

## Appendix A

# Oversight Committee Meeting Agendas and Summaries

December 2006

January 2007

February 2007

April 2007

May 2007

June 2007

September 2007

October 2007

February 2008



**CITY OF ROSEBURG, OREGON**

Planning Commission Agenda - December 4, 2006 - Special Meeting  
(11-22-2006)

AGENDA

PLANNING COMMISSION

CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS

Monday, December 4, 2006

6:30 p.m.

I. SPECIAL PRESENTATION

Oregon HWY 138 Corridor Solutions - ODOT

Improving Connectivity between Harvard Avenue and Diamond Lake Boulevard

900 SE DOUGLAS AVE | ROSEBURG, OR | 97470 | TEL: 541.672.7701 | FAX:  
541.673.2856 [info@ci.roseburg.or.us](mailto:info@ci.roseburg.or.us)

# HIGHWAY 138 CORRIDOR SOLUTIONS STUDY

## CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

### Kick-Off Meeting

6:00 pm to 8:00 pm

**December 5, 2006**

ODOT Region 3  
West Conference Room  
3500 NW Stewart Parkway, Roseburg

## AGENDA

---

**I. Introductions**\_\_\_\_\_ **Mike Baker, ODOT**

**II. Project Overview**\_\_\_\_\_ **John Wiebke, DEA**

**III. Project Discussion Items**\_\_\_\_\_ **All**

Review and approve Technical Memorandum #1, Definition and Background. CAC may provide comments and revisions, if necessary.

Define the project area and discuss purpose/need and goals/objectives

Summarize key tasks from start to finish

**IV. Next Steps**\_\_\_\_\_ **John Wiebke, DEA**

Review existing plans, land uses and environmental constraints

Collect traffic counts, analyze existing traffic operations, and evaluate crash history

Assess future operations of the transportation system

Summarize upcoming scheduled/planned meetings with City Council/Planning Commission and Committees.

Attachments for this meeting: Technical Memorandum #1

# Highway 138 Corridor Solutions Study



## Summary of Discussion

### Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC)

Kick-Off Meeting

6:00 to 8:00 P.M.

December 5, 2006

#### **Attendees**

Georgia Stiles, Property Developer

Mike Parker, Local Engineer

Brett White, Downtown Small Business

Michael Widmer, Economic Development Commission

Art Adams, Nordic Veneer

Neal Hadley, At-large Citizen

Gary Crowe, Chamber of Commerce

Sande Dixon, Umpqua Transit

Chad Ambrose, Bike-Pedestrian Advocate

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

## **Introductions and Project Overview**

Following introductions of those present, Mike Baker (ODOT) opened the meeting by providing a brief summary of the corridor study to the committee members. He added that the study will be conducted in the context of early phases of a NEPA study. Afterward, John Wiebke (DEA) gave a PowerPoint presentation describing the existing conditions within the corridor study area, an initial study purpose and list of transportation system deficiencies that impact the corridor, study goals and objectives, summary of work tasks, public participation plan, and preliminary future meeting dates. He also displayed locations throughout the study area where peak three-hour turning movement counts (TMCs) were collected in May 2006 and where origin-destination license plate surveys were being conducted on the same day as the meeting.

The preliminary study goals were presented as follows:

- 1. Maintain highway performance and improve safety by improving efficiency and management*
- 2. Enhance through-traffic circulation and accessibility while mitigating impacts to downtown Roseburg and local neighborhoods*
- 3. Improve access to the transportation system for other modes of travel including bicycles and pedestrians*

## **Project Discussion Items**

The committee endorsed the purpose; need and goals statements forwarded by the SC and presented the following comments and questions.

- Are the study boundaries too constrained? What happens past Fulton Street where most of the potential future development lies?
- Buses (transit and school) are a safety issue with a high need for bus stop accessibility.
- Neighborhoods such as Laurelwood, Jackson, Klamath and Mill/Pine are sensitive to discussions of adding a bridge in their vicinity.
- Aesthetic/visual issues are a key component that should not be overlooked in the study process.

## **Next Steps**

The next meeting will be held on January 29, 2007 and will discuss the Task 4 data collection items as well as fine tune the purpose and need statement and goals and objectives.

# HIGHWAY 138 CORRIDOR SOLUTIONS STUDY

## TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

### Kick-Off Meeting

10:00 am to Noon

**December 5, 2006**

ODOT Region 3  
West Conference Room  
3500 NW Stewart Parkway, Roseburg

## AGENDA

---

**I. Introductions**\_\_\_\_\_ **Mike Baker, ODOT**

**II. Project Overview**\_\_\_\_\_ **John Wiebke, DEA**

**III. Project Discussion Items**\_\_\_\_\_ **All**

Review and approve Technical Memorandum #1, Definition and Background. TAC may provide comments and revisions, if necessary.

Define the project area and discuss purpose/need and goals/objectives

Summarize key tasks from start to finish

**IV. Next Steps**\_\_\_\_\_ **John Wiebke, DEA**

Review existing plans, land uses and environmental constraints

Collect traffic counts, analyze existing traffic operations, and evaluate crash history

Assess future operations of the transportation system

Summarize upcoming scheduled/planned meetings with City Council/Planning Commission and Committees.

Attachments for this meeting: Technical Memorandum #1

# Highway 138 Corridor Solutions Study



## Summary of Discussion

### Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

Kick-Off Meeting  
10:00 A.M. to Noon  
December 5, 2006

#### **Attendees**

Nikki Messenger, City of Roseburg Public Works (sitting in for Clay Baumgartner)  
Mike Luttrell, Douglas County Public Works  
Ray Lapke, Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) Traffic Operations Engineer  
Chris Blevens, ODOT Roadway/Bridge Design  
James Burford, ODOT Roadway/Bridge Design Manager  
Bob Grubbs, ODOT Senior Bridge Designer  
Tom Hawksworth, Central Oregon and Pacific Railroad (CORP)  
John Raasch, ODOT Environmental Project Manager  
Mike Baker, ODOT Project Manager  
Thanh Nguyen, ODOT Transportation Analyst  
Brian Davis, Roseburg City Planning  
Jennifer Danziger, David Evans and Associates (DEA), Inc. Senior Project Manager  
John Wiebke, DEA Project Manager

## **Introductions and Project Overview**

Following introductions of those present, Mike Baker (ODOT) opened the meeting by providing a brief summary of the corridor study to the committee members. The study was proposed following a determination that the intersection of Stephens and Douglas could not be improved to accommodate future demand. He added that this is a more in-depth planning process than typical in that it will address some NEPA guidelines. This should streamline the EA process should it be deemed necessary.

John Wiebke (DEA) gave a PowerPoint presentation describing the existing conditions within the corridor study area, an initial study purpose and list of transportation system deficiencies that impact the corridor, study goals and objectives, summary of work tasks, public participation plan, and preliminary future meeting dates. He also displayed locations throughout the study area where peak three-hour turning movement counts (TMCs) were collected in May 2006 and where origin-destination license plate surveys were being conducted on the same day as the meeting.

The preliminary study goals were presented as follows:

1. *Maintain highway performance and improve safety by improving efficiency and management*
2. *Enhance through-traffic circulation and accessibility while mitigating impacts to downtown Roseburg and local neighborhoods*
3. *Improve access to the transportation system for other modes of travel including bicycles and pedestrians*

John Raasch (ODOT) informed that the first CETAS meeting, originally scheduled on February 7, 2007 has been rescheduled to February 20, 2007.

## **Project Discussion Items**

John Raasch stressed the importance of the purpose and need statement in the NEPA process, stating that a purpose statement should be a single sentence broadly summing up what the study or project is striving to achieve while the needs statement individually describes the deficiencies addressed in the purpose statement. Serious consideration should be given toward adopting a strong purpose and need statement, because it cannot change during the planning process without going back and redoing previously accomplished work.

Using the study purpose presented by DEA as a springboard for discussion, an agreed upon purpose and need statement was established by the TAC at the conclusion of the meeting as follows:

### **Initial Purpose Statement**

*Document existing and forecast future system deficiencies and identify potential solutions*

## TAC Endorsed Purpose Statement

*Address mobility, safety, connectivity, and multi-modal needs on Highway 138 between I-5 Exit 124 and Fulton Street while maintaining downtown accessibility*

Five needs were identified as follows:

Mobility: Restricted freight movement downtown due to tight curb radii, railroad crossings that disrupt circulation, congestion along Stephens Street, and access management.

Safety: Bicycle and pedestrian amenities, railroad crossing queuing and stacking, and emergency response

Connectivity: Freight access, gaps in bicycle and pedestrian amenities, railroad crossings effectively divides city in two, Stephens Street to Highway 138, and community impact and livability.

Multi-Modal: Dysfunctional bicycle and pedestrian amenities and maintenance of transit

Downtown: Controversy over consideration of a by-pass, need for good connections, and addressing business interests.

Potential indirect impacts of the by-pass option were expressed that centered on the possibility that it may direct additional traffic onto I-5 for short distances between the Garden Valley and Harvard Avenue interchanges.

Finally, the TAC recommended the addition of a fourth goal centering on the environment.

## **Next Steps**

The next meeting will be held on January 30, 2007 and will discuss the Task 4 data collection items as well as fine tune the purpose and need statement and goals and objectives.

# HIGHWAY 138 CORRIDOR SOLUTIONS STUDY

## STEERING COMMITTEE

### Kick-Off Meeting

2:00 pm to 4:00 pm

**December 5, 2006**

ODOT Region 3  
West Conference Room  
3500 NW Stewart Parkway, Roseburg

## AGENDA

---

**I. Introductions**\_\_\_\_\_ **Mike Baker, ODOT**

**II. Project Overview**\_\_\_\_\_ **John Wiebke, DEA**

**III. Project Discussion Items**\_\_\_\_\_ **All**

Review and approve Technical Memorandum #1, Definition and Background. Steering Committee may provide comments and revisions, if necessary.

Define the project area and discuss purpose/need and goals/objectives

Summarize key tasks from start to finish

**IV. Next Steps**\_\_\_\_\_ **John Wiebke, DEA**

Review existing plans, land uses and environmental constraints

Collect traffic counts, analyze existing traffic operations, and evaluate crash history

Assess future operations of the transportation system

Summarize upcoming scheduled/planned meetings with City Council/Planning Commission and Committees.

Attachments for this meeting: Technical Memorandum #1

# Highway 138 Corridor Solutions Study



## Summary of Discussion

### Steering Committee (SC)

Kick-Off Meeting

2:00 to 4:00 P.M.

December 5, 2006

#### **Attendees**

Dan VanSlyke, Commissioner, Douglas County Board of Commissioners

Tim Freeman, Council President, Roseburg City Council

Eric Swanson, City Manager, City of Roseburg

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

John Raasch, ODOT Environmental Project Manager

Chris Blevins (sitting in for James Buford), ODOT Roadway/Bridge Design Manager

Lisa Cortes, ODOT Planning

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

John Wiebke, DEA Project Manager

## **Introductions and Project Overview**

Following introductions of those present, Mike Baker (ODOT) gave an overview to committee members of the planning process. Afterward, John Wiebke (DEA) gave a PowerPoint presentation describing the existing conditions within the corridor study area, an initial study purpose and list of transportation system deficiencies that impact the corridor, study goals and objectives, summary of work tasks, public participation plan, and preliminary future meeting dates. He also displayed locations throughout the study area where peak three-hour turning movement counts (TMCs) were collected in May 2006 and where origin-destination license plate surveys were being conducted on the same day as the meeting.

The preliminary study goals were presented as follows:

- 1. Maintain highway performance and improve safety by improving efficiency and management*
- 2. Enhance through-traffic circulation and accessibility while mitigating impacts to downtown Roseburg and local neighborhoods*
- 3. Improve access to the transportation system for other modes of travel including bicycles and pedestrians*

## **Project Discussion Items**

Questions and comments were fielded during and after the presentation and are summarized below:

- What will be achieved with the Study? Will it assume that a project will happen or will it go through the justification process?
- Roseburg has a limited number of options for expansion, particularly because of topography. Many of the areas to the north and west are fairly developed already; Diamond Lake Boulevard is one of the last available flat areas.
- A project will advance from the study but the timing will be an unknown factor.
- What will be the function of the committees?
- An issue that may impact downtown is the relocation of a switching yard from downtown to a new location north of the city.
- The Highway 138 corridor (Diamond Lake Boulevard) is one of the last places that can be developed. However, expansion (particularly big box retail) is limited due to the existing transportation system.
- Roseburg is the central shopping area for Douglas County. Therefore, businesses are typically undersized, attracting more traffic than typical for the size needed. Development along Diamond Lake Boulevard is awaiting a solution to the corridor.
- Missing from the presentation and notes for TAC is expansion of economic growth along Diamond Lake Boulevard, including tourism gateway to Crater Lake, seasonal travel, and Roberts Creek Enterprise Zone.

- The South Umpqua riverfront will be a factor in the study. Much of the land is under tribal ownership and a potential bridge alignment will necessitate taking of floodplain property. The challenge will be to develop a plan that will accommodate both the bridge (if it's the chosen alternative) and development.

### **Purpose and Need**

Presented with the purpose statement developed by the TAC during the earlier meeting, the SC discussed and modified the statement as follows:

#### TAC Endorsed Purpose Statement

*Address mobility, safety, connectivity, and multi-modal needs on Highway 138 between I-5 Exit 124 and Fulton Street while maintaining downtown accessibility*

#### SC Endorsed Purpose Statement

*Address mobility, safety, connectivity, and multi-modal needs on Highway 138 between I-5 Exit 124 and Fulton Street*

The primary change was the deletion of the reference to downtown accessibility, which the SC recommends as a stated goal.

The five needs listed by the TAC were reduced to four by the SC and modified as follows:

Mobility: Restricted freight movement downtown due to tight curb radii, railroad crossings that disrupt circulation, congestion along Stephens Street, and access management. NO CHANGE

Safety: Bicycle and pedestrian amenities, railroad crossing queuing and stacking, and emergency response. NO CHANGE

Connectivity: Freight access, gaps in bicycle and pedestrian amenities, railroad crossings effectively divides city in two, Stephens Street to Highway 138, and community impact and livability. ADDED LONG DISTANCE, TOURISM, AND RECREATIONAL TRAFFIC ON HWY 138

Multi-Modal: Dysfunctional bicycle and pedestrian amenities and maintenance of transit

Downtown: Controversy over consideration of a by-pass, need for good connections, and addressing business interests. DELETED AND ADDED AS A GOAL STATEMENT

### **Goals and Objectives**

The committee recommended that the goal statement cover the following topics:

- Address deficiencies

- Economic development
  - Development along Diamond Lake Boulevard
  - Urban Growth Boundary expansion
  - Tourism gateway
  - Riverfront development
- Downtown access
- Environmental
  - Minimize wetland impacts, etc.

Committee members were particularly interested in economic development that ties Diamond Lake Boulevard to downtown, enhances tourism, and coordinates with tribal members on development along the riverfront.

### **Next Steps**

The next meeting will be held on January 30, 2007 and will discuss the Task 4 data collection items as well as fine tune the purpose and need statement and goals and objectives.

# HIGHWAY 138 CORRIDOR SOLUTIONS STUDY

## CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting**  
6:00 pm to 8:00 pm

**January 29, 2007**

ODOT Region 3  
West Conference Room  
3500 NW Stewart Parkway, Roseburg

### AGENDA

---

**I. Introductions**\_\_\_\_\_ **Mike Baker, ODOT**

**II. Project Overview**\_\_\_\_\_ **John Wiebke, DEA**

**III. Project Discussion Items**\_\_\_\_\_ **All**

Review/comments: *Technical Memorandum #1, Definition and Background.*

Review/comments: *Technical Memorandum #2, Existing Conditions and Review of Existing Plans*

Conclusions from data collection

**IV. Next Steps**\_\_\_\_\_ **John Wiebke, DEA**

Assess future no-build conditions

Concept Development

Attachments for this meeting: Technical Memorandum #1 (2<sup>nd</sup> Revision)

Technical Memorandum #2 (1<sup>st</sup> Draft)

# Highway 138 Corridor Solutions Study



## Summary of Discussion

### Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC)

2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting

6:00 to 8:00 P.M.

January 29, 2007

#### **Attendees**

Georgia Stiles, Property Developer

Brett White, Downtown Small Business

Seth Buechley, Laurelwood Neighborhood

John Kennedy, Public Works Commission

Art Adams, Nordic Veneer

Neal Hadley, At-large Citizen

Gary Crowe, Chamber of Commerce

Chad Ambrose, Bike-Pedestrian Advocate

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

## **Introductions and Project Overview**

Following introductions of those present, Mike Baker (ODOT) opened the meeting by providing a brief summary of the December 5<sup>th</sup> CAC kick-off meeting. Afterward, Jennifer Danziger (DEA) and John Wiebke (DEA) gave a PowerPoint presentation describing the Purpose, Need and Goal statements that evolved from the three December committee meetings and that are outlined in Technical Memo #1. The contents of Technical Memo #2 were summarized, beginning with a review of documents pertinent to the Study such as the City and County TSPs, Oregon Highway Plan, Roseburg Comprehensive Plan and City Ordinance, OR 138E Access Management Plan, Oregon Rail Plan, Downtown Master Plan and Waterfront Concept Plan. Next, a summary of the environmental reconnaissance and existing land uses was presented that included Goal 5 resources, FEMA floodplain information, historic and archaeological resources, air quality, socioeconomic and environmental justice, hazardous materials, wetlands, existing land uses, and Section 4(f) resources was presented. The presentation then shifted to traffic analysis and a discussion of the results of traffic counts and origin-destination license plate surveys, collision data collected, and existing deficiencies in the transportation system.

The presentation concluded with a brief summary of the next task, which will entail analyzing future conditions based on the no-build scenario. The consultant team will conduct the 20 year forecast from 2005 to 2025 and then extrapolate the projections out to 2030.

## **Project Discussion Items**

Committee members addressed the following questions, comments and concerns:

- No mention is made within the four Need statements presented on transit issues, particularly the need for bus pull-outs.
- How will the relocation of the train switching station impact the traffic operations presented?
- A number of additional historic resources not presented are located along Stephens Street
- An historic and archaeological expert from Salem will be assessing the area within the next few weeks.
- Do the crash rate data take into account the age of the drivers involved? It would be interesting to see the results presented in this format given the location of the high school within the study area.
- The Diamond Lake/Winchester intersection did not have a protected left turn lane during the time period of the recorded crash data.

- Bicycle access from downtown Roseburg to Diamond Lake Blvd and points east needs improvement given that the only streets feeding onto Diamond Lake Blvd are Winchester and Rifle Range Streets.
- Will the 2030 projections be confined to the urban growth boundary?
- Approximately 120-130 additional acres within will be transferring to the City's Mixed-Use Zoning District.
- Will population projections take into account aging baby boomers?
- Development along Stewart Parkway was cited as an example for how the Diamond Lake Blvd. corridor could develop.
- How do we differentiate freight movement to and from Central Oregon from local traffic movements?

### **Next Steps**

The next meeting will be held on February 26, 2007 and will discuss the Task 5 future condition (2030) no build analysis.

# HIGHWAY 138 CORRIDOR SOLUTIONS STUDY

## TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

### 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting

9:00 am to 11:00 am

**January 30, 2007**

ODOT Region 3  
West Conference Room  
3500 NW Stewart Parkway, Roseburg

## AGENDA

---

**I. Introductions**\_\_\_\_\_ **Mike Baker, ODOT**

**II. Project Overview**\_\_\_\_\_ **John Wiebke, DEA**

**III. Project Discussion Items**\_\_\_\_\_ **All**

Review/comments: *Technical Memorandum #1, Definition and Background.*

Review/comments: *Technical Memorandum #2, Existing Conditions and Review of Existing Plans*

Conclusions from data collection

**IV. Next Steps**\_\_\_\_\_ **John Wiebke, DEA**

Assess future no-build conditions

Concept Development

Attachments for this meeting: Technical Memorandum #1 (2<sup>nd</sup> Revision)

Technical Memorandum #2 (1<sup>st</sup> Draft)

# Highway 138 Corridor Solutions Study



## Summary of Discussion

### Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

Kick-Off Meeting

9:00 A.M. to Noon

January 30, 2006

#### **Attendees**

Rick Castle, City of Roseburg Public Works

Mike Luttrell, Douglas County Public Works

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

Chris Blevins, ODOT Roadway/Bridge Design

James Burford, ODOT Roadway/Bridge Design Manager

Tom Hawksworth, Central Oregon and Pacific Railroad (CORP)

Ron Hughes, ODOT Access Management

John Raasch, ODOT Environmental Project Manager

Mike Baker, ODOT Project Manager

Thanh Nguyen, ODOT Transportation Analyst

Brian Davis, Roseburg City Planning

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

John Wiebke, DEA Project Manager

## **Introductions and Project Overview**

Following introductions of those present, Mike Baker (ODOT) opened the meeting by providing a brief summary of the December 5<sup>th</sup> CAC kick-off meeting. Afterward, Jennifer Danziger (DEA) and John Wiebke (DEA) gave a PowerPoint presentation describing the Purpose, Need and Goal statements that evolved from the three December committee meetings and that are outlined in Technical Memo #1. The contents of Technical Memo #2 were summarized, beginning with a review of documents pertinent to the Study such as the City and County TSPs, Oregon Highway Plan, Roseburg Comprehensive Plan and City Ordinance, OR 138E Access Management Plan, Oregon Rail Plan, Downtown Master Plan and Waterfront Concept Plan. Next, a summary of the environmental reconnaissance and existing land uses was presented that included Goal 5 resources, FEMA floodplain information, historic and archaeological resources, air quality, socioeconomic and environmental justice, hazardous materials, wetlands, existing land uses, and Section 4(f) resources was presented. The presentation then shifted to traffic analysis and a discussion of the results of traffic counts and origin-destination license plate surveys, collision data collected, and existing deficiencies in the transportation system.

The presentation concluded with a brief summary of the next task, which will entail analyzing future conditions based on the no-build scenario. The consultant team will conduct the 20 year forecast from 2005 to 2025 and then extrapolate the projections out to 2030.

## **Project Discussion Items**

Committee members addressed the following questions, comments and concerns:

- The TAC were informed of a comment raised by CAC members noting that there was no need statement addressing transit.
- Is there anything known about archaeological locations?
- Summary of freight movements is missing from the O/D data.
- It might have been useful to measure O/D trip between Garden Valley and Diamond Lake Boulevards.
- The collision data recorded at the Diamond Lake/Winchester intersection occurred before the intersection was improved with a protected left turn lane off of Diamond Lake Boulevard.
- The railroad switching yard relocation will be complete by August/September.
- Inter-modal freight facilities will be constructed.
- Winchester has bike lanes from Diamond Lake to Stephens Street.
- Thanh Nguyen questioned the model employment projections for the Diamond Lake corridor given the Mixed Use designations in the vicinity. The overall figures appear low, which will affect the accuracy of the 2030 no-build projections or Task 5.

- The City is considering expanded transit options that may include planned transit service expansion.
- Does the railroad industry and CORP in particular differentiate lane closures or do all railroad crossings have equal status.

### **Next Steps**

The next meeting will be held on February 27, 2007 and will discuss the Task 5 future condition (2030) no build analysis.

# HIGHWAY 138 CORRIDOR SOLUTIONS STUDY

## STEERING COMMITTEE

**2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting**  
6:00 pm to 8:00 pm

**January 30, 2007**

ODOT Region 3  
West Conference Room  
3500 NW Stewart Parkway, Roseburg

## AGENDA

---

**I. Introductions**\_\_\_\_\_ **Mike Baker, ODOT**

**II. Project Overview**\_\_\_\_\_ **John Wiebke, DEA**

**III. Project Discussion Items**\_\_\_\_\_ **All**

Review/comments: *Technical Memorandum #1, Definition and Background.*

Review/comments: *Technical Memorandum #2, Existing Conditions and Review of Existing Plans*

Conclusions from data collection

**IV. Next Steps**\_\_\_\_\_ **John Wiebke, DEA**

Assess future no-build conditions

Concept Development

Attachments for this meeting: Technical Memorandum #1 (2<sup>nd</sup> Revision)

Technical Memorandum #2 (1<sup>st</sup> Draft)

# Highway 138 Corridor Solutions Study



## Summary of Discussion

### Steering Committee (SC)

Kick-Off Meeting

2:00 to 4:00 P.M.

January 30, 2006

#### **Attendees**

Tim Freeman, Roseburg City Council

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

John Raasch, ODOT Environmental Project Manager

Chris Blevins (sitting in for James Burford), ODOT Roadway/Bridge Design Manager

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

John Wiebke, DEA Project Manager

Robb Paul, Douglas County Public Works Director

## **Introductions and Project Overview**

Following introductions of those present, Mike Baker (ODOT) opened the meeting by providing a brief summary of the December 5<sup>th</sup> CAC kick-off meeting. Afterward, Jennifer Danziger (DEA) and John Wiebke (DEA) gave a PowerPoint presentation describing the Purpose, Need and Goal statements that evolved from the three December committee meetings and that are outlined in Technical Memo #1. The contents of Technical Memo #2 were summarized, beginning with a review of documents pertinent to the Study such as the City and County TSPs, Oregon Highway Plan, Roseburg Comprehensive Plan and City Ordinance, OR 138E Access Management Plan, Oregon Rail Plan, Downtown Master Plan and Waterfront Concept Plan. Next, a summary of the environmental reconnaissance and existing land uses was presented that included Goal 5 resources, FEMA floodplain information, historic and archaeological resources, air quality, socioeconomic and environmental justice, hazardous materials, wetlands, existing land uses, and Section 4(f) resources was presented. The presentation then shifted to traffic analysis and a discussion of the results of traffic counts and origin-destination license plate surveys, collision data collected, and existing deficiencies in the transportation system.

The presentation concluded with a brief summary of the next task, which will entail analyzing future conditions based on the no-build scenario. The consultant team will conduct the 20 year forecast from 2005 to 2025 and then extrapolate the projections out to 2030.

## **Project Discussion Items**

Committee members addressed the following questions, comments and concerns:

- Downtown businesses have strong concerns regarding a “flyover” as cited in the newspaper article.
- The City of Roseburg Waterfront Concept Plan will not be adopted and can be dropped from the list of existing plans summarized in Technical Memo #2.
- Historic sites listed by SHPO are protected resources that cannot be developed or impacted without justification.
- A potential bypass could protect the downtown waterfront area.
- The crashes at Winchester/Diamond Lake Blvd does not appear to be accurate and may include crashes prior to the recent improvements.
- Very little discussion occurs in Technical Memo #2 regarding Garden Valley Boulevard.
- Development within Roseburg’s designated Enterprise Zones along the Diamond Lake Boulevard corridor are hampered by the lack of adequate transportation facilities.

## **Next Steps**

The next meeting will be held on February 27, 2007 and will discuss the Task 5 future condition (2030) no build analysis.

# HIGHWAY 138 CORRIDOR SOLUTIONS STUDY

## CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting**  
6:00 pm to 8:00 pm

**February 26, 2007**

ODOT Region 3  
West Conference Room  
3500 NW Stewart Parkway, Roseburg

### AGENDA

---

**I. Introductions**\_\_\_\_\_ **Mike Baker, ODOT**

**II. Project Overview**\_\_\_\_\_ **John Wiebke, DEA**

**III. Project Discussion Items**\_\_\_\_\_ **All**

Review/comments: *Technical Memorandum #2, Existing Conditions and Review of Existing Plans*

Review/comments: *Technical Memorandum #3, 2030 Baseline Conditions (No Build)*

Establish Screening Criteria and Brainstorm Design Concepts

**IV. Next Steps**\_\_\_\_\_ **John Wiebke, DEA**

Concept Development and Screening

Attachments for this meeting: Technical Memorandum #2 (2<sup>nd</sup> Revision)  
Technical Memorandum #3 (1<sup>st</sup> Draft)

# Highway 138 Corridor Solutions Study



## Summary of Discussion

### Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC)

3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting

6:00 to 8:00 P.M.

February 26, 2007

#### **Attendees**

Georgia Stiles, Property Developer

Brett White, Downtown Small Business

Seth Buechley, Laurelwood Neighborhood

Art Adams, Nordic Veneer

Neal Hadley, At-large Citizen

Gary Crowe, Chamber of Commerce

Chad Ambrose, Bike-Pedestrian Advocate

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

## **Introductions and Project Overview**

John Wiebke (DEA) opened the meeting by presenting a brief summary of natural and cultural resource barriers that will need to be a factor when considering potential build alternatives that are forwarded for consideration. Jennifer Danziger (DEA) followed with a presentation of the existing and projected future no-build traffic conditions within the study area. Afterward, attendees were presented with a proposed series of screening criteria for review that will be used to filter and narrow a list of alternatives for modeling.

## **Project Discussion Items**

Committee members addressed the following questions, comments and concerns:

- Regarding traffic generation projection, the consultant team was advised to be prepared for residents who will not be convinced of future projections nor the methodology used no matter how the study is conducted.
- It could be useful to learn more about traffic movements in the downtown vicinity between the river and the railroad tracks.
- Once the preferred alternative is identified, how will the funding sources be proportioned among the federal, state and local jurisdiction? Reply: Funding will likely be from a combination of federal, state and local sources. Mike Baker noted that \$4 million of State funds have been allocated for improvements at Diamond Lake Boulevard and Stephens Street.
- Regarding the draft criteria, shouldn't cost be a contributing factor in determining which conceptual ideas advance to the modeling stage? Reply: Cost should not be a critical factor in identifying concepts for screening (otherwise nothing would likely advance). A more important consideration would be the impact to natural and cultural resources.
- Will the criteria be weighed equally or will some have more weight than others. Reply: The criteria have equal weight from the standpoint of the study process. Each committee member is here to serve as a representative on a particular interest. Therefore, it would be expected the individual member will weigh some criteria heavier than others based on their perspective primary concerns and issues (i.e. downtown business, bicycle/pedestrian enhancement, transit, etc.).
- Missing from the list of criteria is an emphasis to protect downtown accessibility, to enhance current and future economic development, and to place value on aesthetics.
- When considering projects for funding, does the federal government place greater emphasis on some factors such as commerce, tourism and economic development? Reply: According to Representative DeFazio's office (who serves on the Congressional Transportation and Infrastructure Committee), the three priorities when considering projects are congestion, safety, and economic development.

Attendees sketched proposals on aerial maps. Concepts proposed for consideration from the CAC include:

- Baseline/No-Build
- Intersection specific capacity improvements
- Portland Avenue Bridge
- Bridge from Harvard to Diamond Lake Boulevard with existing at-grade intersection
- Bridge from Harvard to Diamond Lake Boulevard with grade separated intersection
- Move/relocate railroad alignment
- Connect to Stephens north of Diamond Lake Boulevard

### **Next Steps**

The next meeting will be held in April 2007 (most likely Monday, April 2) and will further discuss the concept development and screening criteria process.

# HIGHWAY 138 CORRIDOR SOLUTIONS STUDY

## TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting**  
9:00 am to 11:00 am

**February 27, 2007**

ODOT Region 3  
West Conference Room  
3500 NW Stewart Parkway, Roseburg

### AGENDA

---

**I. Introductions**\_\_\_\_\_ **Mike Baker, ODOT**

**II. Project Overview**\_\_\_\_\_ **John Wiebke, DEA**

**III. Project Discussion Items**\_\_\_\_\_ **All**

Review/comments: *Technical Memorandum #2, Existing Conditions and Review of Existing Plans*

Review/comments: *Technical Memorandum #3, 2030 Baseline Conditions (No Build)*

Establish Screening Criteria and Brainstorm Design Concepts

**IV. Next Steps**\_\_\_\_\_ **John Wiebke, DEA**

Concept Development and Screening

Attachments for this meeting: Technical Memorandum #2 (2<sup>nd</sup> Revision)  
Technical Memorandum #3 (1<sup>st</sup> Draft)

# Highway 138 Corridor Solutions Study



## Summary of Discussion

### Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

3rd Meeting

9:00 A.M. to Noon

February 27, 2007

#### **Attendees**

Mike Luttrell, Douglas County Public Works

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

Bob Grubbs, ODOT Senior Bridge Designer

James Burford, ODOT Roadway/Bridge Design Manager

Tom Hawksworth, Central Oregon and Pacific Railroad (CORP)

Ron Hughes, ODOT Access Management

Sam Dunnivant, ODOT Regional Environmental Coordinator

John Raasch, ODOT Environmental Project Manager

Mike Baker, ODOT Project Manager

Peter Schuytema, ODOT Transportation Analyst

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 a brief summary of natural and cultural resource barriers that will need to be a factor when considering potential build alternatives that are forwarded for consideration. Jennifer Danziger (DEA) followed with a presentation of the existing and projected future no-build traffic conditions within the study area. Afterward, attendees were presented with a proposed series of screening criteria for review that will be used to filter and narrow a list of alternatives for modeling.

## **Project Discussion Items**

Committee members addressed the following questions, comments and concerns:

- Projected traffic growth appears to increase more rapidly than project population growth.
- Increase downtown development in the vicinity of the riverfront will spur additional railroad conflicts.
- The Portland Avenue Bridge alternative could potentially increase downtown congestion and would work only if it was part of a southern bypass. Nonetheless, it was suggested that it might be worth running a model if for no other reason, than to demonstrate its likely minimal impact on improving conditions along the Diamond Lake corridor and downtown.
- Once the railroad switching yard is relocated, CORP will be able to operate shorter trains through Roseburg and potentially be better able to run the trains through the least busy parts of the day. As it currently stands, they are at the mercy of the Eugene switching yards.
- Reduced train activity would reduce the impacts on traffic circulation and may make a grade-separated crossing a less critical element in the concept and alternatives screening.
- Based on the license plate survey, 65% of the total traffic coming eastbound off the Oak Avenue Bridge into downtown Roseburg is either staying in the downtown area or going south. The remaining 35% continues north or east along Diamond Lake Boulevard. These percentages will change in the future with more rapid growth north and east of the project area and DEA will confirm when the necessary modeling information has been received. However, existing volumes suggest that both of the existing two downtown bridges may need to remain open even with a new Harvard to Diamond Lake Bridge in place.

Attendees built upon the ideas presented by the CAC and sketched additional concepts onto aerial maps. Concepts proposed for consideration from the CAC and TAC include:

- Baseline/No-Build
- Intersection specific capacity improvements
- Portland Avenue Bridge

- Bridge from Harvard to Diamond Lake Boulevard with existing at-grade intersection
- Bridge from Harvard to Diamond Lake Boulevard with grade separated intersection
- Move/relocate railroad alignment
- Connect to Stephens north of Diamond Lake Boulevard

### **Next Steps**

The next meeting will be held in April 2007 (most likely Tuesday, April 3) and will further discuss the concept development and screening criteria process.

# HIGHWAY 138 CORRIDOR SOLUTIONS STUDY

## STEERING COMMITTEE

**3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting**  
1:30 pm to 4:00 pm

**February 27, 2007**

ODOT Region 3  
West Conference Room  
3500 NW Stewart Parkway, Roseburg

## AGENDA

---

**I. Introductions**\_\_\_\_\_ **Mike Baker, ODOT**

**II. Project Overview**\_\_\_\_\_ **John Wiebke, DEA**

**III. Project Discussion Items**\_\_\_\_\_ **All**

Review/comments: *Technical Memorandum #2, Existing Conditions and Review of Existing Plans*

Review/comments: *Technical Memorandum #3, 2030 Baseline Conditions (No Build)*

Establish Screening Criteria and Brainstorm Design Concepts

**IV. Next Steps**\_\_\_\_\_ **John Wiebke, DEA**

Concept Development and Screening

Attachments for this meeting: Technical Memorandum #2 (2<sup>nd</sup> Revision)  
Technical Memorandum #3 (1<sup>st</sup> Draft)

# Highway 138 Corridor Solutions Study



## Summary of Discussion

### Steering Committee (SC)

3rd Meeting

1:30 to 4:00 P.M.

February 27, 2006

#### **Attendees**

Tim Freeman, Roseburg City Council

Robb Paul, Douglas County Public Works Director

Eric Swanson, Roseburg City Manager

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

## **Introductions and Project Overview**

John Wiebke (DEA) opened the meeting by presenting a brief summary of natural and cultural resource barriers that will need to be a factor when considering potential build alternatives that are forwarded for consideration. Jennifer Danziger (DEA) followed with a presentation of the existing and projected future no-build traffic conditions within the study area. Afterward, attendees were presented with a proposed series of screening criteria for review that will be used to filter and narrow a list of alternatives for modeling.

## **Project Discussion Items**

Committee members addressed the following questions, comments and concerns:

- When the time comes to visually articulate the alternative under consideration, it might be beneficial to factor in some aesthetic considerations.
- The screening criteria should place greater emphasis on connectivity and economic development.
- Do not identify the criteria by a number because it suggests that a ranking mechanism may be in place.

Attendees reviewed and discussed the ideas presented by the CAC and TAC. Concepts proposed for consideration include:

- Baseline/No-Build
- Intersection specific capacity improvements
- Portland Avenue Bridge
- Bridge from Harvard to Diamond Lake Boulevard with existing at-grade intersection
- Bridge from Harvard to Diamond Lake Boulevard with grade separated intersection
- Move/relocate railroad alignment
- Connect to Stephens north of Diamond Lake Boulevard

## **Next Steps**

The next meeting will be held in April 2007 (most likely Tuesday, April 3) and will further discuss the concept development and screening criteria process.

# HIGHWAY 138 CORRIDOR SOLUTIONS STUDY

## CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**4<sup>rd</sup> Meeting**  
6:00 pm to 8:00 pm

**April 2, 2007**

ODOT Region 3  
West Conference Room  
3500 NW Stewart Parkway, Roseburg

### AGENDA

---

**I. Introductions**\_\_\_\_\_ **Mike Baker, ODOT**

**II. Project Overview**\_\_\_\_\_ **John Wiebke, DEA**

**III. Project Discussion Items**\_\_\_\_\_ **All**

Review/comments: *Screening of Circulation and Design Concepts*

**IV. Next Steps**\_\_\_\_\_ **John Wiebke, DEA**

Presentation of Concept Screening at Public Meeting #2  
Finalize Alternatives for Detailed Evaluation

Attachments for this meeting: Screening Criteria Matrix  
Illustrations of Circulation and Design Concepts

# Highway 138 Corridor Solutions Study



## Summary of Discussion

### Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC)

4<sup>th</sup> 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 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> were recorded and are summarized in Table 1 with accompanying comments displayed in Table 2. 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 3.

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.

<b>Table 1</b>	<b>Yes</b>			<b>No</b>			<b>Neutral</b>		
	<b>CAC</b>	<b>TAC</b>	<b>SC</b>	<b>CAC</b>	<b>TAC</b>	<b>SC</b>	<b>CAC</b>	<b>TAC</b>	<b>SC</b>
<b>Concept 1a</b>	5	9	4	0	0	1	0	0	0
<b>Concept 1b</b>	0	0	0	4	9	5	1	0	0
<b>Concept 1c</b>	*	4	0	*	5	5	*	0	0
<b>Concept 2a</b>	3	8	4	3	1	1	0	0	0
<b>Concept 2b</b>	1	1	0	5	8	5	0	0	0
<b>Concept 2c</b>	2	6	4	4	3	1	0	0	0
<b>Concept 2d</b>	3	3	0	3	6	5	0	0	0
<b>Concept 2e</b>	0	0	0	6	9	5	0	0	0
<b>Concept 3a</b>	3	7	5	3	1	0	0	0	0
<b>Concept 3b</b>	3	2	0	3	6	4	0	0	1
<b>Concept 3c</b>	1	2	0	5	6	5	0	0	0
<b>Concept 3d</b>	*	7	5	*	1	0	*	0	0
<b>Concept 4a</b>	1	4	5	5	3	0	0	0	0
<b>Concept 4b</b>	0	0	0	6	7	5	0	0	0
<b>Concept 4c</b>	0	0	0	6	7	5	0	0	0
<b>Concept 4d</b>	1	3	0	5	4	5	0	0	0
<b>Concept 5</b>	0	0	0	6	7	5	0	0	0

\* CAC was not presented with the concept

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

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.

# HIGHWAY 138 CORRIDOR SOLUTIONS STUDY

## TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**4<sup>rd</sup> Meeting**  
9:00 am to 11:00 am

**April 3, 2007**

ODOT Region 3  
West Conference Room  
3500 NW Stewart Parkway, Roseburg

### AGENDA

---

**I. Introductions**\_\_\_\_\_ **Mike Baker, ODOT**

**II. Project Overview**\_\_\_\_\_ **John Wiebke, DEA**

**III. Project Discussion Items**\_\_\_\_\_ **All**

Review/comments: *Screening of Circulation and Design Concepts*

**IV. Next Steps**\_\_\_\_\_ **John Wiebke, DEA**

Presentation of Concept Screening at Public Meeting #2  
Finalize Alternatives for Detailed Evaluation

Attachments for this meeting: Screening Criteria Matrix  
Illustrations of Circulation and Design Concepts

# 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> were recorded and are summarized in Table 1 with accompanying comments displayed in Table 2. 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 3.

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.

<b><i>Table 1</i></b>	<b>Yes</b>			<b>No</b>			<b>Neutral</b>		
	<b>CAC</b>	<b>TAC</b>	<b>SC</b>	<b>CAC</b>	<b>TAC</b>	<b>SC</b>	<b>CAC</b>	<b>TAC</b>	<b>SC</b>
<b><i>Concept 1a</i></b>	5	9	4	0	0	1	0	0	0
<b>Concept 1b</b>	0	0	0	4	9	5	1	0	0
<b>Concept 1c</b>	*	4	0	*	5	5	*	0	0
<b>Concept 2a</b>	3	8	4	3	1	1	0	0	0
<b>Concept 2b</b>	1	1	0	5	8	5	0	0	0
<b>Concept 2c</b>	2	6	4	4	3	1	0	0	0
<b>Concept 2d</b>	3	3	0	3	6	5	0	0	0
<b>Concept 2e</b>	0	0	0	6	9	5	0	0	0
<b>Concept 3a</b>	3	7	5	3	1	0	0	0	0
<b>Concept 3b</b>	3	2	0	3	6	4	0	0	1
<b>Concept 3c</b>	1	2	0	5	6	5	0	0	0
<b>Concept 3d</b>	*	7	5	*	1	0	*	0	0
<b>Concept 4a</b>	1	4	5	5	3	0	0	0	0
<b>Concept 4b</b>	0	0	0	6	7	5	0	0	0
<b>Concept 4c</b>	0	0	0	6	7	5	0	0	0
<b>Concept 4d</b>	1	3	0	5	4	5	0	0	0
<b>Concept 5</b>	0	0	0	6	7	5	0	0	0

\* CAC was not presented with the concept

<b>Table 2</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

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.

# HIGHWAY 138 CORRIDOR SOLUTIONS STUDY

## STEERING COMMITTEE

**4<sup>rd</sup> Meeting**  
2:00 pm to 4:00 pm

**April 3, 2007**

ODOT Region 3  
West Conference Room  
3500 NW Stewart Parkway, Roseburg

## AGENDA

---

**I. Introductions**\_\_\_\_\_ **Mike Baker, ODOT**

**II. Project Overview**\_\_\_\_\_ **John Wiebke, DEA**

**III. Project Discussion Items**\_\_\_\_\_ **All**

Review/comments: *Screening of Circulation and Design Concepts*

**IV. Next Steps**\_\_\_\_\_ **John Wiebke, DEA**

Presentation of Concept Screening at Public Meeting #2  
Finalize Alternatives for Detailed Evaluation

Attachments for this meeting: Screening Criteria Matrix  
Illustrations of Circulation and Design Concepts

# Highway 138 Corridor Solutions Study



## Summary of Discussion

### Steering Committee (SC)

4<sup>th</sup> Meeting

1:30 to 4:00 P.M.

April 3, 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 Buford, Roadway/Bridge Design Manager, ODOT

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

SC 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> were recorded and are summarized 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.

<b>Table 1</b>	<b>Yes</b>			<b>No</b>			<b>Neutral</b>		
	<b>CAC</b>	<b>TAC</b>	<b>SC</b>	<b>CAC</b>	<b>TAC</b>	<b>SC</b>	<b>CAC</b>	<b>TAC</b>	<b>SC</b>
<b>Concept 1a</b>	5	9	4	0	0	1	0	0	0
<b>Concept 1b</b>	0	0	0	4	9	5	1	0	0
<b>Concept 1c</b>	*	4	0	*	5	5	*	0	0
<b>Concept 2a</b>	3	8	4	3	1	1	0	0	0
<b>Concept 2b</b>	1	1	0	5	8	5	0	0	0
<b>Concept 2c</b>	2	6	4	4	3	1	0	0	0
<b>Concept 2d</b>	3	3	0	3	6	5	0	0	0
<b>Concept 2e</b>	0	0	0	6	9	5	0	0	0
<b>Concept 3a</b>	3	7	5	3	1	0	0	0	0
<b>Concept 3b</b>	3	2	0	3	6	4	0	0	1
<b>Concept 3c</b>	1	2	0	5	6	5	0	0	0
<b>Concept 3d</b>	*	7	5	*	1	0	*	0	0
<b>Concept 4a</b>	1	4	5	5	3	0	0	0	0
<b>Concept 4b</b>	0	0	0	6	7	5	0	0	0
<b>Concept 4c</b>	0	0	0	6	7	5	0	0	0
<b>Concept 4d</b>	1	3	0	5	4	5	0	0	0
<b>Concept 5</b>	0	0	0	6	7	5	0	0	0

\* CAC was not presented with the concept

## 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.

# CETAS Presentation

ODOT Region 1 Headquarters

May 15, 2007

**CETAS**  
**Draft Technical Meeting Notes**  
May 15, 2007

Flanders Building – Room 228  
123 NW Flanders, Portland

**Members (in attendance):**

Hal Gard, ODOT	Susan Haupt, ODOT	Michelle Eraut, FHWA
Yvonne Vallette, EPA	Charlotte Kucera, NMFS	David Leal, USFWS
Joyce Cohen, ODOT	Eric Metz, DSL	Michael Turaski, USACE
Corey Saxon, DEQ	Mollie Manion, SHPO	Art Marin, ODFW

**Guests:**

Rod Thompson, ODOT	Dan Ferke, ODOT	Tim Burkhardt, CH2M HILL
Susan Whitney, ODOT	John Raasch, ODOT	Mike Baker, ODOT
John Wiebke, DEA	Jerry Marmon, ODOT	Barbara Fraser, ODOT
Greg Holthoff, ODOT	Patti Caswell, ODOT	Claire Carder, ODOT
Tyler Deke, Bend MPO	Darcy Macnamara, Consultant	Emily Moshofsky, ODOT
Ron Weinman, Clackamas County	Larry Conrad, Clackamas County	Linda Wannamaker, Wannamaker Consulting
Kay Van Sichel, Otak	Isaac Sanders, ODFW	

**Meeting Facilitator:** Susan Haupt, ODOT

**Note Taker:** Donette Miranda, HDR

**Agenda Item:** Oregon 138 Corridor Study

**Lead:** John Raasch, ODOT

**Notes:**

John Raasch (ODOT) stated that the refinement plan began in January 2007. Oregon 138 Corridor runs east and west through Roseburg. The attempt is to bring environmental into refinement planning, rather than having two separate processes (refinement and NEPA). Early on the team was not sure if minor improvements or bigger projects would move forward into a NEPA document. The team formed a few stakeholder groups.

Oak Avenue and Washington Avenue bridges are in the study area. Washington Bridge was built in the early 1970s. Oak Bridge was built in the early 1960s. There is a 90 degree corner on Stevens Street. Heading east on Diamond Lake Boulevard there is a dual left turn lane. The outside lane provides access back onto I-5. The intersection is pretty much at capacity. The zoning is mixed-use, with mainly commercial use. Off I-5, Oak Avenue leads to Stevens Street. It is difficult to stay in the lane at the 90 degree corner. The environment is built-up. Any alternative will have a fair amount of impacts. The Diamond Lake Boulevard intersections are 0.1 mile apart and are the only access.

The study is in the planning process, not NEPA. Existing data has been gathered.

Resources:

- South Umpqua River
  - Fall Chinook
  - Spawning area
- Deer Creek
- Elk Island
  - Left flow path is dry most the year
- Fisheries (South Umpqua River and Deer Creek)
  - Chinook, coho, winter steelhead, cutthroat trout
  - Mainly a migration corridor, except Fall Chinook spawning
  - EFH
- Avian Species
  - Herons, raptors, waterfowl, jays, songbirds
- Terrestrial Wildlife
  - Small mammals, Columbian black and white tailed deer, northwestern pond turtle
- Federal Species of Concern
  - Northwester pond turtle, Franklin's bumblebee
    - ONHP report

David stated that he can provide more information on Franklin's bumblebee.

- Elk Island
  - Provides nesting, perching and roosting habitat for avian species
  - Terrestrial habitat for riparian species
  - Fall Chinook spawning grounds

The study area contains tribal property that is held in trust. The tribe would not consider an alternative that hit the property a fatal flaw.

Historic Districts/Sites

- Three natural historic districts
  - Laurelwood District, known archeological site
  - Downtown District
  - Mill-Pine District
- Individual properties on the register
  - Lane house
- Eligible properties
  - Committees stated that impacts to those properties would be considered fatal flaws

Mollie stated that there is a high potential for more archeological sites in the area and deep sites.

Parks/bicycle Facilities

- Riverside park between the existing bridges and north
- From Deer Creek north

#### Traffic Count

- Existing roads are expected to fail with no build.

#### Existing Deficiencies

- Traffic conditions
- Collisions
- Freight mobility
- Railroad crossings
- Bicycle/pedestrian amenities

There is a railroad switching center in downtown Roseburg

#### Purpose

- Mobility, safety, connectivity, multi-modal on Highway 138

#### Need

- Congestion, railroad tracks, freight movement, bicycle/pedestrian system

#### Goals

- Address deficiencies, mitigate rail and automobile traffic, minimize/mitigate impacts to natural/cultural resources, economic development, and minimize community impacts

The planning phase will be finished late June/early July. The team will then go to management to determine if the alternatives are fundable. If so, they will be advanced into a NEPA document. It will then be determine when construction will occur.

#### Alternatives recommended for further study:

- Minor improvements on existing route
  - Corner improvements
  - Capacity improvements
  - Could be Class 2
- Widen Washington Avenue Bridge
  - Improve turning
  - Capacity improvements
- Widen Washington Avenue
  - Widen to four lanes
  - Would becomes a highway
  - New connection to Diamond Lake Boulevard
  - May have some historic property issues
- New at grade bridge
  - Build new bridge and widen the existing

- Project is in the Roseburg TSP
- Crosses the railroad
- Comes in before the parks and is beyond the historic sites
- More natural resource impacts
- Crosses Elk Island
- Impacts to Elk Creek
- Oak Avenue Bridge may be four lanes
- New at grade bridge
  - Elevated railroad
  - Natural resource impacts
  - Historic property impacts
- Grade separated to the north
  - Natural resource impacts
  - Socioeconomic impacts
  - Committee Interest in cost

Some of these alternatives may be forwarded into a NEPA document.

### **Questions/Comments:**

Corey asked if the city wants an arterial to go through the downtown area. Mike Baker (ODOT) stated that the city is trying to encourage better connectivity between downtown and the waterfront. The city would like to move heavier traffic out of the downtown area. Hal asked how this initial work would be retained. Barbara Fraser (ODOT) asked if it is adequate to adopt a refinement plan. Mike Baker stated that they are trying to mirror the NEPA process. The team will narrow down to the final two or three alternatives, but will not go further. Barbara stated that this process helps narrow down so that the team will not have to start over. Hal mentioned that work often gets shelved. Mike Baker stated that there are dollars available toward an environmental assessment and a possible project. Susan stated that Linking Planning and Environmental Process (LPEP) developed a draft planning recovery document, which never went anywhere. The Linking Planning and Project Development group is working on a template. Those are templates available for use. Barbara stated that Lisa Nell (ODOT) is a good person to work with. John stated that this study has been documented like 103. There is no engineering detail. Hal stated that the team does not want to lose decision sets that went into this process. Record and retain those decision sets. Maybe develop an interim document. John stated that they may add a deliverable document at the end of the process. Susan stated that the team can pilot the project and work with FHWA on whether it is appropriate to document. Michelle said that if the alternatives are carried through, FHWA would be the lead agency. It would be good for us to communicate in more detail. The guidance has been to not create purpose and need in a planning study. We would agree to dismissal and retention of alternatives. Hal recommended capturing all discussions and disseminating pitfalls and successes. Barbara stated that there is an LPEP steering committee.

Mike Baker stated that there are nine intersections that exceed the VC in 2030. Michelle stated that there are limited resources for transportation improvements.

Charlotte mentioned that there are a lot of fishery resources in the area. New bridges will have an impact. There are resources impacts with each alternative. Impacts can be partitioned out. Corey stated that TMDLs on the Umpqua have just been passed. A new bridge would add more impervious surface and therefore more surface water management would be required. Temperature would be a big issue.

**Action Items:**

Project team will send the presentation to Susan Haupt (ODOT). Susan Haupt (ODOT) will put the presentation on the ODOT ftp site.

---

DRAFT

# HIGHWAY 138 CORRIDOR SOLUTIONS STUDY

## CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**5<sup>th</sup> Meeting**  
6:00 pm to 8:00 pm

**June 4, 2007**

ODOT Region 3  
West Conference Room  
3500 NW Stewart Parkway, Roseburg

### AGENDA

---

- I. Introductions** \_\_\_\_\_ **Mike Baker, ODOT**
- II. Project Overview** \_\_\_\_\_ **Jennifer Danziger, DEA**  
**John Wiebke, DEA**  
Traffic Operations analysis of six alternatives
- III. Project Discussion Items** \_\_\_\_\_ **All**  
Review/comments: *Summary Evaluation Matrix*
- IV. Next Steps** \_\_\_\_\_ **John Wiebke, DEA**  
Presentation of Alternatives at Public Meeting #3  
Preferred Alternative(s)

Attachments for this meeting: Summary Evaluation Matrix

# Highway 138 Corridor Solutions Study



## Summary of Discussion

### Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC)

4<sup>th</sup> Meeting

6:00 to 9:00 P.M.

June 4, 2007

#### **Attendees**

Georgia Stiles, Property Developer (attended TAC meeting)  
Brett White, Downtown Small Business  
Seth Buechley, Laurelwood Neighborhood (attended SC meeting)  
John Kennedy, Public Works Commission (attended SC meeting)  
Michael Widmer, Economic Development Commission (attended SC meeting)  
Art Adams, Large Business/Trucking (attended SC meeting)  
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**

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**

CAC 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, members voted their preferences among the six build alternatives. The CAC advanced 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) with the SC opting for 1(a) and 3(a). 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.

Two non-CAC members were also in attendance and were invited to comment.

Stuart Liebowitz sought further clarification of the decision making process, suggesting that final results should be made available at the next Open House and presentation before the City Council. Copies of the evaluation matrix should be submitted in advance of the Open House to enable the public the opportunity to review the pros and cons as outlined. Estimated costs displayed for each alternative should be adjusted for inflation. Finally, the Evaluation Matrix suggested a direct route from Harvard Avenue to Diamond Lake Boulevard would be a benefit for transit. In fact, the direct route would bypass several transit stops, thus potentially restricting transit access.

## **Next Steps**

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

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

<b>Table 2</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>1(a)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriate phased improvements</li> </ul>	
<b>2(a)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enables downtown to open to riverfront south of Washington Avenue</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not resolve the Stephens/DLB intersection</li> <li>• Convoluted Washington to Oak connection</li> </ul>
<b>2(c)</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too much dramatic change to downtown core</li> <li>• Disruptive</li> <li>• Impact to planned Public Safety Center</li> </ul>
<b>3(a)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Directs through traffic flow north of downtown</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Massive intersection at DLB/Stephens</li> <li>• Preferential access given to Harvard to DLB over traffic downtown and points south</li> </ul>
<b>3(d)</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost</li> <li>• Physical and visual impact</li> </ul>
<b>4(a)</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disruptive traffic flow with minimal benefit.</li> </ul>

# HIGHWAY 138 CORRIDOR SOLUTIONS STUDY

## TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**5<sup>th</sup> Meeting**  
9:00 am to 12:00 pm

**June 5, 2007**

ODOT Region 3  
West Conference Room  
3500 NW Stewart Parkway, Roseburg

### AGENDA

---

- I. Introductions** \_\_\_\_\_ **Mike Baker, ODOT**
- II. Project Overview** \_\_\_\_\_ **Jennifer Danziger, DEA**  
**John Wiebke, DEA**  
Traffic Operations analysis of six alternatives
- III. Project Discussion Items** \_\_\_\_\_ **All**  
Review/comments: *Summary Evaluation Matrix*
- IV. Next Steps** \_\_\_\_\_ **John Wiebke, DEA**  
Presentation of Alternatives at Public Meeting #3  
Preferred Alternative(s)

Attachments for this meeting: Summary Evaluation Matrix

# Highway 138 Corridor Solutions Study



## Summary of Discussion

### Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

5<sup>th</sup> Meeting

9:00 A.M. to Noon

June 5, 2007

#### **Attendees**

Clay Baumgartner, Roseburg Public Works Director

Chris Blevins, ODOT Roadway/Bridge Design

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

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 (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, members voted their preferences among the six build alternatives. Prior to the TAC convening, the CAC advanced 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) with the SC opting for 1(a) and 3(a). 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.

Romey Ware forwarded a modification of the grade separated alternative that would cross over the railroad and Stephens Street along the existing Diamond Lake Boulevard alignment, landing in the vicinity of where Diamond Lake and Jackson Street intersect. The proposal would provide direct access between the bridge and Stephens Street via a connector aligned along the south bank of Deer Creek. A secondary access road would link the bridge to Winchester Street to the north. Many TAC members expressing support of Alternative 4(a) suggested a revision that would consider this proposed alignment.

## **Next Steps**

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

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

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

# HIGHWAY 138 CORRIDOR SOLUTIONS STUDY

## STEERING COMMITTEE

**5<sup>th</sup> Meeting**  
1:30 pm to 3:30 pm

**June 5, 2007**

ODOT Region 3  
West Conference Room  
3500 NW Stewart Parkway, Roseburg

## AGENDA

---

- I. Introductions** \_\_\_\_\_ **Mike Baker, ODOT**
- II. Project Overview** \_\_\_\_\_ **Jennifer Danziger, DEA**  
**John Wiebke, DEA**  
Traffic Operations analysis of six alternatives
- III. Project Discussion Items** \_\_\_\_\_ **All**  
Review/comments: *Summary Evaluation Matrix*
- IV. Next Steps** \_\_\_\_\_ **John Wiebke, DEA**  
Presentation of Alternatives at Public Meeting #3  
Preferred Alternative(s)

Attachments for this meeting: Summary Evaluation Matrix

# Highway 138 Corridor Solutions Study



## Summary of Discussion

### Steering Committee (SC)

5<sup>th</sup> 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.

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

<b>Table 2</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>1(a)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Alternative is fine so long as the improvements are not immediately torn out later with a future long term project</li> </ul>	
<b>2(a)</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Too disruptive to downtown circulation</li> </ul>
<b>2(c)</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact to planned Public Safety Building</li> <li>Too disruptive to downtown circulation</li> </ul>
<b>3(a)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moves through traffic north of downtown</li> </ul>	
<b>3(d)</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Projected costs are too high</li> <li>Visual impact</li> </ul>
<b>4(a)</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not a feasible option given priorities elsewhere throughout the region</li> <li>Too many disturbances to access downtown</li> </ul>

# HIGHWAY 138 CORRIDOR SOLUTIONS STUDY

## CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**6<sup>th</sup> Meeting**  
6:00 pm to 8:00 pm

**September 4, 2007**

ODOT Region 3  
West Conference Room  
3500 NW Stewart Parkway, Roseburg

### AGENDA

---

- I. Introductions** \_\_\_\_\_ **Mike Baker, ODOT**
- II. Project Overview** \_\_\_\_\_ **Jennifer Danziger, DEA**  
**John Wiebke, DEA**
- Review of Corridor Study Process  
Summary of Open House #3 Written Comments
- III. Project Discussion Items** \_\_\_\_\_ **All**
- Technical Memorandum #5 (Analysis of Conceptual Circulation and Design Alternatives)*  
*Draft Final Report and Conclusions*
- IV. Next Steps** \_\_\_\_\_ **John Wiebke, DEA**  
**Mike Baker, ODOT**
- Completion of Final Report  
Presentation before the Joint City Council and Planning Commission September 24, 2007  
Future Project Phases

Attachments for this meeting: Draft *Final Report: Highway 138 Corridor Solutions Study*

# Highway 138 Corridor Solutions Study



## Summary of Discussion

### Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC)

6<sup>th</sup> Meeting

6:00 to 8:00 P.M.

September 4, 2007

#### **Attendees**

Georgia Stiles, Property Developer (attended TAC meeting)

Brett White, Downtown Small Business

Neal Hadley, At-large Citizen

Gary Crowe, Chamber of Commerce

Chad Ambrose, Bike-Pedestrian

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**

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:

- Since neither alternative forwarded for further study addresses the railroad crossing issue, could the Highway 138 project be integrated with other projects, such as the Portland Avenue Bridge?
- How would the corridor study tie in with the improvements planned at Interchange 124?
- How would traffic patterns be impacted by expansion of the Urban Growth Boundary for commercial/industrial development?
- Is the lack of a more direct connection to I-5 the primary constraint impeding development along the Diamond Lake Boulevard corridor? To some degree, the constraints appear to be market driven rather than government driven. However, the difficulty experienced by trucks maneuvering between DLB and I-5 is undeniable.

## **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.

## **Guest Comments**

Two non-CAC members were also in attendance and were invited to comment.

Stuart Liebowitz expressed concerns that the complete truth has not been presented with the conclusions of this report. Estimated costs are not presented realistically as evident by cost revision continuously being revised upwards. The annual population growth assumption of 2.5% per year is inflated. Based on recorded growth since 2000, a more

realistic annual growth rate should be 1.2% to 1.5%. Yet the higher (2.5) percentage is the assumption that's used to model 2030 traffic projections. If the driving force of this effort is the perception that a direct connection is critical to economic development, then that should be clearly stated so that the public can weigh in. Finally, be forthright on the potential expectation of local jurisdiction (City, County) contributions toward the project.

# HIGHWAY 138 CORRIDOR SOLUTIONS STUDY

## TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**6<sup>th</sup> Meeting**  
9:00 am to 12:00 pm

**September 5, 2007**

ODOT Region 3  
West Conference Room  
3500 NW Stewart Parkway, Roseburg

### AGENDA

---

- I. Introductions** \_\_\_\_\_ **Mike Baker, ODOT**
- II. Project Overview** \_\_\_\_\_ **Jennifer Danziger, DEA**  
**John Wiebke, DEA**
- Review of Corridor Study Process  
Summary of Open House #3 Written Comments
- III. Project Discussion Items** \_\_\_\_\_ **All**
- Technical Memorandum #5 (Analysis of Conceptual Circulation and Design Alternatives)*  
Draft *Final Report* and Conclusions
- IV. Next Steps** \_\_\_\_\_ **John Wiebke, DEA**  
**Mike Baker, ODOT**
- Completion of Final Report  
Presentation before the Joint City Council and Planning Commission September 24, 2007  
Future Project Phases

Attachments for this meeting: Draft *Final Report: Highway 138 Corridor Solutions Study*

# Highway 138 Corridor Solutions Study



## Summary of Discussion

### Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

6<sup>th</sup> Meeting

9:00 A.M. to Noon

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.

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

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

# HIGHWAY 138 CORRIDOR SOLUTIONS STUDY

## STEERING COMMITTEE

**6<sup>th</sup> Meeting**  
1:30 pm to 3:30 pm

**September 5, 2007**

ODOT Region 3  
West Conference Room  
3500 NW Stewart Parkway, Roseburg

## AGENDA

---

- I. Introductions** \_\_\_\_\_ **Mike Baker, ODOT**
- II. Project Overview** \_\_\_\_\_ **Jennifer Danziger, DEA**  
**John Wiebke, DEA**
- Review of Corridor Study Process  
Summary of Open House #3 Written Comments
- III. Project Discussion Items** \_\_\_\_\_ **All**
- Technical Memorandum #5 (Analysis of Conceptual Circulation and Design Alternatives)*  
Draft *Final Report* and Conclusions
- IV. Next Steps** \_\_\_\_\_ **John Wiebke, DEA**  
**Mike Baker, ODOT**
- Completion of Final Report  
Presentation before the Joint City Council and Planning Commission September 24, 2007  
Future Project Phases

Attachments for this meeting: Draft *Final Report: Highway 138 Corridor Solutions Study*

# Highway 138 Corridor Solutions Study



## Summary of Discussion

### Steering Committee (SC)

6<sup>th</sup> Meeting

1:30 to 3:30 P.M.

September 5, 2007

#### **Attendees**

Tim Freeman, Roseburg City Council

Robb Paul, Douglas County Public Works

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

John Raasch, ODOT Environmental Project Manager

James Burford, Roadway/Bridge Design Manager, ODOT

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:

- In conjunction with Build Alternative 3(a), Oak Avenue could potentially go under the railroad tracks and resurface at-grade in vicinity of Stephens Street. The option would likely require that Pine Street be vacated.
- Another grade separated railroad crossing to explore could be at Steward Parkway.

### **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.

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

<b>Table 2</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>1(a)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Alternative is fine so long as the improvements are not immediately torn out later with a future long term project</li> </ul>	
<b>2(a)</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Too disruptive to downtown circulation</li> </ul>
<b>2(c)</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact to planned Public Safety Building</li> <li>Too disruptive to downtown circulation</li> </ul>
<b>3(a)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moves through traffic north of downtown</li> </ul>	
<b>3(d)</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Projected costs are too high</li> <li>Visual impact</li> </ul>
<b>4(a)</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not a feasible option given priorities elsewhere throughout the region</li> <li>Too many disturbances to access downtown</li> </ul>

# HIGHWAY 138 CORRIDOR SOLUTIONS STUDY

## CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**7<sup>th</sup> Meeting**  
6:00 pm to 8:00 pm

**October 29, 2007**

ODOT Region 3  
West Conference Room  
3500 NW Stewart Parkway, Roseburg

### AGENDA

---

- I. Introductions** \_\_\_\_\_ **Mike Baker, ODOT**
- II. Project Overview** \_\_\_\_\_ **Jennifer Danziger, DEA**  
**John Wiebke, DEA**  
Review of Proposed New Concepts
- III. Project Discussion Items** \_\_\_\_\_ **All**  
Discussion and Scoring of Screening Matrix for Concepts 6(a) and 6(b)  
Summary and discussion of Evaluation Matrix
- IV. Next Steps** \_\_\_\_\_ **John Wiebke, DEA**  
**Mike Baker, ODOT**  
Completion of Final Report  
Presentation before the Joint City Council and Planning Commission November 26, 2007

Attachments for this meeting: Updated *Initial Circulation Options Screening Matrix*  
Updated *Alternatives Evaluation Matrix*

# Highway 138 Corridor Solutions Study



## Summary of Discussion

### Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC)

7<sup>th</sup> Meeting

6:00 to 8:00 P.M.

October 29, 2007

#### **Attendees**

Georgia Stiles, Property Developer (attended TAC meeting)  
Brett White, Downtown Small Business  
Neal Hadley, At-large Citizen  
Gary Crowe, Chamber of Commerce  
Sande Dixon, Umpqua Transit  
Seth Buechley, Laurelwood Neighborhood  
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**

Jennifer Danziger and John Wiebke opened by presenting the two Concept 6 design alternatives 6(a) and 6(b). The screening and alternatives analysis process was also presented for review purposes, followed by an operational assessment of both alternatives. Future build modeling suggests that Alternative 6(a) will operate efficiently and within Highway Design Manual (HDM) standards in 2030. Alternative 6(b) is projected to operate effectively provided that the Oak Avenue Bridge is reconfigured to accommodate single-lane two-way traffic.

## **Project Discussion Items**

The two new build alternatives were scored on the Screening Matrix and assessed on the Alternatives Matrix. Back and forth discussion followed and covered the following topics:

### Transit

Given the distance between Diamond Lake Boulevard and Odell Avenue, coupled with the grade differences between the two roadways, the design options will need to be in compliance with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) by ensuring that the grade differences do not pose problems for disabled residents attempting to access a transit stop.

It will also be important to provide enough side street width to enable transit buses to turn on and off of Diamond Lake Boulevard and Odell Avenue.

### Downtown

The new couplet system will reduce direct access into downtown Roseburg from Winchester Street and Jackson Street. By isolating downtown, the new concepts could potentially harm revitalization efforts currently underway. Reduced access could partially be remedied by reconfiguring a left turn lane off of Stephens Street southbound onto Douglas Street eastbound. However, this would necessitate an additional northbound lane of Stephens Street due to the additional signal phase to accommodate the new left movement.

### Neighborhood Impacts

The Nash-Commercial-Klamath neighborhoods north of Odell Avenue could be impacted by one-way traffic along Winchester Street. Public outreach to residents in the neighborhoods is highly recommended in light of the fact that the Concept 6 alternatives will have a direct impact on the area.

### Recommendations

The CAC were unanimous in recommending that Alternative 6(a) be forwarded for further study and 5 to 1 against forwarding Alternative 6(b). A summary of comments for and against the alternatives is summarized as follows:

#### *Alternative 6(a)*

- *It solves the problems at Diamond Lake/Stephens and Winchester*

- *All intersections perform in 2030 without direction Harvard-Diamond Lake connection*
- *Alternative enables a direct river crossing at a later date if deemed necessary.*
- *Shares similar strengths with Alternative 1(a)*
- *Increases capacity along Highway 138*
- *Enables incorporation of multi-modal facilities along Diamond Lake and Odell (bus turnouts, bike lanes, wider sidewalks)*
- *Forces circuitous routes into downtown from the north and east.*
- *Residential impacts north of Odell Avenue*

#### *Alternative 6(b)*

- *It solves the problems at Diamond Lake/Stephens and Winchester*
- *If modeling suggests that Alternative 6(a) effectively solves the traffic operations problems, why invest millions more on Alternative 6(b)?*
- *Expensive option that still does not provide grade separated crossing of the railroad*  
*Increases capacity along Highway 138*
- *Enables incorporation of multi-modal facilities along Diamond Lake and Odell (bus turnouts, bike lanes, wider sidewalks)*
- *Forces circuitous routes into downtown from the north and east*
- *Residential impacts north of Odell Avenue*
- *Same bridge impacts associated with Alternative 3(a)*

### **Next Steps**

A fourth public Open House is planned November 15, 2007 at the Douglas County Library with final presentation before the City Council and Planning Commission scheduled November 2, 2007. **Scheduled meeting dates were postponed following subsequent discussion with members of the TAC. Open House session will occur early December (tentative) with City Council presentation schedule either January or February.**

### **Guest Comments**

Two non-CAC members were also in attendance and were invited to comment.

Stuart Liebowitz and Polly Stirling agreed that the concepts do not fit with efforts to revitalize downtown Roseburg and will pose circulation problems for the downtown area. Consideration needs to be given to residents of the Nash-Commercial-Klamath neighborhoods in light of this new concept being forwarded at such a late stage in the study process. Stuart also noted that the arguments in favor of doing something have evolved from developing a grade separated railroad crossing to providing added capacity to economic development.

# HIGHWAY 138 CORRIDOR SOLUTIONS STUDY

## TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**7<sup>th</sup> Meeting**  
9:00 am to 12:00 pm

**October 30, 2007**

ODOT Region 3  
West Conference Room  
3500 NW Stewart Parkway, Roseburg

### AGENDA

---

- I. Introductions** \_\_\_\_\_ **Mike Baker, ODOT**
- II. Project Overview** \_\_\_\_\_ **Jennifer Danziger, DEA**  
**John Wiebke, DEA**  
Review of Proposed New Concepts
- III. Project Discussion Items** \_\_\_\_\_ **All**  
Discussion and Scoring of Screening Matrix for Concepts 6(a) and 6(b)  
Summary and discussion of Evaluation Matrix
- IV. Next Steps** \_\_\_\_\_ **John Wiebke, DEA**  
**Mike Baker, ODOT**  
Completion of Final Report  
Presentation before the Joint City Council and Planning Commission November 26, 2007

Attachments for this meeting: Updated *Initial Circulation Options Screening Matrix*  
Updated *Alternatives Evaluation Matrix*

# Highway 138 Corridor Solutions Study



## Summary of Discussion

### Technical Advisory Committee (CAC)

7<sup>th</sup> Meeting

10:00 am to 12:00 pm

October 30, 2007

#### **Attendees**

Nikki Messenger, Roseburg Public Works Director

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

Tom Hawksworth, Central Oregon and Pacific Railroad (CORP)

Bob Grubbs, ODOT Bridge Designer

Romey Ware, Douglas County Surveyor

Brian Davis, Roseburg City Planning

Thanh Nguyen, TPAU

Ron Hughes, ODOT Region Access Management

Chris Blevins, ODOT Roadway Designer

Mike Baker, ODOT Project Manager

John Raasch, ODOT Environmental Project Manager

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 by presenting the two Concept 6 design alternatives 6(a) and 6(b). The screening and alternatives analysis process was also presented for review purposes, followed by an operational assessment of both alternatives. Future build modeling suggests that Alternative 6(a) will operate efficiently and within Highway Design Manual (HDM) standards in 2030. Alternative 6(b) is projected to operate effectively provided that the Oak Avenue Bridge is reconfigured to accommodate single-lane two-way traffic.

## Project Discussion Items

The two new build alternatives were scored on the Screening Matrix and assessed on the Alternatives Matrix.

### Recommendations

By a 9 to 2 vote, the TAC approved forwarding Alternatives 6(a) and 6(b) for further study. A summary of comments for and against the alternatives is summarized as follows:

#### *Alternative 6(a)*

- *It solves the problems at Diamond Lake/Stephens and Winchester*
- *Improvements/widening of existing bridges are not necessary*
- *Alternative enables a direct river crossing at a later date if deemed necessary.*
- *Opportunity to improve Diamond Lake Boulevard*
- *Improvements to bicycle and pedestrian access*
- *Should concentrate efforts on a direct connection*
- *Option represents an opportunity forgone to provide a grade separated railroad crossing*

#### *Alternative 6(b)*

- *If modeling suggests that Alternative 6(a) effectively solves the traffic operations problems, why invest millions more on Alternative 6(b)?*
- *Would prefer a grade separated crossing of the railroad*
- *Option represents an opportunity forgone to provide a grade separated railroad crossing*
- *Alternative 3(a) would likely be more cost effective*
- *Improvements to bicycle and pedestrian access*
- *Will be difficult to fund*
- *Opportunity to improve Diamond Lake Boulevard*

## **Next Steps**

A fourth public Open House is tentatively planned early December, 2007 with final presentation before the City Council and Planning Commission to occur sometime in January or February, 2007.

# HIGHWAY 138 CORRIDOR SOLUTIONS STUDY

## STEERING COMMITTEE

**7<sup>th</sup> Meeting**  
9:00 to 11:00 am

**February 7, 2008**

ODOT Region 3  
West Conference Room  
3500 NW Stewart Parkway, Roseburg

## AGENDA

---

- I. Introductions** \_\_\_\_\_ **Mike Baker, ODOT**
- II. Project Overview** \_\_\_\_\_ **Jennifer Danziger, DEA**  
**John Wiebke, DEA**
- Review of Remaining Build Alternatives  
Preliminary Summary of Public Open House #4
- III. Project Discussion Items** \_\_\_\_\_ **All**
- Summary, Comparison and Discussion of Screening and Evaluation Matrices  
Final Alternative(s) Recommendation
- IV. Next Steps** \_\_\_\_\_ **John Wiebke, DEA**  
**Mike Baker, ODOT**
- Completion of Final Report  
Presentation before the Joint City Council and Planning Commission

Attachments for this meeting: Updated *Initial Circulation Options Screening Matrix*  
Updated *Alternatives Evaluation Matrix*  
Final Report: Section 6 (Draft)

# Highway 138 Corridor Solutions Study



## Summary of Discussion

### Steering Committee (SC)

7<sup>th</sup> Meeting

9:00 to 10:00 A.M.

February 7, 2008

#### **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

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

John Wiebke, DEA Project Manager

#### **Project Discussion Items**

Attending members of the committee arrived at a consensus supporting Alternative 6(a) as the preferred alternative, subject to City approval. Future traffic modeling suggests that 2030 traffic operations under the alternative would function at a satisfactory level. Steering Committee members acknowledge that Alternative 6(a) does not preclude a future direct Harvard Avenue and Diamond Lake Boulevard bridge connection if needed.

Acknowledging the need for general support prior to presenting the preferred alternative to the Roseburg City Council and Planning Commission, it was agreed that a series of "Town Hall" meeting will be held at locations to be yet determined.

## **Next Steps**

Written comments received from Open House #4 will be folded into the Final Report. Using street level photography, conceptual streetscape demonstrations will be developed to visually display how various vantage points along the corridor could potentially evolve. Following conclusion of the Town Hall meetings, the project team will present the Final Report before a joint session of the City Council and Planning Commission (date to be determined).

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.

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

<b>Table 2</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>1(a)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Alternative is fine so long as the improvements are not immediately torn out later with a future long term project</li> </ul>	
<b>2(a)</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Too disruptive to downtown circulation</li> </ul>
<b>2(c)</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact to planned Public Safety Building</li> <li>Too disruptive to downtown circulation</li> </ul>
<b>3(a)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moves through traffic north of downtown</li> </ul>	
<b>3(d)</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Projected costs are too high</li> <li>Visual impact</li> </ul>
<b>4(a)</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not a feasible option given priorities elsewhere throughout the region</li> <li>Too many disturbances to access downtown</li> </ul>

