

Highway 138 Corridor Solutions Study



Summary of Discussion

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

6th Meeting

9:00 A.M. to 11:00 A.M.

September 5, 2007

Attendees

Clay Baumgartner, Roseburg Public Works Director
Ray Lapke, Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) Traffic Operations Engineer
Tom Hawksworth, Central Oregon and Pacific Railroad (CORP)
John Raasch, ODOT Environmental Project Manager
Mike Baker, ODOT Project Manager
Brian Davis, Roseburg City Planning
Romey Ware, Douglas County Surveyor
Jennifer Danziger, David Evans and Associates (DEA), Inc. Senior Project Manager
John Wiebke, DEA Project Manager

Introductions and Project Overview

Jennifer Danziger and John Wiebke opened with a PowerPoint presentation that reviewed the corridor study process, including the purpose, need and goal statements, agency coordination and public process, existing operations, projected future (2030) no-build operations, concept development and screening process, and build alternative evaluation and operations. A summary of Open House #3 written comments was also provided.

Project Discussion Items

Final recommendations were presented and discussed as outlined in Section 6 of the draft Final Report that included a summary of strengths and weaknesses for each build

alternative and why the alternative was recommended or not recommended for further analysis in a future study. Build Alternatives 1(a) and 3(a) were recommended for further study. Back and forth discussion followed and covered the following topics:

- A major challenge in attempting to move forward beyond this corridor study will be achieving common consensus and getting community leaders to work together towards a common goal.
- The degree to which the alternatives spur economic growth should be factored as strength.
- Is it wise to screen out a grade separated option for the railroad before the Environmental Assessment?
- What are the potential ramifications if the alternatives cannot meet HCM standards? Designating a Special Transportation Area (STA) might be one option.

Next Steps

The project team is scheduled to present the Final Report before a joint session of the City Council and Planning Commission on September 24, 2007. Therefore, comments on the draft report should be submitted no later than September 11, 2007.

Following completion of the final report, the next logical step would be to initiate an Environmental Assessment (EA) that would be fully funded by ODOT. EAs generally have a 3 to 5 year life span where beyond that period the process must start over again. Therefore, before pursuing such an effort (an approximate 2-year process), ODOT would first need to gauge the degree of local commitment to the project and the extent of established funding sources – particularly at the local, county and state level.

<i>Table 1</i>	CAC			TAC			SC		
	Yes	No	Advances	Yes	No	Advances	Yes	No	Advances
<i>Alternative 1(a)</i> Existing Alignment Improvements	7	1	<u>YES</u>	4	6	NO	4	0	<u>YES</u>
Alternative 2(a) Harvard-Wash.-Stephens-DLB Align.	5	3	<u>YES</u>	0	10	NO	0	4	NO
Alternative 2(c) Harvard-Wash.-Rose-DLB Align.	0	8	NO	0	10	NO	0	4	NO
Alternative 3(a) Harvard-DLB Bridge Connection (At-Grade)	5	3	<u>YES</u>	6	4	<u>YES</u>	4	0	<u>YES</u>
Alternative 3(d) Harvard-DLB Bridge Connection (R/R above grade)	0	8	NO	0	10	NO	0	4	NO
Alternative 4(a) Northern Alignment (flyover)	1	7	NO	10	0	YES	0	4	NO

Table 2	Yes	No
1(a)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less impact on surrounding land uses • Recommendations should not be limited to something so large scale that it would not be implemented until the very distant future • Not <u>the</u> long term solution but part of the long term solution 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not solve issue of DLB to Harvard • Does not resolve access issues downtown • Same as No-Build • Need to be more progressive in addressing problems
2(a)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not a good long term solution for the money it will cost. • Moves congestion closer to downtown • Large intersections • 1(a) is better as a phased short-term option • Geometry, queuing, potential crashes • Interrupts north-south Stephens Street movement
2(c)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact to planned Public Safety Building • Lost opportunity to redevelop former Safeway property • Disruptive to the downtown area • Disruptive travel pattern • Adds congestion downtown
3(a)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harvard to DLB connection is important • Relocation of RR switching yard should ease somewhat the crossing issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not resolve the RR crossing issue • Should spend the extra amount necessary to grade separate over the RR
3(d)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Projected costs are too high • Impact to downtown (aesthetic, historic) • Noise
4(a)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prefer the grade separation option (explore other alignment options) • Resolve cross over at east end • Provides connectivity to downtown without major impacts to downtown and river 	