



# Highway 62 Corridor Project

**Date:** August 2009

**From:** Sue Casavan, RVCOG

**Re:** **PROJECT DEVELOPMENT TEAM (PDT) / CITIZEN  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC) JOINT MEETING  
MINUTES for August 26, 2009**

---

**CAC Members in Attendance:** Mike Gardiner, Paige Townsend, Don Riegger, Becky Brooks, Wade Six, Bill Blair, Nanci Watkins, Curt Burrill, Richard Moorman, David Elliott, Mike Montero

**CAC Members Absent:** Susan Rachor, David Christian, Mike Malepsy, Bob Plankenhorn

**PDT Members in Attendance:** Mark Gibson, Brian Dunn, Suzanne Myers, Vicki Guarino, Al Densmore, Kelly Madding, Anna Henson, Chris Zelmer

**PDT Members Absent:** Mike Quilty, Nick Fortey

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

**Guests:** 49 members of the public

**Staff Present:** Tim Fletcher, Art Anderson, Dick Leever and Gary Leaming of ODOT; Terry Kearns of URS; Pat Foley and Sue Casavan of RVCOG

## 1.0 Welcome and Introductions

Terry Kearns, URS

Terry K. said there were new members on the committees and asked members to state which committee they were on and who they represented during introductions. He introduced Anna Henson, ODOT Environmental Project Manager, Dick Leever, Project lead, and Tim Fletcher Project Manager.

Art Anderson said it had been two years since the last meeting and tonight will be the start of several group meetings over a short period of time. He explained that with the recent signing of the legislative governor's package on the transportation bill the region received 100 million dollars in funding for the Highway 62 Corridor Project. The projected cost of the corridor project to build from North Medford to Eagle Point is at 400-450 million and he noted that the 100 million coupled with what the region already has totaled about 120 million. He explained that tonight's meeting would be a review of what staff has been doing for the last two years in terms of the whole corridor solution. He said Terry Kearns will review the two alternatives on the table and informed the committee that they will be introduced to the interim build which will be called Phase 1 and in the very near future members will be asked for their recommendations in making decisions on the interim build. He explained that the timeline for an interim solution was short and the work needed to be done by 2013. He thanked members for their attendance.

## **2.0 Update on NEPA Process**

Terry Kearns, URS

Terry K. said that generally when a NEPA document is done, the draft looks at a couple alternatives, an alternative is selected and the selected alternative moves forward into the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) where impacts and mitigations are documented and used to develop the design. He informed members that ODOT had decided to move the entire corridor project forward and an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process needed to be completed to make the project eligible for federal money in the future. He said findings for the entire corridor will be presented and information on what will be included in the draft EIS document and later in the meeting staff will discuss the first phase of the project.

He added that all technical reports for the Draft EIS are available on the project website. He gave a PowerPoint presentation.

### NEPA Process

- What is the purpose of a DEIS?
  - Compare specific impact/topics against a range of proposed actions.
  - Fully inform the public discussion.
  - Assist in the selection of a preferred action/alternative.
- What is the purpose of an FEIS?
  - Further analyze and refine impacts associated with the preferred action/alternative.
  - Commit project to reasonable mitigation measures to reduce impacts.

Terry K. showed maps of the 3 segments of the Bypass Alternative Options presented at previous meetings, reviewed alternative options, and explained design refinements.

## Impact Summary

### Traffic & Transportation

- No-Build: Year 2030 / 17 intersections fail to meet performance standards
- Bypass using Option 1A: 1 intersection fails to meet performance standards (I-5 SB & OR 62)
- Bypass using Option 1B: 2 intersections fail to meet performance standards (1-5 SB & OR 62; 1-5 NB & OR 62)
- Average Daily Traffic (ADT) (south of Delta Waters Road)
  - 2007 Existing Conditions: 48,000
  - 2030 No-Build: 54,000
  - 2030 Bypass using Option 1A: 74,000
  - 2030 Bypass using Option 1B: 73,500
- Air Quality
  - No significant changes expected.
- Cultural Resources
  - No archaeological resources identified
  - No adverse effects to historic resources
  - Option 3A would impact 2.4 acres of Cingcade Complex; Option 3B, 4.6 acres
- Energy
  - Build Alternatives would result in slightly more energy use.
- Geology
  - No impacts.
- Hazardous Materials
  - Segment 1: 24 sites of concern.
  - Segment 2: 48 sites of concern.
  - Segment 3: 26 sites of concern.
- Land Use
  - No Build: If future traffic volumes exceed mobility standards, the violation would limit expansion of Medford and Eagle Point Urban Growth Boundaries.
  - Build Alternatives would require State Land Use Goal Exceptions and TSP amendments.
- Parks/Recreation
  - Option 1A would impact 3.45 acres of the Bear Creek Greenway.
  - Option 1B would have no impacts to the Bear Creek Greenway.

- Construction of Option 1A could result in temporary closures of Bear Creek Greenway Multi-Use Trail.

Kelly M. asked how Option 1A would impact 3.45 AC of the Greenway and if it would be temporary only and Terry K replied it would be permanent and be required for a bridge and the Split Diamond fill slope.

- Right of Way

|                           | 1A | 1B | 2A  | 2B  | 3A | 3B |
|---------------------------|----|----|-----|-----|----|----|
| Acres                     | 49 | 31 | 133 | 124 | 67 | 50 |
| Parcels Impacted          | 39 | 88 | 131 | 137 | 23 | 27 |
| Business Displacement*    | 9  | 18 | 41  | 49  | 7  | 33 |
| Residential Displacement* | 1  | 1  | 12  | 12  | 4  | 0  |

*(Data in this graph is from the preliminary right-of-way report and is in draft form. These numbers will change in the final report as design refinements continue and the team is able to mitigate many of the impacts.)*

***\* Displacement: For those displaced by the project, ODOT provides a relocation assistance program to ensure the fair and equitable relocation and reestablishment of persons, businesses, farms and non-profit organizations. This is done so displaced persons will not suffer disproportionate injuries as a result of projects designed for the benefit of the public as a whole.***

David E. asked if displacement referred to businesses affected by right of way acquisition or businesses that are affected by access issues and Terry K. thought it was a combination of both.

Curt B. asked if there was a value at this point that could be placed on the displacements and Terry responded that the report is still preliminary and the values would be reported as a range.

Paige T. asked if the numbers for business displacements were full takes and Terry K. thought that it was a combination of both but he wasn't sure. He added that in the FEIS stage ODOT will try to minimize those impacts.

- Visual

- Option 1A could have visual impacts to Bear Creek Greenway and from hotels.
- Option 1B could have visual impacts to residences due to expansion of access roads.
- Options 2A and 2B elevated overpass and bypass could obstruct distant views.

- Aquatic Resources

|                                 | 1A  | 1B  | 2A    | 2B    | 3A    | 3B    |
|---------------------------------|-----|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Stream Crossings                | 2   | 2   | 9     | 8     | 1     | 3     |
| Length (feet) of Stream Impacts | 328 | 376 | 1,877 | 1,821 | 2,957 | 2,902 |
| Acres of Riparian Habitat       | 2.3 | 1.9 | 8.9   | 8.9   | 3.5   | 3.3   |

- Terrestrial Habitat Impacts

|                           | 1A  | 1B  | 2A  | 2B  | 3A  | 3B  |
|---------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Vernal Pools              | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 1.5 |
| Mound Vernal Pool Complex | 0   | 0   | 24  | 6   | 11  | 13  |
| Riparian Habitat          | 8   | 1   | 5   | 4   | 0   | 1   |
| Rare Plants               | 490 | 490 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   |

- Water Resources

|                                 | 1A   | 1B  | 2A | 2B | 3A | 3B |
|---------------------------------|------|-----|----|----|----|----|
| Acres of New Impervious Surface | 18.0 | 8.8 | 37 | 37 | 29 | 22 |

- Wetlands

| (in acres)            | 1A   | 1B   | 2A    | 2B    | 3A   | 3B   |
|-----------------------|------|------|-------|-------|------|------|
| Vernal Pool           | 0.23 | 0.22 | 0.93  | 0.35  | 0.51 | 1.52 |
| Palustrine Open Water | 0    | 0    | 0.24  | 0     | 2.79 | 0    |
| Riverine              | 0.37 | 0.08 | 0.25  | 0.25  | 0.10 | 0    |
| Linear                | 0.33 | 0.31 | 1.16  | 1.10  | 0.51 | 1.24 |
| Total                 | 1.39 | 1.15 | 16.46 | 14.07 | 6.68 | 3.28 |

Three Technical Reports are still under review:

- Socioeconomics
- Utilities
- Noise

Man from audience commented that there were already existing flooding issues and wondered about the water issues. Chris Z. said they have not studied the hydraulics yet and Terry K. noted that when an alternative is selected the law requires all water from new impervious surfaces to be detained and treated in a detention area. He added that the law actually requires more detainment than what is produced as regulatory agencies are trying to catch up.

#### NEPA Schedule

- September 2009: Preliminary DEIS to ODOT for review.
- Late October 2009: DEIS review by Federal Highway Administration
- December 2009: Publish DEIS
- January 2010: Public / Agency comment
- February 2010: Select corridor alternative
- February-May 2010: Refine selected alternative
- June 2010: FEIS
- July 2010: Record of Decision (ROD)

Terry K. reported that once the NEPA process is completed the rest of the corridor is eligible for federal money.

### **3.0 Introduction on Interim Solution Concepts**

Art Anderson, ODOT

Art A. said a final full corridor solution alternative will need to be selected to set up the region for state and federal funding in the future. He noted that discussion for the next six weeks will focus on setting up for Phase 1 (interim solution), result of the 100 million dollars from the Jobs and Transportation Act. He asked members to keep in mind the 60% who stop in the corridor and the 40% just want to get through and assume for 450 million a 40% reduction in traffic on the corridor will be achieved and that for 125 million a 10-20% reduction. He explained in order to capture the additional trip reduction alternative modes of travel needed to be looked at. Focusing on a multi-modal endeavor could add the 5-10% more trip reduction bringing the corridor closer to the 40% reduction. He added that the legislature has said they wanted the funds spent on improvements between the North Medford Interchange and Vilas Road, highest volume of traffic is in the Delta Waters area. He explained to members why they would not start at either end, needing to do something that will fit both alternatives that could potentially be selected as the final alternative. He affirmed that time was an issue and construction needed to begin by 2013 and staff would like to get design started in November or December of this year.

David E. asked if the interim phase required an EIS and Art A. said it was part of the overall solution to the corridor and needed to be described in the EIS that the project would be in phases.

Al D. said he had read that some folks had taken out an initiative petition on the governor's package and should it come to a public vote and should it fail, would it affect this project. Art A. said he did not know where that stood and it could change things if it

does go to the voters. He felt the region needed to be proactive because of the short timeline.

Wade S. asked if the 100 million was federal or state dollars and Art A. said it was state dollars.

Vicki G. asked if the interim phase could be done without a Record of Decision (ROD) and Art A. responded that if federal money was used it could not be done but since it is state money the region can proceed on their own with the interim Phase 1 without a ROD.

Mike M. commented that, in effect, the effort to move forward with the EIS would not represent the threat of stranded dollars because at a bare minimum will meet the qualifications for federal funding that might become available in the future. Art A. confirmed that it sets the stage for future federal dollars and they require a ROD. He added that typically this kind of money is not available on the state side.

Man from audience asked if the interim solution went from I-5 to Vilas or I-5 to Commerce and Art A. said it has not been decided yet and this group will help make that decision over the next 6 weeks.

David E. asked what the potential impact to the whole design land acquisition for right-of-way (ROW) moving ahead with the interim design would be and Art A. replied that they will only use funding for ROW that will be needed for the interim solution and not the rest of the corridor at this time.

Mike M. asked if the project will lean more heavily to alternative modes would that qualify the project for additional funding that the region does not already have and Art A. responded that increased focus on alternative modes would definitely open other avenues for funding.

Man from audience asked if there was any idea to when the third phase would happen, Gregory Road, further north and Art A. responded that there is funding for only a quarter of what the requirement is for the corridor and he thought 10-15 years out would be realistic.

Wade S. asked about the shelf life of the plans and when they might expire and Terry K. said the shelf life for the EIS is generally about 5-6 years, after that the document needs to be updated but it is not necessary to go through the whole process just periodic updates.

Terry K. reminded members that the segments were not phases. They were broken into segments for handling of information and to help make the decision-making process simpler. He noted that a no-build alternative could be chosen and that would make the rest of the corridor future improvements not eligible for federal funding. He added that currently the level of design just establishes vertical and horizontal elements of the design so impacts can be assessed. He emphasized that phases of the project must be multi-modal and discussed previous bike/ped subcommittee recommendations but noted that the committees never addressed the issue of transit for this project.

Terry K. gave the following PowerPoint presentation:

#### Corridor Phasing Issues

- Phases should be multi-modal
- Construction needs to begin in 2013
- Each phase should have independent utility (function by itself)

- Each phase should have logical termini
- Need to address 60/40 traffic split:
  - 60% local trips
  - 40% through trips
- Construction north of Vilas will require Statewide Land Use Planning Goal exception(s)
  - Time consuming process
  - Land Use Exception must be granted prior to construction

Terry K. discussed various transit options and said ODOT will work with RVTD to help advance a transit alternative.

#### Transit Options

- Express Bus
- Bus Rapid Transit in Mixed Traffic
- Bus Rapid Transit in Exclusive Lane (Busway)

#### Express Bus

- Non-stop or limited stop service.
- Connects park-and-rides with major employment centers.
- Can run in general purpose lanes, HOV lanes, or dedicated bus lanes.

#### Bus Rapid Transit in Mixed Traffic

- Widely spaced stations for shorter travel times.
- Station amenities such as off-board fare collection, real time bus arrival information, and park-and-rides.
- Runs in general purpose lanes.
- Can include signal priority at intersections and queue bypass lanes.

#### Bus Rapid Transit in Exclusive Lane

- Widely spaced stations for shorter travel times.
- Station amenities such as off-board fare collection real time bus arrival information, and park-and-rides.
- Avoids congestion and maintains reliable schedule by running in a dedicated lane.
- Can include signal priority at intersections.

Terry K. said transit options will be discussed in future meetings and tonight offered ideas to start addressing this.

Wade S. asked if the value of creating the multi-modal segment and the monies received would be in excess of that segment, or could be and if the demand were not warranted at this time could multi-modal funds be secured in order to acquire ROW or be earmarked for when demand triggers the need and Terry K. thought it could but in order for that to happen there must be a plan and costs to compete with other jurisdictions for the additional money, without a plan there is nothing.

Paige T. commented that RVTD was very pleased when ODOT approached them with the consideration of using transit in the corridor. She said that the Hwy 62 corridor has a lot of potential and the most current response from riders and would be riders is the distance and time it takes to get from Eagle Point and White City to Medford. She added that this was a very realistic option for an area this size and grants are becoming more available. The current need for RVTD is operations monies and what is on the table now are capital assistance grants for buses, bus stops, park and rides, etc. She noted that there is a need to provide design plans, ADT on the transit system and look at connections to getting access to transit modes where in this region most begin and end on foot. She said to keep in mind that the corridor is lacking sidewalks. She thought that Park and Rides in this corridor will probably be the most reasonable solution.

## **4.0 Interim Solution Concept**

Tim Fletcher, ODOT

Tim F. reported that staff needed to step things up on the design side and move forward with the draft EIS. He said ODOT now has the task of developing an interim solution and they will look to this group to determine the most appropriate connections at each end of the solution.

### Interim Solution Concept

- Highway 62 Bypass Corridor
- Funding Available \$123M
- Interim Solution
  - Investigated various points of termination to the north
  - Southern terminus to Vilas Road approximately 2.5 miles
  - Vilas Road to northern terminus approximately 1 mile
  - Combined construction and ROW cost varies from \$98M to \$132M

### Challenge

Identify the type of connections to be constructed at the south and north terminus of Interim Solution that will provide acceptable traffic operation and can be constructed within the available budget.

Tim F. presented maps of the South Terminus, North Terminus, and Vilas Road options. He briefly explained the cut and cover and at-grade intersection options.

Curt B. asked what Hwy 62 will look like south back to Poplar and I-5 and if it will have raised medians the full length. Chris Z. there will be raised medians all the way back to Poplar. Brian D. added that with either one of the options ODOT is trying to make Poplar work as well it would be if nothing was done.

Don R. asked what cut and cover meant and Tim F. responded that northbound Hwy 62 to get onto the bypass it will drop down a few feet and the other movement will be elevated, Don R. asked if that will interfere with the airport landing zones and Tim F. said that staff was aware of those constraints and will make sure they do not exceed that criteria.

Tim F. referred to the handout of a concept comparison matrix and told members it was a summary sheet for their use. He briefly reviewed the North and South terminus options tables.

Woman from audience asked if work north of Vilas required a goal exception and Tim F. responded that the as alignment advanced beyond Vilas Road outside the UGB that is what kicks in the goal exception.

Tim F. showed the Vilas Road options: Structure over (no connection) and Partial interchange (SPUI).

#### Traffic Analysis

- Preliminary analysis for Interim Solution
- Congestion issues with ending at Vilas Road
- Terminating Interim Solution north of Vilas Road avoids issues at Highway 62 and Vilas Road intersections
- Larger benefit to the system ending north of Vilas Road (26% vs. 17% reduction in Highway 62 volume)
- Cut and cover, and traffic signal concept at south terminus both operate within Mobility standard (0.80) and queues are reasonable
- Cut and cover concept at north terminus operates within Mobility standard. The traffic signal concept exceeds Mobility standard.

Kelly M. asked if something could be built that exceeds the mobility standard and Brian D. if you make a case that it is a preliminary solution to the technical services people it can be done.

Mike M. asked if the projected V/C ratio takes into consideration the transit option and Brian D. responded no.

## **5.0 CAC / PDT Comfort Check**

Terry Kearns, URS

Becky Brooks: I'm good.

Suzanne Myers: Hoping to get more detailed, larger maps.

Bill Blair: Fine.

Vicki Guarino: I still have a lot of questions.

Al Densmore: Comfortable for now.

Wade Six: Question on Segment 2, does not make sense to me with the colors.

Mark Gibson: Good.

Mike Montero: Good. He suggested a video to explain the cut and cover concept.

Kelly Madding: Assuming we will have better maps and diagrams, I struggled with the traffic flow.

Paige Townsend: Very happy to see the current data results. She thanked the staff for producing the information for the committees.

Nanci Watkins: Very comfortable but would like to see better maps.

Mike Gardiner: Fine.

Anna Henson: I'm good.

Richard Moorman: Good.

Brian Dunn: Good.

Curt Burrill: Good.

Chris Zelmer: Good.

Don Riegger: Fine.

David Elliott: I have one question, we saw an introduction to an interim solution concept, are you asking the CAC and PDT to consider an interim solution or are we committed to an interim solution. Terry K. responded that they are somewhat committed to an interim or phasing solution by the legislative law and the available funding. He said the solution shown tonight will work with either build alternative and what they are asking for is feedback on how we terminate this.

Don R. commented that he had reservations about the height for the airport and wondered if the height meant the top of the structure or the height of the vehicle on top of it. Terry K. said it was the top of an object; the cut and cover will be pushed into the ground. Man from audience asked if they were still looking at the potential viaduct system and Terry K. responded that only a viaduct down by the fire department that will allow movement to occur underneath it.

Gordon Draper, Biomass One, asked how Hwy 140 and the freeway could both go down Agate Road. Chris Z. that would go away when the bypass goes through, the corridor on Agate Road will become the bypass. Gordon D. asked what would happen to Hwy 140 and Chris Z. said at buildout Agate Road will have a directional interchange so trucks when they get to Hwy 62 from Hwy 140 can turn left on through the Agate directional to the bypass or if they choose the other way they can take Antelope Road or Avenue G. Gordon D. said his concern was Avenue G. He noted that his business was located on Avenue G and has been saying for five years that he has 390,000 trucks a year going on the avenue and they stop traffic now. He further commented that he did a survey of his employees of what they thought would speed up traffic on Hwy 62 and more times than not they said it would help to take the buses off. He said he sees buses with one or two people, not saying they shouldn't take the bus that's just what it is today. He noted that he rarely sees anyone on the buses and giving great amounts of funding to transit without the need the public has a concern about that. Paige T. responded that she would be happy to supply ridership information for Route 60 and noted that it was the second most popular route in the system. Nanci W. commented that as the region becomes more populated she thinks the buses will be better utilized.

## **6.0 Next Steps**

Terry Kearns, URS

September 9, 2009 CAC/ PDT meeting

- Further South Terminus Discussion
- Vilas Road Discussion

- North Terminus Discussion

## **7.0 Adjournment**

Terry Kearns, URS

The meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m.