Highway 62 Corridor Project

Date: May 2, 2006

From: Pat Foley, RVCOG

Re: **PROJECT DEVELOPMENT TEAM (PDT) MEETING MINUTES for April 27, 2006**

PDT Members in Attendance: Donna Beck, Brian Dunn, David Elliott, Nick Fortey, Dale Lininger, Kelly Madding, Jerry Marmon, and Mike Quilty

Members Absent: Mark Gibson, Skip Knight, Dan Moore and Suzanne Myers

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

Staff: Martha Richards and Terry Kearns, URS; Debbie Timms, Chris Zelmer and DeLanie Cutsforth, ODOT; Kim Parducci, JRH; Pat Foley, RVCOG

1.0 Introductions/Approval of Minutes/Update

Terry Kearns, URS

Terry convened the meeting at 9 AM. He then asked if there were any changes or additions to the March 23, 2006 minutes. A change was requested: "Terry said that the White City group had ~~a significant problem~~ *concerns* with the Diamond Interchange at Highway 140." The minutes were approved with the above change.

2.0 Updates

Terry Kearns, URS

Terry gave an update on meetings held during the last month.

- **South Terminus Business/Property Owners meetings**
  Two meetings were held on April 19th for property/business owners from Poplar Drive to Delta Waters to update them on the proposed alternatives and to receive their comments and suggestions. One hundred forty six invitations were sent. Six people attended the first meeting (property/business owners located along Poplar/Bullock) and three attended the second meeting (property/business owners

located along Highway 62 from Poplar Drive to Delta Waters). Even so the staff did get good feedback. Representatives from Fred Meyers and Poplar Square did attend. The presentation focused on the Southern Terminus. One suggestion was to consider a frontage road that would extend from Fred Meyers to Delta Waters. The designers are looking at this suggestion. The also asked that the entire alignment be moved as close to the airport as possible. Meeting representatives expressed an interest in serving on the Access Management Subcommittee when it is formed. Because of the low attendance, the staff is looking at other ways to reach out to the business/property owners in this area.

- White City Planning Commission presentation
  On April 25th the staff gave a presentation to the White City Planning Commission. The presentation included a history of the project, the problems in the corridor, the wide range of alternatives that have been looked at, and how the alternatives were narrowed down. The commissioners did not voice their preferences on the alternatives. Primarily they were concerned about the location and size of the interchange at Highways 62 and 140. Two commissioners attended the CAC meeting.
- Multi-modal subcommittee meetings
  Martha Richards said that there have been five meetings. Last night the subcommittee tentatively finalized their recommendations. Martha handed out draft maps showing the committee's recommendations. The final recommendations will be ready for the CAC and PDT May meetings.
- Land Use subcommittee meetings
  Jerry Marmon said that the committee is looking at impacts to EFU and Forest Lands that are going to require an exception to Land Use Planning Goals. The task of the committee is to look at the proposed alternatives to see if there is a way to modify them so that they do not impact lands that will require a goal exception. This study has to be done in order to get a goal exception if needed. Jerry added that the subcommittee will probably be ready to present a report at the meeting next month.
- CAC meeting
  Terry said that the CAC made three recommendations for the PDT's consideration: 1) reduction of corridor alternatives, 2) further direction from the PDT on how to interface with Highways 62 and 140, and 3) North Terminus Options.

3.0 Review Corridor Alternatives

Terry Kearns, URS

Terry said that he would first review the Corridor Alternative's evaluation criteria and additional information before asking the PDT to take action on the CAC recommendations.

Terry showed the group an evaluation summary of alternatives that showed the ranking.

- Bypass Alternative met 19 of the criteria
- Existing Highway Alternative met 17 of the criteria
- Couplet Alternative met 7 of the criteria
- Texas Turnaround Alternative met 16 of the criteria

The PDT asked for additional information on the Texas Turnaround. The PDT wanted to know how many parcels that would be impacted contained buildings. A count was taken on the count of impacted buildings for the following alternatives. The count did not discern on what type of building was impacted.

- Texas Turnaround 65 buildings 176 partial lots
- Existing Highway 99 buildings 200 partial lots
- Bypass 60 buildings 100 partial lots

Another question asked by the PDT, "What is the comparative capacity of each of the build alternatives?" Kim Parducci did an analysis that shows:

Bypass Alternative meets the mobility standards in 2030 at both Vilas/Highway 62 and Delta Waters/Highway 62.

Existing Highway Alternative and the Texas Turnaround both meet mobility standards in 2030 at both Vilas/Highway 26 and Delta Waters/Highway 62.

Couplet Alternative exceeds the mobility standards at one of the intersections. Technically it does not meet the Purpose and Need.

Questions and comments:

Nick Fortey: When we say it doesn't meet the capacity ratio that does not meet the Purpose and Need. If we say that our Purpose and Need is to improve the safety and operations in the corridor, I am concerned that just because we have locations that do not meet a stated level of service, that doesn't meet the Purpose and Need. We have alternatives all of the time that do not meet achieve an overall level of service, but overall you can say it is an improvement over the current conditions. You wouldn't necessarily toss out that alternative.

Terry Kearns: Capacity is one element of the Purpose and Need. In one segment of the Couplet, capacity is not provided. It does not meet portions of the Purpose and Need.

Nick Fortey: I am trying to hinge the decision more on the fact that it ranks significantly lower in the Evaluation Criteria, rather than taking one point of potential failure.

The Evaluation Criteria was reviewed.

4.0 Couplet Recommendation

Terry Kearns, URS

Terry reminded the PDT that the CAC has made a recommendation to drop the Couplet and Texas Turnaround Alternatives. The Staff is recommending dismissal of the Couplet Alternative because of capacity issues and it does not meet the Purpose and Need.

Mike Quilty made a motion to drop the Couplet Alternative from further review. The motion was seconded by Donna Beck.

Discussion:
Mike Quilty: The Couplet has a lot of out of direction travel.
Nick Fortey: Nick asked to have the Evaluation Criteria reviewed.

A vote to drop the Couplet Alternative was unanimous. Terry said that two members of the PDT who were unable to attend this meeting sent emails supporting dropping the Couplet Alternative.

5.0 Design Options at Highway 62 and Highway 140 and Recommendation

Terry Kearns, URS

Terry said that the staff had asked for additional modeling analysis at Highway 62 and Highway 140 to determine if an interchange is needed. The analysis showed that an interchange is needed at this location for most alternatives. The traffic volume is at a point where an at-grade signalized intersection could not carry all of the traffic without failing. The White City Planning Commission had a lot of concern about this intersection because it essentially wipes out businesses in the area.

Terry went on to discuss two Northern Terminus options that have not been dropped even though the committees have shown no interest in pursuing them; 1) "Spaghetti" configuration and 2) option which ties in Highway 140 with the western alignment around White City. The CAC made a recommendation directing the staff to remove these two alternatives because they do not fix the problem. They also directed the design staff to look at other configurations for connecting Highway 62 and Highway 140 that minimizes its footprint.

David Elliot said the recommendation is out there to drop the two options and to look at other grade-separated intersections. "Does Highway 140 have to tie into Highway 62 if we are looking at a Bypass Alternative?" Terry answered no. But on some of the other alternatives it does.

Brian Dunn said that this is something that we have to look at. Terry said that the recommendation from the CAC is to look at other alternatives rather than the traditional diamond interchange. A discussion on moving the interchange to another location ensued.

Kelly Madding made a motion to use the CAC's recommendation to dismiss the two at-grade options and direct the staff to examine other alternatives and locations for the alternatives to come into White City. David Elliott seconded the motion. The PDT voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

6.0 Recommendation on North Terminus' East Alignment

Terry Kearns, URS

Terry displayed maps of the North Terminus Options. He then reviewed the Evaluation Criteria for each Option.

- East Bypass Option met 9 of the stated goals, partially met 10, did not meet 12
- Existing Highway Option met 20 of the stated goals, partially met 10, did not meet 1
- West Bypass Option met 16 of the stated goals, partially met 8, did not meet 7

The East Bypass Option by a large margin does not meet a lot of the stated goals and objectives. There is a staff recommendation to dismiss the East Alignment based on the ranking of the Evaluation Criteria. The CAC made a recommendation to drop the East Alignment.

Donna Beck made a motion to adopt the CAC recommendation to drop the East Alignment.

Discussion:

Nick Fortey asked if there was a template for future land use in this area. "Is there a Comprehensive Plan?" Kelly replied that this area too far outside of the UCB. There may be some zoning regulations. It is under County zoning.

It was noted that two White City Planning Commissioners attended the CAC meeting last night. They did not raise concerns about dropping the East Alternative.

Discussion points included out of direction travel and the fact the East Alternative would prohibit White City from expanding to the north and east. Terry said this alternative has significant residential and environmental justice impacts.

Kelly Madding seconded Donna's motion.

The PDT voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Terry said that the names of the existing Alternatives have been confusing for people to understand. The staff will be presenting suggestions for renaming the Alternative(s). This will be discussed at the next meeting.

Discussion on the original intent of the Project scope which ended before White City raised questions. Does the Purpose and Need have to be amended? What are the project boundaries (Avenue G/Highway 140)? What importance does the Highway 140 connection have in relation to the project?

7.0 Comfort Check

Nick Fortey: I am comfortable. I think we are moving forward. The only concern I have is, what is the scope in the northern end of the terminus? I am uncertain on what the process is for looking at the land use in that area.

Jerry Marmon: This is why we have engaged the White City Planning Commission.

Brian Dunn: The land use subcommittee is starting to gear up. Now that we have refined the alternatives, it will make it easier for the land use committee to take a look at these questions.

Nick Fortey: We may want to bring in Land Use experts to look at the issues in this area.

Kelly Madding: If you look at a map that shows the constraints around the UCB it would be clear that it is not a wide open area. On the west side you have Denman. There are a lot of constraints, vernal pools and the Agate Desert. There are not many variables.

Jerry Marmon: I am comfortable.

Kelly Madding: I like the motions that were made today in terms of the direction of honing down our alternatives.

David Elliott: I feel comfortable. I am happy that we moved on the three motions presented.

Mike Quilty: I am glad to see the way things went today. I am pleased with the fact that we are moving forward.

Donna Beck: I happy.

Dale Lininger: I think I am as comfortable as I can be since this is only my second meeting.

Brian Dunn: I'm good.

8.0 Next Steps

The next PDT meeting will be on May 25th. In June the PDT meeting will be on June 29th. Open Houses are planned in June. There will be one Open House in the south and one in the north.