

Stakeholder Advisory Committee
July 28, 2009 2:00-4:00
Keizer Fire Station
661 Chemawa Road NE Keizer, OR 97303

Meeting Summary

Members in Attendance

Tim Potter
John Schaad
Pat Erlich
Cathy Clark
Larry Epping
Mike Smith
SuAnn Redick
Alan Roodhouse

Scott Lawrence
Sam Brentano

Staff in Attendance

Rick Kuehn, CH2M Hill
Terry Cole, ODOT
Eryn Kehe, JLA
Shareen Rawlings, JLA

Meeting Goals:

- Review Updated Evaluation Framework for Alternatives 21-24
- Review Alternative Packages and Phasing Recommendations from the project team
- Review Travel Demand Modeling and Review Traffic Operational Analysis
- Discuss the Project's Next Steps

Welcome

Eryn welcomed the group and introduced Mike Smith, the new Chemawa Indian School Administrator. Mike explained that he has worked with the Bureau of Indian Affairs for over 6 years, and will replace John Claymore.

Eryn reviewed the agenda, modified times, and outlined the meeting goals. She asked for any changes to the June meeting summary. John Schaad offered a few comments which would be incorporated. The group mentioned some grammatical improvements and then moved to accept the June meeting summary.

Evaluation Framework (Alternatives 21- 24)

Rick referred the group to the project evaluation framework matrix in their handouts. He explained that the project was set up to use this matrix at several different stages throughout the project. He explained that several months ago the framework was used to assess the previous set of alternatives. He noted that the framework was set up before the project team had completed the final traffic analysis. Rick mentioned that for those types of activities where there had been no technical investigation previous, the project team had used their best judgment to determine how alternatives would

perform against the evaluation criteria. He explained that because of the number of previous alternatives, it was not feasible to perform this high level of analysis. Rick explained that several months ago, the team had five or six separate alternatives on the table which added value to the Chemawa interchange. Rick explained that the project team has gone through the previous round of alternatives and consolidated, condensed and improved the improvement options into a recommended alternative composed of four major components. Rick directed the group to the matrix and explained the formatting and key findings. He briefly described the four major components of the recommended alternative including:

- **Alternative 21:** (Full Widening, Overcrossing, Eastside Improvements) This alternative suggests widening to extend to the west of River Road. Rick explained that there was also a limited widening alternative included in the recommended alternative. Rick also mentioned that the project team and PMT suggested that the widening continue all the way to Portland Road from River Road. Terry contributed to the discussion – stating that the previous round of alternatives showed single improvements. He told the group, that at this point in the project, these alternatives were combined.
- **Alternative 22:** (Limited Widening, Overcrossing, Eastside Improvements) Rick explained that alternative 22 was the same as alternative 21 in all aspects, except that it proposes a limited widening, which does not extend all the way to River Road.
- **Alternative 23:** (Full Widening, Half diamond, Eastside Improvements) Rick explained that this option was similar to alternative 21 except that there are two ramps added to the Tepper overcrossing, including a South Bound off ramp off I5, and North Bound onramp onto I5.
- **Alternative 24:** (Full Widening, Overcrossing, Eastside Improvements, Parclo B) Again, this alternative is very similar to alternative 21 except that there is a loop ramp at the Chemawa interchange that has been added. Rick explained that the heaviest movement in the interchange is the northbound left turn turning towards Keizer. Rick explained that this loop ramp would take this traffic under the structure, and then come up to Chemawa Road, to a signal and then take a right turn. He said that right turns are more efficient to handle at an interchange. He explained that there are definite benefits to doing this.

Rick explained that because these alternative components do not stand alone, there was very little differentiation between them in the evaluation. He walked the group through the matrix, and explained that the shaded boxes in the matrix highlighted the areas where there was a difference between the alternatives.

SuAnn suggested that the school entry to Portland Road is incorrectly drawn as only a 2 lane highway. The team agreed to come back to that discussion later in the presentation, but did confirm that the stretch west of the school driveway has 2 lanes in each direction.

Rick went on to explain that there were only five areas where the alternatives differed according to the matrix. In regards to Goal 1: mobility, there are only 2 places where the evaluation criteria is different. Rick explained that the first point of difference was due largely to the fact that alternative 22 (limited widening) is consistent with local TSP plans, and alternative 21 (Full widening) is not consistent with local TSP Plans. The second criteria under Alternative 24 ranked fair rather than premature on mobility. Rick explained that with all of these improvement alternatives, there will be at least one intersection (or more) that will not meet mobility standards in a future year. He explained that the conditions are much better than they would be under a no build situation.

Goal 2: Safety – Rick explained that the only area where there was a difference in the evaluation criteria was in regards to Alternative 23, the Tepper ramps. He explained that technically, these two ramps (half diamond) violate spacing standards between that location and the Brooks interchange. This alternative was marked as “poor”. Rick said that he felt that from an operation standpoint, there would be no degradation shown with this option.

Eryn opened the opportunity for questions to the group. Cathy referred to the City of Keizer’s TSP Section 10, and reminded the group that one of the goals of this section was to address the Chemawa IAMP and ensure that there is a provision for coordinating the two. She said that the City took out some of the initial language because it was premature. Cathy stated that even though the plan does not extend support for an extended widening, it does not preclude the option. Rick referenced Nate Brown’s comment from the PMT meeting, which suggested something similar. Terry explained that the project team would bring the idea back to the City Council for a final decision. He explained that the full widening could be a future decision for the community in the next 20 to 30 years, but explained that the project team could live with either option.

SuAnn stated that in the last SAC meeting, the group discussed the possibility of an off-ramp to Tepper as a possible way to preserve intersections and the access road to the Indian School south of Chemawa Road. Terry confirmed that the options would shift depending on future development. He said that options would be included in the revised recommended alternative drawings. Rick described a possible alignment for that connection.

Alan stated an interest in alleviating rush hour traffic, suggesting that if the loop ramp were connected to Tepper, it would provide a new connection to the City and other areas to the North of Keizer, without having to go onto Chemawa. Alan sketched a possible alignment.

Mike and SuAnn stated that the alignment option would absolutely not work with the Indian school, specifically in terms of public roads going through the private campus. Terry explained that the project team has intentionally avoided having roads go through

the property until this point in the project, and would continue to have that as the foundation for all possible alignments. The group discussed Alan's alignment suggestion further.

Eryn summarized the group comments and questions, and then passed the discussion back to Rick to walk through the rest of the evaluation matrix.

- **Goal 3: Economic Development** – No major differences among the alternatives.
- **Goal 4: Livability** – Again, full widening presented the only difference among evaluation criteria (in reference to compatibility with existing local TSPs).
- **Goal 5: Environmental** – Rick explained that the project team had talked with the PMT about the Tepper alignment. He explained that the team's goal would be to keep this within the UGB. If, for some reason, the alignment was not able to fit within the UGB, there would be some anticipated impacts on farmland. As far as impacting housing areas, or natural habitat – the matrix did not show any difference between the alternatives. Rick also explained that there would be the potential to locate the realignment of 35th around either side of the property north of the Volcano's parking lot and ball field which will have to be done carefully in terms of environmental impact.
- **Goal 6 – Cost:** Rick explained that the project team had previously completed rough estimates about potential cost. He explained that the project team was currently in the process of refining these costs. Rick suggested that the price tag for the recommended alternative package would be more than \$50 million.

Rick also explained that the project team had yet to complete the cost benefit ratio associated with the recommended alternative. He explained that the project team would need to have a more detailed cost before they are able to figure out what the cost benefit of this alternative would be. He stated that from the traffic analysis that has been completed, it was possible to determine what the delay would be, and could convert that into cost to the public. Rick said the project team also planned to include safety (crashes, etc) in the cost benefit ratio.

Alan asked if the total costs were included in the alternative drawings. Rick explained that typically, when teams look at cost and benefit in regards to a family of alternatives, they look at the cost for that project, not the other projects that would not need to be implemented because of the project's efficiency. Alan suggested that there are some factors that are included in the analysis that were not represented on the matrix.

Terry discussed phase-ability, and emphasized that the recommended alternative would be completed one piece at a time, which was a strong advantage to this recommendation.

Draft Recommended Alternative Design Drawings – Rick Kuehn, CH2MHill

Rick described the background behind the alternative design drawings and provided an overview of the analysis process. In his overview, Rick explained that currently the project team was looking at existing conditions in regards to land use (based on existing urban grown boundaries for Keizer). However, the project team has also performed an additional analysis should Keizer decide to shift the UGB in the future. The alternatives presented (the recommended alternative) were selected based on the understanding that they would be compatible should the UGB shift. Rick also discussed opportunities for alternative refinement later in the process – which would include enhancing and combining specific improvements to create a final recommended alternative.

Rick went on to describe the screening process for the recommended alternative. He highlighted the individual components of the recommended alternative's Phase 1, which includes the widening of the Chemawa/Lockhaven corridor. Rick went on to describe the widening process in greater detail including – widening by one additional lane in both directions from Portland Road over to McLeod, and then widening only in the west bound direction with one lane to Verda. Rick explained that this widening would work well as a Phase 1 project. Terry added that, by virtue of analysis, this improvement would be the “biggest bang for the buck” in regards to delay savings. Alan asked if this widening project would result in any widening on the bridge. Rick responded that he thought so, but that the project team had yet to discuss lane impacts on the bridge at this point in the process.

SuAnn asked Rick and Terry if they knew the width of the current Chemawa Road. Terry explained that the right-of-way is different in each roadway, that there is not a standard width. SuAnn mentioned the Indian School's obvious concern about impacts to the campus lands. The group discussed right-of-way standards and procedures. SuAnn mentioned that the area passing over Indian School Road has a very steep embankment. She was interested in learning more about the project's plan or decision to build a wall and potential impacts of that wall to the campus property. Tim Potter explained that the project team would look at the trade off in terms of costs, and specifically mitigating impacts to the campus property. He explained that walls are quite expensive, and that the cost would most likely be the final decision threshold. If the cost of putting in the wall would be greater than acquiring the right-of-way to extend the embankment, then the project team would most likely pursue a purchase of the right-of-way to accommodate the existing slope.

Rick went on to describe Phase 2 of the recommended alternative, which included a variety of additional improvements including: Auxiliary lanes off I-5 to mitigate congestion points (on and off ramps). Rick reminded the group that specific alignments were still open for question. SuAnn suggested that the project team look into connecting Indian School Road west of the rail tracks. Terry explained that there was a limited at-grade crossing across the tracks currently, but he would look in to confirming that. Terry confirmed that the project team would illustrate a variety of options that would match the campus plan.

Rick, Terry and the group discussed several alignment options for Indian School Road and suggested various connections to Tepper Road and the interchange. Terry mentioned that the project team would work to produce several alternative drawings that better illustrate the alignment options for this improvement.

Rick moved on to discuss Phase 3A, which includes a pair of ramps from Tepper to I-5. The group discussed the traffic flow addressed by this alternative. Rick went on to describe Phase 3B, which included the addition of a loop ramp at Chemawa (northbound). Rick and Terry reminded the group that the recommended alternative includes specific improvement options that build upon each other, as opposed to standing on their own.

Rick also described the potential Phase 3C of the recommended alternative – which proposes to extend widening to River Road. This option could be proposed as the last phase, or could potentially be included in the first phase of the recommended alternative depending upon the interests of the local community.

John Schaad suggested an improvement to Phase 3A. He mentioned that Rick met with the supervisor staff at BPA, and that the group expressed great interest in seeing improved access to northbound I-5. He expressed a concern with a roundabout option presented at the last meeting, and explained to the group that BPA headquarters is currently responsible for all maintenance in the region. He explained that when the headquarters office receives deliveries of power lines, they receive 100 ft pole segments delivered on long bed trucks. He suggested that the project team improve access to I-5 southbound so that traffic would not have to go through the shopping center.

Rick continued with the presentation, showing a sketch of the potential widening. Cathy asked if the widening would include turning lanes. Rick explained that there would be turn outs at all intersections, but that there would not be a need for a continuous left turn lane. Rick described the Chemawa/Lockhaven widening in greater detail for the group. Eryn asked Rick to discuss where the project team is in terms of being able to discuss right-of-way acquisition. Rick said that one of the team's next steps will be to develop a 10% engineering drawing of the recommended alternative and specific improvement options. These drawings would include profiles, fill slopes to help determine right-of-way needs for all roadway aspects. From there, Rick explained, the project team can begin to see where alternative improvements fall within the right-of-way line and where/if they call outside of the right-of-way. Rick explained that this next step would help to determine real cost estimates for the project.

John Schaad discussed BPA's right-of-way process. He explained that the agency's process allows BPA to review and comment on all projects in the region which helps BPA plan for transmission lines and placement. He provided an example from the Eugene area. Rick confirmed that the project team would work closely with John to learn more

about the application process and right-of-way permitting. John offered to share this information with the group.

Cathy asked about the Chemawa widening on the west side, she specifically questioned whether this traffic improvement would result in the same queuing effect with the transition from 3 to 2 lanes. Rick explained that Tony's analysis results show that this traffic scheme does not result in queuing back into the interchange intersections. Terry explained that the third lane becomes a right turn drop lane at McLeod. Assuming that the improvement area has a heavy p.m. right turn peak, the analysis suggests that this configuration works out fairly well. Rick explained that Tony included graphics on the alternative drawing that shows where the queuing area would be. Cathy expressed a concern that this widening project would be 'more of the same' in terms of revisiting safety concerns. She asked if on the eastside of Chemawa, if there was sufficient drop off traffic on Indian School Road onto campus property to warrant a third turning lane all the way through, essentially creating a right turn only lane going into the Indian School property. Rick explained that it would be difficult to get through lanes through the intersection. Cathy expressed a concern that the analysis did not show sufficient drop off points for the traffic to diminish. Eryn reminded the group that the drop off point in the widening would be at the connection to Tepper.

SuAnn asked if the meeting today would be the last meeting prior to the presentation to the public. Eryn and the project team explained that there would be another meeting with the SAC prior to the public open houses. SuAnn asked that the drawing showing an alignment through Indian School property not be included in the public open house materials. The group confirmed that the alignments would be revisited to suggest options that would not impact the Indian School Property.

Rick continued with the presentation, and walked through additional details relating to Phase 2 of the recommended alternative (which includes the realignment of 35th and the Tepper overcrossing). Rick then opened up the presentation to comments and questions. Rick explained that some potential issues associated with Phase 2 could include impacts to BPA's tower, wetland areas, nursery business, and/or plans for the City of Keizer's north property. He explained that these were all design level issues that would be addressed as the project moves forward into the design phase.

Pat asked if there would be a signalized intersection at Tepper and Stadium Road. Rick explained that there would potentially be a roundabout or an intersection, depending on traffic volume this intersection could be signalized or a 4-way stop. Pat reminded the group about the heavy pedestrian traffic during the Volcanoes season, and asked the group to remember pedestrian traffic when considering improvements and alignments.

Alan discussed bike path connectivity and pedestrian access to Keizer Station. He suggested that it would be easy to put the bike path under the new Tepper overcrossing

to connect to the stadium. The group went on to discuss the NE quadrant property and possible alignments associated with the Tepper extension.

Recommended Alternatives Traffic Analysis - Rick Kuehn, CH2MHill

Rick walked through a discussion of phasing options, and explained to the group that the analysis methodology used was the same as was presented to the SAC previously. Rick walked through the key highlights of the traffic analysis, and provided a brief description of formatting and findings. He discussed the options for addressing capacity issues, and the individual thresholds for capacity. He explained that any one of the recommended alternative improvement options represents a fairly significant savings over the baseline data.

Rick discussed the traffic analysis and mobility standards. He explained that while many of the improvement options rank just above mobility standards, all of the improvement options are well under capacity. Rick explained that with congestion management the project team would maximize capacity and minimize any potential problems.

Next Steps

Rick explained that the project team would work to finalize development of the 10% engineering plans that would include all elements of the plan including greater detail regarding lane widths and alignment information. Terry explained that the team would also focus on the final stages of the traffic analysis, and would continue to work with Dorothy at ODOT.

Terry and Eryn discussed a future public open house. Terry explained that the project team was looking towards late September/October as a possible date for the open house event. Terry also mentioned that the project team would meet in early September to talk about presentation materials and displays for the open house presentation. The management team would also begin to finalize meeting dates, times and locations for the community open house event. Eryn explained that the project team would return to the SAC and the PMT to review meeting materials and meeting dates prior to the open house. Terry expected that these meetings with the project committees would occur in late August or early September.

Terry also mentioned that the project team would continue to work with local planning staff, to look at the language in the planning documents and see if there are additional policy measures or land use actions that could help to support the recommended alternative. Rick and Terry said that they planned to come back to the SAC following the open house and review comments and recommendations prior to putting together a draft planning document. Rick mentioned that he thought the project team would be looking to bring a final copy of the planning report to the various Planning Commissions and City Councils for final adoption sometime after the New Year.

Eryn discussed meeting schedules and upcoming meeting dates with SAC members. Eryn mentioned that she would send out a couple of meeting date options for late August and/or early September.

Pat explained that she had an issue with meeting on the first Tuesday of the month.

Rick walked back through the key points of the meeting, and summarized several discussion items. The project team would continue to consider:

- The new Tepper alignment to avoid impacts to the Indian School Property as well as opportunities to continue widening to River Road
- Pedestrian flow, specifically in the northern part of the Keizer station.
- Roundabout near BPA and concern over extra-wide/extra long vehicle access
- More efficient access from off-ramp to areas north of Keizer
- Turn lanes as opposed to through lanes on Lockhaven on the Westside in traffic analysis - west bound lanes become turn lanes to create early queuing rather than collision queuing.

SuAnn mentioned that the campus is interested in a signal to facilitate a right turn into campus property. She asked if the project team could give priority to this signal or if the planning process could help to expedite the process of creating a signalized intersection. Terry mentioned that the project team would talk about the safety associated with getting in and out of the school's driveway, and would have to look to the County and ODOT standards for guidance on that decision.

Meeting adjourned.