

Highway 138 Corridor Solutions Study



Summary of Discussion

Steering Committee (SC)

5th Meeting

2:00 to 4:45 P.M.

June 5, 2006

Attendees

Tim Freeman, Roseburg City Council

Eric Swanson, Roseburg City Manager

Mike Baker, Project Manager, Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)

John Raasch, ODOT Environmental Project Manager

James Burford, Roadway/Bridge Design Manager, ODOT

Wayne Shammel, Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians (left prior to vote)

Jennifer Danziger, David Evans and Associates (DEA), Inc. Senior Project Manager

John Wiebke, DEA Project Manager

Introductions and Project Overview

Jennifer Danziger (DEA) opened with a PowerPoint presentation and Synchro SimTraffic demonstration of projected future year 2030 traffic operations for the No-Build and the six Build alternatives under consideration. A summary of the Alternatives Evaluation Matrix followed the demonstrations.

Project Discussion Items

TAC members reviewed the evaluation criteria and corresponding description for each build alternative submitted by the Project Team and made suggestions for further clarity.

Following the matrix review, Mike Baker and John Raasch discussed funding possibilities. Federal matching funds would likely be in the range of \$15-20 million with the State contributing another \$20-30 million. The remaining project cost would have to be incurred through local jurisdiction sources. A local match through the City of Roseburg would likely come from System Development Charges (SDCs) or from urban renewal. Members were reminded that any preferred alternative resulting from the study would be competing with a range of other statewide projects. Given that Highway 138 is rated as a Regional Highway, it falls below the hierarchy of a State Expressway (OR 42) or Interstate Highway (I-5).

In that context, members voted their preferences among the six build alternatives. Prior to the SC convening, the CAC and TAC advanced their prospective recommendations, with the CAC opting for Build Alternatives 1(a), 2(a) and 3(a) as suggested Preferred Alternatives for further detailed study. Members of the TAC selected 3(a) and 4(a). The SC had the final recommendation on which alternatives would advance for further analysis. Members chose Build Alternatives 1(a) and 3(a) for further review. Hence, with the conclusion of the SC vote, alternatives 1(a) and 3(a) will be advanced as Preferred Alternatives for further study. The final votes and results from all three oversight committees are summarized in Table 1. Comments for or against an alternative are summarized in Table 2.

Next Steps

The second Public Open House is scheduled at the Douglas County Library on June 13, 2007 from 6 pm to 8 pm.

Table 1	CAC			TAC			SC		
	Yes	No	Advances	Yes	No	Advances	Yes	No	Advances
Alternative 1(a) Existing Alignment Improvements	7	1	<u>YES</u>	4	6	NO	4	0	<u>YES</u>
Alternative 2(a) Wash.-Stephens-DLB Align.	5	3	<u>YES</u>	0	10	NO	0	4	NO
Alternative 2(c) 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"> Alternative is fine so long as the improvements are not immediately torn out later with a future long term project 	
2(a)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Too disruptive to downtown circulation
2(c)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact to planned Public Safety Building Too disruptive to downtown circulation
3(a)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Moves through traffic north of downtown 	
3(d)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Projected costs are too high Visual impact
4(a)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not a feasible option given priorities elsewhere throughout the region Too many disturbances to access downtown

