

Project Management Team Meeting #11
June 10th, 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
Raymond Jackson
Dan Fricke
Karen Odenthal
Nate Brown
Dave Baltz
Les Sasaki

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 Alternative Packages from Committee
- Review Travel Demand Modeling and Review Traffic Operational Analysis

Welcome

Eryn welcomed the group went over the agenda. Rick explained that the group is going to discuss some additional alternatives, which include several refinements, and noted that the group will see the same kind of information regarding the alternatives that they have received in the past.

Eryn asked if Tony and Rick were looking to the PMT for any decisions. Rick noted that they will ask the PMT for consensus on what alternatives they think should move forward. He explained that Tony and Dorothy are still working on a few refinements, but they would like to get a general idea of how the group wants to move forward.

Approve April 1st Meeting Summary-

The PMT did not have any changes to the April 1st meeting summary and accepted it.

General Project Update

Rick gave the PMT an update on the process. He explained that Eryn, Terry and himself met with SuAnn Reddick from the SAC and another board member from the Chemawa Indian School. He noted that at a previous SAC meeting, SuAnn made a comment about the future land use of Chemawa Indian School. In the meeting they discussed the future use of the school and explained that they are confident the land will be for educational use. Rick also noted that they discussed Tepper and the most logical place to connect to Chemawa. One of the potential idea is to relocate Indian School Rd. to come into Chemawa opposite where Tepper is connected, which would improve access to the school. He explained that relocating the road to the east would put it outside the 1320

feet interchange spacing standard. He also noted that the school would like to have access to Portland Rd. somehow.

Analysis Results Part 1

Rick went over the Key to Alternatives spreadsheet and explained it as a cheat sheet for the PMT to see different features of the alternatives. He also noted that all of the alternatives are based on adopted land use. He explained that Alternatives 15-18 include widening Chemawa east only to Tepper, and Alternative 18 only widens to the west as far as McLeod. Rick continued going over the alternatives and explained that Alternatives 21-23 include widening to Portland Rd and realignment of Indian School Rd to the school's current driveway. Alternative 18 and 22 were evaluated with widening westerly to McLeod. He also noted that the split diamond did not prove beneficial with Alternative 16 and is not included in Alternative 21-23. He explained that the Tepper overcrossing appears to be the most beneficial and is evaluated with full widening to River Rd. and partial widening to McLeod.

Tony went over the history of work completed. He noted that after the alternatives are refined, the team will move into preparing the IAMP and getting consensus on the preferred alternative. Tony went over the alternatives that were analyzed. He explained that under the adopted land use, Alternatives 1 and 6 provided the most benefit. At the last meeting the PMT looked at the alternatives under the UGB expansion scenario and Alternatives 1, 6, 13 and 4 were the most beneficial.

Analysis Results Part II

Tony went on to explain two rounds of refinements for the alternatives. In the first round Anthony Boesen, Dorothy Upton, Terry Cole, Rick Kuehn, Derryl James and Tony discussed ways to enhance and package Alternatives 1 and 6, combined with the most viable options: Tepper overcrossing, optional ramps at Tepper and Chemawa/Lockhaven widening. He noted that they also looked at the Keizer TSP Verda extension and 14th ave right turn, and with that they came up with 6 new refined alternatives (15-20). Tony went over some key findings of the first round of refinements.

In the 2nd round of analysis they did additional work on the alternatives. They looked at round 1 findings, sub group comments and Tier 2 projects.

Tony explained that based on the 2nd round they came up with 4 new refined alternatives, 21-24, all are variations of 15-18. He noted that Alternative 23 is similar to 21 with the addition of half diamond ramps and relocated ramps on the north side of the Chemawa interchange. He explained that they have only analyzed Alternatives 21-23 at this point, and explained that he and Dorothy are still working on Alternative 24.

Dorothy noted that it may be worth looking at doing a Parclo in addition to moving the ramps, it may not be something we have to do, but it may be worth looking into.

Ray asked for clarification on how the alternatives were selected from the alternatives analyzed and if combinations were put together.

Tony explained that there is not much difference from Alternatives 15-20, and noted that the only difference was that they found the Tepper overcrossing and the half diamond operates similarly to each other. He explained that they decided to analyze one of the half diamonds with the full widening to see how it interacts.

Tony went over the Tier 2 projects. Terry explained that “Verda/Hyacinth light” is being taken off the table for consideration in the IAMP and they are leaving it as an option for the Keizer TSP.

Rick noted that the roundabout at Chemawa was taken off for operational reasons; there were too many lanes for a roundabout.

Tony noted that the Parclo B was the only Tier 2 project that was moved into an “add on” option for Alternative 24.

Tony went over the design refinements for Alternatives 21-23.

Dave noted that Alternative 21 appears to eliminate the undercrossing by Chemawa Indian School. He explained that if that happens it would isolate all the land on the southeast side of the interchange where you have to come all the way around.

Terry went over the three possibilities for the undercrossing:

1. Retaining the undercrossing and tying it into the new Tepper.
2. The Chemawa Indian School does have access to the south. He noted that there is a particular piece of property that they don’t necessarily want or need direct access to, and pointed out that access from the south may be sufficient.
3. Extension coming across from the interior road to the school.

He noted that the school came up with the idea of moving the current access road east so it aligns with the developed property.

Dave asked if the crossing will be at grade level and other design specifications. Terry explained that they are not that far yet and right now they are just doing operational analysis.

Ray pointed out that the Tepper/Radiant seems to be disconnected and asked how to get from 35th St. into Keizer. Tony explained that since there is no intersection they would probably have to realign the section by Keizer Station. Rick pointed out that with the half diamond, 35th goes around the other side. Tony explained that they still have to do more refinement on whether they will have to go above.

Tony went over Alternative 22, and noted that it is the same as 21 in the central and east section. He pointed out that the difference is with the west side (page 3 of the

packet), instead of widening to River Rd, it only goes to McLeod in the east and 14th in the west. Tony explained that he included Rob's access management ideas as much as he could.

Rob pointed out that Tony's analysis for Lockhaven/Verda Extension would need a deceleration lane. He explained that it would keep the main line running. Tony noted that it is not included but it is something that can be added.

Tony noted that for Alternatives 21 and 22 there may be other options in between the full and limited widening.

Tony went over Alternative 23, and noted that the difference from Alternative 21 and 22 is the realignment of 35th to Tepper to accommodate for ramps.

Terry noted that they have enough space to probably maintain Salem-Parkway as its own exit. Tony explained that they will need to see if they have modeled the collector distributor roads and refine it as necessary. They continued to discuss the possibilities for the new highway exits (Tepper, Salem Parkway and Chemawa).

Rob noted that the roadway should be moved as close to the baseball stadium as possible, west of the stadium is a gravel lot. He recommended that the curve be brought through the gravel lot. Rick noted that right now it is going through Bonneville Power and they will need to move it anyway.

The PMT discussed the options for connection around the baseball field, they discussed the City of Keizer's ownership of the land and some of the options and possible solutions.

Tony went over Alternative 23 and noted that it is similar to 21 with the addition of a full widening from River Rd. to OR 99E.

Tony went over the mobility standards and explained that since we are just in the refinement stage we don't see a lot of differences with mobility standards changing within alternatives. He pointed out that one difference is with Alternative 22, Kafir fails, because widening does not occur in Alternative 22. Tony noted that mobility standards are difficult to see, they don't give a lot of information as to how much improvement is occurring within the alternatives.

Tony moved on to the intersection analysis; he noted that he can send the intersection analysis results to the group. He noted that they are seeing a difference in delay and V/C ratio in the baseline scenario. He pointed out that Alternative 21-23 are very similar and Alternative 21 and 22's difference is in Trail Ave. because it is not widened. He pointed out that there is 122 seconds of savings on Lockhaven with the widening, and without the widening it is about 50 seconds less of savings. Tony noted that he will look into the

red on Portland and Astoria-Ward Street. Tony and Terry discussed the Tepper ramps and the difference in operations

Terry discussed the potential for phasing and incremental development of alternatives; he discussed some later options and possible project prioritization.

Terry asked if the Hazelgreen east bound approach should be four lanes with the widening instead of three. Tony explained that it could be, he didn't get into that much detail for the analysis. He noted that it could be a dropped lane which is another detail to work out.

Tony went over the draft queuing analysis and noted that they are analyzed with PM peaks. He also clarified that the queuing is for traffic signal cycles. He reviewed the northbound ramps to the stadium for Alternative 21 and noted that they are still in draft version and he and Dorothy are working on it. He also noted that he only did queuing analysis for Alternative 21-23. Tony discussed the queuing involved in Stadium and Ulali.

Rob asked if the team is going to be doing any rail road analysis. He noted that it may strengthen the case for the Tepper overcrossing and give an alternative for people to get around the rail road. He also noted that the pedestrian crossing on the east side of the intersection by Keizer Station is very long. He explained that the City had advocated to not have a pedestrian crossing and were overruled. He noted that if this process comes up with an alternative for the pedestrian crossing to improve operation and queuing the city would be supportive of that.

Tony noted that the conflict is with the double right, and explained that the model shows that 800 vehicles will be using that Stadium and Ulali intersection in the future.

Tony went over Alternative 22 and noted that you start to see spill back going westbound as a direct result of limited widening. He also noted that the east bound is similar to Alternative 21.

Dave asked if you made significant intersection improvements all the way are you still going to have these queuing issues. Tony explained that it is all driven by the fact that there is one lane downstream that more than one lane of traffic wants to get through.

Rob noted that it would be important to see how the 2 lane westbound sections all the way from McLeod to Verda react to the interchange. Terry explained that you don't see a difference with the intersection in isolation, you only see the effect they have on each other.

Tony noted that collector distributor roads are included in all of the freeway analysis. He also noted that the results show the same thing, almost identical results between the alternatives and improvements over the baseline

Tony went over the key findings for the 2nd round of analysis and the cost/benefit of what seems worth it and what may be staged.

Tony went over the next steps:

- Additional Refinements to Lockhaven/Chemawa Widening
- Viability of Parclo B at Chemawa/NB Ramps
- Refinement of Eastside modifications and Tepper Realignment
- Other Strategies (Access Management, Restrictions, etc.)
- Potential Design Modifications

Ray noted that so far the alternatives don't seem to address the issues at Chemawa, and Tepper does not provide any through movement. Tony explained that from a mobility standpoint you see substantial improvement in the study area. Ray asked if 2 minutes is enough. Ray noted that Tepper is interesting because it provides mobility, but he doesn't see why, there isn't any housing in the area, only shopping. Terry noted that it may be a big attraction. Dave noted that Tepper solves the problem on the east side, and explained that he thinks it is a great solution.

Rick pointed out that the volume on Perkins and 35th has really increased, not just because of Keizer station development. He explained that there is more volume from the northern residential part of Keizer that could use a Tepper overcrossing.

Terry explained that the bottom-line is we don't see any real magic bullets but with combinations it is better than doing nothing. He explained that this is for the most part avoidance of failures everywhere.

Eryn brought up evaluation criteria and noted that we have things to look at beyond mobility. She explained that it is not until we look at the alternatives in relation to all choices that we will be able to get to a result.

Dave pointed out that the maps make it look as if Indian School Road will be closed, and noted that Tony may want to cross it off since they are not necessarily closing it, it should be marked as a possible closure. He recommended that it should be crossed off at the loop.

Rick noted that originally at this meeting we would have been trying to settle on two preferred Alternatives to move forward. He noted that the PMT will most likely need one more meeting to fill in the gaps that they have discussed, and they probably won't need 3 meetings to review the IAMP document as planned.

Terry explained that they now have logical steps that are complimentary indeed of one preferred alternative. He explained that once the project team gets consensus from the

PMT on how to move forward with informing the public, they will meet with the SAC and prepare for an open house.

Eryn noted that the next PMT meeting is July 22nd if the PMT agrees that we are moving in the right direction.

Terry noted that the next step is to match the alternatives up with the evaluation criteria and see how they look.

Cecilia and Dave announced changes in their employment. She will still not be on the PMT, and this will be Dave's last meeting.

The PMT thanked Dave and Cecilia for their contributions to the process.