Date: August 24, 2005

From: Pat Foley, RVCOG

Re: **CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC) MEETING MINUTES for August 24, 2005**

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

Members Absent: Mike Malepsy, Susan Rachor and Wade Six

Location: Jackson County Public Works Auditorium

Guests: 10 members of the public

Staff Present: Debbie Timms, Jerry Marmon, DeLanie Cutsforth, Sam Ayash, Brian Dunn and Gary Leaming of ODOT; Nick Forty of FHWA; Terry Kearns, Nadine Lee and John Cullerton 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 thirteenth meeting of the Highway 62 Corridor Project CAC at 6:00 PM. He then asked for approval of the July 27th minutes. The minutes were approved as written.

2. 0 Public Comment

Kathy Helmer, RVCOG

Kathy explained that the agenda had been changed to allow public input before the CAC proceeds with the regular agenda. This change allows members of the public who cannot stay for the meeting to give input. Kathy then asked if there were any members of the public who wished to make a comment at this time. There were no comments.

3.0 Evaluation Criteria

Terry Kearns, URS

Terry made the announcement that Jamie Snook has left URS. He then introduced John Cullerton who will be working on this project.

Terry then reviewed the night's agenda. The CAC would be asked to review the Evaluation Criteria matrix to ensure that all of the additions/corrections had been included as discussed at the last CAC meeting. The Purpose and Need would also be reviewed. Jim Hanks would lead the discussion about the modeling results for the 'Out-of –Corridor" alternatives. Terry explained that the modeling results were very technical in nature and asked the CAC to ask questions if they did not understand the information. If the CAC was comfortable doing so, they would be asked to make a recommendation to the PDT.

The CAC was provided a copy of the revised Evaluation Criteria matrix. Terry stated that the matrix could be refined over time as the alternatives were narrowed down. Terry then asked the CAC if they wanted to add or change any of the evaluation criteria. There were no additions or changes.

4.0 Review of Purpose and Need

Terry Kearns, URS

Terry reviewed the Purpose and Need statement. He reminded the CAC that the Purpose and Need statement was the first filter for the alternatives. If an alternative does not meet the Purpose and Need it will be dropped.

5.0 Modeling Results

Jim Hanks, JRH

Referring to the Traffic Technical Memorandum given to the CAC, Jim gave an overview of the process and results of modeling what he termed the regional and I-5 alternatives and the four northern termini alternatives. The regional alternatives include existing local roads that have been, or will be improved. The I-5 alternatives suggest rerouting I-5.

Jim explained that according to the modeling of the no-build alternative there would be substantial congestion on Highway 62 by the year 2030. In order to reduce congestion there are three ways to accomplish this goal: 1) change land uses, 2) increase the capacity of the existing corridor and

3) provide alternative routes outside the corridor to divert traffic from Highway 62. The modeling results being reviewed at this meeting concentrated on determining if alternative routes outside the corridor would divert enough traffic off of Highway 62 to meet project needs.

Two maps of each modeled scenario and an accompanying alternative evaluation matrix were given to the CAC. The first map compared the projected volumes in the year 2030 to traffic conditions in 2002. The second map compared the year 2030 no-build traffic with the year 2030 PM peak-hour traffic.

Jim Hanks presented modeling results for: 1) Scenario 3000 – Public Alternative 3A & 3B (Highway 140), 2) Scenario 3001 – Public Alternative 1, Partial Interchange at Table Rock Road & I-5 that includes a new connection between White City and Table Rock Road, 3) Scenario 3002 – Alignment Concept C-2-10 Parts A & B, Highway 140 extension, I-5 with connections to Table Rock Road and Foothill, 4) Scenario 3003 – Alignment Concept C2-10, Alternative End 2 connects bypass route to North Medford Interchange and connects existing Highway 62 to Biddle Road and, 5) Scenario 3004 – Newspaper Alternative 7, parts A & B, I-5 Bypass. With each scenario, Jim explained the modeling results and how the alternatives related to the Purpose and Need Statement for the project.

During the presentation many questions were asked regarding the meaning and assumptions of data shown on the maps.

At the conclusion of his presentation Jim recommended that all of the above scenarios (alternatives), be dropped from further consideration because they do not meet the Purpose and Need Statement, per modeling results.

Discussion:

Dale Shaddox stated that he would support this recommendation but felt that reducing traffic volumes was not the only goal of this project. Other goals had not been considered in the analysis.

Kathy Helmer suggested that the members of the public be given a chance to comment. After public comment, CAC members would be given the opportunity to express their thoughts on the materials presented.

Public Comment

Kathy Helmer, RVCOG

Gordon Draper	Gordon reviewed the process since the alternatives were first drawn. In the beginning, it seemed as if the Haul Road might be the alternative that would be the solution. Looking at the alternatives presented tonight, he thought that they showed that people did not live in and commute from Eagle Point, Shady Cove or further north.
Terry Walther:	Terry suggested that in order to get traffic from one end of the valley to the other there should be six lanes on I-5. This would move traffic faster and help reduce the smog problem.

Earl Woods: Earl felt there was a need for a bypass. He cited the growth going on now in Eagle Point and Shady Cove and said that more will happen in the future.

7.0 Recommendation for PDT

Jim Hanks, JRH

Kathy asked the CAC for their feedback on the recommendation and the materials presented tonight.

Bob Plankenhorn: Bob liked the idea of a bypass. The bypass would get the traffic moving. What had been presented was not going to solve the problem

Dale Shaddox: He introduced a motion that Alternatives 3000 thru 3004 be withdrawn from further consideration. David Christian seconded the motion.

A poll on the motion:

Bob Plankenhorn: Bob supported the motion.

Bill Blair: Bill supported it for now. He did not feel comfortable but felt that the CAC did not have too many alternatives.

Dale Shaddox: For clarification, Dale reviewed the motion in place. He said that the motion had been intended to move the process forward and to eliminate the **total** concepts that had been presented. He wanted to reserve the opportunity to revisit some components of the alternatives. It was agreed upon that the motion was to eliminate the alternatives as complete concepts.

Curt Burrill: Curt supported keeping the alternatives on the table because only four alternatives had been presented. He didn't see any reason to throw them out <u>at this point.</u>

Don Riegger: Don did not feel that these alternatives met the Purpose and Need Statement. He was in favor of eliminating the "out of corridor" alternatives.

Becky Brooks: Becky did not support dropping these alternatives at this time. She wanted more time to fully understand the material presented.

Mike Montero: Mike said he wanted to see all of the alternatives. He said he had to make a leap of faith in assuming that there would be better alternatives presented in the future. He respectfully declined making a recommendation to eliminate these alternatives.

Paige West:	Paige did not want to drop these alternatives quite yet. Components of different alternatives could still be mixed and matched. She also wanted time to become comfortable with the information presented.
David Christian:	David felt that the CAC needed to see the other alternatives.
Mike Gardiner:	Mike was in favor of eliminating alternatives. He felt that the professionals had laid out the alternatives that least fit into our purpose and need. Mike thought that alternatives should be eliminated.
Richard Moorman:	Richard was opposed to dropping these alternatives. They need to be massaged and looked at from a different perspective.
Nanci Watkins:	Nanci did not feel the proposed alternatives met our Purpose and Need. She would like more time to study the information presented.
Dale Shaddox:	Dale said that considering all of the previous comments he wanted to withdraw the motion until everyone was comfortable with the process. David Christian seconded the motion. The motion was withdrawn.

Mike Montero summed up the comments made by the CAC. The recommendation that is to be made at the PDT meeting is:

The CAC has decided to not recommend dropping the regional/I-5 alternatives. Some of the CAC members would like more time to review the materials so that they have a true understanding of the alternatives. Several members would like to see all alternatives before making recommendations. The CAC agreed as a whole to wait and see the additional alternatives before making a recommendation to the PDT to drop alternatives.

Jim Hanks went on to explain how the in-corridor alternatives would be modeled and how that modeling would be different than the alternatives presented at this meeting. For the in-corridor alternatives, a preliminary design would have to be completed. This would have to include interchanges, signals, number of lanes, etc. This process would be more time consuming. Jim Hanks told the CAC that the modeling for the in-corridor alternatives would not show reduced traffic volumes. It will show increased capacity. This is the big difference between the two types of modeling. The modeling for the “in corridor” alternatives will be ready for review at the October meeting.

Jim offered to have one-on-one sessions with individual CAC members to answer any questions. He said Kathy Helmer would arrange such sessions upon request.

8.0 Next Steps

Terry Kearns, URS

Terry said they needed to find a better way to present technical information. The team would work on preparing material that was easier to understand.

At the next meeting a representative from the airport will be in attendance. The airport is an important constraint at the south end of the project. The group would also be discussing other constraints to the south.

As mentioned before, "in-corridor" alternatives will be presented to the CAC in October. That meeting will be longer. The CAC will be notified in advance of the time.

Terry emphasized that the CAC will not be rushed in making recommendations. The decisions they make are too important

Nanci Watkins said the maps presented tonight were confusing because they lacked street names. She asked that in the future there be some way of identifying the streets, either with an overlay or a separate reference.

Kathy Helmer asked the CAC to email her any ideas on how to better present information in the future.

The next CAC meeting will be on September 28th at the Jackson County Public Works Auditorium. The meeting was adjourned at 8:20 p.m.