



Highway 62 Corridor Project

Date: October 27, 2005
From: Pat Foley, RVCOG
Re: **CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC) MEETING MINUTES for October 26, 2005**

Members in Attendance: Bill Blair, Becky Brooks, David Christian, Mike Gardiner, Mike Montero, Bob Plankenhorn, Susan Rachor, Don Riegger, Wade Six, Nanci Watkins and Paige West.

Members Absent: Curt Burrill, Mike Malepsy and Richard Moorman

Location: Jackson County Public Works Auditorium

Guests: 5 members of the public

Staff Present: Debbie Timms, Jerry Marmon, DeLanie Cutsforth, Brian Dunn and Gary Leaming of ODOT; Nick Forty of FHWA; Terry Kearns, Martha Richards and Nadine Lee of URS; Kim Parducci of JRH; Kathy Helmer and Pat Foley of RVCOG

1.0 Welcome/Approval of Minutes

Mike Montero, CAC Chairperson

Mike Montero convened the fifteenth meeting of the Highway 62 Corridor Project CAC at 6:00 PM. Mike asked for approval of the September 28th minutes. The minutes were approved as written. Mike went on to announce that CAC member Dale Shaddox had taken the position as Brookings's City Manager, therefore, Dale would be unable to continue as a member of the CAC.

2.0 Public Comment

Kathy Helmer, RVCOG

Time was provided on the agenda for public input by members of the public who could not stay for the entire meeting. There were no comments.

3.0 Modeling Results – In-Corridor Alternatives

Terry Kearns, URS

Terry started by reviewing the meeting objectives: 1) review In-Corridor Alternatives, 2) review all alternatives, 3) discuss alternatives, and 4) if possible, make a recommendation on which alternatives to move forward and which alternatives to drop from further study. At this meeting, the alternatives would be evaluated to see if they met the first screen, the Purpose and Need. Terry pointed out that just because an alternative was dismissed, it did not mean that it had no merit.

The next step in the alternative selection process would be to evaluate the remaining alternatives using the project's Goals & Objectives and the Evaluation Criteria. The CAC and PDT were being asked to reduce the number of alternatives because the next step required significant engineering effort to bring the remaining alternatives to a point where the Goals & Objectives and Evaluation Criteria could be applied.

Using overhead maps, Terry reviewed the original In-Corridor Alternatives which included:

1. 2030 No Build
2. Alignment Concept P1-1, Option 1, Medco Haul Road with Directional Interchange
3. Alignment Concept P1-1, Option 2, Medco Haul Road with Split Diamond at I-5
4. Alignment Concept P1-1, Option 3, Medco Haul Road
5. Alignment Concept P1 2, with frontage and backage roads
6. Alignment Concept, Texas Turnaround
7. Alignment Concept, Couplet

He then went on to review the same alternatives with a North Terminus Option. As presented at earlier meetings, all of the North Terminus Options had worked. The North Terminus Option that showed improvements to Highway 140 with easterly loop around White City was applied to the In-Corridor Alternatives. The alternatives showed congestion at Poplar Drive. The modeling did not assume grade separations in this area. If future modeling used grade separations, congestion could be eased in this area. The addition of the North Terminus Option leads to congestion in the area where the project rejoins existing Highway 62 to the north. This may be solved with design elements.

Terry reminded the CAC that project Purpose is to address current and provide for future highway capacity, multimodal needs, improve intersection operations and to provide enhanced transportation safety in the Highway 62 corridor from Poplar Drive north to Avenue H in White City. The project Need will address system linkage, traffic volumes, intersections and safety. Any alternative that is kept for further study would have to meet the both the Purpose and the Need.

4.0 Review of All Alternatives

Terry Kearns, URS

Last month the CAC studied the Out of Corridor Alternatives. Using overhead maps, Terry went on to review the Out of Corridor Alternatives which included:

1. 2030 No Build
2. Scenario 3000, Highway 140 Extension, Public Alternatives 3A & 3B
3. Scenario 3001, White City/Table Rock with Table Rock I-5 Interchange (Public Alternative 1)
4. Scenario 3002, Highway 140 Extension with north/south roadway improvements (C2-10 Parts A&B)
5. Scenario 3003, Highway 140 Extension with north/south roadway improvements and Highway 62 connection to Biddle (C2-10 with Biddle connection)
6. Scenario 3004, I-5 Bypass Route (Newspaper Alternative 7)

Mike Montero asked if any dropped alternatives would be included in the final report. Terry responded that a chapter in the final report would give an analysis of how the alternatives were selected and why alternatives were dropped. Dropped alternatives did not meet the Purpose and Need of the Highway 62 Corridor Project.

Using overhead maps, Terry reviewed the North Terminus Alternatives which included:

1. 2030 No Build
2. Scenario 3007, South of White City via Highway 140 (North Terminus Concept – Highway 140)
3. Scenario 3008, South of White City via Highway 140 – East (North Terminus Concept – Highway 140 East connection)
4. Scenario 3009, North of White City via Agate (North Terminus Concept – Agate)
5. Scenario 3010 South of White City (North Terminus Concept – Highway 140 South)

Terry then referred the group to a matrix showing whether each alternative met the Purpose and Need and staff's recommendation about forwarding it for further study. All of the In Corridor Alternatives and North Terminus Options met the Purpose and Need. The Out of Corridor Alternatives did not address the problems this project was trying to solve and therefore did not meet the Purpose and Need.

5.0 Recommendation for PDT

Terry Kearns, URS

Don Riegger made a motion to drop the Out of Corridor alternatives from further study. David Christian seconded the motion. During discussion, Wade Six asked if the Northern Terminus point had a flexible location. He was told that it did. A vote was called for on the motion. The CAC members voted unanimously to eliminate the Out of Corridor Alternatives from further study. This recommendation was to be forwarded to the PDT at their meeting the next day.

Wade Six stated that Earl Wood had asked about the possibility having a Northern Terminus that went up Agate Road and joined Highway 62 beyond the city of Eagle Point near Highway 234. Wade recently spoke with City Administrator Dave Hussell and Planner Bunny Lincoln from the city of

Eagle Point. Dave and Bunny volunteered to come and talk about the expected growth in Eagle Point.

Mike Gardiner asked if there were a set of values that could determine whether it was better to choose an alternative that relieved traffic congestion near Costco even though it moved issues with over capacity closer to Eagle Point or White City. Terry responded that this decision would have to be made further along in the project.

Nanci Watkins asked if the modeling took into consideration future transportation improvements. Terry responded by saying that improvements in the Regional Transportation Plan would be taken into consideration.

A request was made for a map with an overlay showing where other transportation projects were located. The project team will develop either an overlay map or a matrix showing this information.

Wade Six asked if it was possible to discuss the costs or benefits of the three different Medco Haul Road alternatives. Terry responded that we did not yet have enough information.

Kathy Helmer wanted to know if there were significant differences between how much under and over capacity the alternatives were. Brian Dunn answered that the capacity ceiling had been set at 1.0 for this modeling run. For the next level of analysis, a .08 or less would be used.

6.0 Next Steps

Terry Kearns, URS

No meeting for either the CAC or PDT will be held in November. The December 15th meeting will be a joint CAC/PDT meeting. At that meeting, the groups will review the refined modeling results of the remaining alternatives and begin the evaluation process. In January, the staff will present their ideas on how the alternatives fare when judged against the Evaluation Criteria and project Goals and Objectives.

7.0 Public Comment

Kathy Helmer, RVCOG

Kathy opened the public comment session, inviting the public to speak.

Gordon Draper: “Is the South Terminus construction to be done at a later date?” Terry responded that there were not a lot of options at the South Terminus. The South Terminus is not like the North Terminus where there is the option of deciding where the alternative will be located.

“In regard to the Agate Road Alternative, how will the interchange interact with Agate Road? When will the cost of the alternatives become a factor in choosing which alternative is most viable?” Terry answered that both of these factors would be considered during the next phase of analysis.

David Christian: “In regard to the South Terminus, with all of the work that is being done now on the interchange, how does that impact making a decision for an alternative?” Terry stated that this work did not preclude doing anything at the Southern Terminus.

Larry Ziegelmeyer: “Some of the alternatives, especially the Texas Turnaround, require a lot of businesses to be obliterated. In today’s climate, the owners will probably litigate. That is something that can increase your project costs. I am kind of excited about the Medco Haul Road because it will be easier to litigate than some of the other alternatives.”

Earl Wood: Earl is interested in seeing the northern terminus take Agate Road north because as Eagle Point grows, more businesses will develop on Highway 62. Development is already starting to impact Highway 62. Earl would like to see Agate Road as a through bypass.

Kathy Helmer congratulated the consultant team for finding a way to express the differences between the alternatives in an understandable manner.

8.0 CAC Comfort Check

Kathy Helmer, RVCOG

Kathy asked the CAC to comment on the process.

All of the CAC members said they felt good about the progress made at the CAC meetings. Wade Six added he would like to encourage the committee to think about the issue of congestion at the point where the project is slated to end. Is the congestion problem being pushed out to Eagle Point? Eagle Point would like a route through their proposed industrial area. Wade said he understood that this might be beyond the scope of this project, but he suggested that this be looked at in terms of how there could be a natural jump off point to allow for another project to be built. Susan Rachor noted her concerns about project costs.

9.0 Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:05 p.m.