

Highway 138 Corridor Solutions Study



Summary of Discussion

Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC)

4th Meeting

6:00 to 8:00 P.M.

April 2, 2007

Attendees

Georgia Stiles, Property Developer (attended TAC meeting)
Brett White, Downtown Small Business
Seth Buechley, Laurelwood Neighborhood
John Kennedy, Public Works Commission
Neal Hadley, At-large Citizen
Gary Crowe, Chamber of Commerce
Mike Baker, Project Manager, Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)
John Raasch, ODOT Environmental Project Manager
Jennifer Danziger, David Evans and Associates (DEA), Inc. Senior Project Manager
John Wiebke, DEA Project Manager

Guests

Polly Stirling, Douglas County Global Warming Coalition
Stuart Liebowitz, Douglas County Global Warming Coalition

Introductions and Project Overview

John Wiebke (DEA) opened the meeting by presenting the circulation and design concepts under consideration and summarizing the criteria that will be used to screen and narrow the concepts down to a select few that will be modeled for year 2030 performance.

Project Discussion Items

CAC members reviewed the scoring matrix submitted by the Project Team, modified where they judged necessary, and voted on their preferred alternatives. The up, down or neutral votes from the three committees (CAC, TAC, and SC) held on April 2nd and 3rd. Committee comments are summarized in Table 1. The final scoring matrix that reflects results from the three committee meetings held on April 2nd and 3rd is attached as Table 2.

NOTE: Two additional concepts (1c and 3d) were added and reviewed by the TAC and SC. Concept 1c combines design options of 1a and 1b whereas Concept 3d developed from a proposal by CORP to elevate the railroad bed through downtown to enable roadways to pass under the tracks.

Table 2	Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC)	
Concept 1a	General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Economic development regarding waterfront not called out specifically Alternative is one step beyond no-build
Concept 1b	“No” Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns about impacts to neighborhoods along Winchester and potential confusion on routes into downtown Cross traffic and intersections along Winchester Not enough value for impact Other options look better
Concept 1c	Not Reviewed	
Concept 2a	“Yes” Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Least environmental impact and disruption of the downtown alignment options More circulation
	“No” Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not adequately improve Stephens and Diamond Lake
Concept 2b	“No” Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not adequately improve Stephens and Diamond Lake Impacts to the Lane House
Concept 2c	“No” Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greater potential impact than (2a) to historic homes along Rose and future development (e.g. public safety facility)
Concept 2d	“Yes” Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential for addressing Stephens and Diamond Lake
	“No” Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cultural and historic impacts similar to (2b)
Concept 2e	“No” Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Too great an impact along Douglas and Jackson Bridge over Deer Creek along Jackson may be historic
Concept 3a	“Yes” Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would potentially address Stephens and Diamond Lake intersection Best at-grade option and relatively reasonable cost-wise
	“No” Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bridge is not grade separated Wetland impacts Bypassing downtown Cost and impacts versus benefit
Concept 3b	General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there any way to keep the Washington Avenue Bridge open? (DEA will look into the possibility)
	“Yes” Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grade separated intersection
	“No” Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High environmental impact and poor connections to Stephens
Concept 3c	“No” Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental impacts, cost, and neighborhood impact
Concept 3d	Not reviewed	
Concept 4a	“No” Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cuts off Winchester and downtown Environmental impact
Concept 4b	“No” Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Too much bridge structure Business and environmental impacts
Concept 4c	“No” Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bypass of city Environmental impacts
Concept 4d	“No” Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Too aggressive grade on Stephens Environmental impacts
Concept 5	“No” Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not fix problem

Two non-CAC members were also in attendance and were invited to comment following the review of the concepts and scoring matrix.

Stuart Liebowitz suggested that the study and projected need for a new Highway 138 route is based on faulty premises. For example, he questions the projected population increases and future dependence on automobiles. He also objected to the study process, particularly how the various concepts were assessed during the committee meeting. Instead of the project team filling out the scoring matrix in advance of the CAC meeting, committee members should have had an unbiased view of a blank matrix to fill in individually. The results following the three committee meetings should be shared with the public – particularly on split votes. Finally, the city should be considering maximum implementation of non-auto facilities and services.

Polly Stirling expressed concern that the concepts discussed that are more extreme will have a significant impact on the community. She also stressed the importance of maximizing the opportunity for the public to be heard and to enable them to shape the final decision.

Next Steps

The second Public Open House is scheduled on April 11, 2007 from 6 pm to 8 pm and will be held at Douglas County Library.