Highway 62 Corridor Project

Date: October 12, 2004

From: Kathy Helmer, RVCOG

Re: **PROJECT DEVELOPMENT TEAM (PDT) MEETING MINUTES for September 23, 2004**

PDT Members in Attendance: Mike Arneson, Brian Dunn, David Elliott, Mark Gallagher, Mark Gibson, Jay Harland, Kathy Helmer, Greg Holthoff, Terry Kearns, Skip Knight, Gary Leaming, Rick Levine, Jerry Marmon, Dan Moore, John Morrison, Jamie Snook, Debbie Timms.

Members Absent: Nick Fortey, Mike Quilty.

Location: Jackson County Public Works Auditorium, Mosquito Lane, White City.

Guests: Eryca McClartin, Jim Hanks.

Resource Technical Team in Attendance: Art Anderson, Alex Georgevitch, Shirley Roberts, Leslie Schwab, Joe Thomas.

1.0 Introductions

Project Leader Debbie Timms convened the meeting of the Highway 62 Corridor Project PDT at 9:00 AM. She welcomed PDT and RTT members and asked members to introduce themselves.

Rick Levine moved that the minutes of the August 26, 2004 meeting be approved as written and this motion passed unanimously.

Terry Kearns informed members that the next 3 meeting dates would be October 28th, Nov.18th and December 16th. Beginning in January 2005, the PDT meeting date will be the fourth Thursday of each month.

John Morrison provided an update on activities of the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC). He noted that the CAC's meeting the previous day had been devoted to understanding the NEPA process and Highway Design. CAC members were very positive about the value of the presentations. They also elected a Chair (Mike Montero) and a Vice-Chair (Curt Burrill). Skip Knight said he would like a roster of CAC members; Gary Leaming noted that he could find that information on the project web site.

2. 0 Introduction to NEPA

Terry led the group through a power point presentation on the National Environmental Policy (NEPA) process. The power point slides were provided in the meeting packet.

After the presentation, there was discussion of a number of topics. Greg Holthoff noted that the group needed to stay open to the idea that more than one alternative could move into the Final Environmental Impact Statement process. The Record of Decision is actually the final document. To illustrate the relationship of the Purpose and Need to the alternatives, Terry suggested the metaphor of the dart target. Alternatives that hit closest to the bull's eye should be selected. Dan Moore asked what were the study area boundaries and Terry said that they would be set in the next few months.

Skip Knight asked what would happen if the project got to the point of having selected the best alternatives only to find that funds were not available. Would the project be put on the shelf? Would the entire study have to be redone? Terry responded that the project could be done in stages. Debbie said that they needed to think long-term about staging. Art answered that staff were rather confident about getting funds for the first stage. No one can project all the funds and timing. Greg Holthoff noted that costs should be built into the goals and objectives as a criterion. Brian Dunn noted that there are ways to update a plan if it has been shelved for a while.

Jim Hanks noted that the project might cost around $120 million, given that three interchanges @$30 million may be involved. It may be possible to build it at grade. In any case, one criterion that should be included is the ability to phase the construction of the corridor.

Jay asked who writes the ROD. It is written by the Project Management Team (PMT) and forwarded to the FHWA for their signature.

3.0 Highway Design

Mike Arneson led the group through a power point presentation on Highway Design. The power point slides were in their meeting packet. In previous work, the project identified two "build alternatives" and one "no build" alternative. A tentative preferred alternative was also identified. At that point, the project had to go back to the Poplar to I-5 segment and conduct an Environmental Assessment. This project will reopen the previous work and look at all alternatives. That work had merit. Now we will need to identify any

changes that have occurred since that work was done. Mike described the two build alternatives from the past project.

During his presentation, Mike explained that highway engineers strive to provide for the needs of highway users while maintaining the integrity of the environment. He asked PDT and RTT members to identify a set of Highway User Needs. They came up with the following list:

Highway User Needs

Community Buy-In
Access
Connectivity
Safety
Effective traffic movement
Visibility
Route choice
Driver expectations
Service life
Multi-modal
Aesthetics
Utilities
Weather utility
No delays
Lighting
Drainage
Landscaping
Emergency Services
Community info signs
Freight mobility
Stretching available funds
Reliability
Transit Options
Life cycle costs

Mike asked the group to identify aspects of the integrity of the environment and they made the following list.

Integrity of the Environment

Endangered species
Wetlands
Air quality
Erosion/sediment
Vernal pools
Property values
Noise
Water quality
Minimal displacement of people
Hazardous materials
Lighting
Land use
Socio-economic
Historic/archeological
Resource land
Aesthetics
Utilities
Efficiency of facility
Community relationship to public space
Connect to environment
Open space

Mike discussed the topic of highway design and asked participants to identify design elements of importance. They produced the following list.

Design Elements

Geo-tech/hydraulics
Bridge, culvert
Traffic analysis
Air quality
Design standards
Environmental mitigation
Land use planning

ADA	Lighting	Utilities
Geometry	Urban design	Signal design
Multi-modal	Access control	Water quality
ITS	Lawyers	Staging
Biology	ROW	Storm water mgt.
Illumination	Pavement design	Raw materials
Striping	Cost mgt	Cost estimates
Guard rail flares	Maintenance	Surveying

4.0 Next Steps/Adjournment

Terry Kearns explained that the next meeting would be devoted to the study of traffic. Jim Hanks will make a presentation on the analysis of traffic problems and ways to deal with such problems. He will provide information on the intersection analysis done on Crater Lake Avenue and Highway 62 and an accident analysis.

Terry noted that two years ago, a very useful Origin and Destination Study was done on the Highway.

Skip Knight asked if the PDT could begin at 8:30 AM, so that he could stay to the end of the meeting before going to a City of Medford meeting. The PDT agreed to begin future meetings at 8:30 AM.

John Morrison asked participants to share their reactions to the meeting. Many said how much they appreciated the presentations. Brian Dunn suggested that it would be good to use the NEPA schema at the beginning of all meetings, to show people where the project is in the process. Jay Harland said that he expected policy conflicts and would like to have a discussion of how the PDT would tackle those issues as a group. David Elliott said he appreciated that the presentations had started at the beginning level.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:55 AM.