

The logo features a blue curved line that starts on the left, curves upwards and then downwards to the right, resembling a stylized 'C' or a road curve. The text 'Highway 62 Corridor Project' is written in a bold, blue, sans-serif font, positioned to the right of the curve.

# Highway 62 Corridor Project

**Date:** October 3, 2005

**From:** Pat Foley, RVCOG

**Re:** **CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC) MEETING MINUTES for September 28, 2005**

---

**Members in Attendance:** Bill Blair, Becky Brooks, Curt Burrill, Mike Gardiner, Mike Malepsy, Mike Montero, Richard Moorman, Bob Plankenhorn, Susan Rachor, Don Riegger, Wade Six, Nanci Watkins and Paige West.

**Members Absent:** David Christian and Dale Shaddox.

**Location:** Jackson County Public Works Auditorium

**Guests:** Bern Case and Robert Russell of Medford Airport and 5 members of the public

**Staff Present:** Debbie Timms, Jerry Marmon, DeLanie Cutsforth, Brian Dunn and Gary Leaming of ODOT; Terry Kearns, and Nadine Lee of URS; Kim Parducci of JRH; Pat Foley of RVCOG

## **1.0 Welcome/Approval of Minutes**

Mike Montero, CAC Chairperson

Mike Montero convened the fourteenth meeting of the Highway 62 Corridor Project CAC at 6:00 PM. Mike asked for all present to introduce themselves. He then asked for approval of the August 24<sup>th</sup> minutes. The minutes were approved as written.

## **2.0 Public Comment**

Pat Foley, RVCOG

Time was provided on the agenda for members of the public who could not stay for the entire meeting to make comments. Pat asked if there were any members of the public who wished to make a comment at this time. There were no comments.

## **3.0 Funding Highway 62 & South Medford Interchange**

Debbie Timms, ODOT

Debbie gave an overview in response to recent articles in the newspapers regarding the South Medford Interchange Project's (SMI) anticipated construction costs. The estimates for construction have come in higher than anticipated. Based on the anticipated costs, ODOT went to RVACT to discuss options to help fund or find solutions for the South Medford Interchange Project. One of the multitude of options being looked at is to use some of the funds designated for the Highway 62 Project. If this project donates funds toward the SMI, there are some expected additional bridge dollars that can be reallocated to this project. This project is on the state's significant list which is important for future funding.

Wade Six asked how and when the decisions on funding are made: Debbie replied, RVACT has to look at more funding solutions/options. The South Medford Interchange Project goes to bid in February 2006. The decision will be made between now and February.

Mike Montero added that Highway 62 is one of only five projects that are classified as having statewide significance. There is a discreet pool of funds set aside to fund those five projects. While we rely on a variety of funding mechanisms, the fact that this project competes with only four others makes a much higher probability that there will be additional funding available. We don't want to become alarmed and feel that the work we are doing will have been for naught.

## **4.0 The Airport Master Plan**

Bern Case, Medford Airport

Bern started his presentation thanking the committee for inviting him to speak and to express his appreciation for the work that has been done in the past;

In order for airports to receive funding, FAA requires that they have a Master Plan which plans 20 to 30 years into the future. Work on the present Master Plan was started in 1999 and finished in 2001. Since that time several adjustments have been made. For those interested in examining the Master Plan, the document can be downloaded from the Jackson County website or a hard copy can be checked out at the airport with a \$100 deposit.

Bern went on by describing projects recently completed, that are presently in progress and planned for the future. An extension of the main runway has been completed. A parallel runway, designated as 3-2 right 1-4 left is planned for the future. This runway will be based on capacity needs. This runway could affect your project. When we extended the present runway we had to move Upton Creek. The

process for moving the creek was harder than extending the runway. In order to avoid having to move that creek again we have realigned the future runway more to the south and adjusted the airport boundary. Bern doesn't feel that this change will affect the Highway 62 project. He said the airport wants to work with this committee to make the project work. He gave an example of working with the community. Butler Ford has set up their business within the airport boundary. Instead of saying no to Butler Ford, all of the restrictions were laid out. Working together the plan was approved by FAA. One restriction was solved by placing the lights lower than the surrounding lights. This way the lights would not impede the incoming air traffic.

Using an overhead map Bern showed that a portion of the Medco Haul Road's bike path goes through airport property. One point in favor of the Highway 62 project is that this road is grandfathered in. If a swap of lands is necessary, this could be worked on. Bern said that a trade is much easier than buying and selling land. In Bern's opinion if the conceptual road alignment is used and is not elevated, we would have a chance getting it approved by FAA. There is a form that has to be submitted to FAA. They will evaluate the proposal and make comments which may recommend changes. If the Highway 62 Project Leaders and the Airport submit this form together, the process will be shorter.

Bern gave some suggestions. If you are going to put in street lights you need to think about height. Another issue is the trajectory of car lights. I don't think the conceptual road alignment shown tonight will cause a trajectory problem. If there is a problem it could be handled by adding barriers to block the light.

Bern completed his presentation by stating that the airport plans on working with the team. This project is important to the airport.

Questions:

The overhead map shows three hangars on the east side of the airport property. Can the location of these hangars be changed? Answer: The hangar locations are conceptual. Their location could be changed.

What kind of access is needed for the east side of the airport? Answer: We have options for future development on the east side. We do not need multiple accesses, but we do need access to this area.

Could the access be road that goes under the bypass facility? Answer: We do need to allow for freight ingress and egress. Yes that type of road would be acceptable.

When should a land trade document be done? Answer; As soon as you have selected serious alternatives. I can look at your proposal and if I don't think the proposal will work I will let you know. I will work with you on a proposal.

The Legislature just passed Connect Oregon. Are you going to be applying for some of those funds? Answer: Yes. A portion of that legislation is earmarked for commercial airports. With our terminal project going on, we believe we can meet all of the criteria.

One component of this committee's project is the flow of freight. Can you give us a sense of the square footage needed for freight related facilities? Answer: Our present freight facilities utilizes between 5 and 6 acres. We plan to increase that to 60 acres. Another question I am frequently asked is why we don't purchase more land. The Medford Airport owns 1,000 acres. This is more acreage than Reagan International and the San Jose facility. If we make good decisions in the future, the present acreage will meet our needs.

## **5.0 Constraints at the Southern Terminus**

Terry Kearns, URS

Terry began his review of the constraints at the Southern Terminus by stating that there are not a lot of options because of space needed for an expressway and the constraints that include vernal pools, wetlands, airport safety zone and planned growth for the airport. Using three maps with the constraints overlaid Terry went on to explain the possible impacts to the project. Vernal pools and wetlands have very strict specific regulation that governs whether they can be impacted. If a wetland is impacted you are required to mitigate. That is not easy to do with vernal pools. To be able to impact a wetland, first we have to show why we could not avoid the wetlands. If that threshold is met you then have to show how to minimize the impact. Finally the third step is mitigation. In regard to vernal pools, we are fortunate because the regulatory agencies in this area recognize that some of the vernal pools are isolated. The regulatory agencies would rather preserve larger vernal pool complexes and are willing to give up isolated vernal pools.

Using the map Nadine Lee prepared, showing a conceptual bypass alternative using the Medco Haul Road alignment, Terry went on to show how a possible bypass alignment could be laid out. The area at the southern tip is very narrow.

Concern was raised regarding putting a bypass through planned development at Delta Waters and Highway 62. Curt Burrill said that the developers had already gotten permits to build (vernal pools on site). This development is being done in phases and the developers are aware of the potential of an expressway going in.

### ***Break***

## **6.0 Northern Terminus Alternatives**

Terry Kearns, URS

Terry started his presentation by stating that at the last meeting the committee asked for simplified maps for the Out-of-Corridor alternatives and information on destinations and origins within the corridor. Terry went on to explain the results of the Origins and Destination Analysis.

Origins/Destinations:

Maps using three different intersections were prepared (Poplar, Vilas and Antelope) and used to explain the origins and destinations. The information on each map is based on, 2030 RTP, PM peak demand (4 to 5 PM). The data was extrapolated from Transportation Analysis District models.

Map 1           Origins for trips using Highway 62 northbound at Poplar

34% originated West of I-5, North of Stewart Road  
20% originated West of I-5, South of Stewart Road  
20% originated I-5/Highway 99 South of Talent  
12% originated East of I-5  
14% other

Map 2           Destinations for trips using Highway 62 northbound at Poplar

36% had a destination north of White City  
28% had a destination east of Highway 62 south of Vilas  
19% had a destination south of Vilas  
11% had a destination in White City  
5% had a destination Highway 140, east of White City

Map 3           Origins for trips using Highway 62 northbound at Vilas

15% originated West of I-5, north of Stewart Road  
31% originated West of I-5, south of Stewart Road  
23% originated I-5/Highway 99 South of Talent  
43% originated East of I-5  
4% other

Map 4           Destinations for trips using Highway 62 northbound at Vilas

61% had a destination north of White City  
20% had a destination in White City  
11% had a destination Highway 140, east of White City  
3% had a destination of Central Point  
5% other

Map 5           Origins for trips using Highway 62 northbound at Antelope

13% originated West of I-5, north of Stewart Road  
28% originated West of I-5, south of Stewart Road  
18% originated I-5/Highway 99 South of Talent  
38% originated East of I-5  
3% other

Map 6           Destinations for trips using Highway 62 northbound at Antelope

42% had a destination of Eagle Point  
43% had a destination north of Eagle Point  
15% had a destination of White City

Terry explained that the results of this study show that the corridor problem is confined to Highway 62. The Out-of-Corridor alternatives do not solve the problems the CAC is working on.

Terry went on to review the modeling results for the North Terminus Options. He explained that there are some traffic issues that most likely can be made to work through design. All of the Northern Terminus options meet the Purpose and Need.

## **7.0 Revisiting the Out-of-Corridor Alternatives**

Terry Kearns, URS

Terry reviewed simplified maps of the Out-of-Corridor Alternative. These alternatives were discussed at the last meeting. Members of the CAC expressed their appreciation at having the information presented to them in this format.

Terry gave a summary of the current status of what has been done to date. The CAC has reviewed the future “No Build” conditions, evaluated the “Out-of-Corridor” Alternatives, “North Terminus” Alternatives, and “South Terminus” Constraints.

The next steps are:

1. Evaluate “In-Corridor” Alternatives
2. Utilize the first tier screening, Purpose and Need
3. Select Alternatives
4. Apply second tier screening, Project Goals and Objectives and Evaluation Criteria
5. Select Reduced set of alternatives

The CAC and PDT will be having their regular meetings in October. Neither group will have a meeting in November. A joint CAC & PDT meeting is planned for December. This meeting will be a longer meeting and is scheduled for either December 14<sup>th</sup> or 15<sup>th</sup>. The CAC will be notified by email as soon as a date is selected.

## **8.0 Public Comment**

Pat Foley, RVCOG

Pat opened the public comment session, inviting the public to speak.

Earl Wood: Earl felt that a bypass was needed to solve the traffic problems

Terry Walther: He inquired how the project works with other groups, i.e. Medford. Answer: The Project Development Team which meets tomorrow has City representation.

## **9.0 CAC Comfort Check**

Pat Foley, RVCOG

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

## **10.0 Adjournment**

The next CAC meeting will be on October 26<sup>th</sup> at the Jackson County Public Works Auditorium.