

# Highway 138 Corridor Solutions Study



## Summary of Discussion

### Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

4<sup>th</sup> Meeting

9:00 A.M. to Noon

April 3, 2007

#### **Attendees**

Mike Luttrell, Douglas County Public Works

Ray Lapke, Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) Traffic Operations Engineer

Bob Grubbs, ODOT Senior Bridge Designer

Tom Hawksworth, Central Oregon and Pacific Railroad (CORP)

Thanh Nguyen, Transportation Analyst, ODOT

John Raasch, ODOT Environmental Project Manager

Mike Baker, ODOT Project Manager

Patrick Kerr, Assistant General Manager, CORP

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**

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**

TAC 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 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Committee comments are displayed in Table 1. The final scoring matrix that reflects results from the three committee meetings held on April 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> 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.

Patrick Kerr (CORP) proposed a solution that would raise the railroad through downtown more or less within its existing alignment with fill and structure that would take advantage of the natural grade changes. A grade and elevation map was provided for review and consideration

## **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.

<b>Table 1</b>	<b>Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)</b>	
<b>Concept 1a</b>	General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The concept does not address multi-modal. Is this a fatal flaw?</li> <li>Has anyone considered the lifespan of the existing bridges?</li> </ul>
<b>Concept 1b</b>	General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concept would not impair access to downtown</li> <li>Some would like to consider in combination with other concept options</li> </ul>
<b>Concept 1c</b>		Reviewed but no comments
<b>Concept 2a</b>	General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Option needs to show Douglas connection at Stephens</li> <li>What would be happening at Stephens and DLB?</li> <li>Would need to consider widening Harvard Avenue to six lanes</li> </ul>
<b>Concept 2b</b>	General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would harm downtown couplet signal system</li> </ul>
	“No” Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cultural and 4(f) impacts are likely to be a fatal flaw</li> <li>Concerns expressed about interaction with downtown</li> </ul>
<b>Concept 2c</b>	General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How would Stephens/DLB intersection work?</li> </ul>
	“Yes” Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May not work but would like to see more detail</li> </ul>
	“No” Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concept would impact City investment in old Safeway and Rite-Aid sites, public service building proposed.</li> <li>Concept would implement two parallel highways and three intersections on DLB.</li> </ul>
<b>Concept 2d</b>	General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cul-de-sac at the end of Rose Street can be remove because the existing roadway does not extend that far</li> <li>Prioritization of Highway 138 would have extensive impact to downtown traffic flow</li> </ul>
	“Yes” Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Keeps new bridge option open in downtown vicinity</li> </ul>
	“No” Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cultural and 4(f) impacts and Stephens/DLB concerns</li> </ul>
<b>Concept 2e</b>	“No” Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cultural and 4(f) impacts</li> <li>Shifts problems from Stephens to Winchester</li> <li>New bridge but no significant realignment</li> </ul>
<b>Concept 3a</b>	“No” Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not provide grade separated crossing</li> </ul>
<b>Concept 3b</b>	“No” Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disruption to Winchester</li> <li>Questionable connection to Stephens</li> </ul>
<b>Concept 3c</b>	“Yes” Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not likely possible to raise railroad</li> </ul>
	“No” Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns over environmental impact and cost</li> </ul>
<b>Concept 3d</b>	“No” Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unsure of feasibility</li> </ul>
<b>Concept 4a</b>		Reviewed but no comments
<b>Concept 4b</b>	“No” Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Elevation difference will impact too many businesses</li> <li>Too much bridge structure</li> </ul>
<b>Concept 4c</b>	“No” Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Stephens access</li> </ul>
<b>Concept 4d</b>	“Yes” Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minimal impacts to neighborhoods</li> </ul>
	“No” Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environmental justice issues?</li> <li>Stopping traffic on hills on Stephens and Winchester</li> </ul>
<b>Concept 5</b>		Reviewed but no comments

