

Project Management Team Meeting #9  
February 18, 2009 1:30-3:30  
Oregon Department of Transportation Region 2 HDQ  
455 Airport Road, Building B

Meeting Summary

**Members in Attendance**

Dorothy Upton  
Matt Crall  
Raymond Jackson  
Glen Hadley  
Rod Thompson  
Anthony Boeson  
Rob Kissler  
Karen Odenthal  
Nate Brown

Derryl James  
Les Sasaki  
Kevin Hottman

**Staff in Attendance**

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

**Meeting Goals**

- Review Doubleline Drawings
- Discuss Quantitative Evaluation of Five Alternative Packages
- Review Travel Demand Modeling
- Review Traffic Operational Analysis

**Welcome**

Eryn welcomed the group and reviewed the agenda.

Terry reminded the group where we are in the process. He explained that the project team is working on the operational screen for the 5 alternatives. Since the last meeting in October they have taken the committees ideas and are looking at which ones have operational merit. He explained that out of the 15 original alternatives about 10 fell off the table without analysis, and they are now looking at the other 5 alternatives recommended by the PMT for this analysis. Terry also noted that a second land use scenario was developed in December that will be brought to the next PMT meeting. He noted that once they have completed the operational comparisons, the PMT and project team will look at what is being solved and what issues, if any, are not adequately addressed.

*Approve October 22<sup>nd</sup> Meeting Summary-*

Eryn asked the PMT if they had any changes to the October meeting summary. The PMT approved the meeting summary without any changes.

***Review Doubleline Drawings***

Tony went over what was included in the PMT's packet. He explained that the doubleline drawings are a more detailed look at the 5 alternatives that were chosen, and pointed out that the PMT reviewed single line drawings for the 15 alternatives in October.

Tony went over each of the 5 alternatives and noted what was included in each alternative and invited the PMT to comment and ask questions.

Tony pointed out that Alternative 1 added auxiliary lanes, ramps from Portland Road, and additional off and on ramps from Chemawa Road. He explained the land additions from the Chemawa overpass, between Indian School Road to River Road, one additional lane in each direction. He also pointed out that in Alternative 1, around the Chemawa interchange, the Salem Parkway on and off ramps had been combined.

Dorothy asked that a line be added to show the grade separation. She pointed out that many people may not be able to see it, and it would be helpful to see all of the structures.

Many PMT members asked if the dotted line by the parkway connection shows that it is separated. They also asked for more clarification on how the on and off ramp to the parkway would work.

Nate pointed out that there are new aerial photos available, and that the city has current photos that show the current configuration of the parkway.

Derryl asked what the gain was for combining the parkway's and Chemawa off ramps.

Tony explained that in the future baseline condition they are seeing a lot of operational issues occurring in that area, and combining the exits would simplify the mainline.

Derryl pointed out that the double exit will require decision lanes, which will significantly affect the length of the ramp. He noted that it could require ROW.

Tony explained that the consolidation of the Salem Parkway and Chemawa ramp will be an operational gain as far as merge and exit maneuvers.

Tony explained that in Alternative 1 the road from Lockhaven Dr. to River rd. would be widened from 2 lanes to 4 lanes.

Nate pointed out that the City of Keizer's TSP is currently working on a connection with Verda that would siphon off some traffic from River rd. which will relieve the intersection of River rd. and Lockhaven Dr. He explained the new roadway proposition in the TSP.

Rob asked about the possibility of phasing build out for Alternative 1.

Tony explained to the PMT that they are not thinking about phasing or design specifics quite yet, they are currently working on the operational aspects of the alternatives, but will come to that later in the process.

Tony continued to go over the doubleline drawings. He explained the two half diamond interchanges involved in Alternative 6, and explained that they have been modified a little since the last PMT meeting in October. He noted that it is not a traditional split diamond. He also explained that this was done to address freeway deficiencies, and that they are trying to consolidate as many of the ramps as possible.

Nate asked if there have been any conversations with stakeholders around the ball field about potential changes to 35th.

Tony noted that in this step of the process they are just looking at the alternatives from an operational stand point, and if this alternative and feature moves forward, they will look at the alignment and what is involved. At this point all alternatives are being reviewed and discussed as far as what it does and does not fix and what may need to be modified and included in order to address the issues in 2031.

Rick noted that this concept was discussed in the last SAC meeting, and there did not seem to be any opposition.

Tony went over Alternative 12, Brooks Interchange SPUI and noted that it does add capacity to the system, but it does not have the effects that they were expecting. He explained that it is not a fix all for the area.

Dorothy asked if the overpass for Brooklake takes into consideration the grades involved for trucks.

Tony noted that they will have to look at the grade in more detail, but it does take that into consideration. He explained that those details will come up in the next stage of analysis. He noted that some of these alternatives may prove to be more beneficial than what they are showing now; they will have to do more in depth analysis and modeling.

Terry pointed out that from a land use stand point; Alternative 12 is operating fairly independent from the rest of the system under the current land use scenario.

Tony explained Alternative 13, Quinaby diamond interchange. He noted that this alternative does have a little bit more benefit, but is similar to Alternative 12 in that it is not going to draw as much from Chemawa Rd as anticipated in the current land use scenario.

Tony moved onto Alternative 14, Hyacinth-Verda Corridor Improvement which would be the gateway to Keizer using the interchange from the south. He noted that the biggest improvement involved in this alternative is the classification change. He explained that it is more of a widening which makes the roadway more desirable. Tony pointed out that for this scenario they will be grade separating Hyacinth-Verda, which removes the current Salem Parkway/Verda-Hyacinth signalized intersection and creates a new diamond interchange. The current Salem Parkway/Verda-Hyacinth intersection will be replaced with two new intersections at the interchange, one for the northbound ramps to Salem Parkway and one for the southbound ramps to Salem Pkwy.

Dorothy asked if the grades involved in this alternative can hit the railroad exactly with the Hyacinth overpass.

Rick explained that it involves pretty extensive construction, and the committee and project team may want to look at a light version of this alternative.

Tony pointed out that all of the alternatives include frontage roads as well as the consolidation of ramps. He noted that they also all address the freeway sections that were not meeting ODOT standards.

Rick explained that in Alternative 14 the frontage road would connect to Salem Parkway, not Hyacinth.

Terry asked the PMT to keep in mind that the idea was to determine if removing conflicts with the railroad and Salem Parkway would make Verda a more attractive option for vehicles traveling north to Keizer from I-5.

Tony noted that the doubleline drawings are still in draft form. He will take the comments and recommendations from the PMT and update the drawings; the PMT will receive a new version in the next couple weeks.

### ***Discuss Quantitative Evaluation of Five Alternative Packages***

Tony went over the schedule and overview and noted that they are working with adopted land use for the alternative analysis. He explained that the next PMT meeting will discuss the alternative analysis with the UGB expansion scenario. He noted that members of the project team had a meeting in December and came up with assumptions for this future land use scenario.

Terry explained that when an IAMP is done it has to be consistent with adopted plans. He noted that we could be several years away from the City of Keizer's TSP and updated land use, but the idea is that we need to develop some perspective on transportation system performance in the area under a growth scenario similar to what Keizer may ultimately consider. He also noted that the IAMP initially will be based on current land

use and that the alternative land use scenario will be included as an informational appendix.

Matt expressed concern that that the UGB process will cause the IAMP process to be redone several times.

Terry explained that the alternative UGB expansion scenario is not expected to be the same as what the City may ultimately adopt. It is only intended to serve as an order of magnitude demonstration if higher growth occurs in the area that Keizer is looking at for expansion. As such, Terry explained that it can serve to inform Keizer's decision making process. Expecting that this scenario will almost certainly be different than what is eventually adopted, ODOT will update the IAMP, when Keizer's land use planning update process is completed. Consequently, ODOT does not expect that it will be necessary to conduct multiple IAMP iterations in conjunction with Keizer's land use update process.

Nate explained that because they are dealing with elected officials this alternative IAMP scenario is very necessary for credibility.

Terry also explained that they can't let the TSP and UGB discussion go forward without looking at potential implications. He noted that he understands the given assumptions and what additional issues may come up, and reminded the PMT that they are dealing with a lot of variables while this process moves forward.

Tony went over the north and south study area intersections and a summary of the existing and future baseline conditions as a reminder to the PMT. He discussed the traffic operational analysis for freeways and the future alternatives analysis assumptions.

Tony went over the graphics and tables for the 5 alternatives and showed the raw model volumes (travel pattern shifts), and operational analysis (intersections, freeway). The PMT received handouts and maps of the information that Tony went over.

Tony explained that they will get into fine tuning the designs once there is an understanding and grasp on all the information and studies that have been done thus far. He explained that more detail will come as we move forward.

Dorothy noted that the alternative analyses are a draft and she and Tony still need to go over all the data because some of the numbers are not adding up. She asked the PMT to take all this data with a grain of salt, and informed them that they are going to work on the numbers.

Tony went over the analysis for each of the alternatives and further explained the handouts that were given to the PMT.

In terms of Alternative 12, Brooks Interchange SPUI, Rick pointed out that it does not pull traffic off of Chemawa, something that the project team and PMT were expecting, but after modeling they found that it doesn't have that effect.

Terry pointed out that the effect on Alternative 13, Quinaby Interchange, is far more significant on Brooks than Chemawa, and it has hardly any effect on Chemawa over the baseline. He noted that, while it does help Brooks to a degree, it does not have enough of an effect on Brooks to keep it from failing.

Tony pointed out that overall the north end freeway segments are failing with all 5 alternatives. He explained that they would need to add more lanes in order to bring it to acceptable, and pointed out that the issue is with the volume of traffic from Salem to Portland.

#### ***Review Travel Demand Modeling & Review Traffic Operational Analysis***

Tony went over the alternatives comparisons and different table comparisons. He pointed out that Chemawa/Lockhaven and Radiant overpass with the half diamond had the most effect.

Rick pointed out that the Trail Ave. and Lockhaven improvement made Alternative 1 stand out and is the biggest improvement, creating more mobility.

Tony explained that any one of the alternatives by themselves don't cut it, and that they will need to look at combinations, and what needs to be done to increase the effectiveness of the alternatives. He noted that Alternative 1 shows the most benefits under the adopted land use, and that they may need to look to what Alternative 1 has that can be added to others to increase the effectiveness.

Doroty asked that the local vs. freeway improvements be added to the difference table.

Tony explained that the difference between Alternative 1 and 6 is adding some sort of capacity to the area as opposed to something that is outside of system that is meant to divert traffic. He explained that the initial attempt to draw traffic away is not really occurring.

Matt asked Tony to double check the operations handouts, and send out the difference table as well as the corrected operations hand out.

Tony explained that all the materials will be updated and there will be a new set. He noted that they are in the initial phase of modeling and will have tech memos and updated work in the next couple weeks. He explained that they are working on expanding the land use scenario, and still working through cleaning up and addressing comments for all the analysis and modeling.

Rick explained that the next step should be getting an alternative that works with existing land use.

Dorothy also noted that once the numbers are figure out we can simulate and model the laternatives to see how things work.

Terry noted that he is not as concerned with perfecting the alternative land use scenario as he is with optimizing the various alternative components of the existing comprehensive plan scenario. When Tony and Dorothy are comfortable with numbers, we can get them hooked in with Rick, Derryl and Anthony so we can figure out the details and look at simulation and more detailed modeling. He explained that the PMT will be looking at the alternative land use scenario at the next meeting in April, and it will be necessary for the smaller group to do some offline work between now and then.

Matt asked about possible phasing, and what the little fixes we can do to help the area live with what they have. He noted that the set of solutions all seem to be about major construction projects. He asked if the possible land use changes may contribute to a solution.

Terry explained that they will look at the phasing potential of the various alternatives later in the process. He also explained that Keizer's existing UGB is largely built out and does not appear nearly big enough to accommodate the 10-12 thousand person increase in population (and associated employment growth) that is forecast. Consequently, the existing land use plan that is already being analyzed can reasonably be considered to be the "low growth" scenario. It is not likely that there are any significant land use changes that could be made to reduce transportation impacts to something less than what results from the existing comprehensive plan. In that sense, the existing plan and the alternative land use scenario effectively create a set of "bookends" of low and high growth futures. Having these "bookends" will better enable us to infer the potential implications of other land use alternatives that Keizer may consider after the initial IAMP is adopted.

Matt noted that the IAMP does not solve the problem, it just points out what can be done and what will happen if it is not done—it puts forth ideas but does not ensure funding.

Eryn thanked the PMT for coming and providing comments. She noted that the next meeting is April 1<sup>st</sup>. The PMT can expect similar analysis on the alternatives scenario, and can expect materials before the next meeting.