
Meeting Minutes

Jackson County TSP Update

Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #4

Wednesday, December 2nd, 2015 – 2:00 to 4:00 p.m.

Jackson County Roads – 200 Antelope Road, White City, OR 97503 – Conference Rooms B and C

Meeting Organizer: Mike Kuntz, County Project Manager

Attendees: Josh LeBombard, Matt Samitore, Robert Miller, John Krawczyk, Jonathan David, Allie Coates, Jerry Marmon, Jenna Stanke, Craig Anderson, John Vial, Mike Kuntz, Susan Wright, Matt Bell.

Meeting Purpose: The purpose of Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting #4 was to provide an overview of Tech Memos 6 (Preferred Alternatives) to the TAC and obtain feedback on the alternatives presented.

Functional Classification Map

- Hard to see when blue lines under. **Remove blue lines that highlight changes in the functional classifications plan.**
- Eagle Point will provide comments on functional classification – Royal Avenue may be a comment.

Roadway Standards

- County interested in shifting to 11 foot standard everywhere – not a minimum.
- Can we make the minimum a standard but still have a range?
- Should we do any with minimum?

Design Standards

- Discuss enhanced facilities, but no standards. **Update Tables 1 and 2 to include a description of enhanced facilities.**
- Many areas have very little pedestrian demand, but still two sidewalks. **Include a footnote to Table 2 that says sidewalks may be constructed on one side of the roadway only or replaced with a shared-use facility.**
- Could we consider shared facilities or giving more space to bikes? See above.
- Urban arterial standards for new facility?
- Villas Road - What would standard be? –A path may be better. Vilas Road is currently not identified as an enhanced facility.

- Antelope Road - Most of Antelope Road is built to standard.
- Is appropriate design for bikes an urban versus rural issue or an industrial area issue?
- Can you retrofit 5 foot sidewalks to 10 foot shared facility? Or two side paths? Yes.
- Upcoming STIP Project: I-5 to Kirtland, exit 35.
- Neighborhood Park Road. **Consider an additional classification with design standards for park road.**

Roadway Projects

- R13 - split into two projects. **Split R13 into two projects.**
- Rogue River - trouble with sidewalks not being used (doing TSP soon).
- Penninger - Do we need 3 lanes? Can we do turn pockets? This project involves widening Penninger Road from E Pine to the Expo, which currently has turn separate left-turn lanes at E Pine and at the Expo driveway. **Remove project from project list.**
- Question – 3-lane std. on major collector?
- County roads in cities - left out on purpose. The TSP needs to state that county roads in cities will not be improved by county unless the city participates.
- Have a table that lists them. **Include a table of all county roads in cities and potential improvements in the appendix.**
- Want to be easy to show consistency with county TSP.

Freight Routes

- Confirm MPO routes not adopted - Is it in RTP or a study? The routes are identified in the study, not the RTP.
- NHS – confirm updates. **Update Freight Route designation map to include latest NHS routes.**
- OR 99? Not NHS? – may be added. **Review NHS routes and include OR99 if applicable.**
- G6 – not freight routes. **Review Freight project to determine if any are not located on a freight route. If not, remove from project list.**
- ODOT = MCTD's – Show them. **Update Freight Route Designation map to reference ODOT MCTD Freight Routes.**
- Kirtland - should be state. **Update Freight Route designation Map to include Kirtland Road.**
- R13 – split in two projects. See above.

Safety Projects:

- In text or table, identify county looking at number of ped/bike specific projects. **Update text to include a description of other “safety” projects included in the Preferred Alternatives.**
- Safety Tool Kit. **Develop a safety toolkit for the TSP.**
- **Move S7 & S8 to Roadway and the rest into Intersection projects.**
- TSP – no safety specific section.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects

- Biking definition – 1st sentence misleading. **Update text supporting bicycle and pedestrian improvement project to refer to bicycle “treatments” rather than facilities.**
- “Rumble strips optional”
- 99 corridor plan – look at it for bike projects. **Review OR 99 corridor plan and include projects in the list of preferred alternatives.**
- Complete blue bike network with a project. **Confirm that all “County Bikeways” include a project in the Preferred Alternatives.**
- S28 – Want enhanced facility for greenway to central point on Upton (Penninger to scenic). **Update S28 to be an enhanced facility.**
- Language - Bike route designations. See above.

Other

- Urban containment boundary – show? **Update maps to include Urban Growth Boundaries of incorporated areas.**
- MPO hatching is hard to read – translatable to black and white. **Update maps to remove hatching.**
- Show City boundaries and Urban growth boundary. See above.
- White City – separate chapter or section needed? - No
- Policies – White City
- Land development ordinance
- White City standards? Do they have separate standards? Yes. **Review Previous TSP for White City and incorporate standards for White City streets as applicable.**
- Bicycle Route Designations = bicycle “treatment” not facility, bicycle lanes or shoulders (not facilities). See above.