is the right place to discuss this. Barry added while this is a capital improvement project, it doesn't mean its not a good project, and a few years back it would have been a lot easier to have done without a lot of deliberation. With the loss of federal money, our capital improvement program has turned into almost entirely a preservation program. Barry said we do have grant opportunities and this would be a good candidate for a school or safety grant. Funkhauser said she'd wondered about approaching the school district. Barry provided contact information for the Safe Routes to School coordinator Shane Rhodes for Funkhauser to contact.

### II. GROUP INTRODUCTIONS

Committee members and staff introduced themselves with their background information, including newest member Sean Barrett.

### III. APPROVAL OF D JANUARY 27, 2010 MINUTES:

**Motion:** Ogle moved to approve the minutes as-is; Barrett seconded; all present voted in favor.

### IV. 2011-2015 DRAFT CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT (CIP) PACKET OVERVIEW

Bajracharya reviewed changes made to the Draft 2011-2015 Capital Improvement Program since January's meeting. The changes include additions of Game Farm Road Overlay, Hyacinth Street

Sidewalk Installation, and the exclusion of the Beaver Street Extension Development Project due to recent Board direction received. General discussion ensued.

Anderson asked if the city can take over Hyacinth once we improve it. Barry responded we no longer have agreements with the city nor provide a share of federal funds like we used to, and therefore cities are less motivated to take jurisdiction of roads. Different cities view the issue differently. On the one hand getting the county out of a city's business can be viewed as a positive; on the other taking additional roads increases the cities' maintenance costs.

Barrett asked if we receive funding for Hyacinth through ODOT Lane Mile Program even though the city has annexed this area in. Barrett also asked if the City annexes an area, do they annex it all including the roads? Barry answered it depends; Glenwood is an example of this not being the case. When Glenwood was annexed, they annexed everything except the streets. Morgan further clarified annexation does not mean the roads are taken into the city's maintenance system. For that to happen the city must request surrender of the road – such as Hyacinth.

Wilcox asked what happens next in this process. Anderson answered tonight is the public hearing in order to record public testimony on the draft CIP document before we deliberate in April. Wilcox said he asks because someone asked him about the Beaver Street/Hunsaker project. Bajracharya answered that this project was excluded by the Board of County Commissioners. Wilcox said people have asked about the connection to the new Eugene bike path being developed. Barry said staff proposed the Beaver/Hunsaker project for STP-U funding in order to provide a connection a pedestrian/bike path connection, in addition to addressing congestion issues, from Beaver Street to possibly Wilkes Drive since the city's new bike path extension terminates at Beaver Street.

V. REPORT ON THE AREA COMMISSION ON TRANSPORTATION FOR LANE COUNTY (ACT)

Barry summarized the February 10<sup>th</sup> meeting and said it was well attended with about 27 in attendance, including Fleming and Barrett. The group came up with a proposed name of "Lane ACT" and discussed Bylaw related issues including how much time they may devote their time to land use related issues. Linda Cook gave public comment regarding the importance of disaster planning and the importance of highway connections and evacuation routes. Fleming commented during the land-use related discussion it became clear there isn't a regulatory role but rather the ACT is an advisory group. Fleming said there was also a lot of discussion regarding who will be members. Fleming said this brings up the role of the RAC and their involvement with the ACT. Fleming said there may be some overlap as previously discussed. Barrett commented the ACT is only supposed to deal with STIP funding – not the cities and not the county's funding, and therefore the RAC is a very important tool for county road projects. Barrett added the other item discussed was that the ACT was supposed to take a system-wide approach

Goldstein commented that he keeps mentioning that we take care of main roads but not the immense amount of other unincorporated roads. Goldstein is concerned we need more oversight into multiple developers and construction. Goldstein said these unincorporated roads are just going to decay and there doesn't seem to be a solution for these. Barry stated these issues Goldstein mentions will not be addressed at the ACT because the ACT addresses highways. Goldstein added he mentions this because he doesn't see any unincorporated areas represented in the ACT. Barry responded that Highway 126 East representation is specifically being discussed and they want to have a voting member for the ACT.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

- **Beltline Delta Road Stakeholder Meeting Update:** Ogle summarized they discussed nine concepts of how to deal with the congestion through the corridor- all at varying budget levels. Some of those in the discussion included on-ramp changes, weave zones, leaving the existing bridge alone and building a new arterial bridge by going through Division and tying into Green Acres, and consideration of adding a lane onto Beltline. At the next meeting they will narrow down options in order to begin NEPA work. The open house is March 15 at the Irving Grange, 5:30-7:30p.m.
- **ACT/Next Meeting:** Anderson said Barrett and Fleming should collaborate on who will attend until we know what kind of RAC committee presence they want.
- **George Goldstein's Last Meeting Tonight:** Anderson acknowledged Goldstein's leaving the committee and that he will be missed. Anderson presented a years-of-service recognition award from Chair Anderson and Marsha Miller.

Goldstein commented he sent an agenda request in for tonight, and while we are nearly out of time, he would like the committee to vote on it. Goldstein clarified he'd like a vote to support the repair of a road. Goldstein stated Treewood Lane is a Local Access Road, leaving the locals responsible for normal maintenance. Goldstein described a long divot in the road and feels it's a safety issue. Goldstein said he and the county do not agree on two items – the first is when its full of water and dark out, people don't see it and bottom out on the hole as the photo illustrates, creating a safety hazard; the second issue of difference is that Goldstein thinks the county should not have approved the construction of this road being built upon wood debris.

Wilcox stated the photos show this item should be looked into further for more information for a full understanding before anyone could weigh in with an opinion in order to make a recommendation. Wilcox suggested this be brought into the next meeting. Anderson stated tonight's public hearing is the forum for the community of this subdivision to bring this to us as an item to be part of the CIP program or maintenance program. Goldstein said, as he now understands it, he should have had the people come in tonight. Anderson said they also can submit written comment. Morgan said this is not the first time this has come up and has provided information to Commissioner Fleenor in the past. Morgan said this is a Local Access Road issue. Morgan suggested we do a "Local Access Road 101" at our next meeting to ensure the RAC understands the policies behind local access roads. Anderson suggested Goldstein ask the people to come in and talk about this. Morgan said staff applies what Lane Code and other policy stipulates. Russell commented that the people in this community were mailed the information from us on what a LAR is and how they work. Goldstein said the county should not have allowed it to be constructed to begin with.

**Lisa Arkin, Oregon Toxics Alliance:** Lisa presented information on the economics of idling and the reasons they want to get more people involved. Arkin said a number of partners have joined and Public Works has already implemented the "no Idling more than 30 seconds" with fleet vehicles. Arkin said she is seeking a recommendation from the committee on broadening this policy.

VII. 7:00p.m. PUBLIC HEARING - 2011-2015 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Chair Anderson called the hearing to order, explained the format, and stated we are here to take public comment in order to deliberate and make a recommendation at our next committee meeting on April 28, which will go to the Board of County Commissioners. Bajracharya gave a

15 minute PowerPoint presentation along with printed materials. No public comment was received during the hearing.

VIII. NEXT MEETING – April 28, 2010

Meeting adjourned @ 7:30 p.m.

---

Christy Mosier, Transcribing Secretary