



# Highway 62 Corridor Project

**Date:** December 21, 2004

**From:** Kathy Helmer, RVCOG

**Re: PROJECT DEVELOPMENT TEAM (PDT) MEETING  
MINUTES for December 16, 2004**

---

**PDT Members in Attendance:** Mike Arneson, Donna Beck, Brian Dunn, David Elliott, Nick Fortey, Mark Gallagher, Mark Gibson, Kathy Helmer, Terry Kearns, Gary Leaming, Rick Levine, Kelly Madding, Jerry Marmon, Dan Moore, John Morrison, Mike Quilty, Jamie Snook, Debbie Timms.

**Members Absent:** Skip Knight.

**Location:** Jackson Co. Auditorium, Mosquito Lane, White City.

**Guests:** Frank Stevens, JRH.

**Resource Technical Team in Attendance:** None.

## 1.0 Introductions/Agenda Review/Minutes

Terry Kearns convened the meeting at 8:40 AM, welcoming members and reviewing the agenda. The minutes of the previous meeting were approved as written.

John Morrison reported on the CAC meeting held December 15<sup>th</sup>. He described the process by the CAC for developing draft goals and objectives. He mentioned that Commissioner Gilmore had attended the meeting and expressed a desire to give a presentation on the idea of a Highway 140-Interstate 5 connector at some future CAC meeting.

## **2.0 Crash Trends on Highway 62**

Frank Stevens of JRH provided a PowerPoint presentation on crash trends along segments of the Highway 62 corridor. He noted a relationship between access control along the highway and the number of crashes. Segments with almost total access control have the lowest number of crashes. Segments with many business accesses onto the highway have many more turning accidents. Mike Arneson showed slides illustrating typical misuse of turning and refuge lanes, as well as drivers turning with inadequate gaps to do so. He reviewed the crash analysis before and after the Linn/Dutton Project was executed on Highway 62. Improvements on the highway led to a 50% decrease in the number of reported crashes; a more than 50% decrease in the number of fatalities; a change in the types of crashes; and a dramatic decrease in the cost of crashes to society.

## **3.0 Review Revised Purpose and Need Statement**

Terry Kearns led the group through a power point presentation regarding comments received in the past month regarding revisions to the Purpose and Need Statement. Based on this feedback, the Purpose and Need Statement was revised to include “multimodal needs”, identify exact termini and broaden the safety issue to cover all “transportation”.

Brian Dunn said he was concerned with having the term ‘multi-modal’ in the Purpose, since it was so broad and vague a term. The Need section would also need to identify specific multi-modal needs. Terry offered to draft information to that effect. Mike Quilty asked if there were standards/guidelines about mixing highways, people and bicycles. It may be that some multi-modal facilities would be provided, but not right next to the highway.

Terry Kearns asked for the PDT’s approval of the Purpose and Need Statement, with the understanding that he would send out his proposed revisions for their review before the next meeting. Then it would be finalized at the next meeting.

Mike Arneson moved to adopt the Purpose and Need statement, as revised with a paragraph regarding multi-modal needs in the Need section. Jerry Marmon seconded the motion. All members voted in favor of this motion.

Nick Fortey suggested that the project refer to Highway 62 by its National Highway System (NHS) route designation, along with its Oregon Highway Plan designation. This would give the project higher national interest and importance.

## **4.0 Introduction to Goals and Objectives Development**

Referring to the PowerPoint presentation, Terry Kearns explained the relationship of the Goals and Objectives to the Purpose and Need Statement. It is not mandatory to meet all Goals and Objectives, but they describe the desired features of alternatives and aid in differentiating among alternatives that satisfy the Purpose and Need.

## **5.0 Goals and Objectives Development Exercise**

During the break, the PDT reviewed all the goals and objectives devised by the CAC during their meeting the previous evening. John Morrison provided an overview of the process used by the CAC to draft Goals and Objectives at their meeting. PDT members then followed the same process, devising goals and objectives and giving them to meeting staff to place under a goal category, alongside the ones created by the CAC. John then reviewed the placement of the goals with the group, to ensure that members were comfortable with their placement. He told them that RVCOG would type the material up as is, work on refining the organization in a second document, and send it along to the CAC and PDT for their review and comment.

Nick Fortey said that it would be good to have a way to objectively decide if alternatives accomplished goals and objectives; he envisioned a kind of grid or spreadsheet to facilitate that. He also asked if the project planned to develop quantitative evaluation criteria. John Morrison answered that the project intended to develop such criteria.

## **6.0 Alternatives Development Process**

Terry Kearns asked the PDT to think about how they would like to proceed with alternatives development, a process that will soon begin. Would it be more helpful to develop alternatives without first reviewing the alternatives developed during the last study or to start by reviewing those previous alternatives and then developing others? Debbie Timms expressed her desire that the PDT follow the same process as the CAC.

Mark Gibson said he would like some guidance and guidelines and be told right away if they were going down the wrong road. Mark Gallagher said that the advantage of not first reviewing the previous alternatives was that people would not be saddled with pre-conceived ideas. But after that, and soon, he would like to see the previous ones. The group also said they would like to know what kinds of design constraints there are. Mike Arneson suggested having a kind of “brainstorming process” regarding the needs of the corridor, as well as looking at the corridor through designers’ eyes.

Jerry Marmon spoke with the group regarding the determination of the study area. The study area “box” is where a reasonable range of alternatives would likely fall. The boundaries of the area can tighten up or expand, so that no alternatives are precluded. Jerry shared the idea of a study area bounded on the west by Table Rock Rd. and on the east by Foothills Road. Mike Quilty said that that make sense since there are really no other major facilities in the broad corridor area. The group concurred that Table Rock Road and Foothill Road would be the western and eastern boundaries of the study area, respectively.

## **7.0 Public Comment**

As there were no members of the public present, there was no public comment.

## **8.0 PDT comfort Check**

John Morrison asked members to share their reactions to the meeting. Nick Fortey said he liked the process used for identifying goals and objectives because it was very democratic and everyone got their ideas into the hopper. The other members expressed their comfort with the meeting.

## **9.0 Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 AM.