

ROADS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

August 26, 2009

Deleted: <sp>

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: Jack Radabaugh

STAFF & OTHER PRESENT: Marsha Miller, Mike Russell, Bill Morgan, Celia Barry, Christy Mosier.

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

I. PUBLIC COMMENT – None.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES –

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

III. SCHEDULE FUTURE MEETINGS

Committee reviewed a calendar through December 2010 and decided to modify two meeting dates: September 23, 2009 to be a 12:30 meeting over lunch so the group can tour county projects, and to move March 24, 2010 meeting to March 31 to avoid spring break conflicts.

IV. COMMITTEE INTRODUCTIONS –

Due to two newer members on board, members and staff did brief, individual introductions to the group sharing a summary of their personal background.

V. REVIEW COMMITTEE CHARGE & GOALS/OBJECTIVES FOR 09/10

The committee reviewed their work plan developed for 2009 and noted areas of accomplishment under each item. The committee wants to work on item number two "conduct at least one on-site inspection of road activities and consider, if available, inviting other entities such as the Board". The committee and staff agreed to do an afternoon meeting on September 23 to tour projects. Members discussed committee representation at stakeholder groups and agreed to discuss at the next meeting which groups have representation and consider others that they want representation at. General group discussion ensued.

Bodner asked what the work plan item [Review preparation of Total Maximum Daily Load] (TMDL) was for. Morgan answered and also explained we had a recent requirement from DEQ in April where we needed to create a TMDL plan, which would then go into a permit. Presently we have annual reporting requirements. Morgan added we create Intergovernmental Agreements between agencies, relying on the cities to be the backbone to provide the storm water element of these permits.. Morgan said while storm water is no longer very road-centric, staff will come back to the RAC and Board at some point to talk about storm water fees, planning, etc.

Russell commented that item number 10 [Review Underground Injection Best Management Practices] was carried over from a time when it was a present issue and staff would use the committee to run ideas by. Morgan said the things we are dealing with now are bacteria and temperature issues – and trying to avoid a need to treat storm water due to the amount of rain we get in the Northwest. General discussion ensued. The committee agreed this should be an item to be aware of, but not a work plan item to accomplish. Group discussion ensued with agreement that Item 13 [monitor committee activities and service delivery to ensure consistency with Diversity Action Plan] would be removed if it no longer applies. Mosier will research and see if this item was directed to stay as a regular work plan item.

VI. UPDATE: HARLOW ROAD/HAYDEN BRIDGE WAY UPDATE

Barry said the Board adopted the committee's recommendation in July and added that while they expected a significant outcry against the recommendation, staff were surprised no residents were present to voice against it. Barry said they expect it to go to contract in March 2010 and because the project received stimulus funding it will need to be completed by 2010. Anderson asked if Springfield will take ownership of the road. Barry said the road is in the city limits, so staff will

always be interested in the city taking over jurisdiction of the road. Bodner asked why it's a county road. Barry explained that many county roads are in cities, and city limits change over time. Russell interjected there were parts of this road that were surrendered as part of the agreement – mostly near the new round-about.

Wilcox asked about connectivity and what the communication is like among cities when a shared road crosses jurisdiction lines so that it carries through the same kind of design from where it leaves one jurisdiction and transfers to the other. Wilcox explained that bike lanes tend to change as they go from one city or jurisdiction to another – from not carrying the same design features not continuing with the path all together. Morgan answered that we apply city standards for local, county roads. Wilcox said it seems different in Springfield – that the bike lanes aren't consistent with our standards. Wilcox asked if there are groups that get together and discuss these kinds of things. Barry answered there are a variety of issues around this that create difficulties because of the county and city having different policies. Barry added at the metro level there are weekly planning meetings, but that on the ground, the county may have long ago approved an old subdivision in Springfield without any sidewalks. Today, the Springfield City Council has a policy whereby the City won't take jurisdiction of county roads unless they are modified to their standards. On the other hand, the county's position is that the city's urban development is creating the need for the urban standards to be met. Barry added that the county does not have a System Development Charge (SDC) that would allow the county to make some of these improvements, but we are working on establishing one. Wilcox said he is interested in learning what those differences and challenges are to help create continuity. Wilcox said he would like more information on how this committee can work better by knowing what the interfaces are, and is asking if the committee thinks it would be useful to know. Morgan offered to meet with Wilcox after the meeting to learn more detail on how projects come together.

VII. REPORT BACK: THERMAL PLASTIC PAVEMENT STRIPING/Bill Morgan

Morgan referred the group to the memo provided – which responds to Goldstein's question he asked in a previous meeting about profile (raised) striping vs. non-profile striping to help with safety. Morgan reviewed the systems we use in comparison to what other options are available. Morgan said in snow country like ours, profile striping is twelve times the cost due to the snow plow blades removing it from the pavement and ODOT is finding that to be true on 126. Wilcox interjected that profile striping has negative effects on cyclists due to the product being raised and slippery. Morgan concluded this isn't a viable option for Lane County due to cost to maintain and the cost of contracting out for the machinery needed. Morgan said the best option is traditional paint – which meets the reflective requirements. Goldstein said he never intended to focus on thermal plastic striping and that his focus was rumble strips and not knowing the latest technology for them, and that he thought psychologically the rumble strips might help with safety in areas where there are no passing or turn off lanes.

VIII. PROJECT SUMMARY/Bill Morgan

Morgan provided and reviewed a project summary report. Morgan said the first three are last year's projects, but we keep them open for one year to ensure the contract is fulfilled with proper plant establishment. Morgan reviewed the summary and commented that Harvey Road went so well that Creswell even added their funds to complete the project. Barry added that four of the six school zone flashers are working well and are a major cost savings. Morgan said there was money well spent on the EWEB trail and now Willamalane is taking it over. Barry said the EWEB path is a great example of jurisdictional issues. Barry explained that laws changed and monies were not to be spent on bike paths, then funding came available and several agencies got together to make this happen. Barry added this was an extremely fast transfer of ownership of just 24 hours due to everyone's efforts.

Goldstein commented on Morgan's Construction Recap for 2009 and said we don't show the value of the work engineers put in, and only shows the bid amount and not actual costs. Goldstein said we should show the engineering costs. Chair Anderson said if Goldstein is suggesting a change be made to reporting, we first need to review why we are doing it this way. Mosier added she remembers this committee asking and reviewing this same subject and why the reporting is done this particular way when Snowden was Director. Mosier agreed to review past minutes and report back.

IX. VIDEO: LANE COUNTY PAVING THE WAY

The committee watched the video and shared positive feedback.

X. NEXT MEETING – September 23, 2009

XI. OTHER BUSINESS

Goldstein said he wants ODOT to put up signs along HWY 36 that indicate “Cyclists in the Road” because of there not being a shoulder. Goldstein asked the committee if we should put a request directly into ODOT or if we just wait and see what ODOT will do. Wilcox added its all kinds of cyclists. Ogle said because we publish HWY 36 as a bike route we should do something about it. Wilcox said he will start this process by asking his contact with the State to learn more on this suggestion.

Chair Anderson asked the committee to email him if they'd like to be part of a subcommittee to screen applicants for the vacancy in order to make a recommendation to the Board. Mosier commented that we have two new applicants and Bodner who has reapplied for her position. Goldstein said he wanted us to first look into policy because he believes we may not have followed process last time by having a sub committee that possibly included non-appointed member making recommendations. Mosier agreed to verify policy and get back to Goldstein.

Meeting adjourned @ 7:45 p.m.

Christy Mosier
Transcribing Secretary