



Highway 62 Corridor Project

Date: October 5, 2004

From: Kathy Helmer, RVCOG

Re: **CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC) MEETING
MINUTES for September 22nd, 2004**

Members in Attendance: Bill Blair; Becky Brooks; David Christian; Mike Gardiner; Curt Burrill. Mike Malepsy; Mike Montero; Bob Plankenhorn; Dale Shaddox; Wade Six; Nanci Watkins; Paige West.

Members Absent: Richard Moorman; Susan Rachor; Don Riegger.

Location: Girl Scouts of Winema Council, 2001 N. Keene Way, Medford.

Guests: Two members of the public.

Staff Present: Debbie Timms, Gary Leaming, Jerry Marmon, Mike Arneson and Greg Holthoff of ODOT; Terry Kearns and Jamie Snook of URS; Jim Hanks of JRH; John Morrison and Kathy Helmer of RVCOG.

1.0 Introductions

John Morrison convened the second meeting of the Highway 62 Corridor Project CAC at 6:05 PM. He welcomed the CAC members and reviewed the meeting agenda and objectives. The objectives were: 1) to elect a Chair and Vice-Chair; 2) to gain an understanding of the project outcome; 3) to gain an understanding of the NEPA process; and 4) to become familiar with the basics of highway design.

John asked Curt Burrill and Mike Gardiner, absent from the first CAC meeting, to introduce themselves to the group. Curt is a realtor and Mike manages a freight terminal. Jim Hanks was also introduced. He is a consulting traffic engineer and he will present the basics on the study of traffic at the next CAC meeting.

2.0 Selection of CAC Chair and Vice-Chair

John Morrison reviewed the handout on the role of the CAC Chair and Vice-Chair with CAC members. He noted that Mike Montero had expressed an interest in serving as chair and that Curt Burrill might also wish to serve. John asked for nominations from the floor. Curt Burrill nominated Mike Montero for Chair and there were no other nominations. CAC members voted unanimously in favor of Mike serving as Chair. John Morrison asked for nominations for Vice-Chair and Mike Montero nominated Curt Burrill. Paige West nominated Becky Brooks, but Becky could not accept the nomination. Wade Six nominated Paige West for Vice-Chair. John asked CAC members to vote for Vice-Chair and the vote was 6 for Curt and 4 for Paige. The CAC officers are Mike Montero, Chair, and Curt Burrill, Vice-Chair.

John then shared the project team's difficulties in devising a meeting schedule that worked for all involved. It was decided that November and December CAC meetings would be held on the third Wednesday. Those CAC members who cannot meet then will be offered a one-on-one session to cover meeting materials at another time.

In January, the CAC will go back to meeting every fourth Wednesday.

3. Project Outcome and Decision Process

Since this topic would be covered during the presentation of the NEPA process, no special discussion was dedicated to this agenda item.

4. Introduction to the NEPA Process

Terry Kearns of URS presented a power point presentation on the NEPA (National Environmental Policy Act) process, referring CAC members to the materials included in their meeting packet. Terry explained that NEPA is not an outcome-based project; the project is obligated to look at a range of reasonable and feasible alternatives. Terry reviewed the major steps in the NEPA process, the decision-making process and bodies, the required technical analyses, and concurrent regulatory processes.

When Dale Shaddox asked if public comments received at the Open Houses would be presented to the CAC, Terry assured him that that would happen. Dale also asked about the form of the public hearing and Terry explained that it could take several forms, for example, a court reporter may be present or written comments may be received. Dale asked what body would hold and conduct the hearing. Terry responded that the Project Management Team would organize and facilitate the hearing and ODOT specialists would be on site.

Jim Hanks noted that in previous hearings, a court reporter made the record. Every comment was given to the reporter and compiled in one document. There is a response to every comment.

Dale asked what would happen if the CAC's final recommendation disagreed with the Project Development Team's final recommendation. Terry responded that it would need to be worked out. A joint session for discussion of differences would be one way to proceed. Jerry Marmon noted that sometimes a CAC will not reach consensus and that it may recommend two alternatives, one preferred by the majority and the other by the minority. Wade Six spoke to his experience in the S. Medford Interchange project, saying that the process of assessing alternatives results in only one or two that meet the criteria and create the least impacts.

Dale asked if there was a given dollar amount for the cost of the selected alternative and Terry said no. Mike Montero noted that financial feasibility is a criterion applied to the alternatives. An alternative must also be amenable to implementation in phases, as the funds become available.

Curt Burrill noted that Mike Montero would make a good chair because he understands the process and can articulate the process. Mike Montero emphasized that the Chair and Vice-Chair are obligated to represent the CAC's perspective, whether or not they personally agree with that perspective.

5. Introduction to Highway Design

Mike Arneson led the CAC through a power point presentation on Highway Design. The slides were provided to the CAC in their meeting packet. He noted that the NEPA process was the only way to control politics in the development of highway projects.

Mike spoke of the balancing act involved in designing highways, namely how engineers must provide for the needs of highway users while maintaining the integrity of the environment. He engaged the CAC in identifying the needs of highway users, and then, the integrity of the environment. The following lists resulted:

Needs of Highway Users

Safety	Traffic control
Freight mobility	Pollution control
Efficient movement	Aesthetics
Access	Preserving the investment
Connectivity	Fit into community planning goals
Multi-modal	Shorter trips (reduce VMT)
Information (signage)	Pedestrian/bike (3 people mentioned this)
Please trip (low stress)	

Integrity of the Environment

Pollution	Lighting
Air quality	Noise

Water quality
 Natural surrounding
 Traffic calming
 Safety for neighborhood
 Wetlands
 Property values/property access
 Socio-economic (Environmental Justice)

TODs
 Endangered species...plants and animals
 Historic/archeological
 Land use
 Utilities
 Hazardous materials

After completion of the lists, Mike noted that the interests of users and those of the environment can compete or conflict, and when they do, compromises must be found. As the CAC considers alternatives in the future, it will see these kinds of conflicts.

Mike then asked the CAC to identify highway design elements. They came up with the following list:

Design Elements

Lane width	Multi-modal interface	Bridges/retaining walls
Materials used	Turning radius	Bio-swales
Geometry	Landscaping	Emergency vehicles
Lighting	Freight versus cars	Utilities
Signage	Drainage	R.O.I.
Spacing	Shoulder width	Benefit/cost of .8
Intersection type	Car pool lane	Meet demand

Regarding land use, transportation infrastructure investments can be used to direct growth. Mike noted that we need to plan and build infrastructure with land use changes that use the land efficiently.

The design horizon is 20 years from the date of construction start-up. All analyses are pegged to the improvement functioning at least until that point.

Related to the presentation on traffic modeling, Mike noted that a better database regarding bike and pedestrians is needed before traffic modeling will predict their use.

The last two slides were of the two build alternatives that came out of the last Highway 62 ODOT study, namely, the hybrid alternative and the existing highway alternative. That study was at the point of developing a Draft Environmental Impact Statement when they had to stop for funding reasons. Mike noted that these alternatives were being shared as a starting point for the group. The conditions that held four years ago may have changed and need to be reviewed. Mike Montero underscored that the CAC was not going to be a rubber stamp and that there was new information and conditions, such as the Regional Problem Solving project, that could make a real difference. David Christian asked if this CAC would also find itself in the position of having to stop when it was close to finishing. Mike Arneson answered that the team was sure that they could complete this process. Funding is assured for this process.

Wade Six suggested that it would be good for the CAC to hear the entire story about the first study at the next meeting.

6. Miscellaneous

John Morrison asked the CAC if there were any corrections to the minutes of the meeting of August 25, 2004. Mike Montero moved to accept the minutes as written. The move was seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Gary Leaming announced that the project website was now functioning at www.odot.state.or.us/region3public/hwy62. Gary provided a handout on the site.

7. Public Comment

There was no public comment. Gary Leaming introduced his son Eric who was in attendance and observing the project process for his Senior Project.

8. Comfort Check

John asked CAC members to share their reactions to the meeting and all expressed their appreciation for the quality of the presentations, noting that they were helpful. Curt Burrill said that a dictionary of acronyms would be helpful.

9. Adjournment

Mike Montero adjourned the meeting at 8:05.