

Stakeholder Advisory Committee  
April 7th, 2009 2:00-4:00  
Keizer Fire Station  
661 Chemawa Road NE Keizer, OR 97303

DRAFT Meeting Summary

**Members in Attendance**

Tim Potter  
Jerry Lelack  
John Schaad  
Sam Brentano  
Eric F. Scott  
Dan Goffin  
Alan Roodhouse  
Pat Erlich  
SuAnn Reddick

Christine Dieker  
Randy Jackson  
Cathy Clark

**Staff in Attendance**

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

**Meeting Goals**

*Expanded UGB*

- Discuss Quantitative Evaluation of Five Alternative Packages
- Review Traffic Operational Analysis

**Welcome**

Eryn gave an overview of where the group is in the process for those members who were not at February's meeting. This month the group was asked to look at a theoretical land use scenario in which Keizer's UGB boundary expanded north, put together by SKATS, Marion County and the City of Keizer.

Rick emphasized this is just a theoretical exercise looking at a possible UGB expansion. He noted that it does not take place of formal process done by City of Keizer, and that it is done purely to look at what replications might be.

Eryn noted that the IAMP has to be based on current land use, and this exercise is outside of the plan itself. It will likely appear later as an addendum to the plan

*Approve February 24th Meeting Summary-*

The SAC approved the February 24<sup>th</sup> meeting summary.

**Review Quantitative Evaluation of Five Alternative Packages**

Tony explained what they looked at last meeting. He noted that they used the same summary sheets for the 5 alternatives for adopted land use.

Eryn asked for those SAC members who were not present at the last meeting if they would like to receive the alternative packages in the mail.

Tony walked through the packet that was provided to the SAC. He went over the IAMP process and current work for the last few months. He noted that the IAMP has to be adopted off the adopted land use plan, and reiterated that this work is a supplemental analysis that will be attached to the IAMP. He explained to the SAC that they are still in process of refining alternatives down and assessing impacts.

Tony went over the purpose of UGB expansion traffic analysis, and a brief description of the alternatives being analyzed.

Terry explained that for this exercise we are looking at each alternative by itself and the strength they have on their own. He also noted that they will be looking at what value they have relative to the Chemawa interchange in isolation. Next meeting we will look at alternatives in combination. Terry also commented to Cathy that the project team is aware that in the Keizer TSP there is not the widening of 4 lanes to River Rd. as it is in Alternative 1. He explained that they will do additional analysis to see how wide the road needs to be, and where, in order to keep the interchange operating acceptably.

Cathy asked if the team is going to look at turn lanes/merge lanes.

Terry explained that the team would look at operational details where necessary to maintain the interchange operations, but would likely leave other details for the local TSPs or subsequent project development.

Rick noted that most of the queuing is in west side of intersection.

Sam asked if the team is factoring schools into the analysis since they seem to cause a lot of backups.

Tony noted that they looked at entire 16 hour counts and it is more significant during the p.m. peak, which is outside of school hours.

Tony went over the land use assumptions and explained that they based it off of the SKATS model. Tony went over the network assumptions and noted the planned improvements. He explained that there would be improvements to Quinaby, River Road, new east-west connector south of Perkins, minor north-south arterial near railroad tracks and a signal at 35<sup>th</sup>/Perkins.

Terry noted that DLCD has raised concerns through the PMT about showing the 35<sup>th</sup> extension north to Brooklake. He explained that something like that would require a goal exception because the UGB is not expected to expand up there in any case. He noted that the team will look at this scenario both with and without 35<sup>th</sup> to see how much value it does add.

John noted that at the last SAC meeting the team showed Teper lane as going through the rail road. He asked if any models show that as being open.

Tony explained Teper did not extend into the neighborhood and that they also did not add the north-south connector into the neighborhoods. He also explained that the only way to go north-south is to take Keizer Station Blvd.

Terry discussed some hypothetical road networking that may be brought up when Keizer begins their UGB discussion. He noted that chances are they will need something between 35<sup>th</sup> and River Rd to tie everything together. He explained that for this exercise the project team is focusing on the interchange, collector and arterials. He noted that there is no need to push for specific local connections now because they are going to be politically sensitive and will require a great deal more local discussion.

Alan noted his concern with the estimated 120 acres of retail. He noted that it seems about 10 times too high. He explained that about 8000 people would support about a 10-12 acre area, and that 120 acres is about 50 acres larger than Keizer Station.

Tony explained that they worked with SKATS and looked at a general percentage based on existing residential and retail ratios in Keizer.

Rick explained that unless there is a math error it is based on estimated percentage of retail versus total land use in Keizer.

Alan asked if Keizer Station is included in that. He noted that Keizer Station doesn't just serve Keizer and that there wouldn't be a demand for another Keizer Station, they would need at least another 150 thousand people to fill the demand for a center like that.

Terry explained that he expects that it would represent some neighborhood commercial like a grocery store as well as some additional retail like a cleaners or video store. He noted that it was a standard ratio comparison. He also noted that Alan raised a good point and just looking at the Keizer area may be a bit skewed. He explained that retail tends to generate more traffic than residential. The team will talk to the Council of Government folks about it.

Alan went over some rules of thumb for retail: it takes about 10 thousand people to serve a full grocery store; Targets want to see a minimum of 120 thousand to support. He explained that Target will probably locate a third store in the metro area in about 5 years. He note that it will be quite awhile before another center the magnitude of Keizer Station is built in the area, 8000 people will barely support a super market.

Tony explained that they have further notes and will talk to Ray Jackson. He noted that the project team will do a more detailed look, and look more at what retail was and what trips were generated.

Tony went over the land use assumptions map with the adopted land use and expanded UGB scenario. He noted that the non retail area is designated in the northern zones.

Alan explained one potential major change to overall trade area is a potential regional shopping center with department stores. He noted that because Lancaster is gone the trade area is big enough to support two regional's, and there is a possibility that there is enough demand for another large enclosed type mall. He mentioned that SKATS may have included that possibility in their model.

Tony noted that when the model was put together it was a very high level.

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

Tony went over a map that shows what growth occurs you when take the UGB expansion scenario and subtract out the adopted land use scenario. He noted that the SKATS model is showing more orientation towards the Salem vicinity, and less interaction with Portland.

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

#### ***Alt 1-Chemawa/Lockhaven Corridor Widening***

Tony went over the traffic operational analysis for intersections. He noted that this is based on mobility standards. Tony pointed out that 35<sup>th</sup> and Perkins is operating ok, because of the intersection.

Tony went over the traffic operational analysis for freeways and pointed out that it just passed the threshold (.75), 1% over. Tony explained that the reason there is a lot of red has to do with fact that there is too much traffic on the north end of the freeway. He explained that the only way to fix it is beyond the scope of this project and would involve adding a lane. Tony noted that failing movements occur on all of the alternatives and is from too much traffic coming from Portland.

Cathy asked if the number they were sighting is daily or weekly. She noted that north seems to be through trips and seems steadier.

Terry noted that it is daily. He explained that there is some commuting from Woodburn and back, and that they do see some freeway peaking on the weekends. He explained that the net effect is traffic builds up as you go north and that volumes north of Salem Keizer will exceed standards regardless of what happens in the immediate Keizer area.

Dan explained that making deliveries becomes more difficult with more growth, which increases stores which increases truck volume. He noted the difficulty in maneuvering heavy trucks and noted that he does not see anyone effectively addressing truck issues. He noted that he is seeing more trucks on Chemawa Rd. crossing north and southbound from I-5. He explained that the project needs improvements for trucks. He suggested showing the team some of his ideas. He expressed that it is difficult to go through intersections and that problems occur on both sides of the highway.

Terry reminded the group that in this analysis they factor in heavy vehicles effect on operations.

Rick explained that during the final design phase they factor in trucks and turning lanes.

Tony went over the difference table which compares the adopted land use scenario to the UGB expansion scenario for Alternative 1. He explained that this identifies where we see improvements over the baseline, and noted that with Alternative 1 they see a lot of improvement where we are adding capacity directly. He noted that there is not any "red" involved in Alternative 1, which would be where the improvements have made the situation worse.

Terry explained that this doesn't mean we are meeting standards, it just means that this is much better than if we were to not do anything. He reminded the group that this is just for Alternative 1; they have not combined anything yet.

#### *Alternative 6: Chemawa/Teper Half Diamond Interchange*

Eryn asked Tony to give a brief description of Alternative 6 since the group does not have line drawings and it is somewhat hard to understand.

Tony pulled up a line drawing of Chemawa/Teper. He explained that Teper connects to 35<sup>th</sup>, and 35<sup>th</sup> will be realigned and connect to Keizer Station Blvd. He went on to explain that Teper will be expanded and cross over I-5 and connect somewhere along Chemawa Rd. on the east side, which is still to be determined. He also explained the consolidation of the ramps. He explained the new connection to divert some traffic off Chemawa, instead of having to go up to Keizer Station Blvd you can now access Teper and access Keizer station that way.

John asked for a copy of the line drawings.

Rick suggested that they mark where the towers are.

Eryn noted that they have talked about Alternative 6 a lot. In addition to where Radiant would go on the east side being unknown, they have discussed 35<sup>th</sup> going around the back of the station.

Dan brought up suggestions for the overpass to avoid bottle necks and accidents.

John noted that he likes this option; it provides an easier way to bring heavy equipment and large trucks into and out of the BPA Chemawa Substation from I-5

Tony went over freeway analysis and noted that mobility is still not being met on the north end. He then discussed the difference table.

The PMT discussed different options for intersection 9.

Terry noted that Indian School Rd is too close to the interchange; it is 400-500 ft and should be a quarter of a mile. He noted that they have a lot of details to work out on the east side.

Rick noted that they are starting to look at ways to combine Alternatives 1 and 6, because together they do a better job addressing issues than by themselves.

#### *Alternative 12: Brooks Interchange SPUI*

Tony explained that before they had two intersections that were stopped controlled, and what they did was replace them with one higher capacity intersection which fixes the problem at Brooks. He noted that you see very little improvement with this alternative at Chemawa, however.

Terry pointed out that for some reason Lockhaven and River Rd show some small improvements. He noted that at this point they are coming to a conclusion that Brooks is largely its own problem. He explained that they will need to conduct a separate effort at Brooks; they will have a note in the IAMP that Brooks should be looked at.

Cathy noted that it is a huge safety issues and effects trucks.

#### *Alternative 13: Quinaby Road Interchange*

Tony pointed out that the freeways analysis shows that there is a lot of "red", but it is not as bad as it looks. He explained that it is just barely over mobility standards, only 1-2% capacity reduction.

Tony noted that on the difference table there is a lot more "green". He explained that there are mainly a lot more improvements along Chemawa and Lockhaven. He noted that with the UGB expansion the baseline doesn't have the capacity to hold any traffic,

and adding capacity at Quinaby really frees things up. He explained that you see the opposite with the adopted land use scenario in which there is not enough land use density to justify improvements at Quinaby.

*Alternative 14: Verda/Hyacinth Corridor Improvements*

Tony explained that Alternative 14 looks pretty much the same as other alternatives. He noted that with the adopted land use scenario you don't see much improvement at Chemawa, but the UGB expanded scenario shows improvement over the baseline condition.

Terry explained that there is a big problem at Chemawa and Verda, which would need significant improvements. He noted that in Alternative 14 we are seeing much bigger values, but nowhere near the level of improvements with Alternatives 1 and 6.

Cathy asked how this alternative will play out. She noted that Verda to Parkway is a problem with the school zone at some points during the day.

Tony explained that it would be grade separated at Verda and Salem Parkway, with separate movements.

Cathy explained the problem with the rail road tracks on the north end. She noted that traffic flows well except if there is a train or during school hours. She expressed concern that this may be more construction than needed to solve the problem.

Terry explained that by making this a more attractive route it could be drawing more traffic to the area than you want coming through neighborhood. He noted that this might be an exercise in which we want to be careful of what we ask for. He also noted that this could be very expensive and involve high dollar improvements that could only start to show value in the expanded UGB scenario.

Rick noted that this alternative also came up during the PMT meeting. He suggested a Hyacinth "light" with fewer high-cost improvements that they could use for modeling purposes to see the effect on Chemawa.

Tony noted that down the line they will have a cost benefit ration which would help determine if the benefit gained is worth the expense.

***Review Traffic Operational Analysis***

Tony went over the difference table comparison for adopted land use. He noted that this is just one way to look at whether improvements are occurring or not, and reminded the group that there are other methods we can look at like travel times, number of vehicles, etc.

Tony explained that “red” is degradation; “yellow” is intersection removed or added, and “green” is improvement. He pointed out that Alternative 1 and 6 makes the most sense and has the most benefits in the adopted land use scenario. Tony noted that with the expanded UGB scenario we start to see four alternatives with improvements, the only wash being Alternative 12. Looking at intersection delays, Tony noted that Alternative 1 adds less delay and more improvement. He reminded the SAC that they are just looking in the Chemawa interchange vicinity; they have to look to see what is happening elsewhere in the network as well. He pointed out that Alternative 14 has a big area that got worse.

Terry pointed out that the “red” for Alternative 6 is for Chemawa and Indian School Rd., a lot of which is due to the fact that the team did not do much as far as engineering analysis. He thinks that the area can easily turn “green” with some tweaks.

Tony noted that for Hyacinth they are not getting benefits of Lockhaven. He noted that they will use this tool to help assess how things are occurring overall.

Rick explained that the value that the UGB scenario brings shows that the alternatives that are working for the adopted land use scenario are not contrary for future expansion.

Tony pointed out that for adopted land use Alternatives 1 and 6 shows the most improvement, and with the UGB expanded scenario Quinaby jumps ahead if you look at improvements to intersection delay.

Terry noted that with the IAMP they will probably look at a combination of Alternatives 1 and 6. He also noted that they will start to look at phasing later.

Cathy thanked the team for looking at the expanded UGB scenario; she noted that this information will be very helpful during policy discussions with the Keizer City Council.

Terry noted that this analysis made some people nervous, but if we continue to discuss that we did this for demo purposes it will be something that we can come back to.

Tony went over the difference table for freeways and noted that for the most part we see an improvement over the baseline. Tony went over the conclusion and summary.

Terry discussed next steps and noted that during the PMT meeting last week they had a more robust discussion about combining alternatives and refinement. He shared with the SAC that the team needs to sit down with operations folks and take high level concepts and look at operations feasibility. He noted that they are going to skip the next meeting in order to have time to come up with combinations and begin analysis before the group meets again.

Eryn told the group that the next meeting will be held in June, they still have to determine if they are going to stick with the currently scheduled June date, or find another date. She will send an email out to the SAC with an update on the next meeting.

Pat asked when the next public meeting is occurring.

Eryn explained that they are still trying to figure it out. They are hoping to present something to the SAC that they can comment on before it goes out to the public. Eryn asked the SAC to think about the project's audience and how we can target them.

Terry suggested using July and August to target specific groups with individual meetings and hold the next big public meeting in September.

Cathy noted that the grand opening for City Hall is June 1<sup>st</sup> from 4pm-7pm, and invited the SAC to attend.

Eryn asked the SAC to send her an email with ideas of who the small groups may be, like neighborhood associations, business associations, etc.

Cathy announced that River Fair is August 8<sup>th</sup>; they had about 1000 people last year. It will be a one day event at Keizer Rapids Park if the team is interested in having a booth they should contact Lyndon Zaitz, the editor of the Keizer Times is in charge. She will send Eryn information about the fair.

John announced that once a month they have a meeting with all the employees at BPA and he will see if they have any ideas.

Eryn thanked the group for participating in the meeting and reminded them that she will update them soon via email about their June meeting.