



Highway 62 Corridor Project

Date: February 24, 2005
From: Pat Foley, RVCOG
Re: **CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC) MEETING
APPROVED MINUTES for February 23, 2005**

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

Members Absent: Bill Blair and Curt Burrill

Location: Rogue Family Center, White City

Guests: Four members of the public.

Staff Present: Debbie Timms, Brian Dunn, Jerry Marmon, DeLanie Cutsforth and Mike Arneson, Gary Leaming and Kent Belleque of ODOT; Jamie Snook and Terry Kearns of URS; Kathy Helmer and Pat Foley of RVCOG.

1.0 Review Agenda/Approve Minutes

Chair Mike Montero convened the seventh meeting of the Highway 62 Corridor Project CAC at 6:05 PM. He reviewed the meeting agenda. The minutes of the previous meeting were approved, as written, by a unanimous vote.

2.0 Revised Goals and Objectives

Terry Kearns of URS led this discussion. The PDT reviewed the draft Goals and Objectives at their January meeting and made revisions. The revised draft was sent to the CAC for their review. Terry asked the CAC if they had any comments or additional revisions. The CAC accepted the revised Goals and Objectives as written. This

document will be presented to CETAS for review in March. The approved Goals and Objectives for the Highway 62 Corridor Project are:

Goal 1 (Multimodal)

Ensure solutions that provide for alternative modes of transportation

Objectives:

- Improve and provide bike and pedestrian facilities and improve connectivity in the corridor
- Improve bike and pedestrian connectivity in the corridor
- Provide opportunities for increased transit utilization

Goal 2 (Environment)

Protect and enhance the natural environment

Objectives:

- Minimize air quality impacts
- Protect and enhance fish and wildlife habitat
- Avoid and/or minimize impacts to ESA listed species
- Minimize impacts to water quality
- Avoid and/or minimize impacts to wetlands/vernal pools
- Minimize noise impacts
- Enhance through context-sensitive design
- Avoid and/or minimize impacts to cultural resources

Goal 3 (Economic)

Preserve economic vitality in the corridor

Objectives:

- Provide for safe and efficient movement of freight
- Minimize impacts to businesses and residents
- Address accessibility to businesses
- Encourage opportunities for economic development
- Develop solutions that allow construction phasing relative to funding

Goal 4 (Safety)

Ensure the solution is safe for all modes of transportation

Objectives:

- Follow applicable design standards
- Reduce the number and severity of crashes and conflict points
- Apply access management standards within the corridor
- Accommodate emergency vehicles

Goal 5 (Transportation)

Provide a solution that addresses capacity and connectivity needs

Objectives:

- Meet design year mobility and capacity needs (v/c, LOS)
- Provide facilities that are user-friendly (signage, visibility, etc)
- Provide efficient connectivity within the corridor
- Find a balance between different users (through vs. local) needs

Goal 6 (Planning)

Ensure the solution is consistent with existing land use and transportation plans

Objectives:

- Consistent with county and city(s) land use and transportation plans
- Consistent with State land use planning goals
- Consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan
- Minimize impacts to resource lands

Goal 7 (Social)

Enhance community livability and quality of life

Objectives:

- Address all transportation user groups
- Minimize adverse impacts to neighborhoods within and adjacent to the project area

3.0 Alternatives Development

Mike Arneson explained that this meeting's design exercise was the start of developing conceptual alternatives directed toward addressing current and future capacity needs, transportation safety and multimodal opportunities along the Highway 62 study area. He told the CAC to develop potential solutions without considering constraints that have been discussed in the past. The purpose of the exercise was to get basic ideas. The CAC was divided into three work groups at separate tables, name C1, C2 and C3.

Mike explained the four steps in the meeting exercise, as follows.

First, each CAC member was asked to sketch independently his or her own ideas for conceptual alternatives on the 11 x 17 maps provided.

Secondly, each table was to discuss each person's options and work to consolidate those individual ideas and sketch them on large maps. Each CAC member was to use a different colored pen to show their ideas.

Thirdly, a spokesperson from each table was to present their tables' ideas to the entire CAC.

And finally, each conceptual alternative would be given a unique number. This same exercise for developing alternatives would be used the following morning at the the PDT meeting. ODOT will plot all of the alternatives in a geometrically correct form and build a matrix of all alternatives.

At the end of the exercise, the three tables made the following reports.

Table C1 Alternatives

Table C1 participants were Nanci Watkins, Mike Malepsy, Don Riegger, Bob Plankenhorn, and Richard Moorman. The group suggested three alternative routes for an Expressway, which would leave Highway 62 as a business access road. In order to miss the Denman Wildlife area, they made a modification to get off Highway 62 near the Big R Store. The group suggested that interchanges be built at Vilas Road and at Coker Butte. They suggested that the current Coker Butte and Agate Road accesses to Highway 62 be eliminated.

Table C2 Alternatives

Table C-2 participants were Susan Rachor, Mike Gardiner and Dale Shaddox. This group suggested a frontage road west of the current Hwy 62. This frontage road would connect to Hwy 140. This road would move "through traffic", thus leaving Hwy 62 as a business access road. They suggested improvements to Foothill and Table Rock Roads. These two roads would connect to Hwy 140 with direct access to I-5. The improvements the city of Medford is planning for Coker Butte and McLoughlin Drive would provide access from Foothill Road to Highway 62.

Table C3 Alternatives

Table C3 participants were Mike Montero, Paige West, Wade Six, Becky Brooks and David Christian. The first problem addressed was the bottleneck at Poplar Drive. It was suggested that Poplar Drive be tunneled in front of the two shopping centers in the area. This group also agreed that Foothill Road and Table Rock Road needed to be improved. The idea of developing a new Hwy 62 to move "through traffic" and keeping the old Hwy 62 for local circulation was presented. There would be interchanges at Vilas Road and Hwy 140. In order to avoid dumping truck traffic in the middle of White City, it was suggested that the new Hwy 62 extend beyond Hwy 140 to north of the Domiciliary. Mike Montero explained that Jackson County has plans to connect the existing Hwy 140 to the Seven Oaks interchange on I-5. Paige West suggested a dedicated bicycle facility separate from traffic that would allow residents to access the commercial areas.

4.0 Public Comment

Eagle Point City Councilor, Earl Wood, expressed his desire to make a presentation detailing his ideas for an alternative concept at the next CAC meeting.

5.0 CAC Comfort Check

Kathy Helmer asked each of the participants to share their reactions to the meeting. All members expressed their sense that things were going well. Susan Rachor and Dale Shaddox noted that a map with all improvements planned by Medford would have helped them during the exercise.

6.0 Adjourn

Chair Mike Montero adjourned the meeting at 8:05 p.m.