



Highway 62 Corridor Project

Date: April 28, 2005

From: Kathy Helmer, RVCOG

**Re: PROJECT DEVELOPMENT TEAM (PDT) MEETING
FINAL MINUTES for April 28, 2005**

PDT Members in Attendance: Dave Abbott for Kelly Madding; Donna Beck, Delanie Cutsforth, Brian Dunn, David Elliott, Mark Gallagher, Mark Gibson, Skip Knight, Rick Levine, Dan Moore, Jerry Marmon, Mike Quilty and Debbie Timms.

Members Absent: Nick Fortey, Kelly Madding

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

Guests: Kent Belleque, Mike Montero, Shirley Roberts.

Staff: Gary Leaming and Kent Belleque, ODOT; Jim Hanks, Kim Parducci, and Brian Genovese, JRH; Kathy Helmer, RVCOG; Nadine Lee and Jamie Snook, URS.

Resource Technical Team in Attendance: Susan Landis, ODOT.

1.0 Introductions/Agenda Review/Minutes

Jamie Snook convened the meeting at 8:37 AM, welcoming members and reviewing the agenda. Jamie explained that she was chairing the meeting in Terry Kearns' absence. Jerry Marmon moved and Mike Quilty seconded the adoption of the minutes of the previous meeting as written. The motion carried unanimously.

2.0 Origin and Destination Studies

Jim Hanks of JRH presented information from three origin and destination studies conducted a few years ago. One was of Highway 62, one was from the South Medford Interchange study, and the last one was of Highway 140 itself. Jim explained the methods used to produce the information and then correlate the information. Vehicles' use of the corridors was tracked using license plate numbers.

Jim noted that some of the understandings gained from these studies were pertinent to the Highway 62 Corridor Project. The Highway 140 study showed that an I-5 connector for freight trucks from Highway 62 would take traffic off the Highway 62 corridor. Jim stated that, by itself, this type of connector would not take enough traffic off Highway 62 to eliminate the need for improvements to Highway 62. When traffic enters Highway 62 from the N. Medford Interchange and heads north, many vehicles are going to destinations on the corridor. An open question was whether or not a parallel corridor to the west (further west than the Haul Road) could siphon off enough traffic from Highway 62. One objective is to figure out how to deal with access issues. Should it be done on an intersection-by-intersection basis, by using a by-pass, or by using both approaches?

3.0 Additional Alternatives

Gary Leaming shared a PowerPoint presentation the Texas turnaround design. He was doing this on behalf of Lyle McLaughlin who was unable to attend. Gary explained how the turnaround concept worked with one-way frontage roads on both sides of a freeway, allowing drivers to essentially perform u-turns on overpasses from one frontage road to another. Mr. McLaughlin proposed Texas turnarounds at a few major intersections on Highway 62, including Vilas Road. Gary shared some of the pros and cons of the concept. Pros include that frontage roads providing access to businesses; non-signalized flow of traffic; and high capacity. The cons include wide right-of-way impacts; the need for additional interchanges; and concerns about whether or not they meet current ODOT standards. Another idea Mr. McLaughlin wished to have presented was that of building a tunnel under the grass extension of the airport runway.

Skip Knight advocated for the concept, saying that it meet the objective of limiting access to businesses on Highway 62. The turnaround gives people the opportunity to access businesses without impacting the freeway. He emphasized that the turnarounds in Texas were built 40 years ago and are still working. He said he believed that enough land was available at the intersections along Highway 62. Skip said the turnarounds were 100-year solutions, better than the 20-30 year solutions that the project was targeting. It had the added benefit of being easy for the public to use and understand. He encouraged ODOT to travel to Texas to explore the idea and learn more about them.

Debbie Timms asked Gary Leaming how the Texas turnarounds actually worked. He noted that there was direct driveway access to businesses, no bike lanes and traffic was very fast moving.

Brian Dunn said he was not sure that a Texas turnaround would fit into the existing right-of-way. Jim Hanks said that we would need to first determine the connections that were needed and then sketch out the turnaround in its true dimensions. Skip repeated that he wanted a lasting solution to the problems on Highway 62 and that the turnaround should be taken seriously.

Nadine then presented additional alternatives resulting from the newspaper invitation to the public to identify alternatives. She presented only those alternatives that were different from the set of alternatives the group was already considering. She referred participants to the set of handout maps on these alternatives. She noted that the tunnel concept under the airport runway might well be an issue with the Department of Homeland Security. She will check with the FAA about this issue.

4.0 Interchange Types

Kent Belleque explained the benefits and typical usage of various interchanges, using a PowerPoint presentation. He explained the technical criteria for deciding which interchange was appropriate. They have to do with expected traffic volumes, turning movements, topography, the surrounding culture and design controls.

5.0 Grouping the Alternatives

Nadine Lee explained to the group that she had developed a set of categories to summarize the alternatives shared to date. She stressed that the goal was to find an alignment that worked. She had maps to illustrate what each of the categories meant. The categories were: 1) the By-Pass grouping; 2) the Existing Highway 62; 3) the Couplet; 4) the RTP grouping; and 5) the I-5 grouping.

6.0 Developing a Northern Terminus

Nadine shared some maps depicting potential designs for the northern terminus. This was in response to the CAC expressing a desire to have some ideas brought to them. There had been some concern that White City shouldn't have to live with a freeway through the middle of town. There was not enough time to allow people to draw, so participants were asked to send their ideas to Jamie Snook and she will work with Nadine Lee on them.

Participants made some comments on the concepts. Mark Gallagher said that the concept that took the freeway north on Agate felt better because it was moving through an industrial area. But he said it would be important to know if the industrial neighborhood would consider that an advantage or not. Jerry Marmon noted that the East-West access to Crater Lake Highway would be maintained.

With respect to the concept showing the freeway running further east through White City, Donna Beck shared that sewer and other infrastructure had already been built to the east in White City. That is where the community is planning to grow. Jamie Snook said that

the project would look at all county and local plans as part of the planning and decision-making process.

7.0 Wrap Up and Adjournment

Given time constraints, no PDT comfort check was conducted. Jerry Marmon said that by the next meeting, all alternatives would be on the table and a winnowing down process would begin. The group would need tools to do this and so a set of evaluation criteria would be developed.

Jamie thanked all participants and adjourned the meeting at 10:30 AM.