

Meeting Summary
IAMP: I-5 at Chemawa Road
Project Management Team Meeting #4
June 18, 2008 1:30 pm to 3:30 p.m.
Oregon Department of Transportation Region 2 HQ
455 Airport Road, Building B

In attendance:

Staff-

Rick Kuehn, CH2MHill
Eryn Kehe, JLA
Tony Woody, CH2MHill
Terry Cole, ODOT Region 2

Committee Members-

Nate Brown, City of Keizer
Kevin Watson, City of Keizer
Les Sasaki, Marion County
Cecelia DeSantis Urbani, City of Salem
Dorothy Upton, ODOT Region 2
Dan Fricke, ODOT Region 2
Dave Baltz, City of Salem
Ray Jackson, SKATS
Glen Hadley, Salem-Keizer Transit

Welcome

Eryn Kehe opened the meeting just after 1:30 p.m. She asked members to introduce themselves. After a review of the agenda, she asked if there were any changes for the May 21 meeting summary. Two changes were suggested (“Crall” not “crawl” and to put “Salem” in front of parkway) and accepted by the group. The meeting summary was approved.

Review Future Conditions TM

Tony began his presentation by reviewing where the project is in the schedule and he reviewed the study area. Then he reviewed the crash analysis that wasn’t available at the last meeting. Dave asked for clarification on the crash analysis which Tony provided.

Tony shared the assumptions of the future baseline based on SKATS model (2005 existing and 2031 Action scenario).

- Land use from adopted Comprehensive plans.
- Projects from committed and high priority lists.

He discussed the future planned projects (already scheduled) and the assumed improvement at each.

- Four in the south end of the study area
- One in the north end (Brooklake Road/ River Road).

He discussed mobility standards. Existing and future no build to the OHP standard. In cities they are based on Salem, Keizer and Marion county standards from their TSP.

Ray asked for clarification about the standards used and why. Terry shared that within ODOT's office there is discussion currently occurring about these standards. Ray asked for an explanation of how numbers were displayed in the table Tony provided to the group. Tony shared the results displayed in a table he handed out to the group.

Rick added that at some intersections which are further from the interchange the purpose has been to understand any potential impact on these intersections of changes to the interchange.

Dave asked for clarification about what "future baseline" meant. Tony responded that it is an analysis of 2031 with the assumptions about future projects and land use made by SKATS in their work.

Terry pointed out Lancaster Dr NE and 99E where the situation seemed to get better, although it remains at level F. Tony said that could be a result of changes in travel/movement. Then Tony presented the freeways analysis.

Dorothy shared that crash data will be available this July/August for 2007.

Ray asked about the analysis tool and Tony said that it is SYNCRO. Ray asked Dorothy when ODOT may decide about the use of two standards. Terry said it will likely remain two. Eventually OTC will discuss standards in 6-9 months. With respect to this project, further discussion will occur later in the project as recommendations are determined.

Rick asked Tony if he had begun thinking about possible solutions. Tony has only thought about high level alternatives. Brooks has issue, but also has the potential to pull traffic away from Chemawa. Tony added that there do not seem to be easy solutions at the Chemawa interchange. Discussion will likely bring up policy questions about Brooks interchange because it is designated as a rural interchange.

Nate asked if it is possible that a new interchange at a location further south (Perkins, for instance) could improve the situation? Terry said that it is possible. That brings up other policy issues, however. ODOT policies say work to improve what you have first. However, that is only one of several policies that guide decisions of this type.

Dorothy added that FHWA will ask what the benefit and improvement will have on the interchange system first.

Confirm purpose/need and evaluation framework

Rick shared a new purpose statement that he brought to the group as a handout. He said that at the next meeting at end of July the process of identifying alternatives would begin.

Dorothy asked how the scoring/rating system will be set up. Terry said that what is being considered is a "consumer reports" rating system.

Dorothy talked about the importance of crafting objectives and criteria so that they can be measured. Terry responded that some will be qualitative and others will have real numbers that can be measured.

Dave said he had never seen a set of criteria that can differentiate between project alternatives better than good human judgment. Terry said that the final determination will be a combination of both the evaluation tool and human judgment. Nate added that there will always be decisions about prioritizing required.

Terry said the team will post new criteria on internal website for team review in next few days. Rick talked about what some of those criteria may be.

Dave suggested changing the language that said “reduce future congestion” to “minimize” congestion.

Nate said the purpose of this plan isn't to actually build improvements but to have improvements scheduled in plans.

Ray asked are the objectives potentially conflicting? Rick said some could conflict.

Glen said they will be watching for the ability for transit riders to move as a pedestrian in the area and the general capacity for buses to move through the area.

Changes suggested:

Goal , 4th bullet-- Provide “a plan for” make it clear that this is a guiding document and won't result in projects (doesn't result in funding).

Dorothy shared that in past projects, truck traffic has been identified separately from vehicle or customer access to businesses.

Goal 2, 1st bullet--Ray asked how land use can impact safety. Rick said different land uses and intensity levels could impact safety.

Goal 2 3rd bullet-- Dave asked if we need an objective that says “meet sound engineering”? The others agreed to remove this objective.

Goal 2, 4th bullet--Dorothy suggested saying “accommodation” for emergency response.

Goal 3--Dorothy suggested changing “local business”. Rick suggested combining the first two objectives by removing them. The others agreed. Nate asked about the word “support”. Terry suggested “serve” as an alternative. The others agreed.

“Provide for local attractions” as a change to the last bullet.

Les suggested adding an objective to address agricultural uses and access. Ray suggested adding “agricultural” to the second bullet instead.

Goal 4--Dave said he was concerned about the first and third bullets and wondered how this impacts livability. Rick suggested that the plan’s recommendations could include future land use recommendations as much as transportation projects.

Dorothy said that community development plans can include corridor plans.

Ray suggested mentioning the need to capture noise impacts and environmental justice issues. Rick pointed out that these can come out in criteria developed from the fourth bullet. Ray suggested that there is a place for these items under livability (goal 4) as well. Terry said that through the criteria there is the opportunity to address issues like these under multiple goals.

Goal 6, 2nd bullet--Dave suggested making the 2nd bullet plural.

Goal 6, 3rd bullet-- Dave also suggested saying “equitably among partner jurisdictions.”

Discuss First Open House July 9th

Eryn talked about outreach strategies that the team had been using in preparation for the July 9th open house.

The meeting ended just after 3:30 p.m.