

The logo consists of a blue, thick, curved line that starts at the top left, curves to the right, and then curves back down to the left, forming a shape similar to a stylized 'C' or a road curve. The text 'Highway 62 Corridor Project' is written in a bold, blue, sans-serif font, centered within the curve of the line.

Highway 62 Corridor Project

Date: October 25, 2006

From: Sue Casavan, RVCOG

Re: **CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC) MEETING
MINUTES for October 25, 2006**

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

Members Absent: Curt Burrill, Wade Six, and Mike Malepsy

Location: Jackson County Public Works Auditorium, White City

Guests: 28 members of the public

Staff Present: Jerry Marmon, Chris Zelmer, and Gary Leaming of ODOT; Terry Kearns of URS; Mike Arneson and Kim Parducci of JRH; Gary Shaff of GSA; Pat Foley and Sue Casavan of RVCOG

1.0 Welcome and Approval of Minutes

Mike Montero, CAC Chair

Mike Montero convened the meeting of the Highway 62 Corridor Project CAC at 6:02 p.m. Mike M. reviewed the meeting's agenda and said that public comment would be moved up in the agenda and taken into consideration prior to any recommendation the CAC would forward to the PDT. He asked the committee for approval of the September 27th minutes. The minutes were unanimously approved as presented. Mike Montero abstained.

2.0 Updates on PDT Meeting and Committee Presentations

Terry Kearns, URS

Terry K. said the CAC and the PDT needed to direct project staff as to which alternatives will be moved forward into the EIS to study. The PDT wanted to wait until the end of the public comment period and evaluate input from the various committees. He presented the latest public comment totals from the open houses. Terry K. said the project staff did not receive recommendation from the Jackson County Commissioners. They were primarily concerned with if the traffic models took into consideration known large developments. Terry K. explained to them that if the developments were known they were included in the model and the two developments they were asking about were included in the regional model. The MPO Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was primarily concerned with traffic operations especially the split diamond concept. The Medford City Council issued a recommendation for 3 in favor of dropping the Texas Turnaround and Existing Highway alternatives and 1 opposed to all the alternatives. The MPO Policy Committee provided comments and input only and no vote for recommendation.

3.0 Discussion on Reduction of Alternatives

Terry Kearns, URS

Terry K. reviewed the purpose and need of the project with committee members. He showed the latest detailed maps and explained traffic movements and property impacts.

- Bypass Alternative
 - Poplar would be grade-separated with series of backage roads for access
- Bypass with Split Diamond

Mike G. asked if it was elevated. Terry K. said it was elevated over Biddle and I-5. Susan R. wanted to know if it utilized the work already done in that area. Terry K. said the only throwaway would be the current southbound lane to I-5. Mike M. added that an important distinction with the split diamond concept is that Poplar is not required to be grade separated and Highway 62 would stay as is. Nanci Watkins asked about environmental impacts to the greenbelt. Terry K. said the engineers could stay within the existing right-of-way.

- Existing Highway
 - Controlled access, frontage and backage roads
 - Interchange at Vilas, Delta Waters, directional interchange at Hwy 62 and Agate
 - Poplar grade-separated
- Texas Turnaround
 - Parallel access roads on either side of expressway, one direction lanes
 - Poplar grade-separated
 - Slip ramps for off / on to access roads

Terry K. referred the committee to the updated goals and objectives and explained that the first filter was the purpose and need. He said the evaluation criteria was applied to the 4 remaining alternatives and using the evaluation criteria, the Bypass and the Bypass

with the Split Diamond rank more favorably than the Existing or the Texas Turnaround due to operational efficiencies as well as the number of impacts. He presented bar graphs of partial property takes, complete property takes, and numbers of buildings impacted for each alternative.

Mike G. asked if property impacts had any relation to dollar amount. Terry K. said there was no relation to dollar amount but generally the ROW dollars would be higher for the Existing and the Texas Turnaround because they affect the existing corridor. He added that generally ROW is 25% of construction cost but would be higher for the Existing and Texas Turnaround. David C. asked what it meant for number of buildings impacted. Terry K. said it is a tallying of buildings that would be affected in some way.

Staff Recommendations

Project Staff recommend that the CAC and PDT dismiss the Texas Turnaround and the Existing Highway Build alternatives based on the following:

A comparison of the alternatives' ranking in the evaluation criteria shows significant differences between those two alternatives and the Bypass alternative in regard to:

- Opportunities to provide Multi-Modal improvements
- Number of parcels partially impacted
- Number of parcels completely impacted
- Number of residential buildings impacted
- Number of commercial buildings impacted

Mike Montero said that none of the committee members are insensitive to the impacts and for members to deal with the problem the committee goal is to provide the valley with the best transportation system for the next 50 years. He said one of the comments heard at the MPO was that the Texas Turnaround provided the highest potential capacity going forward but also had the greatest impact and he wanted to know if that was true.

Terry K. explained capacity and said there are two things that determine carrying capacity of a roadway. One is area and one is operational speeds. He used the Bypass as an example; it bypasses the highway and leaves Highway 62 alone and within that corridor there is Crater Lake Avenue and Highway 62. Highway 62 has 5 lanes with the center turn lane and the Bypass has 4 lanes so there are essentially 10 lanes through the corridor. Looking at the Texas Turnaround and Existing there are 2 lanes for the access roads in each direction and 4 lanes in the center for a total of 8 lanes and the access roads operate at lower speeds. He said the one that provides the most capacity is the Bypass by simply counting the lanes across.

4.0 Public Comment

Mike Montero, CAC Chair

Ken Hanks urged the committee to forward the Bypass with the Split Diamond. He thought it looked to be the best out of all four.

Gordon Draper said he didn't hear much about the public feedback. Terry K. explained how he presented information to each committee and what the focus was for each group.

Rick Hicks from the White City Planning Commission commented that on the White City end it seemed the Bypass comes awfully close to the Fire Department and wondered if it would restrict their accessibility. Terry K. said project staff had looked at this community facility and it would not be affected.

Jim Coombes of Fred Meyer said they are very much in favor of the Bypass with the Split Diamond as it preserves all business access in the Crater Lake corridor. If they grade-separate Poplar it will have major impacts for businesses. He thought it seemed the most logical and would solve the problem.

Warren Cooper asked if there was enough room in the next 20-30 years on Hwy 62 to take it out to 3 lanes both ways. Terry K. said not without affecting access and one of the goals is to provide access to businesses in different ways, this is what slows the traffic. Warren C. asked if the Bypass would create a bottleneck up by the freeway. Terry K. said yes, the Bypass has a design life for 20 years but with the split diamond it adds additional capacity.

David Osborne asked if there had been any projection as to what it would cost to buy all the properties out. I see jobs being lost and the county being burdened with more roads. Terry K. said staff needed to detail that precisely and that will be done in the EIS.

Terry K. said there was a letter from Wayne Hanlon in the CAC handouts. Wayne H. states since a basic objective is to separate local traffic from through traffic, he believes a bypass alternative is the most logical, least destructive and disruptive to existing businesses and presumably less expensive concerning both right-of-way acquisition and construction.

5.0 Recommendation to PDT

Terry Kearns, URS

Mike M. explained that the project staff has asked for the CAC recommendation to go forward to the PDT tomorrow with regard to the elimination of 2 alternatives from further consideration, the Texas Turnaround and the Existing alternative. Each committee member was asked to respond and give individual reasons for response.

Existing Highway Build

Becky Brooks: I would support the recommendation to drop this alternative. It doesn't appear to enhance the efficiency of travel and it will have an awful lot of impact on land use. It will not allow the community of White City to grow well; will cut through and bisect residential areas and it does not work well for multi-modal travel.

Don Riegger: When you look at the criteria chart it just partially meets five of the goals and only really meets two of the goals. I don't think it will meet the goals of our whole project. I think it is destructive to a lot of businesses with the backage roads and it will

take away their existing frontage now. It will have an impact on the residential area with the realignment of Crater Lake Avenue. I don't think it is a good idea.

Bill Blair: I agree with Don, there is too much of an impact on business and the residents. It is not what we really need. I think we should move on without it.

Mike Gardiner: It only meets 2 of our 7 criteria. It is not a preferred alternative. I am in favor of dropping it in terms of moving on to more suitable alternatives.

Richard Moorman: The evaluation statistics are against it. It appears there will be a drastic impact on residential and commercial. There will be more impacts even above and beyond what is anticipated. I would say we should move on also.

Nanci Watkins: My vote is to eliminate it also. I don't like the businesses it impacts especially at Vilas; it basically wipes out that whole economic center. This alternative is quite a bit more expensive than the Bypass options.

David Christian: I agree with everything I have heard so far. The impact is too great both on commercial and residential and it only meets two of the goals we had established at the beginning. I vote to eliminate it.

Bob Plankenhorn: I think we should drop the Existing Build because there is too much impact on business and residential and it does not meet our purpose and need. I recommend dropping it.

Paige West: I recommend that we dismiss the Existing Build to the PDT for the reasons of not providing safe bicycle and pedestrian access and the drastic impacts it has on residential and commercial.

Susan Rachor: I recommend that we drop the Existing Highway Build as well. The ROW expenses are too great for residential and commercial and it doesn't meet our need.

Mike Montero: I concur with all the comments. I also recommend that it be eliminated from consideration. It does not meet the goals and criteria that we have established and it subjects our community to needless disruption of business and our livability and it should be tossed.

Curt Burrill: (E-mail response) I believe the cost associated with the displacement and loss of access for all of the businesses' fronting onto the existing highway is too great to keep this alternative moving forward. I am in favor of continuing to analyze the Bypass Alternatives with and without the split diamond connection at Interstate 5.

Texas Turnaround

Becky Brooks: I would accept the recommendation to drop the Texas Turnaround. It creates far too much disruption to the community and will not serve the needs.

Don Riegger: When you look at the evaluation criteria the Texas Turnaround fails completely to meet 3 of them and only partially meets two of them. It has the most impact on everything and is not a good alternative. I vote to not continue it. Don R. voiced his concern that one of the strongest members of the PDT is in favor of this alternative and he felt unsure of what the PDT would do.

Bill Blair: I recommend that we drop the Texas Turnaround. It is the most costly and the most disruptive to business.

Mike Gardiner: I would be in favor of dropping the Texas Turnaround. I feel there is too much impact on the economic corridor as we try to build in the existing corridor as well as being unsafe for multi-modal transportation.

Richard Moorman: I would recommend dropping the Texas Turnaround for the stated statistics; it has the most impact. As Mike indicated it is almost a double construction.

Nanci Watkins: I recommend dropping the Texas Turnaround because it barely meets only two of our goals and it wipes out the entire economic base of Highway 62.

David Christian: I have the exact same reasons as for voting down the Existing Build. The Texas Turnaround demonstrates more impact and certainly causes more devastation.

Bob Plankenhorn: I recommend that we drop the Texas Turnaround. It is too costly, does not meet purpose and need, and will destroy all the businesses along Highway 62.

Paige West: I recommend to the PDT that we dismiss the Texas Turnaround. It does not provide safe bicycle and pedestrian access and it causes too much out-of-direction travel to make sense.

Susan Rachor: I recommend that we also drop the Texas Turnaround for all the reasons discussed. It doesn't meet our needs, too disruptive to all the businesses, and the impacts to the community would be too great.

Mike Montero: I also recommend the Texas Turnaround be removed from further consideration. It simply does not meet the purpose and goals established by the CAC. It has a disproportionate, adverse impact on businesses. It inhibits multi-modal opportunities and the out-of-direction traffic puts an additional adverse affect on our air shed where there is a relationship between VMT and pm10.

Curt Burrill: (E-mail response) I stand firmly behind the CAC's January 25, 2006 decision to remove the Texas Turnaround Alternative from consideration. As I stated in January, the Texas Turnaround is a good alternative if you were building a highway in an undeveloped area. To try and fit the Texas Turnaround within the right of way constraints on the existing highway will cost too much and will displace too many businesses to make it a viable option.

6.0 Review of Bypass Land Use Alternative

Gary Shaff, GSA

Gary S. presented the land use avoidance alignments for the Bypass Alternative. Mike A. developed designs for the avoidance alignments that could compare with the original Bypass alignment. He reviewed the Land Use Subcommittee recommendations.

- Selected avoidance alignments should be reviewed by the CAC and the PDT for “reasonableness”.
- If reasonable, avoidance alignments should be considered within the DEIS either together with, or in lieu of the original alignment(s).
- If unreasonable, document the facts, findings, and conclusions in as much detail as is possible using objective (preferable) and subjective measures.
- Alignments requiring an exception should not be considered within the DEIS unless
 - The PDT finds that avoidance alignments are unreasonable, and
 - All build alternatives require an exception, and
 - Exception alignments, if they are carried into the DEIS, are redesigned to minimize their impacts on farm and forest lands, and to the degree possible, site interchanges wholly within Medford’s UGB or the White City UCB, or
 - The inclusion of an exception alignment is necessary to document its merits while acknowledging that an exception may not be justified.

Gary S. defined Statewide Land Use Goal Exception: A decision by a local government (in the form of Comprehensive Land Use Plan amendment and supported by substantial evidence) demonstrating that reasons justify why the state policy embodied within the applicable goal(s) should not apply. He further explained the standards for an exception and problems with the Bypass Highway Alignment.

Problems

1. Portions of the interchange ramps at Vilas lie outside the Medford UGB.
2. The Bypass would cut through land designated EFU.
3. The Bypass would cut through land designated Open Space.

Two land use avoidance alternatives were developed to address these issues.

Land Use Avoidance Alternative 1

- Impacts 54 buildings, primarily commercial structures along Hwy 62 corridor
- Bypass in same area, impacts 32 buildings
- Would require 2 directional interchanges outside UGB and UCB (Bypass needs one)

Land Use Avoidance Alternative 2

- Would require 3-level interchange to accommodate movements
- Would require long stretches of elevated ramps
- Significant impacts to buildings (greater than Alternative 1)

Staff Recommendations

Project staff recommends that the CAC dismiss the two land use avoidance alternatives for the following reasons:

- Operational issues
- Access issues
- Significantly (and unreasonably) higher number of commercial impacts than with non-avoidance alternative
- Significantly (and unreasonably) higher costs associated with Avoidance Alternative 2 than with non-avoidance alternative

Gary S. said the project staff is recommending that the CAC dismiss the two land use avoidance alternatives. Terry K. said the committee could accept Gary's recommendation without drafting a motion.

Paige W. asked about EFU and if it was private land, and was it being used. Gary S. it is largely dry land pasture but they are potentially an agricultural use. Paige-the open space parcel if you use one parcel do you need to designate one in another place. David C. asked if the exception was just for the boundaries where the highway goes through and if it would change the nature of the space. Gary S. said it would not change, there would be no access along the Bypass, the exception is to construct along EFU.

Mike M. said the committee has recommendation from project staff to eliminate the two avoidance alternatives and proceed with our justification for goal exception.

David C. made a motion to accept the project staff recommendations on dismissing the avoidance alternatives. Seconded by Don R. and passed unanimously by committee members.

7.0 CAC Comfort Check

Pat Foley, RVCOG

Nanci W. – I feel good about tonight's meeting especially about getting rid of the Texas Turnaround.

David C. – I think we have worked really hard and we came up with this recommendation months ago. Like Don says there may be some strong voices on the PDT committee about the Texas Turnaround but I would hope our recommendation is a very strong recommendation and we won't be sent back to look at it again, I would be very disappointed.

Bob P. – I'm good.

Paige W. – I'm good.

Susan R. – I'm good, too.

Mike Montero – Fine.

Becky B. – I am really encouraged by all the different methods of measuring or weighting the criteria and we keep coming back to the same thing. I feel we are on the right track.

Don R. – I think we made the correct decisions tonight, I hope they fly.

Bill B. – I feel good about it tonight.

Mike G. – Fine.

Richard M. – I'm fine. Thank you.

8.0 Next Steps

Terry Kearns, URS

- November 2006: CAC and PDT approve refined design of alternatives that will be analyzed in the DEIS.
- December 2006: Staff begins technical analysis, identifying impacts and potential mitigation strategies for each alternative under consideration.
- Spring 2007: Publish DEIS. Solicit comments from public and affected agencies.
- Summer 2007: Select preferred alternative, based on analysis results and comments received.
- Fall 2007: Publish Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS).

Mike M. asked if there would be an impact analysis for the Bypass as it runs along the east side of the airport. He said the airport expressed a willingness to explore exchanges on that boundary that might lessen impact on properties in that area. Jerry M. said those discussions are already occurring and he hoped to have an update in November.

9.0 Adjournment

Mike Montero, CAC Chair

Meeting was adjourned at 7:50 p.m.