



# Highway 62 Corridor Project

**Date:** January 28, 2005

**From:** Kathy Helmer, RVCOG

**Re:** **PROJECT DEVELOPMENT TEAM (PDT) MEETING  
MINUTES for January 26, 2005**

---

**PDT Members in Attendance:** Mike Arneson, Brian Dunn, David Elliott, Mark Gallagher, Kathy Helmer, Terry Kearns, Skip Knight, Jerry Marmon, Dan Moore, Mike Quilty, Jamie Snook, Debbie Timms.

**Members Absent:** Donna Beck, Nick Fortey, Mark Gibson, Gary Leaming, Rick Levine, and Kelly Madding.

**Location:** Rogue Family Center, 3131 Avenue C., White City.

**Guests:** Delanie Cutsforth, John Vial, and Shirley Roberts.

**Resource Technical Team in Attendance:** Leslie Schwab.

## **1.0 Introductions/Agenda Review/Minutes**

Terry Kearns convened the meeting at 8:40 AM, welcoming members and reviewing the agenda. Mike Quilty moved, and Mike Arneson seconded, the approval of the minutes of the previous meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

## **2.0 Revised Purpose and Need Statement**

Terry shared the revised Purpose and Need Statement with the PDT. He told the group that the CAC had suggested no further changes to the document at the meeting the previous evening. He asked PDT members if they had any problems with the Purpose and Need Statement, as currently presented. No one raised any concerns. The project will move ahead with this Purpose and Need Statement.

### 3.0 Discussion of Goals and Objectives

Terry Kearns explained how the goals and objectives produced by the CAC and PDT had been organized, reformatted and then interpreted into those in the Version 3 document. Terry shared the redline/strikeout version of the document that resulted from CAC discussion the previous evening and asked the PDT to review the document and share their concerns.

Rather than document the rationale for all changes to the document, several of which were semantic changes, the reader is referred to the draft document which shows all changes and is to be sent out with the February meeting packet. Some aspects of the discussion are described below.

- The PDT agreed that the last bullet under Goal 1 (Multimodal) should be eliminated because it was a solution to an objective, rather than an objective. Nonetheless, several group members noted that they are not in favor of putting bikes and pedestrians right next to high-speed vehicles on the facility. Mike Arneson said that the solution would play out in the design.
- Leslie Schwab noted that there are cultural resources in the project area, so a bullet was added regarding impacts to cultural resources under Goal 2 (Environment).
- Regarding Goal 3 (Economic), there was concern about the third bullet “Provide/enhance accessibility for business.” It might be interpreted as a promise to increase a particular type of access, rather than overall accessibility. If frontage and/or backage roads were deemed appropriate, people might hold that their accessibility had not been enhanced. The CAC seemed to be talking about access in and out of business, rather than overall ability to move around an area. Mike Arneson also had problems with the goal statement, which was to “enhance economic vitality”. He favored using the verb “preserve”. John Vial noted that the CAC might not be happy with the changes, but the PDT was the body that had to make the hard decisions on this project.
- The PDT did not understand certain changes made to Goal 5 (Transportation); Terry and Mike Arneson explained that the CAC was very interested in multi-modal forms of transportation and this reflected their concern.
- Under Goal 6 (Planning) it was noted that there was Open Space Reserve lands in the project area, but no Forest. The last bullet could be changed to reflect that or could simply substitute “resource lands” for the specific types.

Terry Kearns said that he would produce a document reflecting the changes, along with a narrative explaining them. This would be distributed with next month’s meeting packet and revisited during the February meeting. In March, Terry and Jerry Marmon will go before CETAS with the Purpose and Need Statement and the Goals and Objectives. CETAS can require changes to these documents. It is comprised of several regulatory agencies.

Mike Arneson asked Jerry Marmon how he felt about the goals and objectives and purpose and need statement and Jerry said that they looked solid and provided a good foundation for the study.

#### **4.0 Alternatives Development Process**

Mike Arneson led a discussion of the PowerPoint presentation on the alternatives development process. The presentation was included in the meeting packet. Given time constraints, he quickly reviewed the design considerations previously identified and shared some overarching perspectives on design. Skip Knight noted that the political will to implement unpopular but needed highway designs was often lacking in the past. For this reason, many problems must be corrected now. He said that it was extremely important to have that political will.

Jerry Marmon then led the discussion, focusing on the Constraints section of the PowerPoint. He described the constraints related to farmland, parklands, the airport and vernal pools/wetlands. Inadequate time remained to move into the brainstorming segment.

Terry noted that the February meeting would be used to review the changes made to the Goals and Objectives, to brainstorm alternative ideas, and to do some designing.

Mike Quilty and Dan Moore will both be out of town when we hold the February meeting. Mike Quilty would like the materials in advance so that he can contribute, despite his absence. Terry explained that the development process would proceed over a period of months; missing one month would not cut a person out of that process.

#### **5.0 Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

#### **6.0 PDT Comfort Check**

Terry Kearns asked each member to share his or her reactions to the meeting. The other members expressed their comfort with the meeting. Mike Arneson said he felt that the group was set up for a good development process. David Elliot noted he was still getting used to the process and the fact that certain agencies require a variety of objectives for the EIS process. Mike Quilty said he was glad the group was to the point of putting designs on paper. Dan Moore noted that the Metropolitan Planning Organization was doing a lot of planning for freight, Intelligent Transportation Systems, and other aspects of the system, and that those planning processes should be coordinated with this one. Mark Gallagher said it had been a productive meeting.

Mike Arneson introduced DeLanie Cutsforth to the group. She is a highway designer and will be participating in the study process from this point on.

## **7.0 Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 AM.