



Highway 62 Corridor Project

Date: March 2, 2006
From: René Sjothun, RVCOG
Re: **CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC) MEETING MINUTES for February 22, 2006**

Members in Attendance: Becky Brooks, Bill Blair, Curt Burrill, David Christian, Mike Gardiner Mike Malepsy, Mike Montero, Bob Plankenhorn, Don Riegger, Richard Moorman, Nanci Watkins and Paige West.

Members Absent: Wade Six and Susan Rachor.

Location: Jackson County Public Works Auditorium

Guests: Earl Wood, Gordon Draper, Calvin Martin and Vicki Henry

Staff Present: Debbie Timms, Michael Ronkin, Jerry Marmon, John Raasch, and Gary Leaming of ODOT; Terry Kearns, Hang Reede, and Martha Richards of URS; Kim Parducci of JRH; Nick Fortey, FHWA; Pat Foley and René Sjothun of RVCOG

1.0 Welcome/Approval of Minutes

Mike Montero, CAC Chairperson

Mike Montero convened the eighteenth meeting of the Highway 62 Corridor Project CAC at 6:02 PM. The minutes of the January 24th meeting were approved unanimously, with the following changes; spelling corrections be made to Don Riegger's last name throughout the minutes and to page 7 the last line of his comment should read *litigation* not dedication. On page 6 Mike Montero's comment should read *ability* not inability.

2.0 Bicycle/Pedestrian Planning Issues

Michael Ronkin, Pedestrian and Bicycle Program Manager, ODOT

Michael started by saying he just met with the newly formed bicycle/pedestrian subcommittee. He explained to them the rules and regulations for bicycle/pedestrian facilities that are associated with new transportation projects. He addressed issues that pertain to this project. He cited two projects in Oregon that are similar to the proposed Highway 62 Expressway: Dundee-Newberg and Redmond. These projects have high volumes of traffic. The Highway 62 project has a lot of destinations for bicycle and pedestrian users. Destinations create the need for bicycle/pedestrian facilities. When planning facilities safety is definitely an issue. Data shows that most crashes happen at intersections which also apply to bicyclist and pedestrians. When planning facilities you must be absolutely sure that bicyclists and pedestrians can cross safely. This is why we must look planning from the “needs” and “user” perspective. There are also very stringent legal requirements in Oregon which encompass a lot of mandates. The law does have reasonable exceptions, such as, no sidewalks on freeways. The exceptions all relate to need and future use. As you develop alternatives, each alternative has to look at which bicycle/pedestrian option would be the best one to accommodate the alternative. He encouraged the committee not to just consider one single alternative. Michael added that his role will be a resource once you develop alternatives for this project.

Debbie Timms asked, “If the Existing Hwy 62 alternative is chosen, could we use both sides of the highway?” Michael said the physical limitation would be the determining factor. Would the bicyclists/pedestrians have to cross the street to get to their destination and if they do, is it necessary to have a path on both sides of the street.

Mike Montero asked if the department looks upon having a subcommittee as progressive enough in this process. Michael answered yes, it helps to open communication and he felt that it was fantastic.

Jerry Marmon asked if a bypass with limited access is the selected alternative are we allowed to address that issue. Michael answered yes. In general we have done enough facilities to know that some bicyclist will want to use bike paths if they are just going through and there are very good standards for shoulders.

The question of who is responsible for the bicycle/pedestrian facilities once the highway is turned over to the County and or City was discussed. Usually this issue will be worked out cooperatively.

Note: Agenda Change

As suggested by Terry Kearns, Agenda item #3 – South Terminus business meeting discussion will be changed to item # 4. Other Business (sub-committees will now become agenda item #3.

3.0 Other Business (sub-committees)

Terry Kearns, URS

Terry told the group that two more sub-committees will be formed: (1 land use and (2 access management.

The purpose of the Land Use sub-committee is to develop a strategy for addressing land use issues. There are a number of land use issues that interface with the alternatives. The committee will not be asked to do any land use changes. ODOT is not a land use agency.

The Access Management sub-committee will be responsible for going reviewing and addressing access issues. ODOT has set standards for control for accesses

Terry said that these sub-committees will convene over the next month. The CAC and PDT will be asked for volunteer members.

Paige W. asked how much impact this sub-committee can actually have on determining such things as access when the projects are really being phased in and there is sometimes limited access, etc. Terry K. answered that the sub-committee will probably address the technical issues related to access. Deborah T. added that there are very specific requirements in regard to access, but we are looking for ideas too. David C. asked is this would be the same for the land use issues. Terry answered yes; we will need to develop strategy. These sub-committees will probably consist of about six meetings.

Land Use sub-committee volunteers are: Curt Burrill, Mike Malepsy, Nanci Watkins, Mike Montero and Becky Brooks.

Access Management sub-committee volunteers are: Don Riegger, Nanci Watkins, Curt Burrill, David Christian and Mike Montero. Mike Gardiner said that he would like to be on this committee but will have to first see the meeting schedule.

Deborah T. made note to this committee that there was not a quorum at the January PDT meeting.

4.0 Refinement of new Northern Terminus Options

Terry Kearns, URS

ODOT took the North Terminus alternatives to a group of White City business people. They responded as ODOT asked for suggestions from them. We have taken some of the design refinements on how we might address the issues. Terry reviewed the refinements with power point presentation. Freight was one issue and the some of the refinements reflected variations of the routes. Discussion followed. Deborah T. noted that we will need to look at the purpose. Terry said that these new refinements have not been published yet, as they wanted to bring them before both the CAC and PDT first. Terry K. added that we would also have to go through the criteria evaluation again with any refined alternative before they could be published. These can be reviewed at next month's meeting.

5.0 South Terminus Business Meetings

Gary Leaming, ODOT

Gary L. told the CAC that there are meetings planned for business owners in the South Terminus area. These meetings will have the same format as the meeting that was held in White City. The meetings will take place later in March or early April. When the meeting schedule is set the CAC will be notified. The meeting purpose is to show where we have been as far as history and to give an opportunity to give input.

6.0 Historical Perspective, Southern Terminus Options

Terry Kearns, URS

Terry gave an overview of the power point presentation on the historical perspective of the Southern Terminus. He made note that this location, because of its proximity to the airport, has many restrictions.

Discussion followed. Mike Montero requested a set of larger maps to review. Mike Montero asked if the Airport has seen these options and Terry K. answered they have in the past.

Paige asked if White City will be able to review the North Terminus alternatives before the next meeting. Terry K. said probably not, as White City has some planning department changes in the process. Mike Montero said he would like their input before we make any decisions. Terry K. acknowledged that he understood and would try to get this information out to them.

7.0 Public Comment

Pat Foley, RVCOG

Earl Wood: Earl discussed the problems with the refined Northern Terminus Options. He feels that Gregory Road, as a through road, should be examined.

Cal Martin: Cal made note of the Affordable Housing Summit that had just been held the day before. He feels this is very big problem in our region. He noted that 70% of the Medford workforce can not afford to live in Medford and are forced to move north

8.0 CAC Comfort Check

Pat Foley, RVCOG

Mike Malepsy: Likes where we are going.

Curt Burrill: Fine.

Paige West: Paige was wondering if the transportation expenses were brought up at the Affordable Housing Summit. A two family income could save 20% of their income by using bike/ped or alternative transit systems. This 20% could then go back into their housing income.

Earl W. said that this was discussed at the Affordable Housing Summit.

David C. added that homeless need “affordable” housing and this is a serious issue.

Bob Plankenhorn: Fine.

Nanci Watkins: Good meeting.

Bill Blair: Fine.

Mike Montero: Great meeting.

Mike Gardiner: Okay.

David Christian: Said he needed more meeting notice. He did not get a notice and had to call.

Other committee members stated that they did receive their meeting packets by mail and in a timely manner. After some discussion, it was decided that this committee would receive the agenda and minutes to review by electronic mail. Pat F. made note and said this will be done from this point on.

Don Riegger: He said that he was confused as where we were going with sub-committees.

Terry K. said that the land use sub-committee will probably not meet before the next meeting. We will discuss at the March meeting.

Mike Montero suggested that for the people on the sub-committees having all the information of all the meetings would be useful. This could be distributed by e-mail.

Richard Moorman: Fine.

Becky Brooks: Fine.

9.0 Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:41 p.m.