Highway 62 Corridor Project

Date: September 6, 2005

From: Kathy Helmer, RVCOG

Re: **PROJECT DEVELOPMENT TEAM (PDT) MEETING MINUTES for August 25, 2005**

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

Members Absent: Rick Levine

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

Guests: Mike Montero, CAC Co-Chairperson, Sam Ayash, TPAU, ODOT.

Staff: Gary Leaming, ODOT; Jim Hanks, JRH; Kathy Helmer, RVCOG; Nadine Lee, Terry Kearns and John Cullerton, URS.

Resource Technical Team in Attendance: Shirley Roberts, ODOT.

1.0 Introductions/Agenda Review/Minutes

Terry Kearns convened the meeting at 8:35 AM. Skip Knight moved and Brian Dunn seconded the adoption of the minutes of the previous meeting as written. The motion carried unanimously.

Terry reviewed the agenda and Mike Montero briefed the PDT on the CAC meeting held the previous evening. He reported that the CAC had decided not to recommend the abandonment of certain “out of corridor” alternatives, based on modeling results. About half the group had not been comfortable with the idea. The group said that they would benefit from seeing all the alternatives, before putting some aside. Out of concern for members’ opinions, the CAC decided to wait and see additional results.

2.0 Evaluation Criteria

Referring to the revised Evaluation Criteria document, Terry Kearns asked the PDT if they had other changes to suggest. No one identified additional revisions. Terry noted that the criteria could and would evolve with the project, as the need to differentiate became apparent.

3.0 Review of Purpose and Need

Terry Kearns very briefly reviewed the project's Purpose and Need statement, stressing that it was the first screen through which alternatives had to pass. If they meet the Purpose and Need statement, they will be reviewed with respect to the goals, objectives and evaluation criteria.

4.0 Modeling Results

Jim Hanks presented information on two types of alternatives, what have been called the regional alternatives in which neighboring and or parallel streets and roads have been improved, and the I-5 alternatives which suggested changing the pathway of Interstate 5.

Jim explained the different ways to reduce congestion and noted that this round of modeling had been focused on seeing if providing alternative routes outside the corridor would divert enough traffic from Highway 62 to solve purpose the capacity problems identified in the purpose and need. In discussing the modeling results, he referred CAC members to the narrative and maps in the Traffic Technical Memorandum handout.

Deleted: .

For each alternative, two map illustrations were presented, the first comparing the projected traffic volumes for the alternative in the year 2030 to traffic conditions in 2002. The second compared the year 2030 no-build traffic with the year 2030 PM peak hour traffic for the alternative. In each instance, the increase or decrease in traffic volumes was indicated respectively by red or green and the actual increase or decrease in vehicle counts was also provided on the map.

The overarching question with respect to each alternative was: "Does it take enough traffic off Highway 62 to meet the purpose and need?" Jim Hanks said that the team had added every improvement or connection they could think of to help each alternative succeed. Even with all those additional enhancements, none of the alternatives succeeded.

Deleted: did not succeed.

Nick Fortey asked if there was anything more to be learned from an analysis of origin and destination. Jim Hanks responded that Highway 62 was the main arterial of an island. The airport is to the west, the neighborhoods west of Barnett road to the east, the interchange to the south and Crater Lake to the north. The situation does not lend itself to alternative routes.

Sam Ayash shared an analysis of Highway 62 regarding traffic origin and destination. He noted that the preponderance of traffic was destined for one of the commercial destinations along Highway 62. He said that the challenge would be to connect a by-pass with those commercial destinations.

Jim Hanks then shared modeling results for the northern terminus. With these alternatives, the v/c ratio is not as big an engineering issue. The issue here is the perception of the highway as social barrier to the White City community. The highway functions as White City's Main Street. Jim noted that these alternatives would be better judged on issues other than traffic volumes. Skip Knight questioned why the northern terminus alternatives were needed. Donna Beck answered that residents already have a hard time getting to the post office, the pharmacy and grocery store, since they are west of Highway 62 and residential areas are located east of the highway.

The group requested that an additional alternative be modeled. This one would provide an interchange for Highway 140 and Highway 62; it would also continue Highway 62 northerly on Agate Road.

5.0 Recommendations

Several of the PDT members were comfortable with the idea of abandoning most of the first round alternatives, but the group decided not to, based on the CAC's recommendation that those alternatives be considered in the context of all the other modeling results.

Deleted: recommendatioin

6.0 Next Steps

Terry Kearns spoke to the work to be accomplished over the next few months. He said that the group needed to spend some time on the southern terminus and the constraints presented by that area. In September, there will be a presentation on airport expansion plans. In October, all options will be presented with a simplified decision-making tool. At that point, the group will consider the "in corridor" alternatives.

Dan Moore asked if the team was looking at increasing transit use as part of the modeling process. Jim Hanks said that the model took transit into account. One issue, he said, was that the corridor would be conducive only to express service from White City to the south. Transit in general would not have a strong effect on the corridor.

Dave Elliott said he could understand the CAC not dropping the alternatives, although it seemed reasonable to him to do so. Terry Kearns noted that by October, both groups would likely be ready to make those decisions.

7.0 Comfort Check

Terry Kearns asked each participant to share his reactions to the meeting. Nick Fortey said that process was important, especially with respect to making sure that everyone is

on board. He suggested that a reiteration of the origin/destination study would help. Brian Dunn said that he was comfortable. He encouraged the group to think through the documentation on why alternatives are dropped, so that it would be easy to understand two years from now. Jerry Marmon said that the group would be following a specific format. Mark Gallagher said that it had been a bit strange to look at just the "out of corridor" alternatives. He noted that it's hard to throw alternatives out of the process. Mike Quilty said that he was fine with the process. Kelly Madding said she liked the idea of having Nadine Lee look at a Highway 140/Highway 62 connection. She also expressed her sense that it would be important to have discussions with White City residents about the northern terminus options. Terry Kearns responded that the Draft EIS would generate a lot of public discussion. Dan Moore said he had been comfortable with the process; he encouraged the group to keep transit-oriented development in mind, as well as other land use methods for change.

Deleted: orgin

8. Adjournment

Terry Kearns thanked participants and adjourned the meeting at 10:30 AM.