HIGHWAY 138E
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting #2
February 17, 2010, 6 – 8 p.m.
Roseburg Public Safety Center, South Umpqua Room, 700 SE Douglas Avenue

MEETING SUMMARY

Members in attendance:
Joyce Bartkus, Chestnut/Walnut Neighborhood
Georgia Stiles, Developer
Jim Kent, Public Works Commission
John McDonald, Planning Commission
Art Adams, Trucking/Freight
Greg Rietmann, Diamond Lake Business owner
Lance Colley, Roseburg School District
Dan Baglien, Economic Development Commission
Brett White, Downtown Business Owner
Gary Crowe, Chamber of Commerce
Seth Buechley, Laurelwood Neighborhood
Alison Eggers, Benson Neighborhood

Resource members:
Brian Davis, Community Development Director
Marion Thompson, City of Roseburg
John Raasch, ODOT
Elizabeth Stacey, ODOT

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

Members of the public:
Stewart Liebowitz
Polly Sterling

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:
Brian Davis kicked off the meeting with a welcome and introductions. He explained the purpose of the project, including the distinction between the previous planning study and the Environmental Assessment. Brian added that the City had approved a policy that states there are no preconceived outcomes anticipated regarding the preferred alternative. Brian stated that there are some financial and political realities that may ultimately eliminate some of the alternatives and that can be identified in the project goals to be carried forward.

Project Update:
Marion provided an update on the project from the previous meeting and explained that since that time the project team has met with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). FHWA has determined that sufficient public involvement was done during the Planning Study and therefore the open house has been postponed. Marion said the purpose of today's meeting would be to review and discuss the Goals and Objectives as well as hear the progress of the project and the funding process.

Georgia asked where FHWA was located and whether there was a local representative or someone in Washington D.C. Marion noted that in order to receive federal funding, the project must satisfy federal requirements by going through the Environmental Assessment process. Marion said that the FHWA representative for this project is located in Salem.

Kevin said that the Purpose and Need is critical to the study and that the Need should describe the problems. He said that this document is a living, evolving document that will start with the Purpose and Need from the Planning Study. The Purpose and Need statement will be refined based on the study findings and guidance provided from FHWA. Kevin said that the Purpose and Need will continue to address mobility, safety, connectivity, and multi-modal needs, but will be more narrowly focused than it was previously during the Planning Study. Kevin explained that the Purpose and Need will become more specific and focused in order to more effectively weigh each of the alternatives on a pass/fail basis. Kevin added that the Goals and Objectives will be used as a second review of alternatives that meet the Purpose and Need. He said that the Goals and Objectives should identify what the community needs are related to the project. Kevin explained that the following data needed to be collected in order to refine the Purpose and Need:

- Mobility – the traffic model will need to be updated in order to determine the mobility needs within the project area.
- Safety – safety will continue to be a priority for the project. There are two Safety Priority Index System (SPIS) sites within the project area. These are amongst the top 10% crash sites within the State. Any alternative considered should address the following two SPIS sites:
    - Eastbound from west of Spruce to Oak
    - Westbound at 138E and Spruce

  In addition to the SPIS sites, the Roseburg Bike and Pedestrian Plan identified high priority crash sites at Harvard, Stephens, and Douglas that will need to be addressed.

Kevin explained that in order to update the traffic model, the current model will need to be updated for 2035 projections. This includes updating 170 different Transportation Analysis Zones (TAZs) throughout Roseburg and Winston. Kevin said that this process will take approximately six months to complete.

Seth asked what analysis had been done during the Planning Study. Kevin said that the model was developed in 2010 with growth projections to 2025. For the Planning Study we calculated a straight line projection for 2.5% growth to 2030. Because the NEPA study needs to plan for traffic conditions 25 years into the future we would need to calculate another straight line growth projection for five years beyond what the Planning Study projected. Due to the age of the existing model and potential

inaccuracies of relying on 10 years of straight line growth projections on assumptions made 10 years ago it was agreed that the model needs to be updated, which will slow the progress of the Environmental Assessment. Kevin said that in the meantime, the Purpose and Need will be in draft form.

Lance asked why the model couldn't be run by plugging in a growth rate percentage. Kevin said that it's not as simple as plugging in a percentage because there are different conditions for different areas. There are 170 different zones to be analyzed. The growth rate gives you the total population to be apportioned among the different zones. Some zones may grow faster than the adopted growth rate, while others may grow at a slower rate.

Georgia asked if the project would be held up until a LUBA decision was made on the population growth rate. Brian noted that the City has an accepted adopted population rate of 2.5% which will be used for this project to move ahead, so it is not necessary to wait until LUBA decision on the newly adopted County population rate of 2.0%.

Kevin presented the work done by the project team to study 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 said that these connectivity needs should be incorporated into the project Purpose and Need.

Kevin shared the projected project schedule changes, including the delay in the project due to the traffic study. He said that he wasn't sure whether or not the 10% design could begin without the traffic modeling being completed. In the meantime the Goals and Objectives could be refined and the need could be further documented.

Georgia asked if the only hold up was the traffic study. Kevin said that yes, it was.

Brett asked who is responsible for completing the traffic study. Kevin replied that ODOT is responsible for updating the traffic model; however DEA will work with the City to supply the necessary data.

Project Financing:
John R. briefly explained 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. Most of the funding will come from the Federal government, but other sources of funding may be available from the State. John said that the NEPA process is anticipated to cost $1.6 million and will take approximately 2 years to complete. After that, the decision reached is good for 5 to 10 years before it must be re-evaluated due to a change in conditions. John explained that one type of funding typically available for these types of projects is federal earmarks. Federal earmarks tend to only be for a few million dollars. The largest modernization project on a secondary highway, like Highway 138, was funded for $30 million. John said that secondary highways don't typically get as much funding as regional or interstate highways. John reviewed a handout listing the various modernization projects on secondary highways over the past 13 years. He noted that most modernization projects are for $5 to $10 million. John said that this project has secured $13.2 million thus far.

Alison asked if this funding can be taken away. John responded that the funding shouldn't be taken away.

John told the group that $30 million would likely be the most funding the project could realistically obtain. He said that this amount would be huge for a secondary highway project, but he wanted to give the CAC a sense of what was realistic.

Georgia asked if the funding for Interchange 124/Harvard Avenue project would be separate. John said that the two projects wouldn't compete for funding.

Seth asked where the 124/Harvard Road project is in the process. John McDonald said that this project was being completed in-house at ODOT rather than externally through a consultant. He added that this project wasn't a high priority on the ODOT work program and therefore they are still working on drafting the document and ODOT will likely host an Open House to share information later this year.

Don asked if $30 million is all that can be expected for the project, is it fair to say that some of the options are no longer on the table. John R. said that there will likely be a cap on federal and state funding available.

Lance asked if money would be spent on studying options that won't ultimately get funded. Marion responded that the PDT will ultimately make the decision, but that the City is looking for the CAC to provide advice related to dropping any alternatives due to cost.

Kevin explained that the cost of the NEPA study also included cultural analysis within the defined project area, which could change based on the alternatives forwarded to the 10% design task.

Lance commented that this would lengthen the project and drive up the cost to analyze all eight alternatives. Kevin replied that this is why the project didn't begin with 10% design of all eight alternatives.

Brett asked if future developers could contribute to the project cost. Brian said that yes, it's possible, but their portion of the share wouldn't amount to much.

John McDonald asked that if four alternatives were dropped from consideration, would they be locked into the remaining four alternatives. Kevin said that the Planning Study didn't include any design and that there could be other workable alternatives. John R. added that there may be opportunities for other, smaller solutions. Kevin said that there could be good segments or iterations from the original 16 alternatives explored during the Planning Study.

Georgia asked if everyone on the committee knew what the alternatives involved since only half participated in the Planning Study. All agreed that they did.

Seth asked who the consultant team reported to. Marion responded that ODOT is funding the NEPA study, but the PDT would be making the recommendations on the project to be considered by FHWA. She said that the CAC's advice would be presented to the PDT at the next meeting.

John McDonald asked if they will have input on the TAZs. Marion said that they would not.

Seth said that during the Planning Study they did discuss the possible cost of alternatives early on, which is why they were not moving forward with some alternatives previously discussed. Georgia agreed and said that there have been many past opportunities to do something that have been passed up due to cost.

Don asked if there were opportunities to create local jobs through funding and construction. John R. said that projects of this size typically have to follow bid procedures which wouldn't be limited to Roseburg. Marion added that the local economy will come into play during the funding process.

John R. reviewed the following 2007 projected project costs for each of the eight alternatives:

- Alternative 1a) Existing Alignment - $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 (railroad at grade) - $74 million
- Alternative 3d) Harvard-Diamond Lake Bridge (railroad above-grade) - $350 million
- Alternative 4a) Northern Alignment Flyover (railroad below grade) - $95 million

- Alternative 6a) Diamond Lake Boulevard-Odell Avenue Couplet - $14 million
- Alternative 6b) Couplet with Direct Connection - $82 million

Art asked if there are options for phasing, such as tying in alternatives 1a or 2a with another, larger project. Brian said that the City would like to keep the options open, but focus on what is realistic due to funding options.

Don asked if the projected costs of each alternative included the NEPA study. Brian replied that the $1.6 million was separate from these projected costs and that cost is coming from ODOT. He explained that this cost is determined, however, they didn't want to waste any of it if possible. John R. explained that a lot of the cost from the NEPA study would go towards design. He said that the NEPA study would take each alternative determined to be studied to 20% design which will provide a lot of information, including the necessary permits.

Don asked if this would include eminent domain for right-of-way acquisition. Kevin responded that it would include right of way impacts. Marion added that it is much too early to know if acquisition will be necessary; however, if property needs to be acquired to complete the identified build project the City typically does not immediately consider eminent domain action but instead tries to work with the property owner to reach an agreeable solution.

Kevin said that the committee could choose to include something in the Goals and Objectives related to the impacts to property owners.

Marion said that if the project selected was not fundable or if it was over $30 million, then the money would be spent on developing a document and nothing would ever be built. Marion said that the CAC should consider the project cost as part of the Goals and Objectives.

Georgia said that she hoped the alternative selected would help Art get trucks through town. Art replied that alternative 1a would do that.

Brett said that there are dreams and there is just being crazy. He said that $350 million is crazy and $75 million is a dream.

Art said that relocating the railroad switchyard out of Winchester would be a great improvement. He commented that things should be done creatively and that phasing should be looked at. Art added that they were talking about getting to Glide, but not bypassing Roseburg.

Marion said that the Goals and Objectives could address phasing and access to downtown Roseburg.

Purpose and Need:
Marion reviewed the memo prepared by John R. and distributed to the CAC prior to the meeting. She explained the intent of the Purpose and Need would be to evaluate the build alternatives and therefore

it would be a key factor in developing a reasonable range of alternatives. Marion said that the project will begin with the Purpose and Need established during the Planning Study. Once the traffic model is completed, the Purpose and Need will be refined and presented to the committees at the next meeting for input. Marion explained that in the meantime, the project team needed the CAC's input on the Goals and Objectives in order to present a new draft for review and recommendation to the PDT. The following summarizes the input provided by the CAC regarding the Goals and Objectives for the project:

Goal 1: Circulation

- The group suggested adding a statement related to Bike and pedestrian circulation.

Goal 2: Conflicts between rail and vehicular traffic and improve freight travel

- The group discussed the possibility of relocating the railroad switching yard. It was noted this is process is not directly related to Hwy 138E project and therefore is not likely something that can be done in connection with this project. While it is desirable to have the relocation of the switching yard completed to include it as a Goals of the 138E project may be not appropriate.
- It was suggested to change the word 'resolve' to 'improve' when referring to traffic blockages due to passing trains.
- Marion suggested removing Goal 2 completely and replacing it with a goal related to improved and enhanced connectivity.
- The group suggested revising Goal 2 to include language such as, "create a solution that doesn't prohibit future improvement to railroad crossings".

Goal 3: Mitigate adverse impacts to natural and cultural resources

- The group discussed refining and reformatting any required statements (this should be moved to Goal five with the livability goal being moved up to three).

Goal 4: Economic development

- The group didn't identify any further changes to Goal 4 beyond what was discussed at the last meeting.

Goal 5: Livability

- The group discussed adding a statement related to aesthetics
- It was suggested to change the language from 'maintain' to 'enhance' livability of surrounding neighborhoods.
- The group discussed incorporating some of the elements identified in the Waterfront Plan
- It was suggested to include a statement about enhancing/improve public utilities (i.e. underground telephone lines, sidewalks, planting strips, storm drain facilities, etc.)

Lance asked if they should all agree to remove any of the alternatives projected to cost more than $30 million. All agreed to recommend removing any alternatives over $30 million from further consideration.

Public Comment:
The following summarizes the comments received from members of the public.

- Stuart Liebowitz – Quality of life should be incorporated, including impacts to neighborhoods and the environment. Vehicle miles traveled should be considered. House Bill 2001 criteria to evaluate projects through 2015 should be made available to the public so that they made aware of the full scope.

Next Steps:
Marion explained that the project team would refine the project Goals and Objectives based on the input heard from the CAC at this meeting. A new draft would be sent to the committees for review prior to the next meeting.

John McDonald asked if there was a transit representative on the committee. Marion responded that a transit representative was invited to participate, but didn't respond. John McDonald said that the project should enhance transit and that the old Safeway had been identified as a possible future transit hub.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:00 p.m.