Highway 62 Corridor Project

Date: November 18, 2004

From: Kathy Helmer, RVCOG

Re: **CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC) MEETING MINUTES for November 17th, 2004**

Members in Attendance: Bill Blair; Curt Burrill; David Christian; Mike Gardiner, Mike Malepsy; Mike Montero; Richard Moorman, Bob Plankenhorn; Susan Rachor, Don Riegger, Dale Shaddox; Wade Six; Nanci Watkins; and Paige West.

Members Absent: Becky Brooks

Location: Jackson County Auditorium, Mosquito Lane, White City

Guests: Five members of the public.

Staff Present: Debbie Timms, Gary Leaming, Jerry Marmon and Mike Arneson of ODOT; Jamie Snook and Terry Kearns of URS; Kim Parducci and Frank Stevens of JRH; John Morrison and Kathy Helmer of RVCOG.

1.0 Introductions/Approve Minutes

Chair Mike Montero convened the fourth meeting of the Highway 62 Corridor Project CAC at 6:00PM. He noted that this meeting would likely be the most important meeting in the while NEPA process, since the group was to consider Purpose and Need. This is a statement of the point of this whole 2-year process.

Regarding the minutes of the previous meeting, it was noted that Mike Gardiner had been present, not absent. The minutes were accepted, as corrected, by a unanimous vote.

2. 0 Review of the Traffic Problem Statement

Kim Parducci of JRH made a power point presentation on the Transportation Problem Statement (TPS), explaining what the TPS was and why one is needed. The TPS sets the groundwork for the entire project. In studying the Hwy 62 corridor, JRH has found that traffic volumes have increased by 5% per year since 1998. Numerous intersections are failing and certain segments exceed the statewide rate crash rate.

The corridor is special in that it does not get the chance to recover from peak hour traffic. Traffic volumes shoot up about 7 AM and remain high until about 8 PM.

Curt Burrill noted that White City was actually an Urban Unincorporated Rural Community and suggested that highway segments within its boundaries be classified as urban, rather than rural, for purposes of the study. This labeling may skew our understanding of the corridor. Kim said that she would look into this further.

Mike Gardiner asked why it was important for a highway to "recover"? Kim noted that queuing was continual at some corridor intersections, rather than just periodic. Terry said that slow and idling traffic has important air quality implications.

3.0 Discussion of Purpose and Need Statements

Terry Kearns of URS led the discussion with a power point presentation. He emphasized the importance of the development of the Purpose and Need Statement in as much as it defines the problem. You must define the problem you are trying to resolve, before you are able to come up with solutions.

The presentation covered available guidance on the statement content; how the statement serves as a decision-making tool; problems frequently encountered with Purpose and Need Statements; examples of statements from other highway projects; and, finally, a rough draft statement for the Highway 62 Corridor Project, which Terry developed to encourage discussion.

Mike asked Terry what the CAC's role was vis-à-vis the Purpose and Need Statement and Terry said that it was to provide recommendations and advice to the PDT.

Terry asked for comments on the draft Purpose and Need Statement. Dale Shaddox noted that the language regarding termini left open many options. Nancy Watkins said that the corridor would need to accommodate the incredible growth in Eagle Point. Wade asked what "reasonable and feasible alternatives" meant. Would terminating the project at Cory Road be seen as feasible? Terry responded that funding potential would be a factor.

Terry asked the group to think about the statement and send comments before the next meeting. John Morrison will send an email to everyone on the CAC, requesting their

comments/ideas for the Purpose and Need Statement. These comments will be compiled and discussed at the next meeting.

Mike Gardiner suggested that the statement should identify Ave. H as the northern terminus. Mike Malepsy asked if the project considered the social and economic benefits of decisions. The project would create a sense of community in White City if it went all the way through White City to the Dom.

Paige West noted that the sample statements in the meeting packet looked very similar. Referring back to the brainstorming about user needs in highway design that the CAC had done at a previous meeting, she said that there had been many pertaining to quality of life factors. She would like to see quality of life included in the statement. Terry said that that could be done or it would be included in the Goals and Objectives section. Jerry Marmon said that the Purpose statement defines the transportation problem. While several alternatives may meet the Purpose and Need Statement, then those alternatives need also to satisfy the Goals and Objectives. Goals and Objectives can also be weighted to give some more importance than others.

4.0 Introduction to Goals & Objectives Development

Terry Kearns touched briefly on how goals and objectives provide a context for evaluating alternatives. Examples of goals include: Provide for multi-modal transportation; Avoid impacts to endangered species. Objectives are measurable and specific.

It was decided that RVCOG should get meeting materials into the mail to CAC members by December 5th, since some people are leaving town early and cannot attend the December 15th meeting.

5.0 A Look Ahead to the Next Four Months

Terry Kearns shared what is planned for meeting content over the next few months. The project will first get a solid draft of the Purpose and Need Statement and the Goals and Objectives. Then the process of developing alternatives will begin. Developing alternatives will be an iterative and interesting process. The group will participate in a workshop to draw alternatives on maps.

6.0 Public Comment

Gordon Draper of Biomass asked Debbie Timms what she had meant about there being limited funds. Debbie said that said that some $38 million were earmarked for 2009, but that didn't mean that they weren't looking at other timelines and sources. Gordon said that the Highway 140 to I-5 connection was almost a done deal and it should be discussed. Gordon noted that Biomass was very concerned about Ave.G and trucks that take a left off of Highway 62 onto that avenue. He strongly suggested that the group decide that the Dom be the northern terminus.

8. CAC Comfort Check

John Morrison asked each of the participants to share their reactions to the meeting. Many said that they were comfortable with the meeting. Dale Shaddox asked about the Highway 140 route, as well as about the implications of Measure 37 for how the project would proceed. Debbie suggested that people were confusing the county's idea for a direct Hwy 140 to I-5 connection with the work the county is doing on the Kirkland-Blackwell freight route. Terry responded to the question about Measure 37, saying that no one is yet sure how that measure will affect our work.

9.0 Adjournment

Mike Montero adjourned the meeting at 8:00 PM.