

Project Management Team Meeting #9
April 1, 2009 1:30-3:30
Oregon Department of Transportation Region 2 HDQ
455 Airport Road, Building B

DRAFT Meeting Summary

Members in Attendance

Cecelia Urbani
Dorothy Upton
Matt Crall
Steve Oulman (DLCD)
Raymond Jackson
Dan Fricke
Rod Thompson
Karen Odenthal
Dave Baltz
Derryl James

Les Sasaki
Nate Brown
Rob Kissler

Staff in Attendance

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

Meeting Goals

- Review Expanded UGB scenarios
- Discuss Quantitative Evaluation of Five Alternative Packages
- Review Travel Demand Modeling
- Review Traffic Operational Analysis

Welcome

Eryn welcomed the group and explained that today's meeting will take the same approach as last meeting. She noted that the group will not go over line drawings for the alternatives.

Approve February 18th Meeting Summary-

The PMT approved the summary. It was noted that Dave Baltz was not at the February meeting.

Expanded UGB Scenario

Tony explained that the PMT will go over a similar packet of materials to last meeting. He noted that the consultant team looked at an expanded UGB scenario and noted that it will be a supplement to the IAMP. Tony went over the current work and where we are at. He explained the analysis that has been completed and noted that they are still working on refining the alternatives for the adopted land use.

Terry explained that the expanded UGB scenario will only be used for a threshold comparison to the adopted land use scenario and included as an appendix in the IMAP. It will simply serve as a relative benchmark for the City of Keizer to consider as they develop their comprehensive plan updates.

Dave noted that this is a sensitivity analysis which can illustrate some possible traffic impacts that may result if the UGB expands north and which alternative may have value if the expansion occurs.

Nate reminded the consultant team and PMT that the UGB expansion is a sensitive issue that can create angst. He noted that as we go through the process we want to make people feel comfortable. He noted that we can't pretend that a growth boundary expansion does not have implications on an IAMP, if there is an expansion there are some thresholds that we have to be aware of.

Tony went over the UGB expansion land use and network assumptions, the purpose of the UGB expansion traffic analyzed and the alternatives analyzed.

Rick reminded the PMT that Alternatives 1 and 6 had the most beneficial effects to Chemawa under the adopted land use scenario while the other 3 alternatives didn't really have effect on the Chemawa situation.

Tony went over the network assumptions and explained that it includes:

- Extension from 35th St. from Quinaby to Brooklake
- Improvements to Quinaby and River Rd.
- New East-West arterial south of Perkins
- Minor North-South connector near railroad tracks
- Signal at 35th and Perkins

The PMT asked for the network assumptions map to be emailed to the group.

Terry noted that there was concern expressed by Keizer about providing arterial connections directly into neighborhoods and that the project should look at directing traffic around. He noted that the network assumptions can basically deliver traffic to the bigger system.

Karen asked if there was discussion on where the UGB will be.

Tony explained the land use assumptions and explained that they were developed by a small subgroup: City of Keizer, SKATS, Salem, and Marion County. He noted that the UGB would expand north to Quinaby, and would be approximately 920 acres in size (680 residential, 120 retail, 120 non retail). He explained that based on the Marion County population forecasts there may be approximately 8000 people (mid-level) and about 1800 new households. Tony explained that for the land use assumptions they separated the 2 network zones into 6 network zones.

Nate pointed out that Quinaby is an arbitrary boundary for the UGB.

Tony pointed out that they did not assume anything for the east side they only looked north of City of Keizer, Quinaby and I-5.

Dave asked what the relationship was between households and people. Tony explained that it is based on the same ratios used for the adopted land use SKATS model. The PMT had questions and concerns regarding the number of households in the land use assumptions. It was unclear whether single or multifamily households were taken into consideration. Tony explained that the 8000 people are correct, and he will look over the household number as it may be off, if it is based on 8000 people. He noted that he will check to see if they broke it into single vs. multi.

Tony went over the TAZ map for adopted land use and expanded UGB and noted how they disaggregated the zones. He noted that 8000 people were evenly distributed into all of the zones. Tony pointed out that retail was put into the southern zones and non retail (light industrial, etc.) were put into the northern zones. Tony also noted where the employment and housing were located.

Dave asked where the load points for zones are located.

Tony explained that most zones have at least 2 load points, which are in the existing network.

Cecilia noted that they had discussed having smaller retail areas, neighborhood commercial in other TAZs.

Tony noted that for modeling purposes to make it simple they put it in TAZ 395.

Terry explained that retail and non retail areas are attractions in the model and draw trips to that area from the broader network. He noted that locating them central to the north would probably be adequate for pulling from the network or working with trip distributions.

Tony went over the analysis results for the adopted land use scenario vs. the UGB expanded scenario. He noted that there is substantially more growth for all scenarios, and that the most direct improvements at Chemawa occur with Alternatives 1 and 13, some improvements with Alternative 6, and the least improvement with Alternatives 12 and 14.

Terry explained that Keizer's interaction is much more with the Salem area than with Portland. He noted that Brooks becomes is much less sensitive and little affected because significantly more people in Keizer travel to and from the south.

Tony went over a map that shows what growth occurs when you take the UGB expansion scenario and subtract out the adopted land use scenario. Tony explained the growth and off-loading that the model shows occurring with PM peak trip hours.

Discuss Quantitative Evaluation of Five Alternative Packages

Alt 1-Chemawa/Lockhaven Corridor Widening

Tony went over the traffic operational analysis for intersections and freeways for Alternative 1.

The PMT discussed the precision of the models and some reasons why the out of way and direct routes that individuals may take don't show up on the model.

Tony noted that improvements at Brooks are not assumed in the scenario.

Terry explained that each alternative is being looked at individually; Brooks by itself doesn't become a magnet for trips. The next step of the process is to start to look at things in combination, but for now we are focusing on them individually.

Rob noted that in the UGB scenario some folks may travel to the north and wanted to know if that was that built into the model.

Tony explained that they do see an increase, but not significant enough to show up on the analysis results.

Tony noted that overall for freeways no real changes as a result of the increase in land use.

Tony went over the traffic operational analysis comparison to baseline for the UGB expansion and noted that green is an improvement of 25 seconds or more of delay. He pointed out that there is no red for Alternative 1 because there are a lot of improvements on intersections, particularly for Chemawa.

Alternative 6: Chemawa/Teper Half Diamond Interchange

Tony went over the traffic operational analysis for intersections and freeways.

Rick noted that with Alternative 6 there are still red intersections at the heart of the interchange.

Tony cautioned the PMT to look just at the red and green because the intersection may be just barely passing or failing.

Dorothy pointed out that Alternative 1 shows 35th and Perkins as signalized and Alternative 6 shows it as stop controlled.

Cecilia asked if the signals 27, 28 and 29 were also part of Alternative 1.

Tony noted that it is not part of Alternative 1. He explained that it is an overcrossing at Teper that is connecting over the freeway and bringing it down to Chemawa.

Cecilia clarified that Alternative 6 is the only one with that component for the east side of I-5.

Tony explained that they are still working on the widening and looking at how far it would go over, he noted that it may go past the boundary, but that is something they will look at later in the process. He explained that Alternative 6 is the only one that has the new intersection and crossing.

Dave brought up the idea of having a design charrette to come up with ideas about how to serve access to those businesses.

Terry explained that they will do that in the future.

Rick noted that the team is moving towards looking at a solution that is a combination of Alternatives 1 and 6.

Terry explained that the overall message on the freeway is that the problem is going north. It is not something that can be fixed by the IAMP, it is a main line capacity issue.

Dave asked about Indian School Road and whether having another access point would be counterintuitive. He noted that he doesn't think the red is that bad.

Matt noted that the red may be a delay but that it still meets the standard.

Tony noted that they will have to look at other charts to see what is failing and what is meeting. He asked the PMT to look at raw numbers and difference numbers instead of looking at just the red and green. Terry pointed out that it may be because of the increase lane volumes associated with putting in the bypass. Tony noted that he will talk to Dave after the meeting and explain more of the numbers and modeling.

Alternative 12: Brooks Interchange SPUI

Tony noted that Alternative 12 is almost exactly the same as the baseline as far as the mobility standards.

Rick noted that Alternative 12 makes Brooks work but doesn't make Chemawa work.

Matt noted that Alternative 12 may not show any improvements because 2 intersections have been removed. He pointed out that the new intersection meets capacity, and that intersections 21 and 22 were failing massively and now they don't exist so it should be noted as "green".

Tony went over the comparison to the baseline and noted that the River Rd. improvement seemed counterintuitive, it made very little difference.

Karen pointed out that there are 2 improvements, and that it is making it seem like Brooks is not improving.

Tony noted that for this study they are looking at Chemawa. He noted that if you look at Chemawa, you are not seeing the 100 or 70 second improvements you are with other alternatives.

Alternative 13: Quinaby Road Interchange

Terry noted that intersection 24 will be signalized.

Tony explained that for Alternative 13 the freeway operations are worse, he noted that with the adopted land use scenario the freeway operations were just on the borderline. He explained that Quinaby attracted just enough traffic that it pushed it the freeway capacity over standard. He explained that that the Quinaby interchange is redirecting movements, so instead of taking Chemawa, people are staying on the freeway longer. He noted that the difference is only 2%. Tony also pointed out that the auxiliary lanes are included on all of the alternatives.

Tony went over the baseline comparison and pointed out that there are a lot more "green". He pointed out the 2 new intersections, Quinaby north and south, and noted that he should probably mark them as "yellow" to define that it is not quite an improvement or degradation.

Terry suggested adding a footnote with an explanation to the baseline comparison chart.

Tony pointed out that Brooklake also has improvements on 99 and River Rd. He explained that there is a diversion of some traffic because vehicles are now going down to Quinaby, and because of its close proximity, Quinaby is drawing traffic away from Brooks.

Alternative 14: Verda/Hyacinth Corridor Improvements

Tony noted that there is not much difference north or south from a mobility standpoint. He explained that for freeways, there is still the red at the end because of capacity

restraints. He pointed out that there is not as much of a savings in this scenario for Alternative 14.

Tony went over a difference table comparison for intersections. Tony explained that there is added savings at each of the intersections. He noted that Alternative 1 has 2 times as much savings as Alternative 13. Tony also pointed out that Alternatives 12 and 14 have just about as much improvements as they do degradations.

Tony noted that for Alternative 14, even though there are a lot of “green”, there are a lot that don’t make any difference at all. Tony noted that he will figure out a way to look at new intersections on the comparison charts.

Matt asked about the new interchange included in Alternative 14 and how it affected traffic.

Tony noted that he can look at traffic pattern shifts and diversions for Alternative 14.

Eryn noted that it may be helpful to look more detailed into Alternative 14 before the committee removes it from consideration.

Ray pointed out that Alternative 14 is doing better than if they were to do nothing, he noted that the top half of the sheet that shows a lot of failures but it is failing less.

Tony suggested that they can start comparing all of the alternatives to 1; he noted that there are a lot of ways we can look at this to asses and make sense. Tony noted that the comparison chart just looks at traffic delay; there are a lot of other things that we can look at.

Terry noted that this could be illustrative that it is more of an effect than we say with existing for Alternative 14. He pointed out that with the expanded UGB scenario there may be more improvements along this corridor, at a very basic level of operational analysis. He explained that later in the process they will start thinking about improvements in the context of short and long term.

Rick noted that Alternative 14 does help Chemawa, but all of the intersections are failing, it is not helping enough.

Tony noted that the comparison chart is a way to quantify and put a number instead of just “red” and “green”.

Tony went over the freeways difference table comparison, and noted that compared to the baseline there is hardly any difference, less than .6 of a difference. He pointed out that overall the number of segments gets better. Tony also pointed out that all of them have some level of improvement over the baseline. Tony noted that qualitatively,

Alternative 1 shows the most benefit for intersections, from a delay standpoint, while Alternative 12 has the least benefit. Tony pointed out that for Alternative 12 the benefits are localized to the Brooks interchange.

Dave asked how adding development north impacts the top alternatives. He suggested comparing Alternatives 1,3,6 and 13 to last month's adopted land use spreadsheet to see impacts and if it actually accommodates traffic.

Rick noted that Alternatives 1 makes the most difference for both the adopted land use scenario and the expanded UGB scenario.

Tony brought up the differences for adopted land use and differences for expanded land use to look at how much improvement is occurring over the baseline for each scenario.

Matt pointed out that under the expanded UGB scenario, things get much worse, and the improvements are bigger. He noted that the improvements have a greater effect.

Steve informed the group that the UGB scenario is based on assumptions and are not consistent with the law. He noted that this is a hypothetical scenario and the team needs to be careful about what assumptions come up in the outcome. He noted that there is a lot of modeling that is based on the assumptions and wanted to caution the group against making decisions based on this information.

Terry asked the group to not get stuck on comparing the scenarios against each other. He noted that this is a very high level assessment. He noted that they are trying to look at big picture differences and implications. He reminded the group that the next step in the process is to look at combinations and hybrids of the five alternatives. Terry also noted that the expanded UGB scenario that was pulled together will be used to provide perspective for the City of Keizer. He explained that this work is another way to validate if what works best for the existing land use scenario is likely to continue to add value even in an expanded Keizer growth scenario.

Tony pulled up a comparison chart for all five alternatives.

Ray asked how the alternatives will be combined.

Terry explained that they got a sub group together last week with ODOT and FHWA to validate the freeway assumptions. He noted that for Alternatives 1 and 6 they did come up with a combination, but still have to work out details and refine it. He noted that there is resistance from Keizer about widening Lockhaven, and noted that it is a local political choice. He explained that they have to figure out how far of a detailed analysis they take, if they leave it at 2 lanes, etc. He explained that they will look at queuing effects and run analysis on queue links.

Eryn asked if the PMT will receive that information at their next meeting.

Terry suggested that they continue to work on the combination packages as a sub group and come back to the PMT with the information. He noted that it would be more efficient than trying to do it as part of a PMT meeting. He noted that the PMT could also decide to work on combinations in a work shop. He asked the PMT what they would prefer.

The PMT suggested having a small group work on some ideas and present them to the PMT at the next meeting.

Dorothy asked about revisiting tier 1 and tier 2 projects before we drop alternatives off the list. She reminded the group that they have more options in other tiers. She suggested that the consultant team come back with analysis of the previous list of tiers for the group to discuss.

Rob asked how the PMT can provide input and assumptions to the small group.

Terry noted that they are welcome to be part of the team by emailing that request to Tony, Eryn or himself.

The PMT asked about when they would get a cost benefit ratio, and noted that it is hard to guess the magnitude of the project without seeing the cost.

Rick noted that there was early work done with some costs included on the evaluation matrix.

Terry explained that between now and the next meeting they will pull a small group together to talk about combinations of alternatives and different packages. He noted that they can also discuss rough costs in order to consider those impacts.

Cecelia asked what the SAC will be discussing at their next meeting.

Eryn informed the PMT that the next SAC meeting is April 7th and they will be looking at the same information. She noted that for the last SAC meeting they reduced some detail to avoid members of the group getting confused. She noted that they share information that occurred at the PMT meetings with the SAC as well.

Terry noted that the SAC focuses more on policy issues than technical issues.

Terry noted that because the next PMT meeting is scheduled for April 29th, it may be a tight turn around to get a sub group together.

Eryn noted that we can move the next PMT meeting if needed.

Nate asked how the small group will be formed.

Terry explained that the group will include ODOT, CH2M Hill and FHWA. He noted that if a PMT member has strong feelings about attending they should talk to him

Eryn informed the PMT that the Chemawa Project now has a podcast available on the project website which summarizes the project. Eryn noted that she can send out information about the podcast for PMT members to pass on to those who are interested.

Ray asked if the project pier site can be updated.

Eryn said that she will update it and send out a reminder to folks on how to use it. She encouraged the PMT to use the project pier site since they don't post the maps on the project website. She reminded the group to talk to Terry if they are interested in joining the small group. She will send out an email to the PMT about the next meeting.