



# Highway 62 Corridor Project

**Date:** June 2, 2005

**From:** Kathy Helmer, RVCOG

**Re:** **PROJECT DEVELOPMENT TEAM (PDT) MEETING  
FINAL MINUTES for May 26, 2005**

---

**PDT Members in Attendance:** Donna Beck, Brian Dunn, Nick Fortey, Mark Gallagher, Mark Gibson, Skip Knight, Rick Levine, Kelly Madding, Jerry Marmon and Debbie Timms.

**Members Absent:** Delanie Cutsforth, David Elliott, Dan Moore, and Mike Quilty

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

**Guests:** Mike Montero, CAC Chairperson, and Craig Anderson, RVCOG

**Staff:** Gary Leaming and Kent Belleque, ODOT; Jim Hanks and Kim Parducci, JRH; Kathy Helmer, RVCOG; Nadine Lee and Jamie Snook, URS.

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

## **1.0 Introductions/Agenda Review/Minutes**

Debbie Timms, serving as Chairperson, convened the meeting at 8:35 AM. Skip Knight moved, and Brian Dunn seconded, the adoption of the minutes of the previous meeting as written. The motion carried unanimously.

Mike Montero was asked to brief the PDT on the CAC meeting held the previous day. Mike reported that the CAC was learning a great deal about some complicated issues. They are forwarding four types of alternatives: one focused on east-west connections; one that emphasizes north-south connections; one that focuses on the existing Highway 62 corridor; and one that features a by-pass. The CAC has agreed to collapse the many by-

pass alignments into one that uses the Haul Road as much as possible. The northern terminus is still to be determined.

## **2.0 Follow-up on Ideas from the Last Meeting**

Nadine Lee noted that the PDT and CAC had both focused on alternatives for the northern terminus at their last meetings. The purpose was to avoid exacerbating traffic issues in the White City area. She presented maps of the alternatives developed at those meetings and said that they are still looking for more ideas. People should send all ideas to Nadine.

Regarding the Texas turnaround, Nadine said that it was a design element that could be used with an alignment. She stressed that it was not a new alignment or alternative.

Skip Knight said he was leery of using the Medco Haul Rd. as a by-pass, since that would isolate the airport. It would not allow easterly expansion of the airport. He suggested inviting Bern Case to the meeting to further discuss the issue and investigating the use of other existing roads, including Antelope Rd. that takes people straight to the 7 Oaks Interchange. Debbie Timms said that the project team had met with Bern Case some time ago and learned of certain fatal flaws and airport development plans.

With respect to the northern terminus maps, Kelly Madding asked if the roads in White City could be crossed. She noted White City plans to grow to the east and that a major highway through that area could block that growth or create community issues. She liked the alternative that showed crossings at Atlantic and McLaughlin. Skip Knight suggested that the alternative be south and west of White City, thus allowing for residential growth.

It was suggested that PDT minutes should be made available to the CAC; one way to do that would be to provide the link to the project website.

## **3.0 The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)**

Craig Anderson of RVCOG presented information on the RTP. He distributed a map of proposed construction projects in the study area and a set of tables with descriptions and costs of such projects. Projects in the RTP are regionally significant. Craig reviewed the projects in the short, medium and long-range categories.

It was noted that some CAC members expressed their concern about the \$38 million allocated to a project following the Haul Rd. Debbie Timms suggested that information on the funding and phasing of projects would be helpful, so that people would better understand how projects work through the system. She also said that the project would do an overlay with the short-range RTP projects and the Highway 62 Corridor Project alternatives. Debbie noted that short-term projects needed to be built between now and when the Highway 62 Corridor solution was constructed. Nick Fortey suggested that the overlays include the rationale and need for each RTP project. That would help answer

future questions. Jim Hanks spoke to how the funds are restricted in their use and cannot be used to “mix and match”.

Skip Knight requested a list of the CAC members.

Kelly Madding returned to the maps of the northern terminus alternatives and how those maps should be regarded. It was explained the access control along the major roads was not implied. The maps are suggesting alignments, but do not offer refined design elements.

## **4.0 Alternatives from Previous Studies**

Jim Hanks made a presentation on alternatives that were developed in the past, referring to a handout with maps of those alternatives. Jim described the three types of alternatives that came out of that first study. One was based on the existing highway, one on a new highway and one was called a hybrid because it combined the first two ideas.

The existing highway alternative included a Bullock connector that would have required a tunnel under the area near the runway; it would have been extremely expensive. Skip Knight said that the cost of that alternative, if it had been viewed in terms of the year 2040, might have been seen as reasonable. It would move traffic from east to west without going through the interchange. Jim Hanks agreed that more growth has been occurring and is expected; the idea should be tested again. Perhaps of more significance than cost is the issue of security. The Dept. of Homeland Security is very concerned about roadways close to airports and runways.

The terminus considered for the hybrid alternative was between Corey and Vilas Road. Jim Hanks noted that the maps showed only 6 out of about 40 variants considered during the first study. One understanding gained during that study was that alternatives would have to stay rather close to the existing highway to solve the problem on Highway 62.

After considering all the potential alignments, two alignments remained. The first was the existing alignment, featuring full access control standards along the highway. Access to businesses was to be provided by frontage and backage roads. The second was the by-pass alternative, previously called “the hybrid”.

Jim Hanks told PDT members that the CAC had forwarded a recommendation to them. The recommendation was that all the alternatives suggesting a by-pass between the airport and the existing highway be “collapsed” into one that followed the Haul Road right of way as much as possible, but left the termini to be determined. Jim Hanks asked the PDT if they were comfortable deciding to forward that to the engineers for modeling. Skip Knight suggested incorporating the width of Crater Lake Avenue as right of way available for a Texas turnaround. Jim Hanks explained that this was an attempt to distill specific groupings into one concept that could be modeled. The engineering consultants would like to proceed with a set of basic alignments for modeling. He noted that the Texas turnaround was a design alternative, not an alignment concept.

Brian Dunn noted that there were four concepts, not four alternatives. Rick Levine noted that there were other by-pass concepts, such as those using Table Rock Rd.

Jim Hanks said that there was no need to move forward if the group was not comfortable. He asked the group to let him know what kind of information would be helpful. Skip Knight said that the PDT did not have enough information to make the decision. He knew of two new developments to be built in the study area and he would like the group to have all the information that could affect the area. Jim Hanks said that the longer the project was delayed, the more numerous the number of potential developments. Mark Gallagher said that the group should step back if it was not ready to make the decision. Rick Levine said that the solution should work for all the neighborhoods and developments to be built in the area. Kelly Madding said that the group should have more time to review and group the concepts.

Brian Dunn said that the PDT was fine with the groupings per se and should move ahead with the groupings. Nick Fortey suggested that the group forward the alternatives between Highway 62 and the airport. The PDT agreed with this idea.

## **5.0 Evaluation Criteria**

Referring to a PowerPoint presentation, Jamie Snook explained the purpose and usefulness of evaluation criteria. She said that there was a full spectrum of criteria frameworks and tools at our disposal. Jamie stressed that the more complex frameworks did not result in better decision-making. She described some frameworks and finally focused on what she called the “consumer reports” approach. This approach is favored because it provides a lot of flexibility. At the next meeting, time will be spent discussing a set of evaluation criteria developed by URS.

Kelly Madding asked about the benefits of numerical weighting. Jerry Marmon said that they might be more analytical. Nick Fortey said that the group should also identify where impacts are located. They should look at the sections in greater detail; mapping impacts with GIS would help to determine how to alter the routes.

## **6.0 Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

## **7.0 Wrap Up and Adjournment**

Next steps include looking at a set of evaluation criteria, reviewing some modeling and seeing visuals of the short, medium- and long-range RTP projects. Debbie Timms thanked all participants and adjourned the meeting at 11:00 AM.