

ROADS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

April 28, 2010

MEMBERS PRESENT: John Anderson, Kent Fleming, Jim Wilcox, Sean Barrett

MEMBERS ABSENT: Jack Radabaugh, Jody Ogle

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

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

I. PUBLIC COMMENT – none.

II. AIR POLLUTION PRESENTATION – Guest Lisa Arkin, Oregon Toxics

Arkin shared a presentation on the air pollution in our area due to just vehicular traffic, what the pollutants are and the hazards of each, and facts and figures of the difference it makes by not allowing engines to idle beyond 20 seconds. Arkin stated that the top reasons we should have an interest in getting involved in education and awareness with the public include that the county already supports the 20 second no idle concept, reducing idle time helps reduce greenhouse gases, the pollutants from vehicles create major health hazards, and there is significant money to be saved from the no idle concept. Arkin added that many local businesses have already begun educating the public with signage and policies around reduced idle time and are reporting significant dollars saved. Arkin suggested we find inexpensive ways to promote and educate the public – such as free radio, signage, flyers, and promotional materials available through DEQ.

General group discussion ensued regarding the trucking industry and the changes they are making, technology changes, fuel issues specific to Oregon, upcoming legislation changes, and areas county staff may want to take initiative on such as Fern Ridge Lake where boaters may tend to idle for long periods of time. Wilcox proposed the committee gather information about what an ordinance might involve for boating in Fern Ridge, and that this would be a good starting place to test it out and then propose its success for other areas. Barry suggested it would be more appropriate to bring this up before the Parks Advisory Committee. Anderson stated we should stay within the Roads Advisory Committee scope and instead we could suggest ideas or this presentation be shared with the Parks Advisory Committee regarding Fern Ridge park and lake use. Wilcox modified his recommendation.

Motion: Wilcox moved to send a request to the Parks Advisory Committee for them to hear additional information about the idling impacts to Fern Ridge Lake and offer their recommendation regarding possible policy; Fleming seconded; all present voted in favor with Chair Anderson abstaining.

General group discussion ensued regarding the various ways to suggest Parks Advisory Committee explore options and ideas.

III. APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 24, 2010 MINUTES -

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

IV. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM DELIBERATION – Shashi Bajracharya

Bajracharya referred to the memo provided, summarized the changes in the draft since our last meeting, and explained there is a reduction of about \$3.0 million due to the reductions in FY 2014 and 2015 allocations in the overlay and pavement preservation line item. Bajracharya said this was done in order to make it consistent with the Road Fund budget projections and the elimination of the Game Farm Road Overlay project.

Bajracharya provided follow up regarding the public request in February by Ms. Funkhouser regarding Grove Street. Staff is not recommending the requested work because there is not enough asphalt surface to stripe. Additionally, pedestrian walking on the shoulders is a safety issue. A full urban improvement project would be required.

Wilcox shared an inquiry he received regarding the 30th Avenue overlay project. Wilcox was asked if the County can design a more protected shoulder to offer more protection for cyclist. Wilcox added that some of the options that come to mind also present hazards to cyclists such as a dip in the pavement to indicate a divided area, and visible pavement markings become slick when wet. Wilcox wants this to go in as an option for our traffic engineer to consider. Barry said these are valid safety issues and that there are standard engineering markings that are advised in the national and international guidelines. Barry added that an overlay project is fairly limited to just the overlay application itself and restriping, and that we will check with our Traffic Engineer outside of the CIP process on this request.

Fleming mentioned that the Beaver Street Extension project removed by the Board of County Commissioners a while back continues to come up with residents and their curiosity as to why it was removed as it seemed to mesh well with things the City is doing. Barry answered it was proposed by staff as part of the 2010-2014 Surface Transportation Program-Urban funding that comes in from the Federal Transportation Bill and brought it to the Board but it wasn't included due to other priorities. Barry said there may be other options for funding to pursue, and staff would be looking for those opportunities. Additionally, the Beltline study that is currently taking place may present opportunities to include this area again. Wilcox added that one of the reasons we heard from the Board as to why Beaver Street was not included is because they felt a significant amount of money was already allocated for biking improvements in general. Group discussion ensued.

Motion: Fleming moved to recommend the CIP to the Board of County Commissioners as-is; Barrett seconded; all present voted in favor.

V. LOCAL ACCESS ROADS 101– John Petsch

Petsch explained that local access roads are publicly dedicated roads that have generally been built many years ago – usually privately in order to gain access to one or more properties. Over time these roads became public as a matter of record. Many of these have been accepted by the Board as public and have not been adopted into our road maintenance system. This means they are not eligible for road fund dollars and are open to the public, and Lane County does not maintain them unless it comes down to eminent danger such as fallen tree in the roadway or an obstruction for emergency services access.

Petsch referred the group to Lane Code and Oregon Statutes for regulation requirements and definitions. Prior to 2004, Lane County would regulate and permit activities on local access roads such as a resident who wanted to install a driveway or modify the road or trees in the

road. As of 2004, The Board of County Commissioners directed County staff to not regulate these roads and instead we simply try to advise and make recommendations for residents to follow the code and standards.

Wilcox said it seems like this is a public relations challenge since the county can't respond and maintain these roads but the resident also can't necessarily make changes to it either. Petsch agreed – especially because people have different opinions of what should be happening on “their road”.

Barry said they function as private roads, and are usually less than a half mile long. Barry added statutes around forming local improvement districts to deal with this situation are very bureaucratic and difficult to implement. Ironically, private easements are preferable to local access roads because easements have all of the specifications for maintenance spelled out. Petsch added that home buyers see this in the title report when they buy a home or land but nothing is mentioned about Local Access Roads to a buyer. Petsch said residents can petition to have a LAR brought into the county road system, but the residents are required to bring it up to county road standards first which are very stringent, costly, and is rarely pursued.

VI. UPCOMING VACANCY – The Committee discussed the upcoming a-large vacancy as of July first and agreed to form an interview subcommittee since that has worked well in the past. The subcommittee will make a recommendation to the committee, and the committee will then make their recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners. Barrett, Fleming, and Wilcox agreed to be the subcommittee with Anderson as an alternate for Barrett.

VII. AREA COMMISSION ON TRANSPORTATION FOR LANE COUNTY (ACT)

Fleming provided an update to staff and summarized meeting highlights including that the State has transportation areas and all except Portland have an ACT, who advises the Oregon Transportation Commission. Fleming said the group reached consensus on who will be voting members and what the bylaws shall be. Fleming said there was an important clarification understood when the group realized the ACT will not be a fight for who gets what, but rather getting together and getting each area's share from the State. Fleming said it is now time for us to think about our role on the ACT as well as the committee's role. Fleming anticipates the RAC may experience a fundamental change in how we are involved and our scope. Group discussion ensued regarding the representation on the ACT, voting, and the next steps for the ACT moving forward. Fleming said it may be late summer or fall before the ACT is formed.

Motion: Fleming moved to approve and recommend the ACT's draft bylaws; Wilcox seconded; all present voted in favor.

Anderson opened the discussion for committee representation nominations for the ACT.

Motion: Wilcox moved to nominate Fleming as the ACT Roads Advisory Committee Member representative, with Barrett as the alternate; Barrett seconded; all present voted in favor.

VIII. BELTLINE OPEN HOUSE & STAKEHOLDER ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Barry said highlights from the stakeholder meeting included narrowing down alternatives to take through the NEPA process - an intensive process that looks at environmental, social equity, archeological resources, historic resources, and other resources in order to select an alternative that has the least impact on all of them. Barry said the alternatives that are no longer in

consideration include the “ramp braid” design because it’s not feasible, is expensive, and had little support through the open houses; The low-build concept one and two as stand-alone projects but will be part of the low-build three design which is moving forward. The committee decided to carry forward alternatives including an auxiliary lane – as well as the local arterial bridge as an option to add to any concept, a collector-distributor alternative, as well as a split-diamond alternative. Barry said they are concerned about the collector-distributor alternative in combination with the local arterial alternative because they appear to do the same things, but elected to move it forward for further analysis. The committee wants a transportation demand management component built into the analysis, which is a very high level of assumption about alternative transportation to be used in the modeling. Group discussion ensued.

IX. CONNECT OREGON III

Barry said Connect Oregon III had a full-speed ahead timeline so the RAC was not included in the process, since there was no RAC meeting in March. Summarized the program by saying it’s in the third biennium with \$100 million dollars that comes from lottery backed bonds, with every region in the state receiving at least ten million dollars. The program has been very successful and promotes freight and economic development and getting people to jobs by connecting different modes. Barry explained the program is available for public and private applicants. Barry said the Board, acting as the “ACT”, held a process and public hearing for five applicants – including LTD, Fuel Logistics, Pacific Recycling Inc., the City of Eugene, and the Port of Siuslaw – which came out ahead of the rest. Group discussion ensued. The Board prioritized them in the following order: Port of Siuslaw, Fuel Logistics, Pacific Recycling Inc., and City of Eugene, with LTD withdrawing.

X. OTHER:

Wilcox would like to give his standard presentation to our group regarding bicycling benefits, barriers, and perceptions because this will help us when audiences asked the RAC why we may be doing certain projects. The group agreed for Wilcox to do this presentation in May.

Fleming asked that we also discuss at our next meeting the role of Roads Advisory Committee.

Anderson asked that staff provide a “Road Fund 101” to review where road money comes from.

XI. NEXT MEETING – May 26 , 2010

Meeting adjourned @ 7:40 p.m.

Christy Mosier, Transcribing Secretary