

Chapter 7 Content

- 7.1 SAFETEA-LU Section 6002 Coordination
- 7.2 Consultation and Coordination with Other Public Agencies
- 7.3 Project Development Team and Citizens Advisory Committee
- 7.4 Project Subcommittees
- 7.5 Public Involvement
- 7.6 Comments and Responses to Comments

Comments and Coordination

Early and continuing coordination with the general public and appropriate public agencies is an essential part of the environmental process to determine the scope of environmental documentation, the level of analysis, potential impacts, proposed mitigation measures, and related environmental requirements. Agency consultation and public participation for this project have been accomplished through a variety of formal and informal methods, including: public and agency scoping meetings, CAC and PDT meetings, public open houses, a project website, online surveys, newsletters, media releases, focus group meetings and the public hearing held as advertised on the cover of this document. This chapter summarizes the results of efforts to fully identify, address, and resolve project-related issues through early and continuing coordination.

7.1 SAFETEA-LU Section 6002 Coordination

The coordination plan required from Section 6002 of the Safe Accountable Flexible Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) is included as Appendix L.

7.1.1 Cooperating and Participating Agency Status

The Notice of Intent was published in the Federal Register on November 3, 2005. On September 18, 2007, FHWA extended cooperating and participating agency invitations. Table 7-1 is the list of lead, cooperating and participating agencies for the OR 62 project, their roles and responsibilities.

Cooperating agency invitations were sent to USFWS, US Department of Veterans Affairs, the US Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), and National Marine Fisheries Service. The USFWS, US Department of Veterans Affairs, and Corps accepted invitations to be cooperating agencies. Participating agency invitations were sent to the City of Medford, Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde, the Confederated Tribes of the Siletz, the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development, Oregon Department of State Lands, US Environmental Protection Agency, Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), Jackson County, Jackson County Fire District 3, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW), Oregon Department of Parks and Recreation, and Oregon State Historic Preservation Office. FEMA, ODFW, DEQ, FAA, and Jackson County Fire District 3 accepted invitations to be participating agencies. FHWA and ODOT consulted with FAA to determine whether to consider FAA a participating or cooperating agency; it was FAA's decision to be a participating agency. Oregon SHPO responded to the participating agency invitation but did not accept participating agency status.

Table 7-1 Agency Roles and Responsibilities

Agency Name	Role	Other Project Role(s)	Responsibilities
Lead Agencies			
Federal Highway Administration	Lead Agency	CETAS PDT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage 6002 process • Provide opportunity for public involvement • Provide oversight of NEPA process and compliance • Make Section 106 and Section 4(f) decisions. • Make NEPA decisions
Oregon Department of Transportation	Co-Lead Agency	CETAS PDT CAC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage 6002 process in cooperation with FHWA • Prepare EIS • Prepare and review project plans and specifications • Provide opportunity for cooperating and participating agency involvement • Prepare documentation for environmental compliance (e.g. ESA, Section 404, Section 106, Section 4(f), Section 6(f), etc.)
Cooperating Agencies			
US Fish and Wildlife Services	Cooperating Agency	CETAS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ESA jurisdiction • Provide comments on listed species and wildlife impacts • Review Biological Assessment and complete Biological Opinion • Comment on Section 404 permit application
US Department of Veterans Affairs	Cooperating Agency	Not Applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation on project • Potential federal land transfer
US Army Corps of Engineers	Cooperating Agency	CETAS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 404 permit
Participating Agencies			
Federal Emergency Management Agency	Participating Agency	Not Applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review for floodplain and floodway impacts
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife	Participating Agency	CETAS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment to DSL and Corps on fill removal permits • Comment to USFWS, NMFS on Biological Opinions • Determine state fish passage requirements
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality	Participating Agency	CETAS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responsible for air quality • Monitor hazardous materials • Grants NPDES permits • Approve conceptual storm water mitigation plan
Federal Aviation Administration	Participating Agency	Not Applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure compliance with FAA NEPA and airport restrictions • Form 7460-1 Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration • Land Transfer • Approval of construction equipment in the Runway Protection Zone
Jackson County Fire District 3	Participating Agency	Not Applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review for potential response time delays • Review design/access issues for emergency vehicle access

7.1.2. Summary of SAFETEA-LU 6002 Coordination Points

On August 3, 2012, ODOT mailed to cooperating agencies a request for comment on the project's Purpose and Need Statement, range of the alternatives, and analysis methodologies. Comments were requested via email by August 17, 2012. The request was mailed to FHWA, ODOT, USFW, US Department of Veterans Affairs, the US Army Corps of Engineers, FEMA, ODFW, DEQ, FAA, and Jackson County Fire District 3.

The US Department of Veterans Affairs responded to this request, but had no comments on the materials sent.

7.2 Consultation and Coordination with Other Public Agencies

ODOT has consulted and coordinated with other public agencies that are not the project's cooperating and participating agencies. These interactions have taken place as needed to coordinate compliance with required permits and approvals.

7.2.1 Consultations with CETAS Members

CETAS consists of most of the primary state and federal permitting and regulatory agencies. CETAS includes the following organizations:

- **Federal:** Federal Highway Administration, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and National Marine Fisheries Service.
- **State:** Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Oregon State Historic Preservation Office, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, Oregon Department of State Lands, Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development, and Oregon Department of Transportation.

CETAS is scheduled to meet quarterly and serves as a working group of federal and state resource agencies that provide regulatory guidance and concurrence during major transportation project development. For ODOT projects, CETAS provides concurrence on four project milestones: Purpose and Need, Range of Alternatives, Evaluation Criteria, and the Preferred Alternative. ODOT received concurrence from CETAS on the first three milestones in August 2010. Concurrence from CETAS on the Preferred Alternative will be sought prior to publication of the project's FEIS.

At key points during the project development, ODOT staff presented project information to CETAS representatives. Following is a summary of those meetings.

- **March 2005:** The project's first presentation to CETAS occurred in March 2005. ODOT staff presented the draft Purpose and Need, draft Goals and Objectives, and a general project overview, including potential alternatives, known cultural and natural resources in the area, compatibility with applicable plans, and potential impacts. CETAS members were satisfied with the information presented and expressed general agreement with the materials presented. Since some members were familiar with the project and others were not it was suggested that a field visit to tour the project would be appropriate. A field visit was scheduled for July 2005.
- **July 2005:** CETAS representatives and ODOT staff toured various Region 3 project sites in July 2005, including the OR 62: I-5 to Dutton Road Project. The focus of the tour was on natural resources. They viewed the general alignment of the proposed bypass, traveled OR 62, and walked the area near the intersection of Dutton Road and OR 62. USFW staff stressed the need to first avoid vernal pools impacts if possible, if not, impacts needed to be minimized and mitigated. There seemed to be some consensus that the vernal

pools located near the North Terminus at Dutton Road were degraded by past activities. However it was stressed that vernal pools should be considered a design constraint. During the field trip they discussed potential mitigation strategies.

- **February 2006:** ODOT presented draft evaluation criteria to CETAS in February 2006. CETAS had few questions regarding the Evaluation Criteria, after a short discussion regarding some of the measures they seemed to be satisfied with the staff responses.
- **February 2007:** ODOT presented the draft range of alternatives to CETAS in February 2007. At that time, the range did not include Design Options B or C. CETAS members requested that ODOT develop a bypass alignment that would reduce impacts on vernal pools. In response, ODOT created Design Option B, which could reduce adverse impacts to vernal pools and minimize impacts to wetlands. However, as a trade-off, it could have higher business displacement impacts.
- **April 2008:** ODOT presented a project update to CETAS. Several items were presented. Preliminary findings regarding subsurface hydrology and potential hydrological connections between vernal pools and the effects on these connections from previous manmade obstructions (i.e. railroad alignments, roads and ditches) on hydrological connections were presented. Members directed ODOT to evaluate areas free of manmade obstructions and use a 250 ft. buffer to assess impacts to vernal pools. In areas where previous manmade obstructions were present the buffer would begin at the obstruction. CETAS recommended that this information be used in assessing impacts to vernal pools. ODOT also presented its findings on the recently completed wildflower studies. Woolly meadowfoam was found near the North Terminus and Desert lomatium was not found. The locations of the plants were mapped using GPS. ODOT described an alternative north terminus option, which is intended to reduce any potential land impacts to the VA Domiciliary which had previously expressed concerns about further right of way encroachment on their property. ODOT confirmed that this new north terminus option could further increase vernal pool impacts. Some members expressed concern about the potential impacts, but it was decided that they would reserve comments until after the DEIS was published.
- **August 2010:** ODOT presented revised Goals Objectives, Evaluation Criteria and Measures that were based on recent project revisions. CETAS members presented several suggestions for refining these. It was suggested that the stand alone Planning Goal should be incorporated into other Goals. They also suggested refinements to several measures that would provide the regulatory agencies with better information. These suggestions were incorporated into the presented information and circulated to members within two weeks. Members were satisfied with the revisions.

7.2.2 Additional Agency Coordination

Table 7-2 summarizes coordination that has occurred outside the CETAS process with CETAS members and non-members. Table 7-3 lists instances of coordination with agencies regarding ESA issues.

7.3 Project Development Team and Citizens Advisory Committee

Throughout project development, the PDT and CAC met regularly to review the project and make recommendations.

The PDT members were selected to represent government stakeholders as well as public interests. Table 7-4 lists current PDT members. The PDT included representatives from ODOT, the City of Medford, Jackson County, the RVMPO, Jackson County/Medford Chamber of Commerce, the freight and trucking industry, FHWA, the CAC, one citizens-at-large.

The FHWA representative, the CAC representative, and some ODOT representatives are not voting members.

During the alternatives analysis process, PDT meetings were held nearly every month, typically the day after the CAC meeting was held. The PDT met 25 times; three of these meetings were held jointly with the CAC.

Table 7-2 Consultations with Agencies That Are Not Cooperating or Participating Agencies

Agency Name	Coordination Topic
National Marine Fisheries Service	ESA
City of Medford	Traffic, Section 4(f)
Oregon Department of State Lands	404 Permit
Oregon State Historic Preservation Office	Section 106, Section 4(f)
Oregon Parks and Recreation Department	Section 6(f)
Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde	General project information has been provided
Confederated Tribes of Siletz	General project information has been provided
Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development	Statewide Planning Goal Exception
Jackson County	Statewide Planning Goal Exception

Table 7-3 ESA Consultation and Related Activities

Date	Description	Agencies
October 4, 2004	Agency scoping meeting for proposed project and site visit	ODOT FHWA Corps USFWS ODFW DSL
October 6, 2010	Pre-consultation meeting to discuss project vernal pool impacts, BA format, assessment methodology. First direction about forthcoming Programmatic Biological Opinion (PBO) from USFWS. The PBO is concerned vernal pool fairy shrimp (<i>Branchinecta lynchi</i> (fairy shrimp or VPFS)); Cook's Lomatium (<i>Lomatium cookii</i> (Lomatium)); and large-flowered woolly meadowfoam (<i>Limnanthes floccosa ssp. grandiflora</i> (meadowfoam)). Collectively, these species are referred to as the listed vernal pool species. The PBO is targeted for the vernal pool complexes of Jackson County, Oregon.	ODOT USFWS
December 21, 2010	Aquatic Resources BA provided to NMFS from FHWA	ODOT FHWA NMFS
January 25, 2011	USFWS issued Jackson County PBO for Vernal Pool Conservation Strategy (FWS Reference Number 13420-2011-F-0064) as described in October 6, 2010 entry above.	USFWS ODFW
December 22, 2011	Terrestrial BA provided to USFW from FHWA	ODOT FHWA
December 13-14, 2011	Pre-application meeting at ODOT Region 3 Tech Center for the JTA Phase of the OR 62: I-5 to Dutton Road Project and the Fern Valley Interchange Project.	ODOT ODFW USFWS Corps DSL

Table 7-4 PDT Members

Name	Representing
Chris Bucher	FHWA (non-voting member)
Al Densmore	City of Medford
Brian Dunn	ODOT Transportation Planning and Analysis Unit
David Elliot	Citizens at Large
Mark Gibson	Freight/Trucking
Vicki Guarino	RVCOG/RVMPO
Anna Henson	ODOT
Dale Lininger	Medford Chamber
Suzanne Myers	City of Medford
Mike Quilty	RVMPO
Paige Townsend	Rogue Valley Transportation District
John Vial	Jackson County
Chris Zelmer	ODOT
Dick Lever	ODOT (non-voting member)
Debbie Timms	ODOT (non-voting member)

The CAC is comprised of representatives of neighborhoods, businesses, and community interests. Table 7-5 lists current CAC members. The CAC serves as a communication link to the public, informing the PDT about public interests as well as informing the broader public about the project. At critical decision-making points, the CAC was presented with staff findings and public comments. The CAC provided recommendations during regular CAC meetings. The first CAC meeting was held in August 2004; the CAC met 25 times during the project development process. These meetings were typically held each month on the evening before the PDT meeting; three meetings were held jointly with the PDT. All CAC meetings were open to the public and meeting announcements were sent to everyone on the Interested Parties List. A public comment period was included during each meeting.

The Interested Parties List was developed from the following sources:

- responses to the CAC bulk mailing recruitment letter;
- responses to newspaper articles;
- responses to advertisements regarding the project;
- all attendees at meetings and/or open houses on the project who signed in;
- persons who telephoned either ODOT or RVCOG with a request to be put on the Interested Parties List; and
- all owners of land that would be acquired for one of the alternatives.

After each mailing to the Interested Parties List, the list was updated to reflect returns and changed addresses.

Table 7-5 CAC Members

Name	Representing	City
Bill Blair	Citizens-at-large/agriculture (retired)	Central Point
Becky Brooks	Citizens-at-large/Siskiyou Velo	Medford
Curt Burrill	Citizens-at-large/land development	Medford
David Christian	Citizens-at-large/social work (retired) VA SORCC	White City
Mike Gardiner	Citizens-at-large/freight	Ashland
Mike Malepsy	Citizens-at-large/land development	Shady Cove
Mike Montero	Citizens-at-large/land development	Medford
Bob Plankenhorn	Citizens-at-large/logging	White City
Don Riegger	Citizens-at-large/Human Services Manager (retired)	Medford
Wade Six	Citizens-at-large/real estate	Ashland
Nanci Watkins	Citizens-at-large/small business	Eagle Point

7.4 Project Subcommittees

At various stages of the project development, ODOT formed subcommittees to address specific issues in greater depth than what could have been achieved during CAC or PDT meetings. The subcommittees developed recommendations which they then presented to the CAC and PDT. ODOT invited any interested CAC and PDT members to join the subcommittees, and where appropriate, ODOT also invited government stakeholders and local advocates to join a subcommittee. Following are descriptions of the project subcommittees.

7.4.1 Land Use Subcommittee

The Land Use Subcommittee met seven times between March and June 2006 to discuss potential alternatives that would reduce land use impacts and evaluate the feasibility of alternatives that would not require a Statewide Planning Goal exception. Table 7-6 is a list of the Land Use Subcommittee members.

Table 7-6 Land Use Subcommittee

Name	Representing
Jerry Marmon	ODOT
John Renz	DLCD
Becky Brooks	Citizens-at-large/Siskiyou Velo
Curt Burrill	Citizens-at-large/land development
David Elliott	Citizens-at-large
Dan Moore	RVCOG
Kelly Madding	Jackson County
Mike Malepsy	Citizens-at-large/land development
Mike Montero	Citizens-at-large/land development
Suzanne Myers	City of Medford
Nanci Watkins	Citizens-at-large/Small Business Owner

7.4.2 Access Management Subcommittee

The Access Management Subcommittee met four times between May and July 2006 to discuss access management strategies for the alternatives that were under consideration at the time (the Plain Bypass, Bypass with a Split Diamond Interchange, Existing Highway Build, and Texas Turnaround). They developed recommendations for access control in different areas of the project vicinity, and did not address parcel-specific access issues. Table 7-7 lists members of the Access Management Subcommittee.

Table 7-7 Access Management Subcommittee

Name	Representing
Ron Hughes	ODOT
Curt Burrill	Citizens-at-large/land development
David Christian	Citizens-at-large
Alex Georgevitch	City of Medford
Mike Montero	Citizens-at-large/land development
Don Riegger	Citizens-at-large/Human Services Manager (retired)
Nanci Watkins	Citizens-at-large/small business

7.4.3 Multimodal Subcommittee

The Multimodal Subcommittee, also referred to as the Bike, Pedestrian, and Transit Subcommittee, met six times between February and November 2006 to develop multimodal strategies for the project and to evaluate the four alternatives that were under consideration at the time (the Plain Bypass, Bypass with a Split Diamond Interchange, Existing Highway Build, and Texas Turnaround) in terms of the alternatives' impacts to transit and non-motorized transportation. Table 7-8 lists members of the Multimodal Subcommittee.

Table 7-8 Multimodal Subcommittee

Name	Representing
Debbie Timms	ODOT
Craig Anderson	RVTD
Alex Georgevitch	City of Medford
Mike Gardiner	Citizens-at-large/freight
Don Riegger	Citizens-at-large/Human Services Manager (retired)
Robert Seibert	Citizens-at-large/transit user
Paige Townsend	RVTD

7.4.4 Transit Subcommittee

The Transit Subcommittee was formed following the formation of the multimodal subcommittee, to assist in the Transit Study, a more detailed study of potential transit-related improvements to the OR 62 corridor area. The Transit Subcommittee met four times between June and November 2011. The transit study also included a public open house held on July 13, 2011. The Transit Study was completed in June 2012 and the subcommittee's recommendations are included as Appendix M. Table 7-9 lists members of the Transit Subcommittee.

Table 7-9 Transit Subcommittee

Name	Representing
Al Densmore	City of Medford
Dick Leever	ODOT
Don Riegger	Citizens-at-large/Human Services Manager (retired)
Jenna Stanke	City of Medford Parks
Julie Brown	RVTD
Mike Kuntz	Jackson County
Paige Townsend	RVTD
Richard Arnold	ODOT Transportation Planning Analysis Unit
Vicki Guarino	RVCOG
Wade Six	Citizens-at-large/real estate

7.5 Public Involvement

ODOT has used and will continue to use many methods to share information with and gather input from the public. Those methods include: public meetings, the project website at http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/HWY/REGION3/hwy62_index.shtml, newsletters, newspaper inserts, Rogue Valley TV, focus group meetings, surveys, and project committees.

7.5.1 Public Scoping and Open House Meetings

Throughout the project, ODOT representatives have been available to meet with members of the public and to answer questions. Many people and business representatives have contacted ODOT either in person, by phone, via email, or in writing requesting information. ODOT representatives have responded to those requests with information, maps, and other materials as appropriate. Whenever possible, the interested party has been added to the project mailing list to ensure that they received future project updates and information. At key points during the project development, ODOT held open house meetings to inform the public and obtain public comment.

An Agency Scoping meeting was held on October 4, 2004 from 1:30 PM to 3:30 PM, at the Jackson County Public Works Auditorium, Mosquito Lane, White City Oregon. The meeting was attended by seven individuals representing USFW, DLCD, USCOE, and ODSL. Feedback that was provided included the need to avoid or minimize impacts to Vernal Pools and other wetland areas. There was some discussion about stream crossings and the potential for riparian habitat restoration or enhancement along some of the degraded streams (Lower Whetstone Creek, Lone Pine Creek, and Swanson Creek) within the project area. Agency representatives were told that these issues would be taken into consideration as the project develops. A field visit to the vernal pools located in the southern portions of the project area was provided for those agencies that were interested.

The Public Scoping meeting was held on October 4, 2004, from 5:30 to 7:30 PM at the Family Resource Center in White City. The meeting format was an open house style set up as a self-guided tour of stations addressing various aspects of the project. Members of the public were greeted at the door as they entered, asked to sign in, and given a feedback form to fill out. Seventeen people signed in. Each received a brief orientation on how the tour worked and then was directed to the first station.

White City has a Spanish speaking population that is larger than the County average, so, to facilitate the sharing of project information, a Spanish language translator was present during the duration of the whole meeting. The services of the translator were utilized by a small number of attendees.

Information provided at this meeting included the following materials:

- Copies of an aerial photographs of the corridor;
- A Summary of the known transportation problems in the corridor;
- Presentation boards detailing known environmental constraints in the corridor;
- Xerox copies of the presentation boards;
- Ability to provide suggestions for the range of alternatives; and
- Ability to provide written, mailed and oral comments.

There were two primary concerns expressed at this meeting. The first concern was a solution needed to be provided that did not further divide White City. The second concern was a general consensus that some solution was needed for the corridor's worsening mobility issues and that the project's northern terminus should extend north of White City. The information gathered at these meetings were incorporated into the designs alternatives developed for consideration in this DEIS.

By September 2006, the project team had preliminarily narrowed a very wide range of alternatives to four: the "Plain Bypass" (Option 1B interchange at the southern end, with a generalized bypass alignment to the north), bypass with a split diamond interchange (Option 1A interchange at the southern end, with a generalized bypass alignment to the north), the Texas Turnaround, and widening the existing highway corridor. A set of open houses were held to inform the public about the alternatives analysis process and to gain feedback from the public about the alternatives still under consideration.

In order to facilitate public attendance, one open house was held on September 18, 2006 at the Winema Girl Scout Auditorium in Medford and a second was held the following day at the Family Resource Center in White City. Meeting notices advertised the date and locations of both meetings. Forty-eight members of the public signed in at the two meetings, several additional attendees declined to sign in, and 12 people filled out comment sheets. Comments were also received later by mail or email.

Information provided at this meeting included the following materials:

- Copies of proposed corridor alignments;
- A copy of the Draft Purpose and Need Statement;
- A copy of the Project Goals, Objectives, and Evaluation and Measurement Criteria;
- Xerox copies of the presentation; and
- Ability to provide written and oral comments on the alternatives that were presented.

The primary concerns expressed at this meeting were over the proposed Texas Turnaround Alternative and the Existing Highway Build alternative. Of the opinions presented they were almost unanimous in their opposition to these two alternatives. Of the forty three comments submitted 42 supported the DI and SD Alternatives and opposed the Existing Highway and Texas Turnaround alternatives. One commenter expressed support of the Texas Turnaround alternative. The public concerns were taken into consideration and are reflected in the alternatives developed for consideration for this EIS.

7.5.2 Targeted Outreach to Specific Groups

During the project development, ODOT held meetings with specific groups as described below.

A meeting with White City business owners was held on January 18, 2006, at the ODOT facility in White City. Twenty people were mailed a meeting notice and were also contacted by telephone. The purpose of this meeting was to update White City business representatives on project development, to discuss the proposed alignments in the White City area, and to receive feedback from the attendees. Ten people attended the meeting. At the meeting, ODOT staff gave a presentation on the project background, development, and current status. Following the presentation was an open discussion. During the discussion, a number of attendees expressed concern about Avenue G; these comments included requests for better connectivity for Avenue G to facilitate freight movement as well as emergency vehicle access. There was also a suggestion for modifying the design of the proposed interchange that would provide access to OR 140. The design of the OR 140 Directional Interchange connection to OR 62 was adjusted slightly to the south to facilitate east and west bound traffic to OR 140.

On April 19, 2006, two meetings were held to focus on the Southern Terminus. The first meeting concentrated on the Bullock Road/Poplar Drive area and the second meeting was for the area along OR 62 from Poplar Drive to Delta Waters Road. These meetings were held at the ODOT facility in White City. One hundred fifteen letters were mailed to area businesses. While both meetings covered the project in general, the first meeting focused on impacts on businesses in the Bullock Road and Poplar Road area; this meeting was attended by nine business representatives. The second meeting focused on impacts on businesses from Poplar Drive to Delta Waters Road; this was attended by three business representatives.

Information provided at this meeting included the following materials:

- Copies of proposed corridor alignments;
- A copy of the Draft Purpose and Need Statement;
- A copy of the Project Goals, Objectives, Evaluation and Measurement Criteria;
- Xerox copies of the presentation; and
- Ability to provide written and oral comments on the alternatives that were presented.

The primary concerns expressed at this meeting were over the access management controls that would be implemented as part of the DI Alternative and how the businesses would adjust to the use of frontage and backage roads. Considerable concern was expressed over the effects of grade separating the Poplar and Bullock Drives under the proposed DI Alternative. Businesses along Poplar and Bullock Drives felt that this alternative would deprive them of many current customers. The public concerns were acknowledged and the DEIS commenting process was explained.

A third meeting to discuss the Southern Terminus with representatives from businesses in the south terminus area was held on June 29, 2006. The purpose of this meeting was to inform the business representatives about the project development, including proposed access management plans for each of the alternatives still under consideration (the bypass, the Texas Turnaround, and widening the existing highway), and to gain feedback. One hundred fifteen letters were sent and follow-up invitations were hand-delivered to businesses along OR 62 to ensure that all businesses were informed of the meeting. Nineteen people attended; they included business owners, property owners, and other interested parties. The materials provided at the April 19, 2006, meeting were provided at this meeting as well. The same concerns raised during the April 19, 2006, meeting were also raised during the June 29, 2006, meeting. The concerns were acknowledged and the DEIS commenting process was explained.

On December 21, 2006, a meeting was held in White City to discuss the project and receive feedback from business owners in the White City area. The meeting

focused on proposed alignments for the northern terminus (the segment from Gregory Road north) and the access implications of those alignments. Nineteen letters were mailed to businesses along Agate Road and all parties were also contacted by telephone. Fourteen people attended the meeting.

Information provided at this meeting included the following materials:

- maps of proposed corridor alignments and North Terminus Options;
- a copy of the Draft Purpose and Need Statement;
- a copy of the Project Goals, Objectives, Evaluation and Measurement Criteria;
- photocopies of the presentation; and
- a description of how to provide written and oral comments on the alternatives that were presented.

The primary concerns expressed at this meeting were about how the North Terminus Options would affect White City. Those attending were primarily quite supportive of the proposed North Terminus Options.

A meeting held on May 16, 2007, at the Jackson County Public Works Auditorium in White City which targeted business and property owners in the vicinity of Vilas Road. One hundred forty-six letters were mailed, and 52 people attended this meeting. The purpose of the meeting was to inform people about the project, to discuss the Vilas Road interchange design, and to obtain feedback. At the time, the Vilas Road interchange had not been fully designed, and ODOT engineers were interested in public opinions about potential designs and impacts. The meeting format was similar to the previous public meetings, with an informal presentation followed by an open discussion.

Information provided at this meeting included the following materials:

- maps of proposed corridor alignments and potential solutions for the Vilas Road Interchange;
- a copy of the Draft Purpose and Need Statement;
- a copy of the Project Goals, Objectives, Evaluation and Measurement Criteria;
- photocopies of the presentation; and
- a description of how to provide written and oral comments on the alternatives that were presented.

The primary concerns expressed at this meeting were over the access management controls that would be implemented as part of the build alternatives on Vilas Road. There was strong public support for the Single Point Urban Interchange (SPUI) as it provided the smallest project footprint while meeting the operational needs of the interchange. The public concerns were acknowledged and incorporated to the extent possible into the designs developed for consideration in this DEIS. The DEIS commenting process was also explained to the public.

A meeting with residents of the Justice Road and Peace Lane area was held a half-hour after the Vilas Road business/property owners meeting on May 16, 2007. Forty-one letters were mailed for this meeting, and twenty-two people attended. The purpose of the meeting was to inform people about the project, to discuss the Vilas Road interchange design, and to obtain feedback. This meeting was targeted at residents instead of businesses.

Information provided at this meeting included the following materials:

- proposed corridor alignments and detailed engineering diagrams of the area around Justice and Gregory Roads;
- the Draft Purpose and Need Statement;
- the Project Goals, Objectives, Evaluation and Measurement Criteria;
- photocopies of the presentation; and
- a description of how to provide written and oral comments on the alternatives that were presented.

Some of the issues raised at this meeting included the desire to retain a rural character for the area, concern about drainage and flooding, questions about right-of-way acquisition, potential noise impacts, and access to property. Some suggestions were made about Justice Road, and ODOT was able to incorporate public comments into the eventual design by removing the grade separation being considered at Justice Road, providing alternative access for the residents on Gregory Road. The individual raising the flooding and drainage question was informed of the project's requirement to show no net rise in the floodway.

7.5.3 Outreach to Environmental Justice Populations

Section 3.4.2.3 describes the location of EJ populations potentially impacted by the project and Section 3.4.2.4 states FHWA's policy regarding outreach to EJ populations. As Section 3.4.2.4 states, the following are elements of the project's overall public involvement program that meet FHWA's EJ policy on public outreach:

- To recruit representatives of EJ populations to the project's Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC), ODOT sent invitation letters to all 70 occupants of three apartment buildings in White City because of the high probability that residents included EJ populations.
- Two members of the CAC were knowledgeable of the needs of EJ populations. One member was a retired manager with Jackson County Social Services and the other was a retired social worker for the VA SORCC.
- Jason Elzy, Director of Development for the Jackson County Housing Authority, has joined the CAC as a voting member.
- Public notice of the October 4, 2004, public scoping meeting and September 18 and 19, 2006, open houses was published in the *Mail Tribune* in both English and Spanish.
- Spanish language interpreters were available at the project's October 4, 2004, public scoping meeting and September 18 and 19, 2006, open houses.
- The October 4, 2004, public scoping meeting and September 19, 2006, open house were held at the Family Resource Center in White City because White City has relatively high percentages of minority and low-income residents, which the Family Resource Center serves.
- In summer 2011, ODOT purchased an advertisement announcing open houses regarding possible transit components of the project in the local Hispanic newspaper *Compra & Vende* and the newspaper published ODOT's news release regarding the meetings.
- ODOT published notice of this DEIS in local media in both English and Spanish. This included a notice in the local Hispanic newspaper *Compra & Vende*, which was also sent a news release announcing publication of the DEIS and combined public hearing and open house.
- Notice of publication of the DEIS and the combined public hearing and open house has also been made through announcements posted at public centers and businesses that tend to be visited by people from EJ populations, such as local markets (including ethnic markets), the VA Hospital, churches, community centers, and community rooms at low-income apartment complexes. Local social service providers have also received notice of publication of this DEIS and the combined public hearing and open house.
- The executive summary of this EIS has been translated into Spanish. Translation of additional project documents will be made available, upon request.
- A Spanish translator will be available at the project's combined public hearing and open house.
- ODOT will anonymously survey the CAC members and attendees of the DEIS public hearing and open house to gather demographic data related to EJ populations. Responding to the survey will be voluntary.

-
- After a preferred alternative is selected and before the FEIS is published, ODOT will identify residences and businesses that could be displaced by the project. ODOT will conduct interviews of the residents and business owners and use the results of the interviews to refine the project's outreach to EJ populations.

7.5.4 Media

The project was publicized in press releases to all local media and through ads and articles in the *Mail Tribune* newspaper. Information on the project and alternatives being developed was also provided on ODOT's TV cable program, "Moving Ahead with ODOT," and the ODOT Moving Ahead newspaper insert. ODOT's Moving Ahead newspaper insert is in its 12th year of circulation and is a partnership with the *Mail Tribune* and *Ashland Daily Tidings*. When it is published, it is inserted directly into the daily newspapers reaching about 37,000 circulation. About 200 more copies are direct mailed to transportation stakeholders in Jackson and Josephine Counties. In the early to mid-part of the last decade, the frequency was six times per year due to the large number of construction projects in Jackson and Josephine Counties, such as the North and South Medford Interchange projects. Currently ODOT's Moving Ahead newspaper insert is published four times per year. There have been 22 instances of coverage of the project in ODOT's Moving Ahead newspaper insert or cable TV program, as listed below.

1. October 3, 2003, newspaper insert statement that project under development
2. September 3, 2004, cable TV program story on project
3. October 15, 2004, newspaper insert feature on CAC and the scoping open house
4. December 10, 2004, newspaper insert report on project goals
5. March 11, 2005, large newspaper insert providing maps on which readers were asked to draw and submit alternative routes
6. April 29, 2005, newspaper insert report that work on project continuing
7. March 17, 2006, newspaper insert mention of project in "News Briefs"
8. April 28, 2006, newspaper insert mention of project in "News Briefs"
9. June 2, 2006, newspaper insert mention of project in "News Briefs"
10. September 8, 2006, newspaper insert feature on upcoming project open house
11. October 27, 2006, newspaper insert report that project open house participants favored SD Alternative
12. December 8, 2006, newspaper insert report that alternatives narrowed to SD Alternative
13. February 23, 2007, newspaper insert report that alternatives narrowed
14. August 17, 2007, newspaper insert report that included graphic of SD Alternative
15. November 30, 2007, newspaper insert report that DEIS due in 2008
16. June 2009, newspaper insert report that project to receive \$100 million in funding
17. September 2009, newspaper insert report that 2013 set as construction target
18. November 2009, newspaper insert report that Jobs and Transportation Act directed \$100 million to project
19. April 2010 newspaper insert report, with graphic that Oregon 62 project moving forward
20. June 11, 2010, newspaper insert report describing project's multimodal features
21. June 3, 2011, newspaper insert report that a project alternative recommend
22. September 2011, newspaper insert report on project's multi-modal goal

Throughout project development, ODOT has maintained a project website at http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/HWY/REGION3/hwy62_index.shtml with current information about the project status as well as an archive of past meeting minutes, alternatives considered but dismissed, and other relevant project information. The website has been updated periodically with the latest news and results of technical studies. The website also includes contact information for ODOT project representatives.

7.6 Comments and Responses to Comments

All substantive comments on the DEIS that are received during the DEIS review period will be considered. Substantive comments are those comments that are related to the facts of the project, project environmental documents or studies. Project alternatives and proposed mitigation may be modified in response to comments received. The Final EIS will contain all comments received on the DEIS, as well as response to substantive comments. Comments will not be accepted beyond the close of the comment period.