

Project Management Team
September 24, 2008 1:30-3:30
Oregon Department of Transportation Region 2 HDQ
455 Airport Road, Building B

DRAFT Meeting Summary

Members in Attendance

Dorothy Upton
Matt Crall
Raymond Jackson
Glen Hadley
Karen Odenthal
Nate Brown
Dave Baltz

Les Sasaki

Staff in Attendance

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

Meeting Goals

- Review and approve the Evaluation Framework
- Discuss Qualitative Screening of Alternative Packages

Welcome

Eryn welcomed the group and explained where the group was in the process. She explained that the team had a lot of information to provide to the group and that by October they are hoping to narrow the Alternatives.

Approve August 20th Meeting Summary-

The PMT noted that there were some miss-spellings. Dorothy noted a change on page 4. The group approved the summary with the changes.

Eryn mentioned that the next scheduled PMT meeting is October 8th and the following SAC meeting is October 28th. She noted that the group usually meets a week before the SAC meeting, and proposed moving the meeting to October 22nd. The group agreed to move the meeting to October 22nd.

Evaluation Framework

Dave noted that it is not clear from the alternatives, how the access issues are going to be dealt with on the east side of the freeway. He expressed concern that the curved road to Indian school road will not work without a signal. He asked for clarification on how the alternatives are going to deal with access issues.

Rick noted that we are going through the process now to figure out what the interchange types are and the next step is to come up with an access management plan.

Dave pointed out that access issues are going to have an impact on which interchange types work.

Rick noted that the team tried to take access issues into account as they have gone through the evaluation criteria.

Nate noted that the growth expansion issue is still unknown.

Eryn noted that with the 15 sites it is difficult to do an in-depth analysis; she explained that the team is going to work to minimize the number of alternatives first.

Eryn checked in with the group to make sure they were comfortable with the framework.

Rick noted that he and Tony met with the Evaluation Framework Committee. He explained to the group that nearly all of the committee's recommendations were made into the final framework. Only a few were not. He explained which recommendations were not made.

Les noted there is a lot of redundancy in the evaluation framework. He felt that the perimeters should be different for each one. He noted that the same objective creates the same evaluation criteria no matter what because you use the same perimeters. Les noted that changing the perimeter would change the evaluation. He noted concern regarding how the objective can be evaluated when the same perimeters are used for mobility and livability.

Terry explained that they are not using a quantitative tool, and that they are focusing more on the organization. He noted that if they were weighing the objective against each other they would be more concerned with redundancy and repeating factors.

Terry explained that the group can look at things that are not differentiating between the alternatives. He noted that this tool won't help choose between one alternative and the next, but that it will help point out the relative positives and negatives of each.

Dorothy expressed concern relating to mobility planning and design exceptions. She pointed out that the Brooks interchange is a .6 since it is a rural interchange, not a .8.

Terry noted that they are always struggling with OHP and highway design mobility standards. He explained that they have two different standards that they live by. We are now engaged for TDD and a year long process in revisiting some of our assumptions with the OTC. He noted that the group shouldn't worry about if the outcome means that they might have to look at lower mobility standards on the freeway, he pointed out it shouldn't be concern at this point, nor a restriction.

Dorothy noted that she is concerned with the numbers. She noted that if the numbers are a determinant for a half or full circle, she is concerned if the numbers are not correct.

Tony explained that at this level, because they don't have modeling, they looked at capacity.

Terry noted that mobility is just one point and that we will look at the whole framework.

Nate noted that there are a lot of things up in the air regarding the Keizer expansion, but pointed out that we can start to incorporate some of our assumptions regarding the expansion.

Terry noted that they are looking at the existing conditions. He explained that land use Alternatives are not part of this now, but that they will be needed soon to start to work with the Alternatives. He noted that they are taking a leap of faith that the Keizer growth expansion will not make the things that don't score well look better.

Dorothy pointed out that there are some that are all or nothing and she feels there may be some median. She asked that the team look at impacts that exist that can be mitigated. She noted concern with some of the black and white categories and asked for some grey area.

Rick pointed out that some things are bad, like archeological issues, and there is no in between.

Eryn asked the group to accept the framework enough to move on.

Discuss Screening of Alternative Packages

Tony went over the two maps that the team put together for the PMT to review. Rick noted that the maps are just an example, and that they have not been reviewed. De noted that the group can expect the same kind of maps and level of drawing for all 15 Alternatives. He also pointed out that the auxiliary lanes along I-5 are part of all Alternatives.

Dorothy asked that the Alternatives that don't include such a large area be at a larger scale so that they can see things easier. She asked the team to try and minimize the number of different scales for each map.

Tony noted that there will be some consistency between them, and Terry pointed out that this is a first draft.

Dave asked for each framework and evaluation criteria handout to be labeled draft and get a date so they can track the changes.

Matt asked if any of the Alternatives overshadow all the other Alternatives.

Rick noted that there are a few that barely jump out.

Rick went over the evaluation framework, and noted that it evaluates which Alternative serves best for each goal. He pointed out that the group can start to see some 1's and 0's, and noted that some Alternatives didn't do well at all when compared to the goals.

Rick went over the highlights of the evaluation framework notes and explained the logic they used. He asked the group to take this with them and spend some time with it, and noted that they will go over it again. He noted that the PMT can send Rick notes before the next meeting.

Rick explained a general project assumption that auxiliary lands on I-5 are common to all of the Alternatives. Because they are common to each, their impact was not evaluated.

Matt asked what the cost was just for the auxiliary lanes.

Rick noted that the cost is covered on the last page of the evaluation framework notes, but that they are anticipate \$50 million just for the auxiliary lanes.

The PMT had a lot of questions regarding lanes. Cost was a concern.

Terry explained that the some freeway sections were failing according to the future baseline analysis. He noted that the auxiliary lanes can address the freeway and interchange issues.

Mobility:

1.1.2

Rick noted that for evaluation criteria 1.1.2 Alternatives 1-14 are a way to address mobility standards.

Terry pointed out that until the modeling analysis is done, they won't know how significant Alternatives 13 and 14 will pull traffic away from Chemawa.

1.1.3

Rick went over evaluation criteria 1.1.3, and noted that they are uncertain about what the split diamond in Alternative 5 and 6 will do to Chemawa and Lockhaven. He explained that there needs to be an east to west connection to split diamonds, and they are not sure if it will change traffic on Chemawa. He also pointed out that for Alternatives 13-15 the degree in which traffic will be pulled off of the Chemawa corridor is uncertain.

Raymond noted a concern with the Chemawa widening. Rick explained that a widening project would also involve adjustment of signal timing.

Terry noted that they don't know how much of the traffic is really interceptive and doesn't think that Alternative 13 and 14 has a strong effect as the Chemawa widening.

1.1.4

Rick explained that each of the 15 Alternatives include a package of suggested improvements. He explained that they each have "primary" project elements considered mandatory and "secondary" elements which are not. The "secondary" elements are included in almost all the 15 Alternatives. Since they are common to almost all, the secondary elements were not evaluated.

Ray asked for clarification for Alternative 15 regarding the statement that Keizer Rd. does not have a local improvement project included.

Rick noted that the way the Alternative is put together, the local improvement package is not included. He explained that while there were some the local improvements that they identified, none of them were tied to the Keizer road system. He noted that there may be other local improvements that we don't have that may go into Alternative 15.

Nate noted that if the local improvements don't benefit the interchange, he wouldn't agree with including them into the package.

Matt noted that it may be unfair to score Alternative 15 down because the 2nd elements are not included.

1.2.1

Rick explained that for 1.2.1 two Alternatives are not consistent with existing plans for future growth and land use changes: Quinaby/Perkins and Keizer Road extension.

Tony noted that if they want to think ahead as if the UGB expansion does occur they may need to modify the Alternatives to be premature.

Dave Baltz confirmed that the team was assuming no UGB expansion on the Salem side of the interstate. Terry confirmed that this was the assumption.

Dorothy raised concern about evaluating without analysis of the actual v/c ratios for each Alternative.

Rick noted that this is a visual tool, and Terry pointed out that there are a lot of educated guesses. Rick noted that he and Tony felt that they did need to do a lot of educated guessing and to call all the Alternatives premature and not dispute it at all wouldn't be constructive. He reminded the group that all of this was done without modeling or analysis.

Terry explained that Chemawa widening is the only thing that is not premature, and noted that he can't see a way to dispute it. He pointed out that the north Alternatives are a little overstated in the mobility terms, and explained that Hyacinth has less intercept potential because it doesn't have the future land use information that the north end does.

1.3.1

Dorothy noted that she did not agree with the numbers that for Alternatives 2-4. She felt it was premature to evaluate them without an analysis of the v/c ratio. She suggested changing the score of "bad" to "premature".

Terry noted that they have a clearer expectation for Alternatives 2-4, because it is a redirection of flow; he explained that they are really not so sure until they do the modeling.

Tony noted that it may be that 3 and 4 are going to do spot fixes.

Dave noted that Alternatives 9-12 do not get any deviations, and wondered if that gets Chemawa into mobility standards.

Rick noted that it yet to be verified and needs to be studied.

- ✓ The group agreed to change the score for Alternatives 2-4 to "premature".

1.4.1

Rick explained that for the split diamonds there is going to be a freeway connection that connects some local roads. He noted that there would have to be major reclassification and upgrades to not have a freeway connection to local roads.

1.4.2

Rick explained that impediments to freight travel are mostly connected to whether or not the road is free flowing and what kind of traffic signals are involved. Rick noted for this evaluation criteria they looked at Chemawa and Brooks as a package.

Dorothy was concerned that if an Alternative addresses improvements at the Chemawa interchange, the fact that there are stop signs at Brooks should not impact its score.

Ray pointed out that freight that uses Chemawa does not use Brooks.

Dorothy pointed out that in the other options Brooks and Chemawa has been separated. She also noted that the freight movements at the 2 intersections have different flows.

Rick noted that in terms of freight impediments, if they did the Chemawa widening, they have not addressed the current issue at Brooks.

Dave noted that addressing the freight issue at Brooks is important and should be rated higher.

Terry noted that some of the issues are interconnected and they may end up with more than one IAMP. He noted that from a freight benefit standard, Alt 11, does not deserve a 2.

Rick mentioned that a Flyover would allow free flowing movement, but it could take freight traffic out of direction and result in a longer trip.

1.4.3

Rick pointed out that alternatives 2-4, 10-11 were mainly looking at vehicular solutions, which do cause problems for pedestrians and bicycles.

1.4.4

Ray pointed out that the Chemawa widening which would allow for more room for bus pull-offs assumes that they can buy enough ROW.

Glen expressed concern with 3 lanes and no pedestrian access. He noted that he has an issue with widening to 3 lanes just for the bus and not adding anything for bike/pedestrians. He pointed out that it would be difficult to get people across 3 lanes to catch a bus. He noted that it doesn't help transit, it makes it harder. He suggested changing the 3 lanes, and noted that it would be difficult to do without the land use expansion.

Rick noted that it would be a 4 lane section, not a 6 lane section.

Glen noted that it is not their policy to pull a bus out of traffic that is more than 45mph. He noted that it is easier to do with 2 lanes, and that the 3 lanes would be a benefit to traffic, not transit. Glen noted that all Alternatives for transit should rate as a 2.

Tony pointed out that Alternative 1 increases the level of service, and that was the reason for giving it a 3.

Glen noted that more congestion is an impediment.

- ✓ The group decided to change the score for Alternative 1 from "good" to "neutral."

Terry noted that the group was running low on time, he asked the PMT if they wanted to continue at the pace they were going, or if they wanted to go through the logic quickly and send their feedback and concerns online.

The group agreed to have Rick go over the notes and give their feedback over email and at the next meeting.

Rick went over the framework notes and pointed out each note under the evaluation criteria in order to explain to the group the different assumptions and scenarios Tony and Rick based the scoring on.

1.5.2

Rick explained that there are 3 reasons for volumes of traffic to be diverted to residential streets:

1. Design of future Alternative
2. Insufficient capacity on arterials where through traffic is supposed to be.
3. Change in business access.

1.6.1

Rick noted that improvements at other places distribute traffic away from Chemawa.

Dorothy noted that Verda should get credit for improvements outside of Chemawa.

Safety:

2.1.5

Rick noted that for protection of pedestrian and bicycle crossings they looked at how well the crossing can be protected.

2.2.1

Rick noted that for Alternatives 5-6 the split diamonds scored low because of the indirect traffic pattern.

Economic Development:

3.1.1

Rick noted that for Alternative 4 it is hard to tell how far west the fly over ramp will have to go to get to grade.

Nate asked if the team had specific dimensions.

Rick noted that they don't have dimensions yet, but they will get the numbers once they begin the modeling and go farther into the process.

Livability

4.3.1

Terry asked the PMT to look closely at 4.3 and make sure they give their feedback to Tony and Rick.

Rick noted that there is a level of controversy for the degree of acceptability of local land use decision by local governments.

4.4.4

Rick noted that for this criterion they didn't just look at Lockhaven and Chemawa, they looked at the residential patterns for the larger area, and if those access patterns would be better or worse. Rick noted that this criterion was expanded to include access to the area.

Environmental

5.2.2

Rick noted that records don't show the Chemawa School campus as historical.

Eryn noted that this was brought by SuAnn Reddick, one of the SAC members and she will follow up with her.

Cost

Terry asked the PMT not to quote the numbers. He noted that the group is too early in the process to talk about cost. He asked the PMT to think of the numbers only in relative terms.

Rick pointed out the Alternatives that they estimate as being more than \$50 million. He noted that flyovers are extensive structures, and that the embankment work and ROW would cost more than \$50 million.

Dorothy noted that in terms of cost, we need to start talking about what will be included in each of the Alternatives.

Eryn suggested having the group post comments to the project pier website so the group can see everyone's comments. Eryn will send a reminder of where it is and how to sign on. If you don't feel comfortable send comments to Eryn. She explained that the team will package the concerns and give the group an update in October.

Nate would like some clarification of process.

Rick noted that they will look at the tradeoffs, and look at which Alternatives they prefer, and would be the best fit for each goal.

Terry noted that they are seeing some benefits with certain interchanges. He noted that when they get into the analysis of them they may notice that the others will need to happen in combination. He explained that when the group gets through the next round

of making comments, they will be able to pull out elements of each Alternative to do add analysis on and then pull out and look at some of the possible packages. He noted that they will then look at the land use expansion.

Rick noted that at this point they should take the framework evaluation and add the land use in.