



Highway 62 Corridor Project

Date: February 2010
From: Sue Casavan, RVCOG
Re: **PROJECT DEVELOPMENT TEAM (PDT) / CITIZEN
ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC) JOINT MEETING MINUTES
for February 17, 2010**

CAC Members in Attendance: Mike Malepsy, Susan Rachor, Becky Brooks, Richard Moorman, Mike Montero, Mike Gardiner, Curt Burrill, Wade Six, Don Riegger

CAC Members Absent: Bill Blair, Nanci Watkins, Paige Townsend, David Christian, Bob Plankenhorn

PDT Members in Attendance: John Vial, Brian Dunn, Vicki Guarino, Al Densmore, Anna Henson, Chris Zelmer, Dale Lininger

PDT Members Absent: Mike Quilty, Mark Gibson, Suzanne Myers, David Elliott

Location: Jackson County Public Works Auditorium, White City, Oregon

Guests: 55 members of the public (signed-in)

Staff Present: Tim Fletcher, Art Anderson, Dick Leever, Debbie Timms, Lisa Cortes, and Gary Leaming of ODOT; Pat Foley and Sue Casavan of RVCOG

1.0 Review Agenda and Approval of Minutes

Pat Foley, RVCOG

Pat F. convened the meeting of the Highway 62 Corridor Project at 6:05 p.m. Committee began with introductions. John V. noted that County Commissioner C.W. Smith was present in the audience. She asked committee members if there were any additions or corrections to the December 16, 2009 meeting minutes.

On a motion by John V. and seconded by Wade S. the committee unanimously approved the December minutes as presented.

2.0 Review Agenda / Meeting Objectives

Art Anderson, ODOT

Art A. said at the last meeting members discussed several alternatives and narrowed the selection down to three alternatives 2A, 2B, and 2C (Haul Road). He added that tonight there will be further review and discussion of the three alternatives and the ultimate goal will be a committee recommendation on which alternative the members would like to support.

3.0 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Update

Anna Henson, ODOT

Anna H. showed a map of the full corridor build out that has been studied and said the alignment went from I-5 out to Dutton Road. She explained that there were two options at the south end called the Split Diamond and Plain Bypass and moving out onto the Medco Haul Road behind Sportsman's Warehouse it will come out past Vilas Road and break out into three different options ending in an interchange at Corey and Agate. The alignment will then go up and around with two options behind the VA Domiciliary. She noted that all options were being studied in the environmental document and that Option 2C (Medco Haul Road) will be added into that study. The draft document will be published late summer or early fall of this year. She reminded members that once the document was published there will be a public comment period and open house. The teams will reconvene to get a recommended alternative and forward that recommendation to Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and get a Record of Decision (ROD) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process will be finished. She showed a map of the three alignment options.

Mike Montero commented that a certain analysis on the alternatives must be done and he asked if it was correct that to be consistent with the NEPA process any decision made tonight will make all alternatives subject to that analysis also and Anna H. replied that yes that was correct.

4.0 Review of Questions from Previous Meeting

Art Anderson and Chris Zelmer, ODOT

Art A. said there were questions raised at the last meeting and there will be answers to six of those questions throughout the meeting.

1) How do we avoid impacting the existing floodplain?

Chris Z. presented a map showing floodplains and drainage basins throughout the entire corridor acknowledging that recent concerns have been raised about the Swanson Creek area. It is a very wide 100-yr floodplain, roughly about 1800-1900 feet wide where the Phase 2 will cross. He noted that the lines on the floodplain map were county-based and come from Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) by approximate methods with a best guess of location. He said ODOT will do an on-the-ground topographical survey and produce a hydraulic model and set the 100-year flood boundary. Further into the design process, Chris Z. said ODOT will have to

figure out how to span that portion of the 100-year floodplain. He said staff has gone out and looked at the culverts and they would most likely be upsizing the culverts and providing fish passage so there will be a much greater conveyance than is currently there. He said there was not a definite design as of yet but as the process continues ODOT will figure out what needs to be done to avoid raising the 100-year water surface elevation for that area. He added that ODOT will need to get a no-rise certification and noted that it is allowed by FEMA and the county to allow a one foot rise in the 100-year water surface elevation but ODOT will not go in that direction. He informed the committee that ODOT will not make it any worse than it is today, and in fact, it will probably be an improvement over current conditions.

Wade S. asked for more explanation as to what 'no-rise' meant and Chris Z. said that whatever the base flood elevation is now ODOT will not be increasing it any more, will not be any worse than it is today.

Ron Brion asked how it was possible with 1800 feet wide and a one foot floodplain that construction can have zero impact and Chris Z. responded that he had no definite answer today but there were many options to balance out the impacts and as meetings progress updates will be provided.

Art A. further explained that ODOT was required to get a no-rise certification which means that if anything is built near the waterway they have to show FEMA and whatever jurisdiction they are in that there will be a no-rise which means no more than a foot rise. He added that if it goes over a foot ODOT will be required to mitigate and he briefly discussed various mitigation measures. He emphasized that ODOT cannot move forward unless they prove to FEMA and the county that they are within the no-rise certification.

Wade S. said that one thing the committee has heard is that a foot is still a problem and he thought what people would want to hear is that in no way will they be adversely impacted regardless of what is built. Art A. stated that no-rise for ODOT is zero rise.

2) What are the v/c ratios at major intersections?

Chris Z. showed maps with the following:

- No Build: 2030 Volumes and v/c
- Phase 2: 2030 Volumes and v/c

He explained the standard ODOT was trying to achieve was (.8). He informed the committee that Poplar and Delta Waters will improve once the bypass is built. He added that the travel time with the bypass constructed will be 6.5 minutes and currently it is 14 minutes, the bypass will cut the time in half.

John V. asked why the No-Build showed the Poplar intersection operating better than the bypass and Chris Z. explained that with the bypass constructed it makes the corridor more attractive to users, people that used to take alternate routes are now taking the bypass therefore increasing the volumes.

5.0 Options for Segment 2

Tim Fletcher, ODOT

Tim F. presented a zoning map with the three different alignments. He explained the north terminus configuration and access for all three options.

Option 2A

Tim F. presented a map of Option 2A and discussed an options matrix comparison chart to evaluate the options. He explained that the difference between the high and low cost for the options was determined by a 20% margin added to the base rate to cover inflationary cost increases.

Mike Malepsy said he did not see any acknowledgment of the light industrial taking and Tim F. responded that in 2A there were no takes and explained that it was the option that was in the middle of the zoning map.

Option 2B

Tim F. presented a map of Option 2B and said that this was the option that passed through the light industrial area that Mike Malepsy referred to. He showed the matrix comparison chart. He noted that the cost was higher due to purchase of industrial property for right of way.

Option 2C

Tim F. presented a map of Option 2C and discussed the matrix comparison chart. He said this was the option that followed the Haul Road.

Al D. asked if there were impacts that were more serious from a project viability standpoint and Anna H. reminded members that ODOT will need to go back to the federal regulatory agencies with Option 2C and show them the impacts and they will provide input but she felt that the options were very close with regard to impacts. Tim F. said that ODOT measures all the areas and puts it into a report and through the review process of the draft document they receive comment from the agencies. He added that will be where some of the guidance comes from in determining what the final decision will be.

Mike Montero mentioned the ability to access the wetlands mitigation bank and Tim F. agreed that could help all the alternative options.

John V. asked Tim F. if he felt all three alternatives were viable and Tim F. responded that with the information ODOT currently had he felt comfortable that they are all three viable alternatives. Art A. noted with the caveat that 2B has much higher costs and people impact.

Man from audience asked if any of the options have taken into account what they consider to be secondary impacts where putting a facility in one place it will drain in another place. Tim F. responded that at this point ODOT has not looked into the secondary impacts.

John V. asked if the access impacts for the alternatives were all the same where on the east side of the highway it looked like all the properties take access from a frontage road except the two properties to the very north between Gramercy and Gregory and he asked if those were limited to right in / right out. Chris Z. said those properties will have access off of the re-aligned Crater Lake Avenue and have no access off the highway. John V. commented that the two properties on the west side of the highway have full movement so when ODOT is done no one is limited to a right in / right out. Chris Z. said that was correct.

Comparison of Segment 2 Options	Option 2A	Option 2B	Option 2C
Exclusive Farm Use impacts (acres)	17.0	16.0	18.4
Open Space Reserve impacts (acres)	16.4	11.5	16.9
Separated EFU Ownerships (#)	1	1	2
Separated OSR Ownerships (#)	2	2	2
Goal Exception Required?	Yes	Yes	Yes
Full Property Takes	6	6	7
Access Changes	12	12	12
Partial Takes	22	25	19
Displaced Businesses (answer to question #3)	2	12	2
Displaced Residences (answer to question #3)	4	3	6
Cost (\$ million)	118-141	132-158	117-141
v/c	0.86	0.86	0.86
Number of Stream Crossing	6	6	6
Acres of Riparian Habitat Impacted	5.5	5.1	4.9
Acres of mound/vernal pool complex habitat impacted*	13.6	7.6	11.7
Potential to impact ESA plant species	High	Low	High
Acres of low quality wetlands impacted	14.54	14.01	14.78
Acres of high quality wetlands impacted	0.50	0.11	1.01

*No impacts to USFWS-classified vernal pool critical habitat.

5.1 Answer to Question #4: What does a connection to Hwy 140 look like and what are the impacts?

Art A. presented Hwy 140 alignment option and said he thought cost would be the biggest issue, \$30 million on top of the \$20 million short and the region would be looking at \$50 million. He discussed the following items:

Cost: \$144-173 approx 30 million more than 2A or 2C alternatives

Access Impacts – no access to the Big R and the development he pointed out on map, dropping down a huge intersection in the midst of WC, also adds to the cost, staff recommends that we do not proceed in this direction mostly due to the costs

Environmental Issues:

- 4(f) Denman Wildlife Area not sure about the issues there is a road that goes thru it that might be possible to use
- Vernal pool critical habitat, big issue with the regulators

Pedestrian movement

Mike Malepsy pointed out that the impact on the businesses in White City was devastating and not acceptable.

Curt B. asked what the gain would be to bring it to Hwy 140. Art A. responded that it would be built farther north and with that you might get more people who would use it in White City. He added that a lot of truck traffic gets off from Hwy 140 travels up to Vilas and takes a right. Wade S. asked if the truck traffic was local truck traffic or heading to I-5 and Art A. responded that trucks were predominantly heading to I-5.

Mike Montero concurred with the comments of Mike Malepsy comments and noted that the committee was real sensitive of impacts to existing businesses and he felt it was equally unacceptable.

6.0 Public Comment

Pat Foley, RVCOG

Pat F. asked that comments be limited to three minutes.

Morris Saltekoff: He apologized to members for saying last meeting that they were all insane for doing this and he understood that this money needed to be spent to bring jobs into the county. He thought there would be no place for traffic to go if all of it was put into the north terminus of Medford. He said there was an accident on the viaduct a couple weeks ago that blocked the freeway for hours, the trucks use 27 gallons fuel per hour with hundreds of trucks sitting with no place to go. He said that ODOT should seriously think about putting in a southern bypass from Phoenix to Central Point out Vilas Road, Foothill, and pick up at McAndrews Road. He thought that would get rid of the traffic and would not affect the businesses that are there. He felt that in regard to the clay soils, when it is pushed down in one area it will rise in another, and is the nature of clay.

Morreale: He said he has been coming to these meetings for 16 years and living in the same place on the Old Haul Road. He added that when ODOT put that first map up today and throwing the 2C Option back in there which has been thrown out four separate times makes absolutely no sense. He emphasized that the option has been looked at and analyzed and there are serious flooding issues. He lives right in the middle of the flood impact zone and believes that ODOT has good intentions but right now when it floods their front doors are less than 12 inches away from the water. He felt if a mistake was made by an inch it would destroy a lot of their homes.

Ron Brion: He thanked ODOT for finally getting around to the answer of what they are trying to do about the flooding. He said the map shows the 100-year floodplain with its impressive wide path and it has been insinuated by the county for years that they want to find a way to improve that and ODOT is trying to push for zero impact and it is impossible to push clay down and not have it come up somewhere else. He commented that if a person has never had 16-18 inches of water running through their property they have no business saying that it can be controlled, it cannot happen. His biggest concern was about building the south end first, the north end second and then in the middle. He wondered why hundreds of millions of dollars will be spent to build the second end and maybe never get to the center. He commented that no one knows for certain if an impact statement can be obtained and prove that the lowest part of the valley will not be impacted. He said ODOT cannot find a way to control the flooding.

Jim Bennett: He owns property which includes a hotel where the interchange is proposed for White City and he was totally opposed to it. He said it will destroy everything in there and all the jobs that go with it.

Kent Gutches: He owns property on the Haul Road and he didn't really know how the whole floodplain would change from one plan to another if a structure was built. He noted that the ground under the railroad tracks had already been interrupted and believed some of the wetlands along the ditches of the existing railroad tracks. He said Option 2A and 2B go through a lot of pieces of property and cut them in sections. He did not like either option as they cut his property in half and to get to the biggest section of his property he would have to drive all the way around. He said if ODOT decides to go through his property he would like to be completely bought out so he could go somewhere else. He hopes the Haul Road alignment will be chosen being a much straighter alignment and borders property and does not go through the center. He supported the Haul Road option.

Mark Inman: 1021 Justice Road, come to the realization that this road will go through, we are in favor of the 2C option down the Haul Road, I would like to speak also for my neighbors Craig Morrison 1011 Justice Road and Cheryl Boone at 1031 Justice Road we believe that by cutting our property behind and taking portions of our fields would significantly impact the value of our property. In favor of the Haul Road and possibly being bought out in the future with that being said with the economy being the way it is will talk to odot and the county if that option is selected we would be ready as soon as possible to enter into negotiations for a fair value for our property.

Ted Dole: One of his concerns was that there is a \$20 million shortfall to go to Corey Road and with Options 2A and 2B still on the table it could happen that if the money was not there it could be decided to drop the alignment down through his property. He was concerned that it would be taken out of the committee's hands at that point even if members wanted it to terminate at Corey Road. He would encourage the 2C option and figure out how to get it done to Corey Road. He felt at the last meeting that the Haul Road was the unanimous option and felt ODOT should figure out how to make that work.

Phil Scoles, Wetlands Consultant: He asked to view a slide of Option 2A. He said he has taken time to walk the alignment and one of the issues was quality wetlands. He explained that the

regulatory process ODOT will have to go through to get approval has to also establish that they are choosing an option that is the environmentally preferable solution and in that process it does not mean they are impacting the least amount it is the whole package. He added that the area with the highest amount of quality wetlands is 2A and 2B which curves to the east and connects up to Corey Road and goes right through the biggest complex of vernal pools in the entire alignment. He questioned who is using what definition of high quality in that situation referred to on the options matrix. He noted that the existing Haul Road right now is like a big long regional dike and there are just a couple places through that dike where there are culverts. He added that one advantage of building Haul Road alignment is that it is essentially taking a dam and doubling or tripling the width of it but not creating another dam that would run parallel to it and it is not likely to be increasing flood impacts by essentially widening the width of that dam. He explained that there will be an opportunity to address environmental damages that occurred when the Haul Road was first built with undersized culverts. More culverts could be put in and help to alleviate flood problems there. He agreed that the floodplain map did not clearly show an accurate picture because it shows the width of the floodplain being somewhat uniform across the Haul Road. He felt this could be a new opportunity by essentially getting a win/win solution by putting the Haul Road and the bypass at the same location. He added that the endangered plants piece needed accurate and updated data. He emphasized that all options need to be evaluated for secondary impacts with the Haul Road and bypass separated.

Stan Alexander: He said he would anticipate that in building something like this ODOT would look at flood type issues along with the construction and Art A. said that was addressed earlier. Stan A. asked what the anticipated time period to get to Vilas Road was and was that going to be the first phase. Art A. responded that the idea is to split the design, up to Vilas and then from Vilas on. Stan A. asked what the earliest potential date would be for the connection to Vilas Road and Art A. said that ODOT is planning for 2013 construction, full build out 2-3 years after depending on overlap of the north and south portions of construction.

David Young: He said he has not heard any discussion of the safety of the design and what will be the likelihood of increasing accidents with the options. He asked how you look at the safety of the design and should it not be considered here. He thought that the impacts to people should be considered and be listed on the option comparison matrix.

He was concerned that when asked what was meant by wetlands impact there was not anyone that could answer. He added that there was a wetlands engineer in the audience who said it was the least impact going down the Haul Road, the highest value wetlands are the 2A and the 2B and when you construct through 2A and 2B you will have further long-term hydrology damage than the rest of the vernal pools that are there. He said this was not shown on the comparison and he thought these were three significant areas that should be included in the comparison.

7.0 CAC / PDT Questions

Art Anderson, ODOT

Commissioner C.W. Smith said that he and John V. both had concerns that there may be a bit of an overstatement on the 2C wetlands issue on the numbers and they would like to make sure that the issue was vetted fairly well and there is more clarity. He felt this needed to be clearly

delineated. Art A. asked if he was saying too high or too low and C.W. Smith said too high on the quality wetlands options comparison. There were no further questions from members.

8.0 CAC / PDT Comfort Check

Art Anderson, ODOT

Art A. reported that there will be one more meeting to discuss items that he will explain under the next steps that all members need to be in agreement on. He asked members to respond as to how they were leaning.

Wade S. said he would like to call for a vote to get rid of the Hwy 140 connection. Art A. called for the vote.

Vote on Hwy 140 – Do members support continuing to look at the Hwy 140 connection?

Don R. - No

Richard M. – Yes

Dale L. – Disappointed in the results but will have to say no.

John V. – No

Vicki G. – No

Becky B. – No

Brian D. – No

Susan R. – No

Anna H. – No

Mike Montero – No

Chris Z. – No

Mike G. – No

Al D. – No

Mike Malepsy – No

Curt B. – No

Wade S. – No

Which alternative do members prefer 2A, 2B or 2C?

Wade S. – For 2A and 2B he did not like the idea of segmenting properties, it reduces the utility of the land and the economic benefit that could be derived from it. He said he knew that they were listed as partial takes but he would encourage ODOT to re-evaluate how they really see those. At this point he leans toward Option 2C.

Curt B. – Lean toward 2C option. He liked the existing Medco Haul right of way for the potential flooding issues, keeping largest parcels intact, and it will not be going through some of the high quality wetlands. He noted that he was disappointed that for all the many years the region has been talking about wetland issues that there has not been some type of delineation to understand exactly where these wetlands are.

Mike Malepsy – He also liked 2C with the least impact on people and plants. He really appreciated the input of Phil Scoles.

Al D. – He agreed with what had been stated about 2C in terms of design for reasons already indicated. He wanted to make it clear that he represented the City of Medford on this committee. He said they view this as what is the best possible design and project but in the next steps there are a number of issues included that the city will need to be involved in for the overall project concept including costs and other impacts. He emphasized that there are still significant issues that needed to be discussed.

Mike G. – 2C for most of the reasons already stated.

Chris Z. – 2C keeps more properties intact, geometry is straighter.

Mike Montero – He liked 2C and said when thinking about projects like this there will be impacts and members recognize that some impacts can be mitigated more easily than others. He believes there are mitigation strategies for the wetlands, for the flooding and impacts to businesses but people in these tough economic times are not so easily mitigated.

Anna H. – She liked 2C. She thought there were not huge environmental differences between 2A and 2C but she liked the cleaner lines of 2C. One thing she wanted to bring to the team's attention is that these options have not run through the analysis process which is the NEPA process. As part of the full build out they will be and when the committee comes back together to identify a preferred alternative to Federal Highway Administration for building a full build out members need to keep in mind that they are going for the 2C now.

Susan R. – She was for 2C for all the same valid reasons that have already been mentioned.

Brian D. – He was for 2C for all the reasons stated based on the information they have now. He noted that the committee does not have all the detail yet and have not looked at secondary impacts. Something might show up and will need to be addressed.

Becky B. – 2C, She noted that placement of the Haul Road originally helped direct some of the development in that area and her first priority is having a cohesive community out there and she thinks this is the best way to do it.

Vicki G. – 2C, She said it is the alternative that is already established as a transportation corridor to begin with. The impacts have already been made and it keeps more properties intact.

John V. – 2C, for all reasons stated thus far. He asked that if the decision is unanimous why don't members decide to pick 2C and not call it a comfort check, call it a vote and be done with it. Art A. responded that the final vote and understanding will be tied to the next step issues.

Dale L. – 2C, for all the same reasons.

Richard M. – 2C, benefits already explained.

Don R. – 2C

Art A. informed the committee that this was the closest thing to a vote ODOT has right now as far as he was concerned this will be the alternative to move forward with, however, the committee will need to meet one more time to discuss the issues in the next steps

9.0 Next Steps

Art Anderson, ODOT

Art A. explained that in order for ODOT to move forward there are things they will have to get concurrence from the CAC and PDT on.

He presented the following PowerPoint:

Selected Alternative 2C

- CAC/PDT selection allows ODOT design to continue under HB 2001 (2013 construction start)
 - Alternative will be added to the overall corridor Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)
 - Alternative needs to be looked at in terms of the entire EIS process, need to comply with NEPA to be eligible for any future federal funding
- Approval of alternative must include CAC/PDT agreement with the following items:
 - Additional funding / Option 2C at \$141 million - \$20million short
 - Cost-cutting measures (if funding is not available)
 - Transit Study
 - Jurisdictional exchanges

Additional Funding

- Alternative is short funding by about \$20 million
- CAC/PDT, local jurisdictions, local legislators, ODOT, and other stakeholders will continue to pursue additional funding for the project
 - Commitment needs to be in place by Jan 1, 2012

Cost-Cutting Measures

- If additional funding is not secured, the below cuts will be made, in priority order:
 - Reduce ROW around Vilas Rd. over-crossing to only what is needed for this phase
 - Reduce roadway from 4 lanes to 2 lanes
 - Eliminate the median barrier
 - Construct only a two-lane bridge at Vilas Rd.
 - Eliminate the bridge at Vilas Rd. and construct an at-grade intersection (with limited turning movements and limited improvements on Vilas Rd.)

Transit Study

- ODOT will fund, and RVTD will help lead, a transit corridor study to be completed by Jan 2011
- Results from this study will be folded into final design with CAC/PDT concurrence
 - Transit sub-team to include several CAC/PDT members
- All parties will work to secure funding for the non-highway eligible elements of the plan

- Highway funding eligible elements will be prioritized by the team for project inclusion based on available dollars

Wade S. asked if these are rules under the current authorization under the Federal Highway Administration and would they possibly change under the re-authorization. Art A. responded that if reauthorization says money can be used slightly differently it could change and they could fund transit with highway dollars.

Jurisdictional Exchanges

- Policy Action 1G.5 of the Oregon Highway Plan:
 - “As part of project development, negotiate an intergovernmental agreement with the local jurisdiction affected by a major improvement such as a bypass and transfer the ownership of the state routes that are bypassed...”
- Policy Action 1H.4 of the Oregon Highway Plan:
 - “ODOT will not require transfer of jurisdiction of a bypassed highway if the bypassed highway will continue to function as a state highway because it carries a significant number of vehicle trips that do not originate or terminate in the bypassed city or cities.”
- ODOT will work with the City of Medford and Jackson County to draw up agreements that incorporate the intent of both policy action items mentioned
- Before any part of the project is forwarded for construction, ODOT will have signed jurisdictional exchange agreements with the City of Medford and Jackson County for their corresponding sections of existing Hwy 62

John V. said that the jurisdictional exchange will be an issue for the county but going back to the previous point he made he did not see anything that would cause him or the board to change their decision and vote for a different alternative. He thought the committee all supported the 2C alternative even with this information and he was not sure why they would have to come back and revisit the alternative selection. Art A. said it will be just to revisit this last portion and not the alternative selection.

Al D. commented that the Medford City Council needed to be comfortable with such issues as how will the significant number issue be defined and what implications does that have for the portion of the project in the City of Medford. He said the city was comfortable with Option 2C as being the best design but in terms of the implications of how they move this project forward and those things that affect the capacity of the city to do maintenance of the streets, they needed to do more work.

Art A. suggested taking a vote on the whole thing tonight with the caveat that more information needed to be vetted through the City of Medford and Jackson County for the jurisdictional exchange piece.

Curt B. asked on the issue of cost cutting if the committee will look at the opposite side of that, if for some reason ODOT numbers are high, there may be some extra dollars to prioritize a list of add-ons. Art A. responded that there might be less of a deficit but he did not think there would be any extra dollars and if so, ODOT was thinking of a full interchange at Vilas or at least one or two ramps. He informed the members that ODOT took the

conservative approach and if there were great differences they will call the committee back together to help make those decisions.

Mike Montero said there was an additional concern with jurisdictional exchange where the state, county, and city have different mobility standards and so when we look ahead at the region's ability to have an economic future under the existing TPR standard that we now have it is something that will have to be carefully thought through so as not to find the region in a situation where that had not been thought about and then there would be some kind of constraint to our ability to meet future urban demands. He thought this was a serious issue and would like to see it vetted through this committee. Al D. added that this was a concern for the City of Medford also.

Don R. thought the committee should have a firm vote on Option 2C. He did not think the additional information changed the committee's decision that this was the best option. Art A. felt there was a vote on the option but there needed to be an understanding that the additional items were not just for ODOT to figure out but needed to be a collective effort.

Mike Montero thought all members felt that way but in order to be in compliance with NEPA, his understanding was that the committee would have to make a decision based on an analysis they didn't have. He said, in other words, the committee does not have the basis for dismissal of Options 2A and 2B right now. He added that the committee would not want to disqualify the region for funding in the future.

Art A. asked if members wanted to take an official vote on the alternative and he called for the vote.

Art A. asked for all those in favor of moving Option 2C forward as the alternative say Aye. Committee unanimously voted in favor of moving Option 2C forward the alternative.

Art A. recommended giving time for these items to the jurisdictions and for members to think about it. He said the committee will come back in a couple weeks and work out how these will be included into the yes vote.

Mike Malepsy asked if the committee will be coming back to talk about this again will ODOT meet with the city and county and come back with some comfort level that they have. Art A. responded that yes, they will be doing that.

Wade S. asked with the \$20 million shortfall has ODOT been asked to share their numbers with the city or the county and Art A. responded that they did share numbers with them a couple months ago and laid out the alternatives with the range of costs but in terms of them scrutinizing the cost figures no one has asked to do that.

Mike Montero thought it would be helpful if members could receive meeting information in advance given the importance of the decisions to be made at the next meeting. Art A. said

that could be done and they will try to include conversations with the city and county in that also.

10. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:20 p.m.