

Stakeholder Advisory Committee
February 24, 2009 2:00-4:00
Keizer Fire Station
661 Chemawa Road NE Keizer, OR 97303

DRAFT Meeting Summary

Members in Attendance

Fred VanNatta
Alan Roodhouse
Pat Erlich
SuAnn Reddick
Christine Dieker
Scott Lawrence
Randy Jackson
Cathy Clark

Staff in Attendance

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

Additional Attendees

Dallas Melcher, PGE
Kerri Arnzen, PGE

Meeting Goals

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

Welcome

Eryn welcomed the group and reviewed the agenda. She informed the group that they will be reviewing the 5 alternatives and looking through some initial drawings of concepts. She noted that the SAC will be reviewing the 5 alternatives and some traffic impacts.

Approve October 28th Meeting Summary-

The SAC approved the October 28th meeting summary without any edits or changes.

Discuss Quantitative Evaluation of Five Alternative Packages

Terry provided background information about where we are in the process since the last meeting. He explained that the project team completed a “no build” assessment to see what would happen in 2031 if they did not do any improvements. Since the last meeting CH2M Hill took the 5 alternatives that the PMT and SAC decided to further pursue and developed more refined drawings with some detailed operational analysis. To test what effect the improvement has on its own, Terry explained that they are using the existing land use scenario and existing comprehensive plans.

He noted that in Decemeber some of the project team members met with the City of Keizer to discuss their growth scenario, and reported that it looks like Keizer will be primarily moving north (from existing UGB to approximately Quinaby). He noted that CH2M Hill is working with the council of governments to put together some numbers for

growth and generate an alternative land use scenario. This analysis will be brought to the next meeting.

Terry pointed out that after some operational analysis they have found that improvements to Brooks do not bring any noticeable effects to Chemawa. It is not drawing enough traffic away from Chemawa, mainly because they are too far apart from one another.

Terry went over the next steps in the process and explained that they will start to refine the operational details and will move toward something to address present and future conditions. He explained that they will start to look at things in more depth and consider variations and combinations of different alternatives. Terry discussed the Keizer's comprehensive plan and TSP update process and noted that the City is still several years away from completing these processes.

Cathy noted that the TSP for the existing plan is coming to council very soon, and the city is working with DLCD to begin the Comprehensive Planning process.

Christine asked what the IAMP process is if the Comp plan update results in land use changes.

Terry explained that they are looking at two scenarios for that reason. He noted that we don't want to advocate for improvements to the transportation system that won't work with future conditions.

Terry explained that for existing land uses, Hyacinth, Brooks and Quinaby do not appear to be effective solutions for the issues at the Chemawa interchange; the project team will take combinations of alternatives and spot improvements to package them together to see how we can solve all of the issues at Chemawa. Terry noted that improvements at Chemawa and Radiant/Teper appear to have the most viability for addressing the issues on the Chemawa Interchange and Lockhaven.

Review Traffic Operational Analysis

Tony went over what was handed out to the SAC. He explained the double line drawings and noted that at the last meeting the SAC received single line drawings for all 15 alternatives.

Eryn noted that they are still a long way from actual design, and reminded the SAC that the double line drawings are all in draft form. Tony reiterated that the alternatives are in a very preliminary design phase.

Tony went through his presentation. He discussed the current work that is going on and where we are in the process. He noted that in the next meeting they will go into the

UGB expansion scenario in the same format of today's meeting, with the same type of information.

Tony discussed each alternative in terms of:

- Study area intersections
- Summary of existing and future baseline
- Traffic operational analysis for freeways and intersections
- Future alternative analysis findings

Alternative 1: Chemawa/Lockhaven Corridor Widening

Tony went over doubleline drawings for Alternative 1. He noted that they added auxiliary lanes to the freeway between Portland Rd. and Chemawa Rd. Tony explained that new and consolidated ramps into a collector distributor system can take one off ramp to Chemawa/Salem parkway, and noted that the lane will be separated. He explained that this is still in draft form, and the same concept will occur northbound. Terry explained merge points and weaving. He noted that there is always turbulence when you come to a merge points and noted that Tony's concept reduces the number of points. He also noted that auxiliary lanes serve the same purpose.

Alan asked if we are assuming that they will have major widening of the bridge structure.

Tony explained that they would have to widen the bridge. He noted that they are also looking at widening from McLoed to River Rd.

SuAnn mentioned that there is not a lot of traffic on Indian School Rd. and asked if the widening of Chemawa would go east to 99E.

Tony noted that they are trying to get a broader concept to where the widening would occur.

Rick explained that this is all for modeling purposes at this time. Cathy has already raised concern about widening through a residential area. What the widening would look like needs further discussion.

Terry noted that at the PMT meeting there was a suggestion that as when get into next refinement that we look at an extention of Trail to see if that relieves some pressure on the system and helps address some concerns of distance.

Cathy noted that the extension of Trail is in Keizer's TSP.

Tony went over the SKATS raw model and travel pattern shifts. Tony explained that the collector distributor roads at Chemawa divert traffic from OR 99E. Adding capacity at Chemawa draws more traffic to Chemawa/Lockhaven Corridor. He showed the traffic

operational analysis intersections and noted that Alternative 1 does fix some interchanges but there are still areas along the corridor that are not meeting mobility standards.

Terry noted that for Alternative 1, all intersections are improved over baseline and none of them got worse.

Tony went over the traffic operational analysis for freeways and noted that they simplified the freeway system and fixed quite a few of the freeway sections.

Terry explained that traffic builds as you go through the Salem area, by the time you get to the Salem Keizer area, the added traffic at the northend has then maxed out the freeway relative to ODOT standards. He noted that there is nothing that we can do with an interchange project that can address that, it is coming from traffic commuting from Salem-Keizer to Portland.

Cathy asked how the area operates in terms of capacity and whether this is just a peak hour traffic issue.

Terry noted that you have to get past Wilsonville before it breaks down entirely and that traffic volumes are lower as you move south on I-5. He pointed out that reducing demand for travel close to Salem Keizer could make a difference that may at least extend the life of the interstate and Chemawa interchange. He explained that the I-5 and interchange problems are generally confined to a peak hour, in the morning going north, and in the evening coming back.

Tony noted that when you see red on the traffic analysis handout it means we are not meeting ODOT or jurisdiction mobility standards; in this case mobility standard is .7 or 70%.

Tony went over Alternative 6-Chemawa/Radiant Half Diamond Interchange and explained that they modified it slightly so it is not a split diamond; it is actually two half diamond interchanges.

Additional modifications will be made, for instance, 35th would need to move. In the current drawings it was looped around the stadium to meet with Keizer Station Blvd., Teper lane is a new overpass that ties back in somewhere around Chemawa Rd. Tony noted that as we dive deeper into details we will start to look at the best way to align the overpass, etc. He noted that the handouts are mainly for analysis purposes only. He went over the possible maneuvers with the new overpass at Teper/35th/Keizer Station Blvd.

Alan asked if it will still be possible to get off at Chemawa.

Tony explained that it removes the connection at the mainline and takes it further back. Tony and Terry demonstrated on the map.

Tony continued to explain the maneuvers associated with Alternative 6 and noted that a ramp will take place of where 35th is and 35th will be realigned around the stadium. He reminded the SAC that this is still draft and that the project team will prepare a tech memo that will show new, cleaner versions.

Terry noted that they are probably going to look at 5 or 6 variations of this theme, and the design engineers will get more involved in the process.

Alan noted that if you build the Teper overpass you would hope that cost of building avoids the cost of expanding the Chemawa bridge. He pointed out that you are not going to get gains on Chemawa if you don't add through lanes.

Terry explained that rather than continuing through, you could operate it like a real split diamond and currently it is shown as a very indirect split diamond.

Rick pointed out that in Alternative 1 model they put an overcrossing with no ramp connections, which may create some traffic diversion.

Terry reiterated that they will look at different ways to put these together, one of which could include what would effectively be an interchange bypass.

Scott asked if you don't get off at the new exit point north of Teper if it still possible to get off at Chemawa or Salem Parkway.

Tony explained that once you pass the new exit you can't get off I-5 until the Haysville exit in this particular design. He noted that there are a lot of different alternatives, and this one has the most options to come up with. He noted that they want to work with design engineers and traffic analysis to figure out what will be the most effective.

Cathy noted that she likes the flexibility of this scenario. She noted that she has serious concern with Alternative 1 and the potential impact of widening on Lockhaven.

The SAC discussed Radiant and many noted that it does not exist anymore. There was discussion of what the new crossing would be called and what roads run where. SAC members noted that it should be called Keizer Station Blvd. Alan noted that Radiant does not exist anymore; it should be titled Keizer Station Blvd.

Cahty noted concern with the data pieces for Alternative 1 that show that it attracted traffic from the Portland Rd interchange. She would prefer we spread it out and noted that Brooklake is still failing, and that Portland Rd interchange focused traffic where it did not necessarily need to.

Tony went over the SKATS raw model travel pattern shifts for Alternative 6.

Suann noted that any traffic volumes from the south will use 99E and they should add traffic onto that piece in order to increase traffic on 99E and section of Chemawa Rd.

Terry explained that there is a lot of traffic on Chemawa and they may have a lot of traffic turning north, but because you put a link in, there is probably traffic within the community that may chose to get on the freeway or coming up from Hyacinth and Verda that take the backway which would show as an increase, but there would not be an increase from loading on a new link. He noted that they will continue to refine the alternatives.

Tony pointed out that operational results for intersections and freeway are simplified by adding ramps.

Eryn noted that with so many things still being looked at and different options for Alternative 6, particular property owners in the concept will have ideas of where the road will be located and we will be discussing this for the next several months. She noted that the SAC will be able take the information and discuss it with their constituents.

Tony emphasized that this is still in draft form and the SAC members will get a tech memo out in about a month.

Tony discussed the features of Alternative 12-Brooks Interchange SPUI and noted that this is a very high capacity interchange. He went over the SKATS model and travel pattern shifts.

Cathy noted that there is a huge safety issue which is overshadowed by the Woodburn interchange. She is glad to see this on radar, and noted that in the future analysis with the possible UGB scenarios she would expect to see this in some form or another.

Tony explained that the collector distributor road at Chemawa still diverted some traffic from OR 99E and noted that ramp terminals at Brooks are replaced with SPUI in this alternative. Terry pointed out that there is not a lot of effect on Chemawa with Alternative 6 and that it really fixed Brooks only.

Tony went over Alternative 13 Quinaby Rd interchange and noted the new connections and improvements to Quinaby, improved from OR99E to River Rd. He pointed out that 35th is extended from Quinaby north to Brooklake. Tony explained that Quinaby would be a signalized interchange at River Rd. and there wouldn't necessarily be added lanes, maybe just a higher classification. He explained that for modeling purposes higher classification will increase capacity.

Randy noted that Brooks allows for the best opportunity to get people off Lockhaven. He explained that this should be utilized instead of Chemawa so you can go to Brooks interchange if you are going north.

Tony explained that the adopted land use is more on low end of what we are looking at. He pointed out that Alternative 13 will show a lot more value when UGB is atleast to Quinaby, it will add more value if and when Keizer grows to the north. Tony explained that the model is showing people coming from Brooklake to Quinaby.

Tony went over the SKATS raw model and travel pattern shifts.

Cathy noted that people in meadows use Brooklake, and northbound traffic is using Chemawa. She pointed out that less congested traffic at Quinaby would make a lot of sense. She noted that it would be her interchange of choice.

Randy noted that it would be more appealing when going south to not go to Brooklake; you could avoid Chemawa/lockhaven. He noted that the Brooks interchange is a closer more convenient option, and that it would be a more direct route to the parkway.

Terry noted that looking at the existing land use, travel patterns, and road network, this ends up being more of a Brooklake interceptor rather than a Chemawa interceptor.

Tony went over traffic operations analysis for intersections and freeways.

Tony went over Alternative 14 Verda/Hyacinth corridor and noted that this has the least effect on Chemawa but a lot of effect on areas south. He pointed out that there would be grade separations at Salem Parkway, Verda and Hyacinth which will make it less congested and more direct and take away the major intersection that was not working that well.

Tony went over mobility standards comparison and intersection analysis results. He went over what is failing and passing for each intersection. He noted that the chart associates real numbers with delay and V/C.

Tony discussed the difference table comparison and noted that this table shows the difference between the alternative and the no build condition. He pointed out that Alternative 1 shows a lot of areas improving.

Cathy asked the project team to look at finding a way to relieve and disperse traffic instead of increasing Lockhaven to 5 lanes to River Rd.

Tony went over a conclusion and summary of the alternatives. He discussed some potential new alternatives, for example combining Alternative 1 and 6.

SuAnn mentioned that it seems unreasonable to assume that the current land use for the Indian School property will stay as is forever. With the current economic situation they may look at the value of the land, and consider the possibility of much more intensive land use, which would have a huge impact on the interchange. She noted that it is hypothetical, but may be worth discussing.

Rick noted that they will look at how realistic that is, and pointed out that they were under the assumption from beginning that there would not be any land use changes to the property.

She noted that they are looking at long range plans and there are discussions out there, they are trying to have a protective attitude. She discussed the fact that nothing stays the same, and they shouldn't assume that the land will stay the same in 25 years. .

Eryn thanked SuAnn for providing input and asked that she keep the team involved and provide as much input as possible.

Outreach Activities Brainstorm for spring 2009 Open House

Eryn discussed the next open house and noted that it would not be sooner than May before the team is ready to do some refining and go out to the public with concepts. She asked the SAC to start thinking about an open house approach, the team will have some alternatives for the public to respond to. She noted that the team will want some creative ideas and methods for reaching the public.

Cathy noted the possibility of this process to piggy back Keizer's visioning work. She explained that there are open houses happening and the second open house will occur around May. She also noted that the second week of May is the Iris festival.

Eryn thanked the group and noted that they will not be meeting in March. The next SAC meeting is scheduled for April 7th.