



# Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #2 Summary

Project: US 97: South Redmond Corridor Facility Plan

Subject: Technical Advisory Committee – Meeting #2  
Thursday, February 8, 2018, 9:00 – 11:00 a.m.

Date: Monday, February 19, 2018

Location: ODOT Region 4 Sparks Lake Conference Room

Attendees: ODOT: Michael Duncan, Abbey Driscoll, David Amiton, David Knitowski, David Hirsh, Aaron Smith, Cari Charlton

City of Redmond: Mike Caccavano, Scott Woodford

Consultant Team: Andy Johnson, HDR; Tom Shook, HDR; Doug Zenn, HDR; John Bosket, DKS Associates

## Introductions

The US 97 South Redmond Corridor Project Technical Advisory Committee met for its second meeting Thursday, February 8 from 9 - 11 a.m. in the ODOT Region 4 Sparks Lake Conference Room.

Participants introduced themselves, and Doug Zenn from the project team provided an agenda overview. The meeting objectives included:

- Review and solicit feedback on evaluation criteria
- Review existing conditions
- Review economic development case studies.

The agenda provided:

1. A brief schedule update
2. An overview of existing conditions
3. A draft evaluation criteria review and design concept examples
4. A brief review of the economic development case studies
5. Public involvement updates.

## **Schedule Update**

Andy Johnson of HDR provided a brief overview of the project schedule. He provided clarification about final deliverable dates, which are on schedule for February 2019.

## **Existing Conditions Overview**

Tom Shook explained the corridor's existing conditions, covering corridor crashes from 2011-2015 in the safety focus areas. He also explained that the team will have better access data in the future with driveway traffic counts from 67 driveways. Tom said he expects the corridor to see about a 45-percent traffic volume growth by 2040. A memo covering this information will be completed soon, prior to the next set of meetings, he said.

For future modeling, the group expressed desire for operations to match intentions in the corridor and suggested that the project team take a realistic approach. Dave Hirsh offered to be a resource for refinement of the model. Most complaints, he said, are centered on a half-hour period during the afternoon peak.

Tom explained the crash data. The group suggested focusing on areas where there is a history or the highest potential for severe accidents, highlighting possible areas where the most impact can be made. The safety sub-team meeting will be held in the next month and the memo will be sent for review prior to this meeting, Andy added.

## **Draft Evaluation Criteria Review**

Andy Johnson kicked off the conversation about draft preliminary evaluation criteria for the corridor. He said the criteria would be used in formulating two alternatives for the corridor that consider the evaluation areas of: 1) Community Character, 2) Process, 3) Safety and Operations and 4) Access and Connectivity. He said the project team would be developing alternatives that include access road alignments, access on US 97, access road operations, connectivity, sidewalks and access road parking.

The group asked how “out-of the box” considerations, such as U-turns or ITS solutions might be considered in the evaluation. Andy said the alternative developed would be compared against the no-build option for the evaluation. The group suggested keeping innovations (such as R-Cuts, which allow median U-turns and left turns) in mind as long as they are consistent with improved safety and highway integrity.

The group expressed a need for clear way finding to businesses with each of the alternatives and suggested signage might be included with the criteria. The group also discussed whether a gateway treatment would be a distinguishing criteria. It was suggested that it could be included with Community Character along with walkable, bikeable features and consistent, livable public spaces.

The group also suggested adding measurements for several items: one that measured how much business vitality would be advanced and another for long-term maintenance. Another criteria should address the ability to be implemented, perhaps on a phased basis, and another should ensure ADA compatibility, the group said.



The committee suggested building the alternatives, then highlighting the features in it for further public discussion. For the two alternatives, the group suggested one full-build and one leaning toward more cost-effective basics.

The committee asked to make sure freight and mobility are adequately addressed in the criteria and suggested working with Mark Barrett who coordinates that for Region 4.

The committee also discussed “forward compatibility” and how the project will ensure the alternatives are consistent with long-term city plans. Abbey Driscoll said this will be a needed part of the public process moving forward to make sure the alternatives capture the community character and are community driven.

Additionally, the group suggested:

- Clarifying number of facade and other improvements in the existing criteria
- Considering R-CUT intersections along the corridor (ODOT is currently exploring this at certain rural locations)
- Adding the Homestead Canal Trail into the options
- Posting new information on the website
- Considering ADA improvements a “given”
- Considering winter maintenance and plowing (especially with tree placements).

### **Economic Development Case Studies and Public Involvement Updates**

Andy noted the Economic Development Case Studies provided by Leland Consulting Group. The group had no questions.

Doug Zenn led a brief update about the Project Open House held the night before with comments from those who attended. Zenn estimated that between 60 and 70 people attended. Johnson noted that he spoke with a number of community members who were fairly new to the community and were simply interested in transportation issues. Several other issues that came up frequently were traffic on Canal and the fact that local community members avoid US 97 during busy times when possible and have alternative routes to get to their destinations. Most of those in attendance reinforced concerns about safety and traffic congestion delays. Several attendees brought up the need for a bypass.

### **Next Steps**

Andy Johnson thanked the committee and said it would be getting together as a group again in June, but that sub-groups would be meeting by phone on specific issues in the meantime.