

## Meeting Minutes

Central Oregon Area Commission on Transportation  
*COACT*  
*July 14, 2005*  
*COIC Redmond*

---

---

### Members:

Chair Bill Bellamy (Jefferson County), Dennis Luke (Deschutes County), Scott Cooper (Crook County), Alan Unger (City of Redmond), Mike Morgan (City of Madras), Jeff Monson (Commute Options), Bill Adams (City of Sisters), Anzie Adams (City of Culver), Ron Wortman (Prineville BLM), and Gary Farnsworth and Mark Usselman (ODOT - Region 4).

### Guests:

Susan Ross (Deschutes County), Gus Burrell (City of Madras), Tyler Deke (Bend MPO), Ken Fuller, Deborah Hogan and Michael Magee (City of Bend), Chuck Burley (State Representative District 54), Loren Peterson (Aide to Representative Burley), Neil Mckie and Dean Merrick (visitors), Ed Moore, Peter Russell, Jim Bryant (ODOT), Mark Simmons (USDA Rural Development) and Chris Doty (City of Redmond).

### Staff:

Andrew Spreadborough and Kelly Elzner (Central Oregon Intergovernmental Council).

### Call to Order and Introductions

Chair Bellamy called the meeting to order, and introductions were made. Commissioner Luke introduced Mark Simmons, Director of USDA Rural Development. Mr. Simmons provided a brief overview of his new position programs offered by Rural Development Department.

### Public Comment

Chair Bellamy called for public comment. Mr. Merrick voiced his concerns regarding highway safety and made personal suggestions for improvements to Hwy 20 and Hwy 126.

### Minutes

Minutes from the May 12, 2005, meeting were approved by consensus with the following changes as noted by Bill Adams. Page 8 of 11, under the City of Sisters roundtable section:

1. Sister Bypass: The City of Sisters bypass is the main long-term issue that "should" be considered. The City Council has discussed different possible alignment options.
2. Hwy 20: Ms. Stein has been asked about the widening of Hwy 20 and mentioned that she thought "it would be a part of the Bend to Sisters Refinement Plan."
3. Sisters to Mt. Bachelor Route: Ms. Stein's comment was tongue-and-check. However, Commissioner Luke did mention that a Sisters to Mt. Bachelor route has been looked at at one time.

### **Federal Legislative Update**

Ms. Shirley Spiedell and Mr. Bill Hanka, from the Ferguson Group gave a brief update on the TEA-21, Transportation Reauthorization Bill via conference call. Mr. Hanka explained that each Senator has been given his dollar allocation, which they can spend on any and all projects on their lists. Mr. Hanka explained that releasing the allocation amount is one of the signs that the bill is in its final stages. It was suggested that if there are specific projects of local interest that are earmarked in the bill, individuals should contact their delegations to make sure that these projects remain in the bill.

In regard to the Forest Highway Program, Mr. Hanka announced that the program has been funded at \$171 million the 1<sup>st</sup> year. Mr. Hanka went on to mention that the non-federal match in the current bill is currently at an 80/20 match rate for highway programs. However, if the state has a high percentage of federal property, then that will be taken into account when the non federal match is calculated. If the state shows that there is a preponderance of federal land then it can go as high as 95% federal share, only 5% of local match.

### **State Legislative Update**

Mr. Bill Penhollow, Association of Oregon Counties, joined the meeting via conference call. He gave a brief update on the various state legislative bills still in play.

1. SB-777 - The Governor's Infrastructure Proposal: a House work session is scheduled on July 15<sup>th</sup>, with two sets of amendments having been proposed from what the Senate passed down. The amendments deal primarily with distribution and providing the Transportation division more flexibility.
2. HB-3374: This bill would require new residents to register their vehicles and obtain their license within a 30 day period. The House does not concur with the Senate amendment.
3. HB-3415: This is the measure that would allow the savings from the OTIA III bridge projects to be used toward other highway and freight mobility investments. This measure has passed both houses and is on its way to the Governor for signature.

Mr. Penhollow mentioned how important it is for AOC, ODOT, cities and counties to work together to get a highway funding proposal into the next session, as well as a multi-session strategy to assist the cities and counties to draft their highway needs.

### **Regional Long-Range Transportation Roundtable Discussion**

Chair Bellamy explained that today's long-range transportation discussion is an opportunity for ODOT to respond to the comments made during the May meeting. Mr. Jim Bryant distributed a STIP timeline as well as three separate area maps that illustrated some of the issues that were raised at the May meeting. Mr. Bryant provided a brief discussion on the activities of ODOT in terms of planning.

Map # 1 - Highway Classification: Mr. Bryant explained that ODOT relies on the Highway Plan for highway classification. He referred to the map and recapped the various highway classifications in the COACT area, and what is important to ODOT in terms of the specific designation and how best to address the area's transportation needs. He explained that designation as well as traffic volumes help guide where ODOT dollars are invested. Mr. Bryant provided some of the traffic volume numbers to the group and offered to e-mail them a more detail summary of the numbers.

2008-2011 STIP Development Timeline: Mr. Bryant explained that the 2008-11 STIP handout contained a break down of development activities that ODOT will be working on. The blue highlighted areas on the handout illustrate a one-year time frame of activities for developing a draft program. Mr. Bryant explained that during the one-year time frame, ODOT and COACT will go through the entire spectrum of planning as outlined, including planning, programming and ultimately construction. He explained that during the planning process, ODOT collects all of the information and feedback provided through the TSP and refinement plans, as well as from COACT and the general public, to assist in identifying the projects and work that needs to be completed. Projects are then prioritized.

Local Issues as Linked to the State Highway System: Mr. Peter Russell and Mr. Ed Moore gave an overview of the map that provided detail of local issues that were identified by jurisdictions at the May COACT meeting. The map provided local issues and ODOT planning projects. Together they briefly summarized the projects and transportation needs within the Central Oregon jurisdictions. Mr. Russell explained that he primarily works with the City of Sisters, Crook County, Prineville and the City of Bend, and summarized the project that fall within these jurisdictions. Mr. Moore explained the color coding on the map, and summarized the remaining projects that fell outside of Mr. Russell's areas.

The local issues listed on the map that Mr. Russell and Mr. Moore summarized include, (not in priority order):

1. US 26: Safety/Beaver Creek Rest Area in Warm Springs
2. OR 361: Truck Route
3. US 97: Signal @ Fairgrounds Rd.
4. OR 361: Turn Lanes @ Belmont
5. US 97: Phase III "J" Street Connection
6. US 97: Curb Gutter Sidewalk Drainage
7. US 97: South Y Intersection
8. OR 361: Turn Lanes @ Gem
9. OR 361: Congestion Curb Sidewalk Pavement School Xing Traffic Signal
10. OR 361 @ US 97 Jct.
11. US 97: Passing Lanes/4-lane
12. US 26: Prison Traffic
13. Hwy 370: Aggregate Truck Traffic
14. OR 126: Powell Butte School Zone Safety Congestion
15. OR 126: 4-lane
16. OR 126 @ Millican/Tom McCall
17. US 26/OR 126 Jct.
18. US 26 Truck Route/ Congestion
19. OR 27: Move designation to Millican Road
20. US 20: Bypass of Sisters
21. US 20 @ Cline Falls Hwy.
22. US 97 @ Cooley Road
23. US 97 @ S. Century Interchange
24. US 97 @ Burgess Interchange
25. US 97: Traffic Signals in La Pine

Once the above projects had been summarized, Chair Bellamy opened up the meeting for discussion and asked the group if they had any comment and or questions for ODOT.

Mr. Ken Fuller, City of Bend, asked if the maps and ODOT's overview was intended to be a summary of all of the needs and projects presented at the May meeting. He explained that some of the City of Bend projects that he had detailed at the May meeting were not addressed in ODOT's presentation. Mr. Farnsworth explained that the projects that ODOT had summarized at today's meeting were local projects as linked to the State Highway system. He also mentioned that the intent of the maps provided for today's presentation should not be considered a planning document. The maps were simply a tool to communicate feedback and he encouraged the group to clarify any issues that were not addressed. Mr. Fuller indicated that he would forward any changes to Mr. Farnsworth for the purpose of correcting the May minutes.

Mr. Farnsworth suggested that the group look beyond today's presentation and focus on moving forward and begin to hone in on the specific issues that need to be talked about on a regional perspective. Mr. Moore mentioned that the true guiding documents that ODOT uses as it plans and incorporates transportation needs around the region are the local TSPs. He strongly encouraged that the planners be sure to include any of the projects identified through the COACT long-range planning process to their local TSPs, especially if there is a desire to attain a state route designation for bypass projects.

Mr. Morgan, City of Madras, commented that he was appreciative of the ODOT staff that came to Madras and assisted on their TSP. He mentioned that it was very informative to find that when the City of Madras adopted its TSP, an adopted Traffic Impact Analysis policy had been incorporated, which will be useful in the months ahead as new developments enter the community.

Judge Cooper commented that his recollection of the purpose or the intent of this long range planning exercise was for COACT to develop a master map of system problems that needed regional attention to enhance regional connections and to make sure that the regional system remains operational. The May meeting was the first opportunity for folks to bring their list of transportation needs to the table and should not be thought of as a one-time opportunity. Just a first shot at this process. He asked the group for their input on what steps can now be taken to keep this process moving forward. What can be done to refine the maps that ODOT has brought in to move toward the original goal of producing a document that COACT can use for future funding and planning decisions.

Mr. Farnsworth agreed that this COACT long range transportation planning process is in its first steps, and the presentation made today by ODOT staff was not meant to exclude any projects that may have been missed. He agreed that this is a work in progress and that it is important that the dialogue must continue. As the information flows, staff will update maps and record additions to the needs list.

Mr. Wortman mentioned that this is a very important process and that the COACT group has been engaged in. He mentioned that the new Federal regulation has been initiated and groups like to COACT group should be allowed input when regulations are being adopted that may impact their interest. Mr. Wortman gave an example that the recent regulations that were passed dealt with recovery cost impacting residual requests for rights-of-way. When a group like COACT takes the intuitive to plan for the long term future it will provide an opportunity to bring these types of issues up in a timely manner. Mr. Farnsworth acknowledged the importance of this long-term planning process as well and offered that COACT members can make comment directly to him regarding the process thus far.

The COACT group agreed to e-mail comment to Mr. Farnsworth, but also agreed that the next step should be to have the TAC group meet to continue this long range planning process. Mr. Farnsworth will coordinate with staff on a date and time for the TAC to meet. The TAC will be asked to review the compiled COACT needs and mapping, discuss the intent of long-range planning discussions, brainstorm goals and objectives, plan tasks for plan development, prepare recommendations for the September COACT meeting, and to identify other next steps.

Judge Cooper mentioned that along with this planning process the Needs and Issues process is will soon be underway. He suggested that both processes be looked upon as parallel by taking some of the purely local needs and place them on the Needs and Issues list and continue this process looking at it as the regional process.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.