



Meeting Summary

Project: US 97: South Redmond Corridor Facility Plan

Subject: Stakeholder Advisory Committee #3

Date: Wednesday, June 13, 2018

Time: 5:30 PM - 7:30 PM

Location: City of Redmond City Hall

<p>Attendees:</p> <p><u>ODOT:</u> David Hirsh Rob Hardy Gary Farnsworth Amy Pfeiffer</p> <p><u>City of Redmond</u> Scott Woodford</p> <p>Mike Caccavano</p>	<p><u>Stakeholder Attendees:</u> James Westcoat, McDonalds Bill Hilton, Redmond Planning Commission Charlie Miller, Miller Lumber Ed Fitch, EDC Mark Malott, Central OR Ranch Supply Laura Garcia, Mazatlan Restaurant Bill Braly, Bike/Ped Representative Frank Bowen, Nampa Auto Parts Lindsay Greco, Wilson's Furniture Paul Rodby, McDonalds Gary Snair Keith Sides</p>	<p><u>Consultant Team:</u> Andy Johnson (HDR) Doug Zenn (HDR) Camille Alexander (HDR) John Bosket (DKS) Matt Arnold (SERA) Ben Weber (SERA)</p>
---	---	---

Meeting Objectives:

- Introduce corridor gateway concepts
- Review evaluation criteria from SAC Meeting #2
- Review scorecard and key criteria
- Review Alternatives A and B

Meeting Summary:

1. Introduce Gateway Treatment Concepts

- The project team is looking to update two concepts and have one final concept by the end of 2018.
- Ben Weber presented on the topic of gateways and how they can help anchor parts of the city and enhance specific locations. Gateways provide place making, public amenities and traffic calming measures. They also help break down corridors into manageable sections.

- One location to consider for a gateway would be the interchange at Yew Avenue. There is space and it would be a good location as it is located at the southern entrance to the city.
- A question was raised, the group has already seen some of these gateway treatments in the past, and wondered if we were starting from where we left off or if we are considering new treatments? It was clarified that we were picking up from where we left off a few years ago.
- A comment was raised to ensure we consider maintenance. In the past there have been an examples of planter areas turning into weed gardens.
- Ben mentioned it would be important to take advantage of the natural terrain for gateway treatments.
- A comment was made that we need to be careful not to distract drivers with this element when they enter the city. This would hopefully slow vehicles down as they are entering. Stakeholders would like to see cars slowing down before entering the interchange at Yew Avenue and thought we might consider pushing the treatment/gateway further south.
- Ben mentioned the concepts we are showing are meant to solicit creative ideas. We are trying to stick with the concepts from last time and expand upon and look for future opportunities on gateway treatments.

2. Review Draft Evaluation Criteria and Scorecard

- The refinement of the project goals and objectives were discussed. Of the two options, there were many similar criteria that were close in ranking. There were a total of forty on the scorecard. We have displayed the concepts that have the most drastic ranking from one another and have been broken down into three categories: major differentiators, minor differentiators and safety (see below).

Minor Differentiators	Safety	Major Differentiators
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved travel time reliability • Provide clear understanding of use through signage • Community connectivity and comfortable public space provided • Identified ROW or environmental impacts or needs • Degree to which recommendation requires special approvals or agreements • Consistency with local, regional and statewide policy • Identified ROW or environmental impacts or needs • Ability for City and ODOT to maintain improvement (e.g. plowing and landscaping) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction of conflict points • Encourage reasonable traffic speeds for facility context • Reduction of predicted crash frequency on US 97 • Improved safety for people walking and biking • ADA accessibility achieved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of identified full site acquisitions or full relocations • Level of public and stakeholder support • Cost effectiveness • Ability to accommodate existing business

- Andy Johnson mentioned the goal was to leave this meeting with a clearer understanding of which one of these options we should proceed with or refine.
- A comment was raised that we should be thinking about US 97 long term and how we can plan for the future both from safety and throughput perspectives.
- Another comment was raised based on the information on the scorecard that “encourage reasonable speeds” should say lowering speeds. There are many accidents happening along this stretch of US 97 and safety should be a major focus area. There are places such as Sandy, Oregon that have slower speeds going through their city and it is a state highway. We would like to be able to lower the speed limits. The team responded that speed limits are set at the Oregon Speed Board. While ODOT and the City can propose a change, they can’t go out and just change the signs. The speed reduction would have better chances after the project is built or designed.

3. Review Design Alternative A and B

- Andy Johnson introduced each corridor and the differences between the two.
- Comments made included:
 - i. Most people liked the channelized access option over the frontage road option. A positive for the frontage road option was that you could get out at a signal on Odem Medo but a negative was how to circulate traffic when parking was being taken away and that some businesses with high volumes were not being given direct access.
 - ii. For the channelized option questions were raised if more breaks could be placed in the medians allowing for easier access to certain driveways.

4. PI Approach/Communications Plan

- Public Involvement will focus on the groups most affected first, followed by others indirectly impacted. Stakeholder interviews have been conducted, although the project team intends to conduct more one on one site visits with interested parties.

5. Next Steps

- Andy Johnson thanked the group for its input and informed everyone the meeting materials would be available on the webpage -- <http://southredmond97.org/> . Both designs are currently on the website and we would like to hear feedback from business owners.
- A site visit is an option if stakeholders have any questions to address. The next meeting set is planned for late August/early September. We will have cost differentials prepared for both options at our next meetings. Detailed drawings will be sent before the October meeting so stakeholders have a week to review the materials.
- Stakeholders plan to reach out to their neighboring businesses so everyone has an opportunity to provide input on the alternatives. Stakeholders are driving this corridor every day and see what the direction of the circulation, and can help



determine how this corridor best serves the growth and maintains economic vitality.

- Next committee meeting will be in early October and the project team will be sending out an invite closer to the date.