



Highway 62 Corridor Project

Date: March 4, 2005

From: Kathy Helmer, RVCOG

**Re: PROJECT DEVELOPMENT TEAM (PDT) MEETING
FINAL MINUTES for February 24, 2005**

PDT Members in Attendance: Mike Arneson, Donna Beck, Delanie Cutsforth, Brian Dunn, David Elliott, Nick Fortey, Kathy Helmer, Terry Kearns, Skip Knight, Gary Leaming, Rick Levine, Kelly Madding, Jerry Marmon, Jamie Snook, and Debbie Timms.

Members Absent: Mark Gallagher, Mark Gibson, Dan Moore and Mike Quilty.

Location: Rogue Family Center, 3131 Avenue C., White City.

Guests: Kent Belleque, Shirley Roberts.

Resource Technical Team in Attendance: None.

1.0 Introductions/Agenda Review/Minutes

Terry Kearns convened the meeting at 8:45 AM, welcoming members and reviewing the agenda. Mike Arneson moved and Mike Quilty seconded the adoption of the minutes of the previous meeting as written. The motion carried unanimously.

2.0 Revised Goals and Objectives

Terry Kearns led this discussion. The PDT had received the draft Goals and Objectives in their meeting packet. Terry asked the group if they had any comments or additional, desired changes.

Kelly Madding raised the following points. Regarding the second bullet under Goal 5, the word “that” should be added. In Goal 6, the word “consistent with” should be changed to “Ensure consistency with”. In the same goal, add “city, county and regional” land use and

planning goals. In the third bullet, change the wording to “Ensure consistency with state transportation and land use planning goals.” Once the group had considered and agreed with these points; Jamie Snook made the changes on the screen. Regarding Goal 2, Kelly said that she was not familiar with the phrase “context sensitive design”. The group agreed that that would call for further elaboration at a later point in the project.

3.0 Alternatives Development

Mike Arneson explained the morning’s alternatives development exercise to the group. The group was divided into three smaller working groups, each at their own table named P1, P2 or P3. Each person was given sets of 11 x 17 corridor maps and asked to work independently for the first 15 minutes or so to draw his or her own ideas. After that, each table would discuss the ideas offered by each person, identifying similarities and differences. People at each table would draw their ideas on the layer of acetate covering the large aerial photographs of the corridor. An aerial showing a much broader study area was available to each table, in case people needed that to draw their alternatives. Finally, a spokesperson for each table would present the alternatives on the acetate to the entire PDT. Mike encouraged participants to draw concepts, rather than details, to keep the Purpose and Need in mind, and to ask any questions they liked of the resource people in the room.

Participants were divided among the tables as follows: P1: Donna Beck, Mike Arneston and Nick Fortey; P2: Shirley Roberts, Kelly Madding and Rick Levine; P3: Brian Dunn and David Elliott.

At the end of the process, each table reported back to the entire PDT. The comments by each table are below.

Table P1. Mike Arneson, Spokesperson.

P1-1. Their first idea was to utilize the existing highway and the large investment already made in that facility. The existing Hwy 62 would become the expressway. There would be interchanges at Poplar, Delta Waters and at Highway 62 and Hwy 140. There would be an overpass at Coker Butte and Antelope Rd. He said that his table had been very concerned about the importance of good connectivity between both sides of the highway for White City. There would be no access on the expressway; there would be a frontage road all the way to Agate Road.

P1-2. Another concept was for a new highway to come off Delta Waters Road. This was to follow the Medco Haul Road with directional interchanges at both ends. The group had questions about whether the White City intersections could remain as signalized intersections or not, but did not reach a conclusion.

P1-3. Another idea was to develop a couplet scenario and to use existing infrastructure. The table was not sure about how to blend them together.

P1-4. The last concept was to make a highway out of the existing highway and to have either a frontage road for business access or maybe a by-pass route. This would feature an interchange at Antelope Road.

Table P2. Kelly Madding, Spokesperson.

P2-10. The first concept was to build an interchange with Table Rock Road at I-5. Table Rock Road would be improved to 4-lanes as an alternate route. There would be a Highway 140 connection with Antelope to Kirkland.

P2-11. The second idea was to use Biddle Road to connect with Table Rock Road. There would be an access point on Antelope Road. It would terminate at G Street.

P2-12. The third idea was to make Highway 62 into an expressway and remove existing access. New access roads would be constructed, keeping that traffic off the expressway.

Kelly noted that it would be best for White City if Highway 62 did not become an expressway with limited access. White City's commercially zoned land is along Highway 62. It would not develop if it couldn't access the highway.

Table P3. Brian Dunn, Spokesperson.

P3-20. This concept used the existing highway and the frontage roads. The table group had a hard time tackling the topic of how to connect back in at the north and south termini. This concept uses interchanges. They wanted connectivity on the west side of I-5. One question was what to do with Antelope Road? Brian noted that the county has plans in the short-term to connect Highway 140 to the Seven Oaks Interchange.

P3-21. They called this the hybrid as it consisted of using both Crater Lake Highway and the Haul Road with interchanges. The Haul Road would separate from the existing highway somewhere between Poplar and Delta Waters and would have interchanges. The existing highway would continue to be a signalized facility between Delta Waters and White City.

P3-22. This concept has a split diamond interchange at I-5. You get on the Haul Road and it provides completely separate routes for business access and for highway through traffic. The question was what to do in White City. Should there be an interchange at Hwy 140? This concept would lend itself to phasing.

Terry noted that the March meeting would be devoted to presenting and discussing drawings of these PDT alternatives, as well as the CAC alternatives, bringing some engineering realities into the process of drawing them. Participants will get an idea of how much land each of the alternatives will require; spacing criteria and some general pros and cons of each alternative. Some people may bring additional designs to the next meeting; some members of the public will present their ideas.

4.0 Public Comment

There was no public comment.

5.0 Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 AM.