



Highway 62 Corridor Project

Date: July 28, 2005
From: Pat Foley, RVCOG
Re: **CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC) MEETING MINUTES for JULY 27, 2005**

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

Members Absent: Curt Burrill

Location: Jackson County Public Works Auditorium

Guests: 5 members of the public

Staff Present: Debbie Timms, Jerry Marmon, DeLanie Cutsforth, Sam Ayash and Gary Leaming of ODOT; Terry Kearns, Nadine Lee and Jamie Snook of URS; Jim Hanks of JRH; Kathy Helmer and Pat Foley of RVCOG

1.0 Welcome/Approval of Minutes

Mike Montero, CAC Chairperson

Mike Montero convened the twelfth meeting of the Highway 62 Corridor Project CAC at 6:00 PM. He then asked for approval of the June 22nd minutes. The minutes were approved as written. Two CAC members abstained from voting as they were not present at the June 22nd meeting.

Mike reviewed the meeting objectives. 1) to finalize the Evaluation Criteria 2) to review and discuss the results of 2030 No-Build Traffic Analysis and 3) to review modeling update.

2.0 Evaluation Criteria

Terry Kearns, URS

Using the PowerPoint presentation/handout Terry explained how and when the Evaluation Criteria will be used. The objective he would like to meet this evening is to have a set of Evaluation Criteria that has been approved by the CAC to present to the PDT tomorrow for their review.

The Evaluation Criteria being used has been used in other projects. This method is visual in nature and is sometimes referred to as the Consumer Report's ranking system.

Terry reviewed all evaluation goals, objectives, criteria and measures. With direction from the CAC, the Project Management Team took all of the CAC's Goals and Objectives and developed a set of Criteria (turning the Objectives into questions) and Measures of success. He asked the CAC to add/delete suggestions to the Evaluation Criteria. Following are the changes the CAC made:

Note: Changes are represented by **bold, underlined, italics**

Goal 1 (Multimodal):

Discussion:

Paige West would like to have 'numbers of' and 'miles of' Measures included in the Evaluation Criteria. A discussion on connectivity ensued. Terry said that criteria to help define alternatives can be added as the process goes forward. The Evaluation Criteria developed tonight is not carved in stone.

Objective No. 1: Improve/**increase** bike and pedestrian facilities in the corridor
Criteria: Does the alternative improve/**increase** bike & pedestrian facilities in the corridor?
Measure **1) Number of bike and pedestrian improvements**
2) Miles of new bike and pedestrian improvements

Objective No. 2:
Measure **1) Connects major origins and destinations**

Objective No. 4:
Measure **1) Miles of transit improvements**

Evaluation Criteria for Goal 2 (Environmental) and Goal 3 (Economic) - No changes

Discussion:

A. Goal 2: Mike Montero suggested, under Goal 2 Measure which refers to "decrease or increase regional emissions", have emission specific information available for the CAC to review. Terry responded that this information is not available at this time. It will be available when the Air Quality Analysis is completed.

Terry explained the meaning of: 1) (M³) – cubic yards of fill, 2) (M²) – square feet, and 3) OHW – ordinary high water mark.

B. Goal 3: There was a discussion on how the airport is viewed as a freight generator. Information for the model is generally generated from information provided with County and City comprehensive plans.

Goal 4 (Safety)

Discussion: Mitigation measures such as timed-response lighting and extra-wide shoulders for emergency vehicles can be added in at a later date.

Objective No. 4:

Measure *1) Response time?*

Evaluation Criteria for Goal 5 (Transportation), Goal 6 (Planning) and Goal 7 (Social) – No changes

Discussion: Regarding Goal 5, an explanation of logical progression of modal movement was provided by Jim Hanks. Regarding Goal 7, Terry and Jim gave an expanded definition and an example of Environmental Justice impacts.

Tomorrow the Evaluation Criteria will be given to the PDT for review and discussion. The PDT will then decide whether to adopt the Evaluation Criteria. Terry and Jerry Marmon will be presenting the Evaluation Criteria to CETAS in September. CETAS also has to approve the Evaluation Criteria.

BREAK

3.0 2030 No-Build Traffic Analysis Results

Jim Hanks, JRH

Jim started his presentation by explaining that No-Build means that projects funded under the Regional Transportation Plan, Tier I, are built. Using the PowerPoint presentation he gave an overview of the assumptions used for the model. The Regional Model was revised to include additional components that can influence what happens in the corridor. Namely, Eagle Point growth, and two projects that the City is constructing that are not included in the present model, Owens Drive connection to Crater Lake Highway and the King Center and improvements to the Delta Waters/Crater Lake Highway intersection.

Referring to an overhead/handout map which showed 2030 mobility standard attainment of major intersections in the Highway 62 Project area, he explained that only two intersections will meet standards in the year 2030. Those intersections are Crater Lake Highway/Cardinal Avenue and Crater Lake Highway/Dutton Road. Jim also presented and explained the 2030 No-Build PM Peak Hour Traffic Analysis results and the 2030 No-Build Average Daily Traffic (ADT) volumes which depict a comparison of V/C and LOS standards from 2004 to 2030.

The overall approach of modeling assumptions will be done in three sets of models: 1) off-corridor,

2) Northern Terminus, and 3) refinement of Corridor alternatives. Import modeling measures of success include: 1) Do they meet the Purpose and Need? 2) Do they change volumes of traffic on Highway 62?

4.0 Next Steps

Terry Kearns, URS

Terry reviewed the project schedule for the rest of the year.

- August Initial screening of alternatives. Dismiss alternatives that do not meet P & N.
- September Present reduced set of alternatives. Identify opportunities and constraints.
- October Apply Evaluation Criteria to reduced set of alternatives
- November Select final set of alternatives to move forward in the DEIS
- December No CAC meeting. The Technical Team will be working on the environmental analysis for the reduced set of alternatives. CAC meetings will reconvene once this work is complete

5.0 Modeling Update

Nadine Lee, URS

Time was not available at this meeting for Nadine to provide the group with an update on modeling.

6.0 Public Comment

Kathy Helmer, RVCOG

Kathy opened the public comment session, inviting the public to speak. There were no public comments.

7.0 CAC Comfort Check

Kathy Helmer, RVCOG

Kathy asked each of the participants to share their reactions to the meeting. All members expressed their sense that things were going well.

Paige West asked if it was possible for CAC members to visit the modeling folks during the actual process. Sam Ayash said that if there was enough interest, he would give a presentation.

8.0 Adjournment

Mike Montero, CAC Chairperson

The next CAC meeting will be on August 24th at the Jackson County Public Works Auditorium. The meeting was adjourned at 8:05 p.m.