

APPENDIX D

MEETING MINUTES

Community Outreach and Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Summary

Meetings Prior to Study

Various scoping meetings were held with the Cottonwood community to identify the following project issues and options:

- Roles and responsibilities
- Determination of study area
- What are the problems
- What is the study scope
- What are the relevant public policies
- Role of traffic consultant

The detailed agenda worksheets for these early meetings are contained at the end of this section.

Project Technical Advisory (TAC) and Open House Meetings

The following TAC and Open House meetings have occurred to date:

- **1/27/05 - Initial kickoff meeting with County**
Meeting Highlights:
 1. Introductions
 2. Project Scope of Services (see attached)
 3. Agency review procedures
 4. TAC formation
 5. Format for Public Workshops
 6. Daily and peak hour traffic counts
 7. GIS data
 8. Digital image files
 9. Existing land use information
 10. Year 2015 and 2030 land use projections
 11. Traffic models (Traffix or TransCAD)
 12. Synchro/SimTraffic capacity models
 13. Roadway improvement alternatives
 14. Roadway planline layouts
 15. Cost estimates
 16. Matrix analysis
 17. Improvement phasing options
 18. Zone of Benefit analysis
 19. Traffic Impact Fee calculations
 20. Traffic Impact Fee ordinance
 21. Draft and Final Reports
 22. Public hearings
 23. Project schedule (see attached)

- **4/7/05 – First Open House meeting**

Meeting Highlights:

1. The project team presented work completed to date.
2. Existing and future traffic conditions were identified.
3. Safety concerns were discussed.
4. Development assumptions were reviewed.
5. Matrix analysis procedures were reviewed.
6. Community member discussed concerns both to the group and individually with project team members.
7. Community input included the following concerns:
 - Traffic congestion at Gas Point Road/I-5 Interchange
 - Heavy traffic volumes on Gas Point Road
 - School and afternoon traffic congestion on Gas Point Road
 - School traffic on First Street
 - Safety concerns regarding accidents on Gas Point Road
 - Concerns regarding location of new north/south and east/west roadways
 - Concerns regarding widening of Gas Point Road and taking of existing property
 - Bicycle circulation and safety
 - Pedestrian circulation and safety

- **6/1/05 – First TAC meeting**

Meeting Highlights:

1. Overview of study and methodologies employed
2. Development growth assumptions
3. Existing and future peak hour capacity conditions
4. Matrix analysis procedures
5. Next steps

- **6/14/05 – Second Open House meeting**

Meeting Highlights:

1. The project team presented work completed to date.
2. Existing and future traffic conditions were identified.
3. Safety concerns were discussed.
4. Development assumptions were reviewed.
5. Matrix analysis procedures were reviewed.
6. Peak hour level of service conditions were presented
7. Interchange improvement concepts were presented
8. Community member discussed concerns both to the group and individually with project team members.
9. Community input included the following concerns:
 - Traffic congestion at Gas Point Road/I-5 Interchange
 - Heavy traffic volumes on Gas Point Road
 - School and afternoon traffic congestion on Gas Point Road
 - School traffic on First Street
 - Safety concerns regarding accidents on Gas Point Road
 - Concerns regarding location of new north/south and east/west roadways
 - Concerns regarding widening of Gas Point Road and taking of existing property

- Bicycle circulation and safety
- Pedestrian circulation and safety

- **6/29/05 – Second TAC meeting**

Meeting Highlights:

1. Overview of study and methodologies employed
2. Development growth assumptions
3. Existing and future peak hour capacity conditions
4. Matrix analysis procedures
5. Presentation of preliminary list of roadway alternatives
6. Next steps

- **7/7/05 – Third Open House meeting**

Meeting Highlights:

1. The project team presented work completed to date.
2. Matrix analysis procedures were reviewed.
3. Preliminary list of alternatives
4. Community member discussed concerns both to the group and individually with project team members.
5. Community input included the following concerns:
 - Traffic congestion at Gas Point Road/I-5 Interchange
 - Heavy traffic volumes on Gas Point Road
 - School and afternoon traffic congestion on Gas Point Road
 - School traffic on First Street
 - Safety concerns regarding accidents on Gas Point Road
 - Concerns regarding location of new north/south and east/west roadways
 - Concerns regarding widening of Gas Point Road and taking of existing property

- **8/25/05 – Third TAC meeting**

Meeting Highlights:

1. Review of Working Paper No. 3.
2. Summary of Matrix evaluation
3. Overview of matrix evaluation selection procedure
4. Review of alternatives
5. Preliminary cost estimates
6. Discussion of interchange alternatives and modifications
7. Discussion of improvements needed on Gas Point Road, Rhonda Road
8. Next steps

- **8/30/05 – Fourth Open House meeting**

Meeting Highlights:

1. The project team presented work completed to date.
2. Revised and updated matrix analysis procedures were reviewed.
3. Matrix evaluation results were presented
4. Final preferred roadway alignment corridors were presented
5. Community member discussed concerns both to the group and individually with project team members.
6. Community input included the following concerns:
 - Traffic congestion at Gas Point Road/I-5 Interchange

- Heavy traffic volumes on Gas Point Road
- School and afternoon traffic congestion on Gas Point Road
- School traffic on First Street
- Safety concerns regarding accidents on Gas Point Road
- Concerns regarding location of new north/south and east/west roadways
- Concerns regarding widening of Gas Point Road and taking of existing property

- **10/10/05 – Project meeting**

Meeting Highlights:

1. Gas Point Road/I-5 Interchange and Rhonda Road design plans were presented and discussed.
2. Overview of Working Paper #3 status
3. Discussion of minor changes to N/S and E/W roadway alignments
4. Discussion of utilizing Rhonda Road as extension of N/S roadway
5. Discussion of The Vineyards project and utilization of modified I-5/Main Street interchange
6. Discussion of potential new I-5 interchange at High Country location
- 7.

- **10/18/05 – Project meeting with Caltrans**

Meeting Highlights:

1. Overview of Southern Region Study status and comments
2. RTPA provided an overview of earlier meetings with Caltrans and County
3. Caltrans indicated that the section of I-5 south of the City of Redding was designated as "rural" and would require a minimum of two mile interchange spacing. Section of I-5 north of Cottonwood are designated "urban" and would require a minimum of one mile interchange spacing. It would really tick me off if the north-south arterial uses Rancho Estates Road.
4. The County provided a graphic showing Urban Boundary areas within Cottonwood that indicate the section of I-5 between Main Street interchange and Gas Point interchange is designated as "urban".
5. Caltrans commented that regardless of the urban/rural designation, their desire would be to minimize new interchanges along this section of I-5 to maintain mainline capacity.
6. Caltrans further commented that if the new High Country interchange was considered by the local jurisdictions to be necessary to support local development, then the I-5 ramps at both the SR 273 and Main Street interchanges may need to be removed.
7. Caltrans commented that if the Main Street interchange were improved as a full interchange then auxiliary lanes may be required south to Gas Point Road interchange ramps.
8. Caltrans reiterated the need for local agencies to plan for locally generated traffic through design and construction of local transportation facilities. State and Federal transportation improvements would be reviewed in the context of how each local agency is planning for movement of local traffic on locally owned and operated facilities.
9. Based upon the input from both Caltrans and the City of Anderson, Shasta County RTPA directed Omni-Means to proceed with the Southern Region Study based upon the following:

- a) Analysis will be completed to determine impacts to the Gas Point Road interchange resulting from only constructing a half interchange at Main Street. A full interchange improvement concept will be incorporated for purposes of securing right-of-way, but will be beyond the 20-year improvement program.
 - b) Designs for the Main Street half interchange will include both a direct connection of Rhonda Road to the southbound off-ramp intersection, and realignment of Rhonda Road to connect to the new East/West collector road, or directly to the roundabout, to provide adequate intersection spacing with the southbound off-ramp.
 - c) Improvements to the Gas Point Road interchange would be phased as follows:
 - a. Phase I - Installation of traffic signals at Rhonda Road, Southbound Ramps, Northbound Ramps, and Main Street.
 - b. Phase II – Widening bridge structure to three lanes and relocate ramp intersections closer to I-5 mainline to provide improved intersection spacing along Gas Point Road. (Note: This may not be feasible due to design speed standards exemption to be required from Caltrans. This would be noted in the report.
 - c. Modified Phase II – The report will mention that if the Main Street interchange is not constructed then the Phase II interchange modifications would required a four lane interchange. The design parameters for this facility would require a design exception for interchange spacing or elimination of left-turn access at Rhonda Road and Park Way. The report will make a note of this.
- 7) The Southern Region Study will discuss the potential future need for the High Country interchange, but that no planning documents within either the City of Anderson or Shasta County mention or include this interchange. The conclusion of this discussion will be that the Southern Region Study will include potential for a new interchange and discuss potential impacts to transportation facility planning within the Cottonwood area should this interchange be constructed.