

# 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