

The logo features a blue, stylized curved line that starts on the left, curves upwards and then downwards to the right, resembling a partial 'C' or a road curve. The text 'Highway 62 Corridor Project' is written in a bold, blue, sans-serif font, centered within the curve.

Highway 62 Corridor Project

Date: April 26, 2006

From: Sue Casavan, RVCOG

Re: **CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC) MEETING
MINUTES for April 26, 2006**

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

Members Absent: Bob Plankenhorn and Curt Burrill

Location: Jackson County Public Works Auditorium, White City

Guests: 6 members of the public

Staff Present: Debbie Timms, Jerry Marmon, DeLanie Cutsforth and Gary Leaming of ODOT; Terry Kearns and Martha Richards of URS; Kim Parducci of JRH; Sue Casavan and Pat Foley of RVCOG

1.0 Welcome and Approval of Minutes

Mike Montero, CAC Chairperson

Chair Mike Montero convened the meeting of the Highway 62 Corridor Project CAC at 6:00 PM. Mike reviewed the meeting's agenda and asked for approval of the February 24th minutes. The minutes were unanimously approved as written.

2.0 Meeting / Presentation Update

Terry Kearns, URS

Terry K. began the presentation by informing the CAC that they would be asked to act on two recommendations.

a. South Terminus Business Meetings

Terry K. informed the committee that there were two meetings held last week for the South Terminus businesses and property owners. The staff sent out over 140 notices; 7 people showed up for the first meeting and 3 people for the second. Public comment at the first meeting recommended that some access be provided on the south side of Highway 62. They felt the backage roads in the alternatives did not meet their needs but felt that the frontage roads would. They want us to look at trying to shift Highway 62 as far as possible toward the airport to try to minimize impacts to businesses. Terry K. said that the majority felt most comfortable with the Bypass Alternative. Debbie T. explained that staff was thinking about other ways to do outreach to get more property/business owners involved, such as personal handouts. Debbie T. added that they were all invited to the CAC meetings. Debbie T. said that staff wanted to get the public further involved before the open house because at that point they think decisions have already been finalized. Several business leaders asked to be on the access subcommittee.

b. White City Planning Commission Presentation

Terry K. explained that staff met with the White City Planning Commission. The presentation included a brief history of the project and maps of the proposed alternatives and types of North Terminus options. This was the first time the committee had seen the plans and they felt they wanted to become more actively involved. Terry K. and staff invited the commission members to the CAC meeting. Mike M. said that speaking on behalf of CAC, the committee was glad to have White City in attendance. He added that early participation is best and an additional set of views could only benefit the project. Paige W. asked if public comment from the White City sector could come before the committee decision on the North Terminus Option. CAC agreed that comments would be helpful.

c. Sub-Committee Meetings

Bike/Pedestrian/Transit Paige West
Paige W. said that the committee has had five meetings. The committee may have another meeting to prepare for their presentation to the CAC and PDT. The goal of the bike/ped subcommittee is to provide recommendations to the CAC and PDT for adoption. Mapped and written recommendations will be a part of the presentation. with written recommendations for presentation to the CAC. She added that Martha R., Terry K., and Debbie T. have all attended meetings and have been very helpful in getting background information and giving guidance. The committee looked at all facets of transit facilities, Regional Transportation Plans for the future, and finally, all of the alternatives.

Land Use Mike Malepsy
Mike M. explained that the committee has held three meetings where they worked on 3 alternatives; the Bypass, Texas Turnaround, and Existing Build. The job of the committee is to try to come up with ideas and alternatives to avoid farmland and open spaces. He talked about what would create an exception process. He said the committee is looking at ways to tweak the alternatives so that do not go through resource land. The committee is exploring every option to avoid resource land. Mike Montero commented that it was difficult for the committee as it did not always seem like the

common-sense thing to do. He said they had hoped to be finished in a couple more meetings.

d. PDT Meetings

Terry K. commented that the CAC has not met since February and he presented a PDT update. At the February meeting the CAC put forward a recommendation to the PDT to drop the Couplet and Texas Turnaround alternatives. The information was presented to the PDT and instead of acting on the recommendation they had asked the staff for more information. There were two questions the PDT wanted more information about and they are discussed in 3.0 as follows.

3.0 Review Additional Data on the Couplet and Texas Turnaround

Terry Kearns, URS

Two questions were presented to the staff by the PDT for more information.

1. Based on the count of impacted properties, how many parcels have buildings on them? Terry K. said the PDT wanted to know the impact on structures totally taken.

<u>Alternative</u>	<u>Buildings</u>	<u>Partial Lots</u>
Texas Turnaround	65	176
Existing	99	200
Bypass	60	100

2. What is the comparative capacity of the alternatives?

Summary and Conclusions

- Couplet fails and does not meet performance standards
- Existing and Texas Turnaround meet performance standards; will require a 3-lane section in 2019 (Delta Waters / 62)
- Bypass meets performance standards; will require a 3-lane section in 2023 (Delta Waters / 62)

Chuck Beck asked what dictated the mobility (performance) standard. Reply: it is when 80% of capacity is taken up. The standards vary by urban size. Chuck B. asked what a failed intersection is. Terry K. explained it is when you have such a high volume of traffic going through the intersection that you need to separate it. Chuck B. asked Terry where there were existing failed intersections. Terry K. said the most obvious failed intersection is Poplar and Highway 62. Debbie T. added that Delta Waters and Highway 62 is another.

4.0 Discussion / Recommendation North Terminus Option

Terry Kearns, URS

Terry K. presented information to the committee about the intersection at Highway 140 and 62. He said staff had asked the highway designers if the intersection could operate as an at-grade signalized intersection for the design life of the project. They analyzed a few at-grade options and the conclusion was that it could not operate and it would have to be grade-separated. Terry K. asked the CAC for recommendation to dismiss the at-grade

options and to direct the team to explore options for minimizing the footprint of the standard diamond interchange. Mike Montero added that the committee needs to recognize what the analysis shows. The at-grade does not work. Chuck B. wanted further explanation as to why the dismissed options would not work. Kim P. responded that the traffic volumes are too high. Terry K. added that we know we have to separate it but we also need to explore options to minimize the footprint. Wade S. asked if we are limited to above-grade options or can sub ducted options be considered. Mike Montero asked if the committee wanted to handle this as one motion or two.

Mike G. made a motion to dismiss the at-grade options and directed the team to explore options for minimizing the footprint of the standard diamond interchange. Nanci W. seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed by the committee.

Don R. asked if the committee was free to make further alternative suggestions. He suggested looking having Highway 140 come into Highway 62 and bring Highway 140 into Cory Road. Jerry M. asked if the general concept was to move the connection south. Mike M. would like the design team to look at connections from the freight perspective. Wade S. commented that if options are moving south to be aware of creating a substantial amount of noise by raising platforms. Paige W. wanted to know if they are still looking at the other connections previously given to committee. Jerry M. assured the committee that the design team will give them everything that could possibly work here and that all designs will be looked at. Mike Montero added that the committee will do everything possible to retain the integrity of White City and to recommend the engineers honor that goal. After discussion, Terry K. asked the CAC to dismiss the Eastern Alignment. Mike Montero further explained that what Terry was asking from the committee was to dismiss the Eastern Alternative and to explore other options of how we can grade-separate the connection on Highway 140 and 62 for the Existing or Western Alignment. Chuck B. asked what this alignment would do to the mobility standards with respect to Highway 62 through White City. Debbie T. responded that it would probably become a county road. **Paige W. made a motion to dismiss the Eastern Alternative. David C. seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed by the committee.**

5.0 Public Comment

Pat Foley, RVCOG

Terry Walters- expressed concern about problems with Highway 62 at the North Interchange. He said vehicles miss turns coming off the freeway and they go over the concrete barrier to get back to Highway 62. He thinks it would help to yellow stripe the barrier.

Man from audience- Need to look at engineering mistakes and not repeat the same ones, when going through an intersection people are confused of how to maneuver through the intersection

Chuck Beck-Terry mentioned a budget of \$38M. Are these various things going to have price tags put on them?

Mike Montero said the \$38M is for improvements from Poplar to Delta Waters. He further added that the committee wanted to thank the White City people for their input and presence.

6.0 CAC Comfort Check

Pat Foley, RVCOG

Becky Brooks	Good
Richard Moorman	Very comfortable this evening
Mike Gardiner	Fine. Good to move forward.
David Christian	Pleased with what we did tonight
Nanci Watkins	Agrees with Mike
Wade Six	Same
Paige West	Good meeting
Don Riegger	Good to make decisions, asked if these recommendations now go to PDT
Susan Rachor	Glad to see us back on track again. I feel like we're starting over. It's good to move forward
Bill Blair	Would like to see the process go a little faster.
Mike Montero	Good meeting. I'm grateful to the White City people for being here. Hope they make it a regular feature. Hope the PDT makes the same decision to move the process along.
Mike Malepsy	Good

Debbie T. added that there are issues about all 4 alternatives that we need to look at, getting it down to 3 is good. She wanted the committee to keep in mind that they need more than one alternative.

7.0 Next Steps

Terry Kearns, URS

Terry K. said that hopefully, the PDT will make a decision tomorrow. Next steps will include refining the design of Highway 62 and 140. There is a plan to present the alternatives to the public at two open houses in June, one for the south end and one for the north end.

Mike Montero asked when the Access Management Subcommittee was planning to start. Terry K. responded that we want to reduce the alternatives before the Access Management Subcommittee starts up.

8.0 Adjournment

Mike Montero, CAC Chairperson, adjourned the meeting at 7:32 p.m. Next meeting will be May 24, 2006, at the Jackson County Public Works Auditorium, Mosquito Lane, White City.