



Highway 62 Corridor Project

Date: December 16, 2004

From: Kathy Helmer, RVCOG

Re: **CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC) MEETING
MINUTES for December 15th, 2004**

Members in Attendance: Bill Blair; Becky Brooks; Curt Burrill; David Christian; Mike Gardiner, Mike Malepsy; Mike Montero; Richard Moorman, Bob Plankenhorn; Susan Rachor, Don Riegger, Dale Shaddox; Wade Six; and Paige West.

Members Absent: Nanci Watkins

Location: Jackson County Auditorium, Mosquito Lane, White City

Guests: Five members of the public.

Staff Present: Debbie Timms, Brian Dunn, Gary Leaming, Jerry Marmon, John Vial and Mike Arneson of ODOT; Jamie Snook and Terry Kearns of URS; Frank Stevens, JRH; John Morrison and Kathy Helmer of RVCOG.

1.0 Introductions/Approve Minutes

Chair Mike Montero convened the fifth meeting of the Highway 62 Corridor Project CAC at 6:00 PM. He asked all to introduce themselves and reviewed the meeting agenda. The minutes of the previous meeting were approved, as written, by a unanimous vote.

2.0 Discussion of Highway 62 Crash Trends

Frank Stevens of JRH presented the analysis of crash data, explaining the mapping of the data and what it meant. He reviewed each map, provided in the meeting packet, noting that one important factor in the differences among the crash rates between segments was more or less access control and traffic. He noted a relationship between access control along the highway and the number of crashes. Segments with almost total access control

have the lowest number of crashes. Segments with many business accesses onto the highway have many more turning accidents. John Vial, ODOT District Manager over Maintenance and Operations, explained the types of problems his program faces and complaints they receive from the public. Using a set of photos on slides, he illustrated the kinds of situations that cause crashes on the highway. He referred to a brief report in the meeting packet that analyzed crashes before and after the Linn-Dutton Project was executed on that segment of Highway 62. A key component of this project was access control. The number of crashes and the number of injuries/fatalities significantly decreased after the project was completed.

3.0 Revised Purpose and Need Statement

Terry Kearns of URS led this discussion. Referring to the power point presentation, he shared CAC members' comments on the Statement received since the last meeting. Several had to do with the project termini; others concerned issues related to opportunities for multi-modal transportation choices. Still others concerned safety, intersection operations and traffic volumes.

Susan Rachor noted that some of the comments and phrases, such as "pleasant experience", were general and could be interpreted in different ways. Along other lines, she stressed how important it was to respect the many, long-established businesses along the highway.

Terry then shared the revised Purpose Statement. Explicit termini had been identified, the logic being to connect existing improvements with the project. Regarding the "multi-modal needs" mentioned in the revised Purpose Statement, Wade Six said that people should be thinking about the highway some 20 –30 years into the future. Susan suggested that it might not be possible to accommodate bicyclists right next to the highway; it might be necessary to have separate facilities. Paige West noted that businesses and their customers weren't the only ones to use the corridor; residents and children also use it. The highway shoulder is not at all safe for them. They need to be considered. Debbie Timms said that multi-modal also included buses.

Brian Dunn suggested that multi-modal needs must be identified in the Needs Statement, relating to the lack of bike and pedestrian facilities. The term "multi-modal" needs to be defined; otherwise, people may challenge it. David Christian said it had to do with bridging quality of life and business. It means moving freight and other things like bike and pedestrians. Becky Brooks said that it should also address populations that need to be transported, such as the elderly. David Christian said that jobs in that direction were not likely to be high paying jobs, so there is a need to provide for bus service.

In conclusion, Terry Kearns said that he would draft a definition of multi-modal to be included in the Needs Statement and send it out to the members for their review. In response to Jerry Marmon's query if they were comfortable with the revised Purpose and Need, CAC members said yes.

4.0 Introduction to Goals & Objectives Development

Terry Kearns explained the complementary relationship of goals and objectives to the Purpose and Need Statement. Goals and objectives express a community's desires for the project to serve a variety of objectives, but the project is not required to do so.

5.0 Goals and Objectives Development Exercise

John Morrison described the exercise process to the members, saying that each person was to work independently to write as many goals/objectives as he/she wished, one on each sheet provided. They were not to be too concerned about the difference between goals and objectives; that would be worked out later. Staff would then place each sheet under the appropriate goal category displayed along the walls. Goal categories included: Bike and pedestrian; environmental; economic; safety; transportation; planning; parks and recreation; social; and other.

After all the sheets were on the wall, John Morrison reviewed their placement with the group, moving some sheets to other goal categories, as per the group's desires. Paige West noted that a goal regarding access by emergency vehicles was missing; she added one to the mix. Dale Shaddox said that he had not seen much about other mass transit modes, park and rides, etc. Curt Burrill noted that access to the airport should be listed as an objective.

John explained that their work would be typed up just as it was. It would also be massaged to eliminate redundancies, join similar ideas and differentiate between goals and objectives. This would be given back to the CAC for their review.

6.0 Defining the Study Area & The Alternatives Development Process

Jerry Marmon led this discussion, explaining that the group had already determined the northern and southern termini of the project, but had not decided on the eastern and western boundaries. The Study Area is the area within which the majority of the alternatives are likely to lie. Jerry suggested Foothills Road as the eastern boundary and Table Rock Road as the western boundary. He noted that the boundaries could both expand and become smaller, depending on how evaluated alternatives meet the Purpose and Need of the project.

Dale Shaddox said he was pleased with how broad the area was. He asked Jerry Marmon if that meant that funding could be used to improve Foothills Road and Jerry answered yes, if it were found to be a viable alternative. Page West noted that those two roads are often used to avoid traveling on Highway 62, so it made sense to her. Mike Montero asked Jerry if the team would be relying on the county and city Transportation System Plans (TSPs) and Jerry said that they would not rely on them, but they would certainly be considered. Susan Rachor asked about the validity of rumors that Highway 140 would connect directly to Interstate 5 and Jerry Marmon responded that the project would look to see if it meets the Purpose and Need Statement.

Jerry Marmon also asked the CAC about the process they preferred for developing alternatives. The previous Highway 62 team considered 30 alternatives in depth. How did this CAC wish to deal with them? There are basically two options. The first is to start developing alternatives from scratch, without first viewing the previously considered alternatives. After the CAC had developed some alternatives, they would then evaluate alternatives that were developed during the previous project. . The second option is to start by looking at the alternatives developed previously, and then to develop more alternatives based on that understanding. Jerry asked the CAC for their preferences regarding process.

David Christian said that a blank sheet would be good for him, referring to the goals and objectives the group had drafted. After that, the group might want to compare their work to what had already been done. Dale Shaddox said he would argue that there was a real benefit in knowing what had been done before. Looking at those alternatives would be provocative. Curt Burrill agreed with Dale, saying that lots of work had gone into those previous alternatives. Wade Six said that the group would have access to the previous alternatives. The question was looking at them before or after developing some new alternatives. Mike Montero said that he and Curt had waded through the alternatives before, but they would be new to many others. Looking first might predispose the group one way or the other. He wanted a fresh start. Becky Brooks said that it would tend to limit them if they saw the alternatives first. Mike Arneson asked the group how much guidance they wanted from him on the viability of alternatives they devised. They said they wanted him to be very straightforward with them about why ideas wouldn't work, but they wanted to understand the reason.

It was decided that the group favored starting "from scratch", with some base maps that show constraints on them. The group also indicated that they did not want to spend excessive time working on alternatives that had already been developed, and would like to know if they are moving in that direction before too much time passes. Before beginning the drawing of alternatives, Mike Arneson will engage the CAC in some background discussions on the corridor and design. The group will take a comfort check at the end of each meeting, to determine when they believe they have spent enough time on alternatives development.

7.0 Public Comment

Commissioner David Gilmore, referring to the idea of connecting Interstate 5 directly to Highway 140, expressed his desire to make a presentation on it to the CAC at some future meeting.

8.0 CAC Comfort Check

John Morrison asked each of the participants to share their reactions to the meeting. All members expressed their sense that things were going well.

9.0 Adjournment

Mike Montero adjourned the meeting at 8:10 PM.