

ROADS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

September 22, 2010

MEMBERS PRESENT: Sean Barrett, Kent Fleming, Jeff Paschall, Jim Wilcox
MEMBERS ABSENT: John Anderson, Jack Radabaugh
STAFF & OTHER PRESENT: Celia Barry, Bill Morgan, Howard Schussler, Caroline Manewal
Alex Phillips

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

- I. PUBLIC COMMENT – none.
- II. OREGON SCENIC BIKEWAYS INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION – Alex Phillips, Bicycle and Water Recreation Coordinator, Oregon Parks & Recreation.
Phillips explained she was bringing this information on scenic bikeways to the RAC because these bikeways are mostly located on roadways. Her goal is to let the RAC know about these bikeways and also get RAC's input and feedback on their program. Lane County currently has only one scenic bikeway, the Willamette Valley Scenic Bikeway, which ends at Armitage Park.

Phillips summarized the history of the bikeway program which began in 2005 as a partnership between Cycle Oregon, the State Parks and Recreation Department, ODOT and Travel Oregon. A scenic bikeway is chosen through a specific process: 1) the proposed route needs to have local road jurisdiction (city, county, and ODOT) approval, 2) a completed application is submitted to the Oregon Scenic Bikeway Committee, and 3) the 11-member Committee goes out and rides the proposed route. The Committee looks at, and does a numerical rating on, the scenic value (natural setting, sensory elements, and human-made elements) and road conditions (route separation, traffic volume, and route surface) of the proposed route. Phillips emphasized the Committee is looking for "the best of the best" in Oregon, not just someone's favorite route.

Phillips responded to a question by explaining the Oregon Administrative Rule gives some guidance on the length of a scenic bikeway; a linear route needs to be at least 40 miles and a loop needs to be around 5 miles long. Phillips distributed copies of a September 9, 2010 press release which lists the Committee's first recommendations for the designation of several State scenic bikeways. One of the recommended routes crosses the Cascade Mountains, another forms a second Willamette Valley bikeway, and the other five are east of the Cascades. Phillips noted the absolute number one key is you need a local proponent to apply.

Oregon's scenic bikeway program will be accepting new applications from January 1, 2011 to March 1, 2011. The program's step-by-step designation process is explained in an Oregon Scenic Bikeway handbook available online at www.oregonscenicbikeways.org.

III. WELCOME NEW MEMBER JEFF PASCHALL & COMMITTEE/STAFF INTRODUCTIONS

Committee members and staff introduced themselves to Jeff Paschall. Paschall introduced himself, noting he works for the city of Springfield as their supervisor of capital projects. He is interested in transportation systems, budgeting, road maintenance, etc. and appreciates the opportunity to serve on the RAC.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - JUNE 23 & JULY 28, 2010

Motion: Wilcox moved to approve the Minutes of June 23, 2010, as written. Barrett seconded; all present voted in favor.

Motion: Barrett moved to approve the Minutes of July 28, 2010, as written. Wilcox seconded; all present voted in favor.

V. VERBAL REPORT/UPDATE ON THE BOB STRAUB PARKWAY @ MT. VERNON ROAD PEDESTRIAN INTERSECTION STUDY – Bill Morgan

Morgan noted the July 28, 2010, RAC Minutes summarize Barnett's proposal. Morgan noted he still had a concern regarding traffic speeds, so he had asked the County's Traffic Engineer to do a speed study. The speed limit at the intersection is 45 MPH and the results of the speed study show the current average speed as 53 MPH. Morgan stated staff is working with and gathering information from other entities and is really trying to do a lot of due diligence on the safety and applicability of putting a crossing at a location with this high of speeds. Morgan said staff is looking at what is working on other high speed roads, adding that a lot of the literature does not warrant this type of crossing for speeds greater than 35 MPH.

Morgan noted, in summary, the speed study is completed; we're contacting ODOT traffic engineering to discuss, specifically, high-speed pedestrian crossings; Barnett is contacting an OSU professor to check the possibility of including this intersection in a study they are doing right now on pedestrian crossings; and staff is doing a large literature research on this subject. Morgan said staff wants to come back to the RAC with as much information as possible. He reiterated that his main concern is, if the County puts a pedestrian crossing at this location, it's sending the message to pedestrians that it's a safe place to cross; if it doesn't go in, it's more of an individual's decision whether or not to cross there. There was discussion of several different types of pedestrian crossings. Morgan noted that the traffic speed is what is complicating the situation.

Staff will be coming back with a formal information packet for the RAC's consideration in October.

VI. ONGOING DISCUSSION: THE EVOLVING ROLE OF THE RAC, 10 min.

Fleming referred to an article written by Rob Handy that had recently been published in the Register-Guard, noting it was well written about the many aspects of transportation. He added that the RAC is already dealing with more transportation aspects than just roads which brought up discussion on whether to change the name and/or mission statement to better reflect what the Committee is really doing.

Discussion included the following suggestion: 1) first, decide whether or not there should be the broader role implied by changing the Committee name to a transportation advisory committee, 2) then, if there's agreement to move on to a broader role, develop a subcommittee to discuss what that broader role might be, along with a revised mission statement, to be brought back to the full RAC for discussion/approval

Wilcox commented there are two aspects of the ACT being proposed for the State that confirm the idea of a broader role for the RAC. The first part is spelled out in Handy's delineation of the

larger transportation role in developing an ACT; that transportation involves many groups and has a variety of impacts, from our environment, national security, dependence on foreign oil, health, land use, etc. One medical professional has stated that transportation policy is health policy and we're seeing more and more that we need to consider the health implications of an activity. The second component is when and if an ACT is finally established that will start to consume a fair amount of discussion time around local transportation policy. Wilcox stated, within that environment, he felt RAC would be more marginalized in staying with the current Roads Advisory Committee name.

Wilcox suggested they consider making a motion to broaden the focus of the RAC to a transportation advisory committee, with discussion and feedback to follow the motion. Schussler explained that a "facilitated process" might simplify the entire process. It would include interviews with members, cognitive mapping, etc. He noted he has experience facilitating this type of process and offered his services to the RAC. Schussler noted he would start the process with individual interviews, then create the map, and bring the combined information back to the RAC for discussion. He noted this process would help RAC clarify what their Committee goals are; then they could look at their mission statement to see it needed to be revised.

Wilcox stated he would not want to see the process be more expansive than necessary. Schussler explained his offer would actually accelerate the process. He summarized the information that would come out of this process, noting individual interview information would be kept confidential, that the Committee would only see the paraphrased results. He noted the type of information he could put together would include: what are your goals, what do you want to achieve, what key things do you want to do, what actions/options are available to get there, what are the potential unintended impacts that could happen as a result of any action.

There was discussion on keeping the process open and transparent. Schussler explained that individual interview worksheets and developmental worksheets created by staff would not be considered public information, however, the combined data that is created and brought back to the Committee would be public record. Schussler said, with RAC members' consent, he believed he could complete the process in time to bring information back to the October meeting. Morgan asked Schussler to check on the subject of whether or not the Board might choose to combine the Vegetation Management Advisory Committee with the RAC in the future.

Motion: Wilcox moved to proceed with a facilitated process, beginning with individual interviews, resulting in a cognitive map to be brought back to the RAC in October. General discussion ensued. Fleming seconded; all present voted in favor.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS/AGENDA REQUESTS FOR NEXT MEETING?

Agenda Items for October 27, 2010 –

- Upcoming Project (CIP and other) Summary – Bill Morgan
- Report back/informational packet on Bob Straub Parkway/Mt. Vernon Road Pedestrian Intersection Study – Bill Morgan
- Report back/facilitated process on the evolving role of the RAC – Howard Schussler

Availability of public education monies – Wilcox asked if the County ever received money for public education type activities, e.g. safe routes to school. Barry responded there are grant

opportunities available; the process typically works through a metro area initiative, so it would need collaboration with a supportive partner.

Update on the Lane ACT meetings – Fleming asked for an update on the Lane ACT meetings and any current Board action. Barry responded that, although she had not been able to attend, she did have the following results of today’s meeting: 1) the OTC did not take any action, 2) wording in the bylaws is a concern regarding the method of, and the number of, citizen appointments, 3) the Lane County Board had proposed changing the bylaws to say “10 citizen members appointed by the Board,” 4) the cities of Lowell and Oakridge had both rescinded their support for the proposal submitted by the Board, 5) the OTC has asked the Board/County and the cities to meet to work this out and bring another proposal back to the OTC at their November meeting. The County Administrator, at the request of Commissioner Fleenor, has contacted Barry to check into the possibility of having a consultant re-hired.

Barry went on to give an explanation of why ACTs were formed, the reason Lane County resisted at the time, and that now, the recent enactment of SB944 requires Lane County to have an ACT. Barry noted it will be interesting to see if the cities, especially the smaller cities, get the additional voice they are looking for. Barry stated that one thing that may have come out of this process is that the proportional representation issue is really a non-issue because an ACT is an advisory body; there is no decision or policy making power. Barry emphasized that the most important thing is to show a unified voice to the OTC; that is the bottom line to get more money into the area.

VIII. NEXT MEETING – October 27, 2010

Meeting adjourned @ 6:56 p.m.

Caroline Manewal, Sr. Office Assistant