OR 140 Corridor Plan

Technical Advisory Committee

Meeting #1 – June 16, 2011

Adopted Meeting Notes

Attendees: See Attached List

Introductions

Tom Guevara opened the first TAC meeting with a general overview of the project. He introduced himself as the ODOT project manager and identified the consultant team. We then went around the room and everyone in attendance stated their name and the community or agency they were representing.

Tom requested that all comments on Technical Memoranda (1-4) be submitted to him by July 28, 2011, the next TAC meeting date.

Project Overview

To set the stage for the meeting material Tom reference two adjacent area projects including: Interchange 35 Area Management Plan (IAMP 35) and the OR 62 Corridor Project. He clarified that the OR 140 Corridor project is coordinating with the two projects and the IAMP 35 project will address any improvements needed up to and including Blackwell Road.

Jennifer Danziger, the Consultant project manager, provided a brief overview of the OR 140 Corridor purpose, process, goals, planning area, and environmental and land use reconnaissance. She highlighted two environmental and land use "red flag" locations: high-value vernal pools and threatened species (vernal pool fairy shrimp and dwarf wooly meadow-foam). The information she covered is contained in slides 2 through 10 of the attached presentation.

Review of Existing Conditions

Shelly Alexander, the Consultant traffic engineer, presented a summary of the existing conditions data collection and analysis that has been completed to date. The information she covered is contained in slides 11 through 28 of the attached presentation.

Comments/questions during the presentation are documented below in the existing conditions discussion.

Existing Conditions Discussion

The following comments/questions were received during the meeting:

- Ron Hughes suggested including Division 51, sections 115 (corridor specific) and 125 (interchange specific) in the text. He also mentioned that in January 2012 the new Division 51 changes take effect.
- The standards were discussed for the corridor. Specifically, which apply to White City as it is unincorporated, yet within the Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization Area (RVMPO). The group agreed that we should use the urban containment boundary which will result in the application of the urban standards.
- Robin requested that the crash data be expanded to include truck specific crashes/crash rate, while the group expressed interest in seeing the crashes at the Kershaw intersection broken down by year. There was some discussion regarding anecdotal safety information for the section of Blackwell Road between the Frontage Road and Kirtland Road-property owners indicate that far more crashes occur than what was documented in the existing conditions report. Jennifer reminded the group that while that may be true, unless the crash is officially reported it is not counted in the crash analysis.
- The group recommended checking 2010 partial data for Blackwell Road/Kirtland Road to see if there had been a reduction in crashes since improvements were completed last summer. Jennifer noted that the period of available data may not be long enough to produce any conclusions at this time.
- TAC identified improvements at Kershaw Road in 2007, realignment and turn lanes. Jennifer said DEA would check to see if history at Kershaw showed fewer crashes after the improvements were installed.
- In response to the yearly crash trend declining after 2007, it was noted that the County had completed a paving project along OR 140 between Table Rock Road and Bear Creek Bridge during that timeframe.
- A comment was made regarding the depth of ditch along Kirtland Road stating that it is very deep and non-recoverable for vehicles that enter.
- Jennifer noted that the number of lanes for OR 62 was incorrect on slide 13 and it was pointed out that Antelope is 3 lanes and the speed drops near OR 62.
- Comments on the Rail Crossing history of the corridor included: crossing located at Kirtland Road was replaced but the old crossing remains as a private crossing, there is a spur that crosses Avenue G, CORP co-owns through Agate.
- Comments for slides 18 and 19 (regarding recent traffic volume trends): County should have data to help fill holes in AADT for the section of corridor west of OR 62, if possible acquire freight data as well with the County counts (freight trips may show downward trend). Adam will work with County to get that data to DEA.
- It was suggested that the evaluation consider travel time along the corridor when considering project improvements.
- It was suggested that the “Hole-in-the-Air” (ORS 366.215) concept be considered/evaluated with this project; however, one member suggested that this ORS should not be an issue for this corridor as the effective pavement width would not be made smaller than what is currently there.

- It was recommended that two documents be added to the policy review section: Central Point TSP and the OR Freight Plan (adopted 6/15/11).
- The district is considering a project to add delineators for the length of Kirtland Road. Fog is an issue along the roadway.
- County realignment of Pacific Avenue is scheduled for summer of 2012.

Next Steps

DEA is currently working on the future conditions analysis for the corridor. These will be discussed at the next meeting. We will also be discussing concepts for improvements to the corridor.

The next round of meetings (TAC, Citizen Committee, and Public Open Houses) is anticipated on July 27/28. We will provide as much notice as possible about the schedule for those meetings.

Attachments:
Attendance Sheet
PowerPoint Presentation