

IAMP: I-5 at Chemawa Road
Joint Project Management Team and Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting
DRAFT Meeting Summary
July 30, 3008 1:30p.m. to 3:30 p.m.
Keizer Fire Station
661 Chemawa Road NE, Keizer, OR 97303

SAC Members in Attendance

Chuck Sides
Larry Epping
Elaine Gesik(alternate for Dale Frank)
John Schaad (via phone)
SuAnn Reddick
Eric F. Scott
Raymond Jackson
Cathy Clark
Kate Tarter
Christine Dieker

PMT Members in Attendance

Matt Crall
Dan Fricke
Nate Brown
Anthony Boesen
Les Sasaki
Cecelia Urbani
Karen Odenthal
Dorothoy Upton
Dave Baltz
Rob Kissler

Staff in Attendance

Rick Kuehn, CH2M Hill
Terry Cole, ODOT
Eryn D. Kehe, JLA
Tony Woody, CH2M Hill
Laura DeGraw, JLA

Meeting Goals

- Review project work underway
- Engage SAC in identification of project goals

Welcome

Eryn welcomed both committees and explained the format of the joint meeting. Eryn asked the PMT for any changes to the meeting summary, and no changes were noted. Eryn explained that at the last SAC meeting she had thought that there were not enough members present to approve the meeting, she realized that she was going off an out dated committee list. Eryn noted that there were not enough SAC members present at the joint meeting to approve the 2 previous meeting summaries, the SAC will have to approve their meeting summaries at the August meeting.

Open House Summary

Eryn went over the turn out and results of the open house. She noted that there were a lot of comments regarding a new interchange. Rick noted that congestion at Lockhaven and River Rd were big concerns. Eryn noted that the open house also gave the public an opportunity to understand the process of the project, and better understanding the IAMP. Eryn asked the committees to take a look at the open house summaries and share any questions and concerns.

Terry noted that there was a lot of curiosity about the project and process during the open house. He further explained that questions and information about future growth and long range in the area was brought up frequently as well.

Review Evaluation Framework

Rick went over the evaluation framework and noted that they will come into play after the workshop with the joint committees. He explained that the technical team will come up with viable solutions, which they will then evaluate.

Rick went over the evaluation criteria and scoring perimeters, and explained that there are 6 goals and multiple objectives that match up with each goal. Rick noted that the evaluation criteria are not judgment statements, but instead a form of measurements. He explained that the judgment is listed in the scoring comment, and that the solution is either: good, neutral or bad. He mentioned that some of the scoring is repeated because it applies to various objectives under different goals. Rick pointed out that it is important to know that we are not going to add up a score for each alternative and rank which one scores better. He explained that the scoring will be similar to the consumer reports style circles and will be a visual preference rather than a score at the bottom.

Terry noted that there is also a comment section in the matrix, which gives the opportunity to provide context and perspective. He explained that this creates a subjective assessment of matrix, and can allow the committees and project team to take a look at the nuance of comparing one versus the other.

Chuck was interested in knowing if this format has been used this before in other interchange projects. He asked for a send a sample of what has been used in previous projects, and was interested to know if the matrix explains what it means.

Rick explained that it is very common in interchange projects and they have used it before. He explained that he has examples that he can show the group. Terry noted that he can send examples as well.

Terry asked the group to make notes of any jargon that they don't understand and the project can explain it to the group. He noted that he wants to make sure the group understands the matrix.

Identify Draft Alternatives

Tony went over a presentation about interchange 101, and discussed different types of interchanges and their uses to the committees.

Tony explained system hierarchy and went over the high to low order of roadways (interstate to local street). He explained the different categories of interchanges, such as service interchanges and system interchanges, and noted that in Chemawa we will be dealing with service interchanges, otherwise known as a freeway and an arterial.

Tony went over graphics for different types of interchanges and noted that we will be dealing with diamond and cloverleaf type interchanges in Chemawa. Tony further explained the variety of diamond form interchanges, and explained the general concepts. He went over the advantages of diamonds interchanges and noted that they are primarily lower cost, lower ROW and have better pedestrian

accommodation. He explained that some of the disadvantages of diamond interchanges are higher traffic delay and lower progression.

Tony then went over different forms of cloverleaf interchanges. He noted that the advantages of cloverleaf interchanges are a minimum number of traffic phases, and removal of left turn phases. He also noted that there is less delay and higher progression. Some of the disadvantages of cloverleaf interchanges are that ROW is required in 2 quads, some pedestrian access issues and a higher cost.

Tony went over interchange design and system considerations that the group should keep in mind during their activity. Tony noted that the group should also keep in mind the access spacing requirements of interchanges, right and left turns.

Chuck asked how the community evaluates which design is better, he noted that some may see that one may cost more, but allows more volume.

Tony explained that it goes into the evaluation framework and as the alternatives get narrowed down we will look at a more quantitative evaluation.

Chuck asked how the community benefits from high traffic volumes.

Tony explained that the community could benefit with more business.

Terry explained that the project team and technical team will look at the right sizing of infrastructure to what you want to accommodate in your community. He noted that they want to match what the community is providing to the travel needs, and that they want to balance the needs of the community with what we are investing. Terry explained that an alternative may fully or partially meet standards, and that is what we use the evaluation framework for with making sure we match the values. He explained that the decision is arrived at through consensus and weighing one versus the other.

Rick noted that we need to look at a network and not just this interchange and that mobility should be spread to the area.

Tony went over the future traffic operations summary.

Dave noticed that some of the "failing" intersections are not failing by much; some are more over than other. He explained that it may be important to note that they may be barely failing, or barely passing.

Tony noted that they are not seeing extensive interchange failure in the project area.

Tony went over the guidelines and instructions for the concepts activity, and noted that the goal is to address operations challenges/deficiencies inside the red boundary. He explained that once the groups identified challenges/deficiencies they should develop solution concepts to the challenges, in or out of the red boundary. He explained that all of this is based on the futures analysis. Tony went over some potential concepts and instructions for the small groups.

Eryn gave instructions on the concept workshop instructions. Terry noted that the analysis is based upon current land use plan and employment calculations for Keizer.

Anthony asked if the north Salem population increase was that equated.

Terry explained that Salem is not talking about comp plan changes like Keizer is, and noted that they are not necessarily thinking that Salem is going to make changes. He explained that they are not considering plan changes or land use plan changes, and everything that they have for the future is what we are planning for as opposed to the fact that we know that Keizer is planning on making changes.

Eryn asked the groups to spend 45 minutes going over the activity.

After splitting into groups the committees reconvened and shared their group's ideas with the larger group:

Nate noted that his group focused on providing alternative access to I5. They suggested a new crossing on Keizer Rd. to Indian School Rd., parallel to Chemawa. They also suggested combining south bound exits to Chemawa and Parkway, and having a split diamond at Brooks and Perkins which would split up the weaving for trucks and provide north bound traffic for 15. Nate explained they also thought of a split diamond on Chemawa and Perkins. Modifying the overpass at Chemawa to allow for north bound freeway access was another idea that Nate pointed out. Nate mentioned that some of their future ideas are based on assumptions that the NE quad needs to be updated. They also factored in the commuter rail concept, and noted that it will bring a lot of regional traffic along the commuter rail and the project will need to figure out what the impact would be on the interchange. I

Anthony noted that his group thought there should be a north to south connectivity at the Parkway which would move trucks south to other interchanges. They also liked the idea of having connectivity to the Chemawa School. They noted that the need to keep connectivity for the commuter rail and to look at options for transit and whatever alternative is chosen, to make sure buses can use it. They noted that they would like to develop proper facilities for transit.

Dorothy noted that her group agreed on collector distributor routes. They also had a lot of ideas for interchanges dealing with traffic in the north. They thought that Quinaby should be a new diamond interchange and to take traffic off I5 before it gets to Chemawa. Dorothy explained they want to make improvements to the Brooks interchange and create a better connector road from Stadium to Brooks. Dorothy's group noted they want to make Brooks more urban and signalized. Dorothy pointed out the issues in south, and the fact that the railroad stops on both side of the Crocs center. She explained that they want to add a connector road along the railroad under the freeway, and they want access that does not deal with the railroad. Dorothy explained that they also want to look at widening the crossing at the Indian School in order to add an extra lane on either side.

Cathy noted that her group focused on conflicts at Chemawa and Brooks. She pointed out that both interchanges will struggle in 2031. She noted that her group looked at Frontage roads and enhancing the current ROW that we have. She noted an issue with the Perkins interchange. She also explained that her

group thought of a concept to widen 15 and add merge lanes so that weaving can maneuver better. She noted an idea for a cloverleaf at Chemawa, as well as a cloverleaf north bound to west bound. She also mentioned that her group looked at an option for a south bound fly over to accommodate growth at Chemawa. She also noted that the group thought that traffic should come through Keizer Station instead of around it.

Eryn thanked the committees for their work, and invited the group to take blank maps home and work on them, and send them to her before August 8th.

Next Meetings:

- PMT Meeting: Wednesday August 20th
- SAC Meeting: Tuesday August 26th