

Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #3
June 24, 2008 2:00 4:00
Keizer Clear Lake United Methodist Church
7920 Wheatland Rd, Salem, OR

DRAFT Meeting Summary

Members in Attendance

Bruce Rogers (for Kate Tarter)
Pat Ehlirch (for Fred Nicol)
Fred VanNatta
Alan Roodhouse
Sam Brentano
Cathy Clark
Eric F. Scott
Christine Dieker

Scott Lawrence
Randy Jackson

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 creation of Evaluation Framework

Welcome

Eryn opened the meeting at 2:10. There were not enough committee members present to approve the meeting summary, and Eryn explained to the group that they will approve the summary at the next meeting. Terry explained that he spoke to the Statesman Journal about the project and the open house in July.

Transportation Analysis

Tony Woody from CH2M Hill went over the analysis results presentation
During the presentation the committee had many questions:

Regarding the crash results, Eric F. Scott asked if since the beginning of 5 year average, have there been improvements that may skew the results.

Rick and Terry explained that the improvements to the interchange have largely been done since then and conditions have likely improved.

Sam asked if the safety numbers are cause for concern, and how they compared to other locations the area and state.

Terry explained that it was an indicator that we have a condition from a safety standpoint that could use scrutiny, but they are certainly not the worst in the state.

Rick asked if there is one intersection, or area where the most accidents occur.

Tony explained that we will have more information once we finish the intersection analysis; he explained that it is not complete yet, but will see more insight once we get it finished.

Alan asked for clarification on whether this process is only looking at road projects.

Tony explained that alternatives identified could include road projects or land use solutions. It is unclear at this point what solutions might be suggested.

Fred asked if the growth and trips include assumptions about where the traffic is coming from within the study area. He also commented that he would not be surprised if the growth analysis outgrows the UGB, and asked if it does outgrow, if that means that our assumptions are wrong.

Tony explained that the transportation system plan (TSP) that each jurisdiction puts together is included in the land use analysis used. The assumptions are based on the information provided by the jurisdiction so it won't outgrow the UGB.

Terry explained that we will look at land use alternatives as well as the transportation.

Cathy noted that the population numbers are not showing much of an increase for Keizer, and that there is not a spike. She explained that Keizer is under going periodic review now, and she can provide a complete list of their review.

Rick pointed out that the end of July the group will look at alternatives and that right now we have to look at the baseline to see what may happen if nothing new is planned.

Terry further explained that the baseline will be consistent with the current, legally adopted plans, and that the group we will not come up with new plans.

Eric asked how the traffic generation from schools is handled.

Tony explained that the presentation only shows generic land use categories, but there are numerous categories including types of schools (elementary vs. high school vs. community college). He explained that the documentation from the SKATS model will show that.

Bruce asked if the different vehicle trips are characterized.

Tony explained that they are, and that the model looks at peak times, directions, where they live, shop, work, and the peak hour attributes. The model helps determine what routes are more desirable, speed limit, capacity and future conditions. Tony pointed out that this will be used as a scenario testing tool.

Rick emphasized that they are using the adopted zone areas in the different jurisdictions.

After the presentation Tony walked the group through the traffic analysis results handout.

Fred asked if the freeway numbers shown on the slide are average of the freeways handouts.

Tony- No, the slides represent the same information as in the tables. Each merge (on-ramp) and diverge (off-ramp) will have two calculations, one for the ramp and one for the mainline freeway section.

Rick explained that the ramp right after for the Salem Parkway is probably contributing to the high numbers because they are backing up in the right lane.

Tony agreed that it is probably contributing.

Eric asked if we are going to do anything during this project to impact the through segments for future conditions.

Tony explained that there is a chance. He clarified that we could look at additional intersections, and that the traffic from the north could have some impact on that. Tony explained that it depends on land use decisions and traffic analysis.

Tony explained that the information from the presentation will be summarized in a memo and it will be sent out in a couple weeks

Cathy asked about the list of projects provided by SKATs. She wasn't aware of a Verda expansion into 5 lanes, and found that shocking.

Tony explained that the list was received from the SKATS model for the future baseline. He agreed to double check those projects.

Fred asked if the land use map that is the basis for the presentation be included in the memo.

Tony- The future land use map with household and employment information will be included in the future baseline memo.

Alan asked if the former Colson and Colson land that cannot be developed for 5 years incorporated into the land use map.

Tony- Not directly, it will be incorporated into the large traffic analysis zone structure of the SKATS travel demand model.

Eryn indicated that she is still in communication with the new landowner about their plans for the undeveloped property.

Fred noticed 6 road projects, but noted that the list has 10.

Tony explained that some of the projects have already been built. He noted that everything is in the model and included in the existing conditions. He explained that everything out now will be included into existing conditions.

Terry explained that the existing conditions memo will be posted online soon.

Eryn asked the SAC if they had looked at the website. She encouraged SAC members to give her feedback, what you can or cannot find, etc. so that she can ensure it runs smoothly. www.chemawainterchange.org

Cathy noted that she sent the website link to the Keizer Neighborhood Associations.

Eryn asked what the next step for future baseline work is.

Tony noted that he is wrapping it up, and that they are still working with ODOT and they are working on getting the analysis memo done in the next week or two. The SAC can anticipate 2 memos soon.

Confirm Problem/Purpose & Need Statement, Evaluation Criteria & Evaluation Framework

Rick discussed the new revised Purpose & Needs and Goals and Objectives, as well as the purpose of the project. Rick reminded the SAC that the purpose of the project is to make sure the appropriate interchange function and acceptable interchange operations are developed by 2031.

He explained that the needs are where the present and future requirements are captured as well as what aspects of the interchange may fail and how they will be addressed. He explained that the process is just now creating what that scenario will look like in the baseline projections.

Rick noted that the g\Goals & Objectives in the next evolution of this will turn into the evaluation criteria. The project team started working on the evaluation criteria, and they have developed the basic preliminary draft of the evaluation framework. He explained that they will work on drafting the evaluation criteria and send it to the SAC before the next meeting.

Rick went through the 6 goals laid out in the Goals & Objectives hand out, and explained each of the goals to the SAC.

Goal 1: Mobility-

Cathy would like to see an objective about not making Chemawa interchange the lightening rod for I5 access for the area (add to Goal 1). She explained that part of this should encourage a dispersal of traffic, instead of focusing on one interchange.

Rick and Terry explained that they will work on language to make sure the dispersal of traffic and local intersections, connections and options are included in the Goals & Objectives.

Fred noted that it would also be helpful if the City of Keizer put that in their revision of their local plan.

Cathy asked if the group can add rail as a specific problem in Goal 1, mobility.

Terry edited the goal to say "including but not limited to".

Christine asked that cars and trucks be left out of the last bullet of the objectives.

Terry noted that the change will be made.

Before the group moved onto the next goal Terry clarified that the goals set up what we want to achieve and the objectives set up how we will achieve it. The evaluation criteria addresses whether or not we are meeting the objectives and goals. Terry explained that the Evaluation criteria will not get a 1-10 score for each, it will be graded based on low-high and will be used as a tool.

Goal 2: Safety:

Eric noted that if I5 is the major corridor for emergency response and you have to access local streets, maybe we should consider redundancy for emergency access. He is concerned about having one corridor as the primary route for emergency.

Terry explained that 99 comes into play if there is a problem with I5, and that we need to make sure that whatever we recommend needs to create more impacts.

Rick pointed out that Hazelgreen is an example of redundancy points.

Alan asked for clarification as to what is meant by the first bullet of Goal 2.

Rick explained that the IAMP's are designed to be a corporative document between ODOT and local governments. He explained that the IAMP lays out a marriage between land use and transportation planning.

Alan asked if there has there been a situation in which an adopted plan is involved with changed land use plans.

Terry explained that future changes would need to be coordinated with both documents, develop appropriate land use that helps maintain the function overtime., adopts interchange functionality and adopts something currently that helps maintains function overtime.

Terry noted that safety may not be the correct place to put bullet number 1, it may make more sense to put it under livability.

Christine asked that it be re-worded to provide for, instead of develop.

Goal 3: Economic:

Terry pointed out that ODOT always works to serve existing land uses.

Christine asked if recreation is a component and if it can be incorporated into land uses.

Terry explained that it can be incorporated into land uses.

Goal 4: Livability:

Christine asked if it would appropriate to have a local/regional component of tourism, or does regional cover it.

Terry explained that the interchange is a gateway to regional attractions.

Pat pointed out that there may be a conflict in Goal 3, and noted that there are current land uses and asked if Goal 4 is looking at changes.

Rick explained that planned looks at future as well.

Terry pointed out that there is a range of plans and we cannot just look at one.

Goal 5: Natural and Cultural Resource:

Sam was interested in knowing how they are manmade resources, and wondered if it made sense and if it should be taken out of the Goals & Objectives.

Terry explained that man made is an awkward word, and they want to provide protection from noise, etc. He explained that he will take the goal back to the environmental folks and see if we can word it better.

Goal 5: Cost:

Terry explained that for this goal they are hoping to come up with something that is an equitable funding solution.

Christine asked if all the money for improvement on the intersections is being taking into consideration, or if the project is starting from scratch.

Terry explained that recent improvements will be taken to the table, and they are going by as jurisdictions look at it as well.

Fred asked how long an IAMP lasts and what the status of it is.

Terry explained that it lasts as long as conditions warrant, and noted that it is similar to a TSP, it depends on how quick recommendations to plans will be implemented.

Fred is concerned that this plan will hinder development, and asked if this process is looking at a new level of traffic costs. He explained that he don't understand how that will impact travel and what vehicles will be used, and wonders what can we do to review this, if vehicles sizes are different, etc. He asked if there is an automatic trip wire that we look at this every 10 years even if local jurisdictions have not revised their plans.

Terry explained that it is performance driven, and we can include a policy for reviewing it periodically. He explained that when the plan is adopted it is in sync with local jurisdictions, and if a local jurisdiction does something to change it so it is no longer consistent, we will receive that addition and will be engaged in those changes and the process of that. Terry noted that changes to a local TSP or concept plan will cause us to look at and change the IAMP.

Fred asked if there is a legal option for a citizen to request a change for the concept plan. Fred explained that individuals' comfort level will be increased if the language is changed to show the link between the local jurisdictions.

Terry noted that there will be a section on the local jurisdiction coordination.

Bruce asked if major development and a traffic impact study is required and if it will come into this plan.

Terry explained that the TIA would be measured against the local plan.

Scott L asked how far way we are from understanding the actual scope of work and the cost of the project.

Terry explained that we are 6 weeks away from the alternative discussion, and over next 6 months we will look at recommendations, and costs. Late winter early spring we will have a set of alternative recommendations and costs estimates.

Eryn suggested sending out the Goals & Objectives for public review with the revisions and come back to the SAC for final approval. The SAC agreed.

Discuss First Open House

Eryn discussed the goal of the open house is to share project information and the Goals & Objectives. She explained that she contacted different organizations and asked members to involve their constituencies; they also produced a mailing list that includes postal routes and included 6500 addresses.

Eryn asked the SAC for their ideas as to where to post the open house announcements, and what other groups or organizations they should contact about the meeting. Eryn went through who she contacted for and her outreach for the open house announcements.

Cathy asked if trucking companies had been contacted, especially May trucking.

Eryn discussed the potential format of the open house and that the project team is looking at having a looped presentation, different project stations, and various staff for questions. She explained that the open house is set up to be very casual and encourage folks to come out and ask questions.

Eryn mentioned that the project team will do a presentation at the chamber luncheon, and are also looking at a way to share information with River Fest. She asked for any other suggestions for how to get information about the open house out, and noted that she will send out an email that SAC members can forward.

Christine mentioned that the Keizer Station carnival starts on Thursday and she can provide open house information.

Eryn closed the meeting and explained that the next SAC meeting will be a joint meeting with the PMT on July 30th.