



Highway 62 Corridor Project

Date: July 31, 2006
From: Sue Casavan, RVCOG
Re: **CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC) MEETING
MINUTES for July 26, 2006**

Members in Attendance: Mike Montero, Bill Blair, Becky Brooks, David Christian, Bob Plankenhorn, Mike Gardiner, Richard Moorman, Don Riegger, Wade Six, and Susan Rachor

Members Absent: Nanci Watkins, Curt Burrill, Paige West, and Mike Malepsy

Location: Jackson County Public Works Auditorium, White City

Guests: 36 members of the public

Staff Present: Debbie Timms, Jerry Marmon, Chris Zelmer and Gary Leaming of ODOT; Martha Richards of URS; Kim Parducci and Mike Arneson of JRH; Gary Shaff of GSA; Sue Casavan and Pat Foley of RVCOG

1.0 Welcome and Approval of Minutes

Mike Montero, CAC Chairperson

Chair Mike Montero convened the meeting of the Highway 62 Corridor Project CAC at 6:00 p.m. Mike reviewed the meeting's agenda and asked for approval of the May 24th minutes. The minutes were unanimously approved as written.

2.0 Project Development Team Update

Jerry Marmon, ODOT

Jerry M. explained that the last time PDT met was in May and they looked at three primary elements:

- Multi- modal subcommittee recommendation

- Design refinements on the South Termini particularly looking at the feasibility of a frontage road rather than a backage road
- Looked at design refinements for the North Termini what would Highway 62 and the connections look like if it was kept on the same alignment through White City. No formal decisions were made.

3.0 Public Comment

Pat Foley, RVCOG

Bernard (Foothills Road): Every road you build should have five lanes, think 20 years ahead and start now.

4.0 Discuss new South Terminus Option

Mike Arneson, JRH; Jerry Marmon, ODOT

Mike Arneson said that the team has made refinements to the alternatives. One proposal that has been recommended by the Access Management Subcommittee is the South Terminus Split Diamond Option. Mike went on to explain what it is and how a Split Diamond Interchange operates. This option would have the Bypass connect directly to the I-5 interchange and is the ultimate in the separation of uses. This option only works with the Bypass Alternative.

Regarding Split Diamond Interchange considerations for this project:

- The Split Diamond was on the table as a viable option when the Phase I EIS process was shelved
- Brought back on to the table jointly by the Access Management Subcommittee and the South Terminus Business/Property owners
- Construction and ROW costs combined are comparable to any of the other alternatives
- Frontage/backage road between Poplar and Crater Lake Avenue are not needed
- Minimal “throw-away” from the project that was just constructed
- Provides the most overall increase in capacity for the corridor (doubles the capacity of the corridor)
- Need more traffic analysis to be able to quantify the benefit of the Split Diamond

Discussion:

Mike M. asked if the split diamond is used, would it be necessary to grade-separate existing Highway 62 at Poplar and Mike A. answered it would not have to be grade-separated.

Debbie T. added, keep in mind that there would be a jurisdictional exchange and Highway 62 would become a city facility.

Jim Coombes asked what would happen to the businesses east of Poplar and Bullock.

Mike A. said the team would need to get more detail and will address on a case by case basis as they move forward.

Man from audience asked if the expressway would be elevated. Mike A. replied that it would be elevated from I-5 past Bullock, then down to at-grade.

Woman from the audience asked if there would be a ramp from Bullock onto the new bypass and Mike A. answered no. She wanted to know how it would help Highway 62 if most of the problems were the daily routes of people that live in Eagle Point and White City.

Mike A. said it depended on what your destination was, the traffic flow in the valley is from the north down Highway 62 to I-5 then down I-5 and back. He said we have an origin destination study that overwhelmingly shows that this does give you a choice.

Wade S. asked Mike if he could discuss the Rogue Regency and area up toward Withams.

Mike A. explained the new roadway would be elevated, it would have bridges built over the jughandle ramp, between Biddle and the highway, and over the top of Bullock and the rest would be elevated.

Man from the audience asked what width would be needed to accommodate the bypass.

Mike A. said it be about 70 feet from edge of pavement to edge of pavement.

Man from audience asked what kind of timeframe we are looking at.

Debbie T. responded that the environmental process was hoped to be completed by 2007 and first construction would start 2009-2010.

Update of Texas Turnaround:

Mike A. has been in contact with Texas DOT in order to learn transportation details regarding the Texas Turnaround. He has also been working with ODOT. Details on the Texas Turnaround:

- Texas Turnaround slip ramps are classified as interchanges
- The area surrounding the interchanges have to follow **access management guidelines**
- There are changes to the previous footprint at Vilas and Delta Waters
 - Past maps showed Delta Water connecting at Crater Lake Avenue
 - 1/4 mile is needed between interchange and intersection
 - a. Same spacing is needed at Vilas
 - b. Same configuration would be needed with the Existing Highway Alternative
 - Crater Lake Avenue would have to bulb out into residential/commercial area

Mike went on to show photos of Texas Turnarounds located in San Antonio.

Discussion:

Man from the audience asked why all the designs were focused on this one intersection, why not take studies from Vilas and Table Rock and divert the traffic around that way; these designs are ruining a tremendous amount of businesses.

Mike A. responded that they have tried that, traffic wants to go where everything is, looking at that suggested alternative route does not pull enough traffic off the highway to improve it to the needed level.

Man from audience said he lived in Eagle Point and traveled Foothill Road every day and he thought other people would use it too if it was opened up. He thought it would take a lot of traffic out of the corridor.

Jerry M. said they had looked at a Foothill improvement, extending out to as many lanes as possible and it still did not provide relief on Highway 62 to meet the purpose and need of the project.

Woman from the audience asked how many businesses would be taken out at Poplar and Highway 62 and what would it do to Safeway, Olive Garden, etc.

Mike A. said the alternatives have different impacts, parcel to parcel will be evaluated when we move forward with the alternatives.

Jerry M. further added that there is a set of evaluation criteria where we look at right of way impacts and all of the various elements.

Man from audience commented that he was in Houston last fall and used a Texas Turnaround. He agrees with what Mike A. said about access to businesses. You cannot get off the freeway and then get across the lanes in time to get into the businesses.

5.0 South Terminus Business / Property Owner's Meeting

Gary Leaming, ODOT

Gary said that the second meeting with the South Terminus business and property owners on June 29th had a larger turnout than the first meeting. Gary went through the meeting agenda. Jerry Marmon explained how each of the three alternatives operates. The group then examined enlarged maps of the South Terminus. The group was invited to express their concerns and to provide input.

Concerns included:

- Loss of access from Highway 62
- Loss of business caused by proposed accesses
→Do not like frontage and or backage roads
- Texas Turnaround would have very limited or no access

Input:

- Warren Cooper suggested 1) the Split Diamond concept and 2) moving the airport property to the north.

The consensus of the group was that they liked the Split Diamond with the Bypass and would like to see it studied more.

6.0 Access Management Subcommittee Report / Recommendations

Jerry Marmon, ODOT; Mike Arneson, JRH

Mike said the Access Management Subcommittee had four meetings.

The Purpose:

- To develop general/conceptual access management recommendations for each alternative
- The committee did not address parcel-specific access issues
- Utilize current ODOT guidelines for access management

The Process:

May 25th

- Overview of purpose and process, review of access management techniques, broad overview of each build alternative.

June 15th

- Overview of each build alternative in detail, discussion of access management issues pertinent to each alternative.

June 29th

- Focused on South Terminus issues, discussed 5 concepts, developed specific recommendations for each concept

July 13th

- Focused on North Terminus and Mid-Corridor issues, developed specific recommendations for North Terminus and Mid-Corridor

Discussion:

Man from the audience asked Mike A. at what point do the teams address parcel access decisions.

Mike A. explained that once the alternatives are narrowed down to the ones that will be studied in the EIS they will be analyzed on a parcel by parcel basis.

General Items:

- An overview of the importance of access management in terms of safety, capacity, and long-term protection of the investment was provided as a basis.
- Access management methods were discussed in general and some local, existing examples were used for discussion.
- The Texas Turnaround intersections were defined as interchanges by ODOT, requiring them to comply with interchange access management spacing standards (this resulted in a significant change to the TT footprint at Delta Waters) and we identified some additional concerns along the frontage roads.

Discussion:

Man from audience asked if a study was done to see what most of the accidents are caused by.

Mike A. responded that the majority of accidents were caused by people turning into and out of private accesses.

Texas Turnaround

Mike reviewed 3 maps of the Texas Turnaround which showed 1) Texas Turnaround Interchange at Delta Waters, 2) Texas Turnaround Interchange at Vilas Road and 3) Texas Turnaround weave/merge issues.

- No access for 1/4 mile between Delta Waters and Crater Lake Avenue intersection
- No access for 1,000 feet on Highway 62 north and south of Delta Waters
- Vilas interchange has similar issues as those at Delta Waters
- Weave and merge issues on slip ramps

South Terminus

- The committee identified the issues unique to the South Terminus area including the proximity of the interchanges with I-5 and Biddle Road
- It was recognized that trying to provide access for Poplar Drive and nearby businesses while maintaining a high level of safety and capacity on the highway was going to be difficult
- 5 concepts were developed and evaluated for all 3 alternatives

Mike used five concept maps to show what issues were:

Concept 1 – Crater Lake Highway as an overpass over Poplar, Corona Avenue extended to highway (right in/right out), backage road between Poplar and Crater Lake Avenue

Issues:

- Distance between highway and frontage road at Corona
- Proximity of right in/right out at Corona to exit ramp
- Deceleration on a down grade
- Loop ramp from Poplar to 62 WB – merge/weave concern
- North jug handle ramp modification
- Signal Spacing on Crater Lake Avenue

Concept 2 – Access road off of just built ramps between Biddle and Highway 62 with signal at Poplar.

Issues:

- Connection would be to a designated interchange ramp
- ODOT argued that these are interchange ramps in previous case
- Does not address the concerns of FM and Poplar businesses
- Requires a signal at Poplar – spacing problems for City

Concept 3 – Slip ramp off Crater Lake Highway to Poplar

Issues:

- Proximity of jug handle and gore of slip ramp
- No access to ramp before intersection at Poplar
- Signal spacing is concern on Poplar
- Signal spacing issues at Crater Lake Avenue
- Volume on the ramp likely to result in queuing on Highway 62

Concept 4 – Split Diamond

Issues:

- Environmental
- Cost – qualitative analysis

Concept 5 – Variation of Concept 1, have road off of jug handle connect to Bullock.

Issues:

- Remove portion of existing north jug handle
- Two entrances ramps very close together
- South side, same issues as Concept 1

The committee made specific recommendations on the above 5 concepts;

- Concept 4 (Bypass with Split Diamond) appears to be viable and should be presented to the CAC and PDT for further consideration.
- Off-ramp from Bypass to Poplar/Bullock seems viable and should be considered (Concept 1/5)
- The backage/frontage road on the south side is viable for providing access to the businesses but does not provide direct access to 62
- No access to 62 at the South Terminus. No viable solutions for providing access to 62 between the I-5 interchange and Delta Waters could be found.

Texas Turnaround – South Terminus

Elements:

- No access to mainline of Texas Turnaround
- No access to frontage roads within 1,000 feet of crossroad
- Interchange access management standards at Delta Waters

Existing Build – South Terminus

Elements:

- No access to mainline
- Frontage/backage road between Poplar and Crater Lake Avenue
- Interchange access management standards at Delta Waters

Bypass – South Terminus

Elements:

- No access to mainline
- Frontage/backage road between Poplar and Crater Lake Avenue
- Split Diamond and off-ramp from Bypass SB to Poplar possible

On a motion by Mike G., and seconded by Wade S. the committee unanimously agreed to move the Access Subcommittee recommendations on to the PDT for further study.

7.0 Discuss and Make Recommendation - North Terminus Existing Build Alternative

Mike Arneson, JRH

Using Agate Road Bypass

- The committee identified the issues unique to the North Terminus area including the east-west connectivity in White City
- It was recognized that given any interchange footprint in White City, it would be difficult to provide access to any remaining businesses

Issues:

- Gregory, Hwy 140 Freight Route, Crater Lake Avenue, East/West connectivity
To address the disruption of the freight route the committee took into consideration the planned improvements that will extend the Hwy 140 freight route across the highway by Big R, use Agate to Avenue G on out, improve corners on Kirtland. A concern is having the Bypass on Agate may disrupt the flow. They looked at the traffic that would be pulled off the Bypass; the freight route could be rerouted onto the existing highway with improvements to Avenue G intersection. They also looked at the possibility of extending Crater Lake Avenue into White City.

Connection at Dutton Road (applies to all three alternatives)

Issues

- Dutton Road – east and west sides of Highway and Antelope Creek to Shasta Avenue

White City Interchange

Mike reminded the team that staff was asked to look at ways to minimize the diamond interchange footprint in White City. Three additional maps were shown with possible configurations within White City. The third map compared the diamond interchange footprint to a single point urban diamond. The single point urban diamond interchange shows that it also has a significant impact to the core of White City.

North Terminus Recommendations

- Full access control on the Agate Bypass all the way to Dutton Road
- Explore the idea of having a signal controlled connection near Dutton instead of a directional interchange
- Under crossings at Antelope, Avenue G and Avenue H
- The comparison of SPUI versus the Diamond footprint was shown to the committee and it was determined that access issues and footprints were comparable. Generally the committee felt any concepts that used the existing highway through White City were going to require an extensive rebuild of White City and frontage roads.

Mike said that if the CAC and PDT keep the interchange options as viable options the Access Management Subcommittee would like to reevaluate options to try and provide access to the remaining businesses and residences in White City.

Discussion:

Susan R. commented that it would wipe out White City and there would be no access to the city.

Man from audience asked why it couldn't be moved to right before or right after White City, why in the middle of White City.

Mike A. explained that they have looked at that, Antelope and Highway 140 both need to have interchanges and we tried to consolidate them into one.

Woman from the audience asked if any of the businesses were contacted about this kind of a plan.

Debbie T. responded that we have met with the North Terminus businesses once.

On a motion by Mike G., and seconded by Wade S. the committee unanimously agreed to forward the Access Managements Subcommittee North Terminus recommendations to the PDT for further evaluation.

Mid-Corridor

- The committee identified the issues unique to the Mid-Corridor. It was thought this segment of the project, regardless of the alternative was more straightforward in terms of access management, although not without challenges.
- For the Texas Turnaround and Existing Highway Build there are still significant issues around access to the existing businesses and residences, particularly around Delta Waters and along the frontage roads.
- General recommendations were made.

Mike presented and reviewed maps of each alternative showing where access management guidelines need to be implemented.

Mid-Corridor Recommendations:

Bypass Alternative

- Full access control
- Follow ODOT access management standards

Existing Alternative

- Full access control
- Follow ODOT access management standards

Texas Turnaround

- Full access control
- Full access control ¼ mile at interchanges
- Follow ODOT access management standards
- Turnarounds can be located as needed and do not affect access management standards for the highway

General Recommendations

- Full access control up to the existing Highway 62/140 intersection is recommended to protect any proposed directional interchange

On a motion by Wade S., and seconded by Mike G. the committee unanimously agreed to forward the Mid-Corridor Access Management Subcommittee recommendations to the PDT for further evaluation.

8.0 Discuss North Terminus Refinements

Mike Arneson, JRH

Mike started by reviewing the North Terminus Existing Build history.

- Several options have been considered
 - 1) Interchanges
 - 2) At-grade signalized intersections
- For the most part, the north terminus issues are independent of the corridor alternatives

- Extensive effort has been made to minimize impacts while still meeting the transportation demand

Mike reviewed the Existing Highway through White City – At grade signals with Flyover at Highway 140. This CAC/PDT asked the team to review and analyze this option at their May meetings. A table summarized the findings for at grade signalized intersections at; 1) with and without flyover at Highway 140, 2) Antelope/Hwy 62, 3) Avenue G/Hwy 62 and 4) Avenue H/Hwy 62. None of the options met v/c ratios in 2030 with four lanes. The Hwy 140 flyover and Avenue H/Hwy 62 alternatives met ratios in 2030 with six lanes plus dual left turn lanes. It has been concluded that the six lane alternatives would have significant impacts.

Mike then presented 3 maps: 1) Existing Highway through White City – Standard Diamond Interchange between Hwy 140/Antelope, 2) Existing Highway through White City – Single Point Diamond Interchange between Hwy 140/Antelope and 3) Existing Highway through White City – Comparison of Standard Diamond and Single Point Diamond Interchange between Hwy 140/Antelope. The technical conclusion of the team is that they cannot find a way to continue to use the Existing Alignment through White City without building one of the above mentioned interchanges. Any other alternative that was considered will not meet the traffic demand.

Discussion:

Mike M. asked the committee if they felt they wanted the teams to do any further analysis of the existing alternative through White City.

Susan R. said she did not think we should even consider this; the impact is just too great to the community and businesses. The costs are prohibitive and we should not even have ODOT look at anything like this. I think it is unacceptable.

David C. said it sounds like all the studies of this footprint have been done.

Mike G. added that we identified early on that the at-grade was too disruptive and we wanted to focus on alternatives that did not do this.

Wade S. commented that one thing he thinks this committee has been very sensitive to is to not divide or strip away the character of White City, to let it grow and build what it should be. He further added that he did not know how in good faith the committee could push this one forward.

Becky B. said she thought it would eliminate all chances of White City becoming self-supportive.

Bob P. thought it had too much impact on White City and they did not need that.

Don R. said it was a poor idea and should not be studied further.

Mike M. agreed with committee and would like this to be the end of it.

On a motion by Don R., and seconded by Susan R., the committee unanimously recommended to the PDT that no further study be done on the Existing Highway through White City on the Standard Diamond and the Single Point Diamond interchange between Highway 140 and Antelope Road.

Land Use Subcommittee Report and Recommendations to be presented at the August CAC meeting, committee members agreed the presentation would be detailed and required a substantial amount of time and thought that it should be a priority agenda item at the next meeting.

9.0 Public Comment

Pat Foley, RVCOG

Gordon Draper of Biomass One said that he has been to almost all of these meetings and wanted to share some comments that were made by the teams at the very first meeting. When the process is complete no one will get exactly what they want, but what you will get is a consensus of the community of what is best for the community. He said a lot of things have been put on the table and the teams have really done their homework and they should be congratulated on that.

Earl Wood from Eagle Point said all cities will double in size in the next 20 years. There will be a lot more impacts. There will be a lot of trouble with traffic and I recommend that we don't stop here we just keep going.

Man from Kawasaki in Medford asked if anyone, when looking at the growth in the valley, had considered light rail systems.

Jerry M. said there needed to be a certain population density threshold before light rail would become feasible.

Mike M. added that RVMPO has a study under way for a commuter rail. It is being looked at.

Larry Ziegelmeier talked about light rail systems in California and felt the Bypass would allow enough easement down the center so at some point when light rail could be feasible they already have existing facilities. He said it would be a few years out but if it is considered now it will be easier.

Steve Eastman asked if a designated one-commuter lane has been considered where you could still have entrances to businesses.

Mike A. commented that the through route does not stop with all the options that are on the table.

Woman from the audience asked, with the diamond interchange, why couldn't it be taken all the way out to Eagle Point. Would off-ramps at Vilas, Antelope eliminate any problems on Highway 62.

Mike A. explained they could always extend the concepts but that every project is confined by dollars and reasonable size.

Jerry M. added that the alternatives as you see them would not preclude the idea of extending them and would be included in the option.

10. CAC Comfort Check

Pat Foley, RVCOG

Becky Brooks: I'm good

Richard Moorman: I'm good

Mike Gardiner: I appreciate the public coming out and I hope they can understand a little more of the process we have gone through. It is always interesting to have more public input.

David Christian: I am cool now
Don Riegger: I'm good
Bill Blair: I'm good
Mike Montero: I am great
Bob Plankenhorn: I am good
Susan Rachor: I am good
Wade Six: I'm fine

11. Next Steps

Jerry Marmon, ODOT

Jerry said that at the next month's meeting additional traffic analysis will be presented for the Split Diamond option. Evaluation criteria will be used to compare this alternative with the other alternatives. There will be a presentation from the Land Use Subcommittee. Two open houses are scheduled for September; September 18th, Girl Scout Auditorium and September 19th, White City Resource Center.

12. Adjournment

Mike Montero, Chair

Meeting was adjourned at 8:25 p.m.