



Highway 62 Corridor Project

Date: March 28, 2005

From: Kathy Helmer, RVCOG

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

PDT Members in Attendance: Donna Beck, Delanie Cutsforth, Brian Dunn, Mark Gibson, Gary Leaming, Dan Moore, Jerry Marmon, and Debbie Timms.

Members Absent: David Elliott, Nick Fortey, Mark Gallagher, Rick Levine, Skip Knight, Kelly Madding and Mike Quilty.

Location: Jackson Co. Public Works Auditorium, Mosquito Lane, White City.

Guests: Kent Belleque, Mike Montero, Shirley Roberts.

Staff: Gary Leaming, John Vial and Susan Landis, ODOT; Jim Hanks, JRH; Kathy Helmer, RVCOG; Terry Kearns, Nadine Lee and Jamie Snook, URS.

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. Jerry Marmon moved and Donna Beck seconded the adoption of the minutes of the previous meeting as written. The motion carried unanimously.

Mike Montero provided a summary of the CAC meeting held the previous evening. He noted that several members of the public had attended. The bulk of the meeting was spent reviewing the mapped alternatives displayed on the wall. Mike said that some folks had expressed some frustration with the process, but that staff had answered their questions and concerns. Commissioner Gilmour had presented a proposal to extend Highway 140

to Interstate 5. Earl Woods had also presented a proposal for a by-pass to Highway 62. Some 20 people had responded to the article in Moving Ahead with ODOT publication that had requested the public's ideas for alternatives. At the next meeting, they are expecting to distill the number of alternatives down into a smaller number of more distinct proposals; several had been very similar. Mike said that the CAC's overarching concerns had to do with the integration of freight facilities with other traffic and a desire to see through and local travel separated. There are concerns for the impact of the northern terminus on White City. Mike said that the CAC was a fine group of thoughtful people.

Terry Kearns said that some concerns had been expressed for the lack of multi-modal facilities. One CAC member had been particularly disappointed that the PDT had not come up with multi-modal concepts. CAC members had also expressed their concerns about coordination with the city and the county over the project. These concerns related to the newspaper article about the Transportation System Plan. Staff had explained how dynamic these plans and funding programs were.

Terry introduced Nadine Lee to the group. She will be serving as the conceptual engineer from URS for the project.

2.0 Additional Alternatives

Terry asked if the group had come up with any additional alternatives since the last meeting. No new alternatives had been developed. Donna Beck said that the maps hadn't gone far enough to the north. She wanted new Highway 62 to by-pass White City before reconnecting with existing Highway 62. Gary Leaming noted that he had received some 20 ideas from the public, via the article in the ODOT insert. He said that all would be reviewed; those that were different from the existing alternatives would be included for further review.

Terry Kearns said that the group needed to start decreasing the number of alternatives. He said that staff would mail 11" x 17" pdfs of all alternatives to the members. The termini are most problematic, especially the northern one. Staff will produce expanded versions of the termini areas. At the April meeting, the number of alternatives will be reduced.

3.0 Mapped Alternatives

Nadine Lee noted that the maps at the meeting were "ODOT compliant versions" of the concepts people had drawn. That explained why the designs looked larger than what they had drawn. She also said that they had drawn in the kind of interchange that people had drawn, whether or not that type of interchange was the best fit to that location.

All present moved to the walls to review the maps. One by one, the maps were discussed, along with the comments made about each during the CAC meeting.

After the group had reviewed and commented upon all alternatives, Terry Kearns asked them what they believed to be the best approach for distilling the alternatives. Brian Dunn responded that there were about four types: the existing highway; a Haul Road by-pass; the couplet; and the local roads concept. One main question was where to put the interchanges.

Jim Hanks said that modeling was the first pass/fail test. The group should come up with concepts to model. Based on the modeling, a set of alternatives that worked would be derived. A member asked Jim how well the termini needed to be worked out for purposes of modeling. Jim responded that the type of connection was not so important as its location. The modeling should start as soon as the Regional Transportation Plan was adopted, namely April 5. They would first model the “no build”, but they could start on the alternatives as soon as they were set up.

Dan Moore suggested that the group consider the Regional Problem Solving growth areas. Brian Dunn noted that the process needed to be tied to existing comprehensive plans, but Jim Hanks said that RPS could be considered in the process.

At the next meeting, the mailed in alternatives from the public will be presented. Regarding next steps, Terry Kearns said that staff would mail the 11” x 17” copies of alternatives to all with comments on each one included in a separate document. Secondly, there would be “blow-ups” of the two termini. This will be the first cut of how the number of alternatives will be condensed.

The CAC needs to see the environmental constraints in the context of the alternatives. There also needs to be a discussion of the RTP at some point. A naming convention is needed for the alternatives.

There was some discussion about when the old alternatives, developed in the previous study, should be reintroduced. There is the sense that some CAC members feel the process is going to slowly. Terry asked Mark Gibson and Donna Beck what they would like to see and when. They both answered that they would like to see information on the previously developed alternatives. Delanie Cutsforth said that the CAC had already come up with their ideas; looking at the previously developed alternatives could no longer bias their thinking.

It was decided that at the next meeting, they would move toward a smaller set of alternatives; the two older alternatives would be introduced, and efforts would be made to resolve the issue of the northern terminus.

Jim Hanks suggested that the people who mailed in alternatives should receive some kind of response. Gary Leaming said that this was going to happen. Kathy Helmer said she would add all the people to the project mailing list.

4.0 Public Comment

There was no public comment.

5.0 Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 AM.