

MINUTES

A roll call of members determined that a quorum of the membership was not present. Bruce Smith called to order a discussion of the SR794 Sub-area Study at 12: 10 p.m.

Those Members Present Were:

John Detrick	Kent Sherry	Leo Shanayda	Elmer Beard
Tim Gothard	Alan Thompson	Nancy Brown	Bob McKie
Roger Tackett	Kevin O'Neill	Marjorie Travis	

Also Present Were:

Lamar Daniel	John Balzer	Thea Walsh	Scott Schmid
Joyce Davis	Eric Ottoson	Maggie Barnhiser	Phil Tritle
Shane Farnsworth	Jim Bodenmilller	Kelly Brooker	Lindsey Pflum
Mark Gebhard	William Zieber	Sally Widener	Peggy Hupp
Judith Harrison	David Minard	Glenn Folck	Helen Folck
Douglas Gerhardt	Joe Fugate	Anthony Fugate	David Treolo
Elliot Gaines	Jenell Jackson	Mark Chynoweth	Douglas See
Herb Young	Lois Pelekoudas	Ed Hart	Joan Hart
Melvin Farrell	Ruth Young	Mike Stark	Tom Waddle
Steven Seidl	Larry Shaffer	Terry Shaffer	Dudley Bravard
Sam Minna	Glenn DeHart	Steve Eubanks	Gary Barger
Linda Moeller	Joyce Ambs	Susan See	Phil Ambs
Diana Seward	Roger Pierce	Karen Hamilton	Larry Zawada

S. R. 794 Sub-area Study Presentation

Phil Tritle, Interim Director presented a brief slide show in order to bring everyone up to date on the study. He mentioned that there were 19 alternates studied and that they were presented at the December 9, 2005 and February 10, 2006 meetings. Previously, of the 19 alternatives, D-4 was preferred by the planning study team. After receiving comments from the public comment period, the preferred alternate became D-1. He stated that the route tracings presented were general locations or conceptual corridors. They do not necessarily reflect the true appearance of the related design or final construction. Phil Tritle concluded by stating that the TCC intends to vote on the conceptual study including all alternatives, with D-1 being the preferred.

S. R. 794 Sub-area Study Board Comments

Alan Thompson, TCC Member asked if the FAA accepts D-1 as a preferred alternative. Phil Tritle stated that the FAA's approval was not necessary because the approach zone for the runway will not be too close to the road. Any construction in the general area of the airport would require FAA approval.

John Detrick, TCC Member inquired about how the house on Shaffer property would be affected and requested a verification of the preferred alternate recommended for vote at the next meeting. Phil Tritle assured him that the D-1 alternate does not physically affect the Shaffer property. However, the city does intend to maximize the utilization of their property meaning the D-1 alternative would be modified. He further stated that the road would be taken as far west as possible within the confines of the city's property.

Phil Tritle stated that it would be a modification of D-1. The City is interested in moving D-1 as far west as possible to utilize as much of their land as possible for the base.

Alan Thompson asked whether the D-1 concept would turn into Blee Road and requires a stop sign. Phil Tritle and Tim Gothard agreed that a stop sign is still being considered for the design stage of the project.

Phil Tritle inquired whether the design drawings would be subject to public inspection. Bruce Smith replied that upon completion of the design there would be a public comment period before the design was constructed.

Members of the board had no further questions and the floor was opened for public comments.

S. R. 794 Sub-area Study Public Comments**Speed limit / Cul-de-sac discussion**

A citizen, Steve Seidle stated he was concerned about safety on Peacock Road. He was primarily concerned that the speed limit was too high. He inquired about cul-de-sac and suggested a 25mph speed limit on Peacock Road. Bruce Smith, TCC Member replied that in order to reduce the speed limit a speed study needed to be completed. Lamar Daniel, Transportation Planner confirmed that one had not been done in the area. Nancy Brown, TCC Member inquired whether Peacock Road would be a cul-de-sac in the D1 alternate. Scott Schmid, Transportation Planner replied that having a cul-de-sac on Peacock Road would be difficult for emergency vehicle to access because it is too long of a segment of roadway.

A person from the audience stated that 25 years ago he complained to the base manager about the problem of speeding on Peacock Road. At the time the township

trustees put up 35 mph traffic sign regardless of the fact that it was illegal for them to do so. Tom Waddle, Green Township Trustee acknowledged that the trustees did do this because of the requests by township citizens. The sign certainly helped with the problem. Since then the sign has disappeared and was found in the woods across the base. No new sign has been erected in its place. He requested that if Peacock Road remains open the speed limit should be reduced for safety. Many citizens agreed that the speed limit on Peacock Road needed to be reduced.

D-1 design concerns discussion

Many citizens discussed their stance of the D-1 alternate. Some felt that it was a good compromise; others were not satisfied with the alternate at all.

A citizen inquired about whether the D-1 alternate would T into Blee Road. Phil Tritle replied explaining that the design would be altered to do so.

Army Guard /City interest discussion

Many Green Township residents present stated that they were concerned about the City's interest in further development of the land. Phil Tritle assured the citizens that the primary interest of the City is to expand the base for the Army Guard and future base related development.

Further discussion of development led to an inquiry about having to build another new road for base expansions in the future. Phil Tritle explained that the intention of designing D-1 will be to move the road as far the west on the City's property, to maximize the utilization of the land for the Army Guard and general aviation for the Municipal Airport.

Tim Gothard, TCC Member spoke on behalf of the city and the Army Guard in stating that this study is allowing us to plan for the future. Implementing a viable alternate will prepare the city for any expansion that may come along that will create jobs for people in the community and create revenue.

Many citizens voiced concern about losing farmland and the great amount of land already not developed on the Airport property. Their concerns included the other side of the airport runway. To address the concern Tim Gothard explained that land purchased by the city for an Army Guard and general aviation expansion is the land that would work best for the parties involved.

Jim Bodenmiller, Springfield Assistant City Manager spoke on behalf of the city to explain the local decision-making process after the Base Realignment Closure (BRAC) report, the base master plan and the airport master plan were all finalized. All of these documents are consistent with this transportation study. He explained details of the documents. He further stated that that implementing the D-1 alternate and

maximizing the usage of the land will lend to the greatest good for the future needs of the municipal airport and the base.

Elliot Gaines, a citizen spoke about his discontent for a project resulting from this study and his concern for the greater good of all parties involved. Larry Shaffer, a citizen followed up with a similar concern and further commented on the inability of several agencies involved in the study to provide him with documentation proving the need for the study. Maggie Barnhiser and other citizens expressed that they question the city's motives throughout the study process.

Alan Thompson spoke with foresight stating that he was still in favor of D-4 and asked if it could be built to accommodate the land owners in the area. When asked question about why he supported concept D-4, he stated that he is concerned with the future of the airport and base.

Bruce Smith stated that there has been a majority of input that favors the concept of D-1 as drawn.

Blast Wall discussion

Larry Zawada, a citizen requested that the TCC consider protective blast wall instead of building a new road. Mel Farrell, a citizen furthered Larry Zawada's request by inquiring about keeping the existing road and building wall for protection, noting that other bases have roads that bisect them. After these requests several more citizens became interested in the blasting wall idea and spoke in favor of the study pursuing the idea further.

Scott Schmid stated that study is focused on a transportation corridor, not a wall. He was unsure whether that is a viable alternative.

TCC / Planning Procedure discussion

Elliot Gains stated his displeasure with the planning process. He expressed that the study has been politically and technically motivated, lacking a human appeal. This has led him and others to lack trust in the government officials involved. Phil Tritle responded citing the prior precedent set by the TCC. He acknowledged the TCC's experience in several other similar studies.

Mr. Folck and other citizens stated they were concerned about the lack of attendance by board members at the meeting. Phil Tritle informed them that the secretary calls the members before the meeting to remind them of the meeting. Based on the process the staff expected a quorum at the meeting.

Several citizens stated concerns that if and when the D-1 conceptual alternative is built it will not be built in the same alignment as shown to the citizens during public involvement opportunities.

Larry Shaffer stated he and his neighbors were not in favor of the conceptual alternate D-1, but previously said they were to appease the City of Springfield, Congress Hobson and the military.

As a point of clarification, several citizens were interested in the staff formally stating the preferred alternate and addressing the process should that alternate fail. Phil Tritle responded that the TCC plans to vote for D-1 as the preferred conceptual alternate at next meeting. If the D-1 alternate fails there are 18 other alternates left to consider. Scott Schmid clarified that the staff recommendation is for adoption of the entire study with D-1 as the preferred alternate. He further stated that the study must be adopted before a survey and the environmental work can be done to verify the viability of the D-1 alternate. Phil Tritle followed by stating that a cursory level of environmental review was done to develop the alternates. Further investigation done after adoption of the alternate will determine if D-1 will be a viable alternate.

Citizens inquired about who completed the study. Scott Schmid responded that a consultant group named Tetra Tech, of Columbus did the study for the TCC. A planning study team reviewed the findings of the study to make recommendations. The planning study team included members of the staff and board members. At the last meeting Air National Guard, County Planning and the Green Township Trustees joined the team discussion. It was clear that D-1 was preferred alternate.

Tom Waddle inquired about how one is appointed to the TCC Board, on behalf of Green Township residents. Phil Tritle responded that in some cases the County Commissioners appoint members and the board makeup is geographically representative of Clark County. Tim Gothard added that 51% of the board must be elected officials. Currently there are 30 members; a majority of those members must be present to have a quorum.

Adjournment

Citizen's inquired about distribution of the meeting minutes. The inquiry was address and the minutes will be posted on the TCC website before the next meeting.

The next TCC meeting is planned for Friday, April 14, 2006 at noon in the City Hall Forum.

The meeting date has been changed to April 21, 2006 at noon in the City Hall Forum.

**Clark County-Springfield
Transportation Coordinating Committee
Executive Committee Meeting**

**March 13, 2006
City Hall, Conference Room
8:30 a.m.**

MINUTES

The TCC did not have a quorum on March 10, 2006. On March 13, 2006, the Executive Committee met take action on office operation items including the February 10, 2006 minutes and the expenditures of \$25,960.55. In attendance were Roger Tackett, Tim Gothard, and Bruce Smith.

MINUTES

Motion by Bruce Smith, seconded by Roger Tackett, to approve the minutes of the February 10, 2006 meeting.

Vote: Motion approved unanimously.

EXPENDITURES

Motion by Roger Tackett, seconded by Tim Gothard, to approve the expenditures in the amount \$25,960.55.

Vote: Motion approved unanimously.