HIGHWAY 138E
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
Project Development Team (PDT) Meeting #2
February 17, 2010, 2:00 – 4:00 PM
Roseburg City Hall, 3rd Floor, 900 SE Douglas Avenue

DRAFT
MEETING SUMMARY

Members in attendance:
Bob Grubbs, ODOT
James Burford, ODOT
Mike Lane, Roseburg Fire
Rick Castle, Roseburg Public Works
Mike Luttrell, Douglas County
Peter Schuytema, ODOT
Marion Thompson, City of Roseburg
Jeff Nelson, Roseburg Public Works

Guests in attendance:
Nikki Messenger, City of Roseburg
Mike Baker, ODOT

Members absent:
Brian Davis, Community Development Director
Michelle Eraut, Federal Highway Administration

Resource members:
John Raasch, ODOT
Elizabeth Stacey, ODOT

Consultant team:
Kevin O'Hara, DEA
John Wiebke, DEA
Adrienne DeDona, JLA

Meeting Goals:
- Provide a project update and discuss process changes
- Discuss transportation project financing
- Review project goals and objectives (screening criteria)
- Discuss next steps

Welcome:
Marion Thompson welcomed the group, explained the purpose of the meeting and initiated a round of introductions. Adrienne DeDona reviewed the meeting agenda.

Project Update:
Marion explained that since the group last met, the project team received feedback from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) indicating that they felt that there was sufficient public involvement during the planning study and that an additional open house at the beginning of the Environmental Assessment (EA) project wasn't necessary to reintroduce the various alternatives. Therefore, the open house discussed at the last meeting has been postponed.

Kevin O'Hara provided an update on the progress of the project. He explained that FHWA also directed the project team to refine the project Purpose and Need from the planning study (as presented at the

last meeting). Kevin said that the project team will be working to tighten up the project Purpose with a narrower and more specific focus. However, it will continue to address mobility, safety, connectivity, and multi-modal needs within the corridor. Kevin explained that in order to fully document the project need, further traffic modeling will be required. This includes:

- Updating the existing traffic model with 2035 projections (25 years out).
- Consistency with the County's adopted growth rate (2.0% or 2.5%).
- Updating the 170 Transportation Analysis Zones (TAZ) within the project area. The model covers areas in both Roseburg and Winston and will include collecting and incorporating data related to housing, jobs, growth, etc. specific to each zone. This work, done in collaboration with ODOT and the City of Roseburg will likely take approximately six months to complete.

Peter Schuytema added that a lot of the growth in the area is not occurring as projected. He said that it was also likely that some roadway changes would need to be updated as part of the model.

Kevin said that in addition to updating the existing traffic model, other data will be collected in order to further document the project need, in areas such as mobility, connectivity and safety. Related to the safety needs, SPIS (Safety Priority Index System) sites will be evaluated and incorporated into the project need. There are two SPIS sites within the project area at:

- Eastbound from west of Spruce to Oak
- Westbound at 138E and Spruce

Kevin explained that the Roseburg Bike and Pedestrian Plan also identified high crash sites within the project area at Harvard, Stephens and Douglas that will also be incorporated into the project need.

Kevin said the project team has been working on gathering information on the truck turning radii within the project area in order to document the need related to connectivity. He shared the results of the turning radii analysis for the following intersections (for detailed information, see the February 17, 2010 Committee PowerPoint presentation):

- Northbound Stephens to Eastbound Diamond Lake
- Westbound Diamond Lake to Southbound Stephens
- Southbound Pine to Westbound Washington
- Eastbound Oak to Northbound Stephens
- Northbound Stephens to Westbound Washington

Kevin said that in addition to the tight truck turning radii, there are also connectivity needs related to Bike and Pedestrian access as identified as high priority projects in the Roseburg Bike and Pedestrian Plan. These include:

- Washington and Oak bridges lack of bicycle lanes and sidewalks
- Unimproved railroad crossings at Washington, Oak and Douglas

Kevin told the group that due to the work needed to update the traffic model, the project schedule has been pushed out slightly. The updated schedule also reflects postponing the open house until after the

10% design work is underway. Kevin explained that the discussion at the CAC meeting would help set the stage for determining what projects will move forward to 10% design. Marion clarified that the population and traffic modeling are what is keeping the project from moving forward at this time.

Project Financing:
John R. briefly reviewed the process for selecting a preferred alternative through the NEPA process. He said that depending on the selected Preferred Alternative the City may need to amend the Transportation System Plan (TSP) and the FHWA could then issue a Finding of No Significant Impact (FOSNI). John explained that once this is done, the project will become eligible for funding. He said that funding for these types of projects are typically awarded on a state-wide basis based on population, road type, traffic volumes and need. He said that currently the NEPA study will cost approximately $1.6 million to complete and the document will last approximately 5 to 10 years before an update would be necessary if able to demonstrate that things haven't changed too much. Beyond 10 years, land use, traffic and growth typically change and this would require the study to be updated at an additional cost. John R. said this is why there is a need to identify a project that is doable within a 10 year timeframe.

Mike Baker explained that modernization projects on secondary highways south of Salem, such as Highway 138, include sources of funding from the State, Federal government and the local level. Mike shared a handout with the group that provided a list of modernization projects funded in Oregon over the past 13 years. The largest project on this list was OR238, which was $30 million. Mike explained that Federal earmarks are another method of funding projects; however they are only for a few million dollars and are far and few between. Mike said the largest project funded in the Roseburg area of recent memory was the Stewart Parkway overpass for $5 million.

Mike explained that the project currently has $13.5 million for design, right-of-way and construction. He said that he felt the most the project could realistically get funded for was $30 million, but $20 million was probably more realistic.

Mike said that he thought the project would be ready to go to bid in 2015. He said that the City would need to do some lobbying at the Federal and State level to identify funding and the City could supplement any funding received.

Kevin asked if past project funding impacted the possibility of future project funding. Mike said that it wouldn't and that the EA process would help by getting attention for the project. He added that local politics, such as a Republican county with a democratic congress could have impacts. Mike explained that the Federal earmark process looked to address economic development, safety and capacity.

Kevin reviewed the following 2007 projected project costs for each of the eight alternatives:

- Alternative 1a) Existing Alignment Improvement - $9 million
- Alternative 2a) Harvard-Washington-Stephens-Diamond Lake - $20 million
- Alternative 2c) Harvard-Washington-Rose-Diamond Lake - $21 million
- Alternative 3a) Harvard-Diamond Lake Bridge (RR at-grade) - $74 million
- Alternative 3d) Harvard-Diamond Lake Bridge (RR above-grade) - $350 million

- Alternative 4a) Northern Alignment Flyover (RR below grade) - $95 million
- Alternative 6a) Diamond Lake Boulevard-Odell Avenue Couplet - $14 million
- Alternative 6b) Couplet with Direct Connection - $82 million

Bob Grubbs commented on the project costs presented for other projects and said that these projects were old and costs were different then. He said that the Stewart Parkway Overpass was at least 10 years ago, so costs aren't comparable to current costs.

Nikki said that she expected push-back from the CAC related to not opening the project back up due to funding.

John R. said that alternative 1a should be doable and that they could look at other iterations of some of the alternatives reviewed during the planning study or other, smaller options that haven't been studied.

Purpose and Need Statement:
Marion explained that the planning study Purpose and Need would be refined for the EA after the traffic modeling work was completed. She said in the meantime the project team would focus on refining the Goals and Objectives. Marion referred the group to a memo to the CAC prepared by John R. to explain the intent of the project Purpose, Need, Goals and Objectives. She explained that the project team would be asking the CAC for input related to the Goals and Objectives for the PMT to consider. Marion said that at tonight's CAC meeting, general input would be gathered and following the meeting, the project team would re-draft the Goals and Objectives for both the PDT and the CAC to review and share with other community groups prior to the next meeting. She said that at the first committee meetings, the CAC shared initial feedback about the Goals and Objectives, including the desire to focus on economic development, aesthetics, refine and reformat the required elements and acknowledge the Waterfront Plan. Marion said that because of the project funding impacts, they would more than likely be significantly altering goal two.

Bob asked if goal two would get moved to an objective. Marion said that it would more likely just be completely reworded.

Marion said that the committees will be re-convened after the Purpose and Need is refined and there has been time to review and provide input on the draft Goals and Objectives.

Bob asked how aesthetics would fit in the Goals and Objectives. Marion felt it would fit under goal five related to livability. Marion felt this is also where acknowledgement of the Waterfront Plan could be integrated.

James Burford said that the right-of-way impacts could be significant, especially for lighting and bike lanes. Marion said that the Bike and Pedestrian Plan identifies the realignment of some bike lanes.

James and Bob added that the structure type of the two bridges won't accommodate widening and new rails. New structures would be required to be built. Bob indicated that the structures were in good shape.

Marion said that she thought a new draft of the Goals and Objectives would be sent out to the group in about a month. She said that questions or comments about the goals could be sent to her via e-mail.

Next Steps:
Marion explained the next step in the project would be to refine the Goals and Objectives. The committees would be convened after the traffic study was completed and the Purpose and Need and Goals and Objectives had been drafted.

Marion said that the CAC meeting had been advertised in the newspaper and she was expecting there to be members of the public there to provide comment.

Nikki asked how much the Purpose and Need was expected to change. Marion said she didn't think it would change much. Kevin said it will likely be more focused on problems to address in the project area. John R. said that FHWA has been directing ODOT to focus more on specific intersections with problems between point A and point B. He said that the Need statement will be refined.

Elizabeth asked if project funding would be added to the Goals and Objectives. Marion replied that it would depend on what input the CAC had regarding project funding.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:30 p.m.