



# Highway 62 Corridor Project

**Date:** January 27, 2005  
**From:** Pat Foley, RVCOG  
**Re:** **CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC) MEETING  
MINUTES for January 26, 2005**

---

**Members in Attendance:** Bill Blair, Becky Brooks, Curt Burrill, David Christian, Mike Montero, Richard Moorman, Bob Plankenhorn, Don Riegger, Dale Shaddox, Wade Six; and Nanci Watkins.

**Members Absent:** Mike Gardiner, Mike Malepsy, Susan Rachor and Paige West

**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 of ODOT; Jamie Snook and Terry Kearns of URS; Kathy Helmer and Pat Foley of RVCOG.

## **1.0 Introductions/Approve Minutes**

Chair Mike Montero convened the sixth 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 Revised Purpose and Need Statement**

Terry Kearns of URS led this discussion. Referring to the power point presentation which showed the revisions made in the Purpose and Need Statement, he asked the members of the CAC if they had any issues with the changes. There were no new comments.

### 3.0 Discussion of Goals and Objectives

Terry Kearns explained the process for the development of the Goals and Objectives. At the December 15<sup>th</sup> meeting, the CAC developed a large number of Goals and Objectives. The PDT reviewed the Goals and Objectives at their December 16<sup>th</sup> meeting and added others. The Project Management Team documented all suggestions from both groups in a first version. They then spent time developing two additional versions that were intended to synthesize them into a draft set of goals and objectives. These versions were emailed to the CAC for their feedback.

Terry lead the discussion on the comments and suggestion received. As the changes were agreed upon by the CAC the new verbiage was reflected on the power point version using **bold, italic and underline**, as per below.

#### ***Draft Goals and Objectives***

Goal 1 (Multimodal)

**Ensure solution provides for safe 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
- Consider a separated multi-use path in corridor

Goal 2 (Environment)

**Protect and enhance the natural environment**

Objectives:

- Minimize air quality impacts
- Protect and enhance fish and wildlife habitat
- Avoid or minimize impacts to ESA listed species
- Minimize impacts to water quality
- Avoid or minimize impacts to wetlands/vernal pools
- Minimize noise impacts
- Enhance ~~the~~ ***through design the*** visual/aesthetic landscape

Goal 3 (Economic)

**Maintain ***and enhance*** economic vitality in the corridor**

Objectives:

- Provide for safe and efficient movement of freight
- Minimize *adverse* impacts to businesses and residents
- ~~Provide~~ Enhance business accessibility ~~for 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 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 standards and capacity needs (v/c, LOS)
- Provide facilities that meet user expectations (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 ~~compatible~~ coordinates with existing land use and transportation plans**

Objectives:

- ~~Comply~~ Coordinate with county land use and transportation plans
- ~~Comply~~ Coordinate with city(s) land use and transportation plans
- Comply with State land use planning goals
- Minimize impacts to farmland (EFU) and forestland

Goal 7 (Social)

**Enhance community livability and quality of life**

Objectives:

- Design transportation facilities that ~~are visually pleasing~~ have aesthetic value
- Address all *transportation* user groups
- Minimize *adverse* impacts to neighborhoods within and adjacent to the project area

Terry asked the CAC if they were comfortable with the changes made. There were no adverse comments.

Terry told the group that the Goals and Objectives would be reviewed by the Project Development Team at their meeting the following day (01/27/05). Jerry Marmon will be submitting this information, as well as the Purpose and Need Statement, to the Collaborative Environmental and Transportation Agreement on Streamlining (CETAS) group at their March meeting. The PDT and CETAS can make changes to the Goals and Objectives. Jerry does not feel that any major changes will be made. The CAC will be notified if any changes are recommended.

#### **4.0 Alternatives Development**

Mike Arneson of ODOT gave a power point presentation on Alternative Development, referring the CAC to materials they received in their packet. This presentation was to give basic guidance to the CAC while developing alternatives.

Starting with a definition of “What is highway design?” Mike explained that highway engineers strive to provide for the needs of the highway users while maintaining the integrity of the environment. This element is captured in the Purpose and Need and the Goals and Objectives.

When designing a highway, policies and standards are used to ensure safety, consistency, and to avoid mistakes from the past. Important topics in the 1999 Oregon Highway Plan include highway mobility, interchange spacing policies, access management policies, spacing standards and bypass policy. Mike reviewed design considerations and discussed overarching perspectives.

In summary, important ideas to remember include:

- Think about the major elements of the project
- Be creative within the parameters of the policies and standards
- Know specifically why something will or won't work
- Develop concepts which can be implemented

Jerry Marmon then led the discussion, focusing on the NEPA requirements. He explained that NEPA requires a representative number of reasonable alternatives to be evaluated in detail in the DEIS. Only a representative number of the most reasonable examples must be presented. Usually this includes between two to six alternatives plus the no-build scenario. The determination of reasonable alternatives is evaluated against project Purpose and Need, design and regulatory constraints and the Goals and Objectives.

The alternative development process has several steps. Most importantly:

- Identify transportation problem
- Brainstorm potential solutions
- Review historical data

- Evaluate alternatives using Purpose and Need and Goals and Objectives
- CAC recommends which alternatives to dismissed and which to carry forward.
- Continue evaluation until you are down to a reasonable number to forward into the DEIS.

The primary constraints to alternative development on this project are land use (EFU zoning), the airport, vernal pools and the Denman Wildlife Area. Jerry went on with an overview of the goal exception process which may be needed to address some of these constraints.

In summary the steps for brainstorming alternative development includes:

- Building a qualitative list of what needs to happen in the corridor to meet our Purpose and Need Statement
- Make the list detailed, mention specific connections or concepts that you feel will help solve the problem
- Discuss this qualitative list as a group.

## **5.0 Public Comment**

One member of the public asked how much money was available for this project. Debbie Timms answered that \$38M has been earmarked.

## **6.0 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. Nanci Watkins added that she felt this was the best meeting to date. Dale Shaddox asked, “Is meeting with our constituents to report on the project and to get their input still a part of the process?”. He would like to make a presentation to the Eagle Point City Council and was wondering if there were constraints on what to present. It was pointed out that whatever information on the project is presented must be 100% accurate in order to avoid misunderstandings. Kathy Helmer said that Project Management Team could prepare a presentation package for the City Council meeting. Dale said he would make an informal presentation asking the group for ideas or comments that they would like to have brought forth to the Citizens Advisory Committee.

## **7.0 Adjourn**

The meeting concluded at 8:05 p.m.