

Project Management Team Meeting #12  
July 22nd, 2009 1:30-3:30  
Oregon Department of Transportation Region 2 HDQ  
455 Airport Road, Building B

DRAFT Meeting Summary

**Members in Attendance**

Dorothy Upton  
Raymond Jackson  
Dan Fricke  
Karen Odenthal  
Nate Brown  
Les Sasaki  
Anthony Boesen  
Derryl James

Glen Gross  
Rod Thompson

**Staff in Attendance**

Tony Woody, CH2M Hill  
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 went over the agenda and described the meeting goals.

*Approve June 20th Meeting Summary-*

The group raised several small spelling errors, and made a motion to accept the meeting summary.

Rick went on to explain the evaluation matrixes included in the PMT meeting packets. Rick described the yellow highlighted columns in the evaluation matrix, explaining that these columns pertain to the original set of alternatives. He explained that this document was created for the PMT's review, and these highlighted columns would not be included in the final IAMP document.

Rick explained that the current set of alternatives (Alternatives 21-24) represent a phased approach as opposed to four separate alternatives. He explained that the evaluation process focused on how these phases impact the project goals and objectives. Rick then walked through a description of the matrixes and formatting.

**Evaluation Framework – Alternatives 21 to 24**

Rick went over the evaluation framework matrix and highlighted key findings. Dorothy

suggested that Rick walk through the Alternatives to describe the similarities and differences between the previous (original) alternatives and the current set of project alternatives (21-24). Terry explained that the original alternatives shown on the chart show present ratings from a previous evaluation. The findings associated with the current alternatives present a refined set of mobility standards/mobility characteristics. Terry emphasized that the project team has more information at this point about the current alternatives than we did previous with the original list of project alternatives.

Eryn opened the possibility to shift a discussion of the current list of alternatives up on the agenda. The group agreed to continue with the discussion of the evaluation matrix as presented on the agenda.

Rick walked through several highlights of the evaluation matrix. He explained that there are only very small differences between the alternatives in the mobility analysis. He explained that alternative 24 scores the best in terms of the mobility at the intersection, largely because the northbound left turn is accommodated by the loop ramp. He went on to describe the full widening of Lockhaven, explaining that a full widening was not a viable option at this time due to incompatibility with local TSPs.

Rick explained that when the project team originally evaluated the alternatives, they were under the assumption that all of these alternatives would meet the mobility standards. He explained that many of the intersections are drastically improved over a “no-build” option – but some of them fall just a little short of the mobility standards, although there is a significant improvement.

Rick and Tony went on to describe key findings from the mobility evaluation matrix, including a discussion of improvements to the local circulation program – which addressed a number of intersections that are remote or away from the interchange. Rick also discussed spacing along I-5 and its impact on the evaluation findings. He explained that the signal spacing assessment is still be finalized and can be revised if needed.

Rick walked through the key findings related to Goal 3 (Economic Development). He explained that, at this point, the project team has not differentiated between freight movement and traffic in the mobility study. Dorothy asked Rick to describe the difference between 3.1.2 and 1.5.1 (in terms of access). Rick explained that they are the same measure, and Eryn confirmed that there certain measures are repeated throughout the evaluation. Rick explained that there are 8 repeated criteria throughout the evaluation matrix.

The project team went on to describe the findings associated with livability – specifically impacts to the bike and ped system, as well as overall impacts in terms of how this fits with comprehensive plans, street connectivity and street hierarchy. Rick explained that

there are only two instances where the findings suggest a difference in consistency with local comprehensive plans.

The findings did not suggest any difference between the alternatives in relation to Goal 5 (Environmental). Rick explained that in regards to Goal 6 (Cost), the project team went through improvements and developed very general cost estimates. The project team is currently developing a more detailed recon estimate. The first guess, for the total project cost, was that all alternatives would be over \$50 million. Rick explained that the sum will change based on the additional cost assessment.

Eryn asked the group for questions or discussion items pertaining to the evaluation matrix. Ray mentioned that he would like to discuss the cost benefit, as well as the following criterion: 6.2, 4.2 and 4.4. Dorothy asked if alternatives 21 and 23 were basically the same thing except for the Tepper ramps. She asked the project team to provide input in terms of where these alternatives are different and if they would rank differently. Terry then presented a discussion of Tepper ramps in regards to traffic as well as other physical/compatibility/livability impacts. He explained that if the project team takes this piece by piece, the ramps make more sense if Keizer decides to grow more to the north. Tony explained that the evaluation matrix does not have the refinement needed to evaluate those specific details. Dorothy suggested that the project team refine the measures, specifically in regards to cost benefit – to measure phase-ability. Terry explained that the alternatives laid out could be pursued ‘penny-by-penny’.

The group discussed the Chemawa widening alternative. Nate mentioned a desire to include a footnote that the currently ranking of this alternative reflects the current City Council decision not to support full widening down to River Road. He said that this decision could be revisited in the future. Terry explained that the key factor was that the project team did perform some sensitivity testing to see if and how the limited widening impacted the interchange. Whether Keizer decides to come back to that decision or not, the project team still felt comfortable that the interchange will remain functional with the limited widening.

The group then moved on to discuss criteria 4.2 – gaps in the bike/ped system. Ray mentioned that it would be conducive to bike and ped since the group is talking about moving up to a shopping area from North Salem. Ray expressed that there is a difference between providing a bike/ped system and real connectivity –providing a system that is inviting to people. Ray recommended that the project team refine this measure, and mentioned that he had an issue with the evaluation criteria/scoring perimeters in regards to this measure.

In regards to criteria 4.5 (Noise Impacts) Ray mentioned that he disagreed with anything that would suggest that levels are not changed. Eryn explained that these impacts are compared to the future baseline information. Ray suggested that the criteria reflect the

understanding that there is traffic, but that mitigations would not need to be made. Terry and the group discussed noise impacts. Terry mentioned that it was difficult to make any real assessment at this stage on an upgraded road in terms of noise impacts. Terry asked the group to focus on items that are differential – and suggested that perhaps noise impacts were not a major differentiating factor between one option over another. The group discussed housing, residential development and possible economic development opportunities that would create additional ‘sleeping communities’ within the project impact area.

Ray went on to discuss greenhouse gases, and the finding associated with the evaluation framework. He suggested that the ratings including in this evaluation were premature or wrong. He suggested that there would be more traffic on the roads than with future no build projections. The group discussed this topic. The group suggested that less congestion would help to curb stop and go traffic. Ray argued that because there are more cars on the roads, there would be more CO2. The group suggested that vehicles at rest are far less efficient than cars that are moving. Terry reminded the group that this criterion was a surrogate measure at this point. He explained that the project team and the state do not have measures, so they are constantly looking for surrogate measures. He explained that there was a need to caveat this measure rather than suggest that the project is completing a greenhouse gas study. Terry mentioned that the question of greenhouse gas impacts are questions that people are asking, so ODOT is currently looking at ways to provide comparative direction. The group then went on to briefly discuss VMTs and other possible efficiency measures. Ray asked if life cycle analysis would be included as part of this project.

Ray also asked about the cost benefit ratio. Rick explained that the project team took a quick feel of what they thought the cost would be for this project. He explained that Tony would take a look at this analysis and include delay cost and other standard costs. Tony explained that the benefit that the project team would be measuring would be the operational benefit – he explained that you can also include the reduction or cost of accidents. Terry explained that the project team could be more accurate about delay, specifically in terms of information to present back to the council – he offered the example of a crash study showing the benefit of additional lanes. He explained that where there is less congestion, it would be assumed that it would be a slightly safer facility. Terry said that the project team would relate this benefit back to cost in a future condition study.

Dorothy reminded the group that cost is more than just the construction cost, the cost includes maintenance and operation costs. She requested that the project team include both side of the equation in the final cost benefit analysis. Ray asked if costs would be presented per phase.

Tony went on to describe the cost benefit analysis process – explaining that the project team was still working out details, and would continue to have internal discussions

regarding the final cost analysis. Rick suggested that these alternatives represent the phasing strategy. He reminded the group that the alternatives did not present four different alternatives; they represent the stages of what could be built. Terry countered this point, and suggested that that was one way to look at it – but the evaluation is not broken down piece by piece according to phases. He said that if the team looked at the singular benefits and the cumulative benefits, he wasn't sure how much additional value would be presented if the team started to parse out information in that fine of detail in relation to the level of analysis. He explained that the team does have a directive to come back and look at least cost planning. He said that the team may choose to look to that direction, potentially not for this project specifically, but through other future projects.

### **Draft Recommended Alternative Design Drawings – Tony Woody, CH2M**

Tony reiterated Rick's discussion of the distinguishing factors between the project alternatives – suggesting that there were very few differences between the alternatives in relationship to the mobility analysis. He explained that the alternative maps represented the largest pieces of the alternative components.

Tony explained that alternatives 21-24 presented a phasing plan for a recommended alternative. Tony went on to describe the traffic analysis used to determine each of these phases. He explained that the project team would no longer refer to alternatives by their number, but would instead refer to alternatives as the 'recommended alternative'. He went on to describe construction phasing and highlight the key findings in the analysis results. He quickly presented some background information about the project to date, and then walked through a description of the maps and legend descriptions.

Tony said that the project team was very close, at this point in the project, to having a solid understanding of the IAMP recommended alternative – based on a stronger understanding of the larger components. Tony explained that I-5 improvement would be included in Phase 2 of the recommended alternative.

Tony described the screening process for the recommended alternative and recapped a variety of input opportunities. The PowerPoint presentation highlighted the key components of the recommended alternative, as well as supporting options (or side projects) including:

#### Phase 1:

- Chemawa/Lockhaven Widening: Verda extension to I-5
- Chemawa Widening: I-5 to OR 99E

#### Phase 2:

- Tepper Overcrossing & Realignment of 35th Street
- Realignment of Indian School Rd and Tepper extension

Phase 2:

- Tepper Half diamond (*option*)
- Chemawa NB ramp Parclo B (*option*) – Can be added during or after the project first two phases

Additional Options:

- Transportation Systems Management – not necessarily including in the traffic analysis ,but discussed...opportunities to get some additional capacity out of the system
  - Access Management along Lockhaven
  - Signal Interconnect & Optimization (is included in the traffic analysis)
  - Stadium-Ulali Crosswalk modifications

Tony showed the group a map outlining the key components of phases I and II, including the additional options listed above. He explained that this map includes the Tepper overcrossing and extension. Terry noted that in regards to the Indian School Road realignment, there were discussions that took place earlier in the project brainstorming with the school. He mentioned that he wasn't sure at this point which options the school would be in favor of, but emphasized that there are several options to choose from in regards to the realignment of Indian School Road. A committee member asked what would happen to the efficiency and feasibility of the project if the school did not support any of the proposed realignment options. Terry explained that if the project team could not provide a reasonable alternative they would be forced to buy the property – and would be required to find a way to connect the property to the overpass. Terry and the group discussed several alignment options, as well as existing level of support from the Indian School Board. He explained that at the board level, the school's representative on the SAC indicated that the school would be open to a variety of options with the southern portion of their property. Nate suggested that coordination with the school is a very different political process, and asks that the group be aware and prepare if the realignment option is removed from the 'table'. Terry and Tony both explained that they did not foresee any issues with being able to maintain access and to coordinate with the school to develop a viable realignment option. Terry suggested that it would be more difficult to provide access to the property in the NE quadrant than the Chemawa Indian School property.

Tony continued to describe the other major project components – including the possible extension of Verda/Trail.

Les outlined the current Keizer UGB area northeast of the interchange, and the group discussed the option of looking at a Tepper realignment option within the UGB. Terry reminded the group that the alternative maps did not suggest final alignment. The final alignment would be determined by working with the property developer. The alignment of Tepper could be shifted if it proves to be a problem to fit the realignment within the existing UGB. Rick explained that the zoning report would be included in the final recon report. He suggested that the group check with the zoning report and

reconfigure the alignment to ensure that it fits within the UGB. The team confirmed to check and reconfigure the alignment.

### ***Phase 3 – Options A and B:***

Tony described Phase 3, which proposed two separate and additional improvement options: Phase 3A (Tepper Half Diamond), and Phase 3B (Chemawa NB ramp, Parclo B). Tony explained that these two options would not have to be implemented in sequence – both options could be implemented at the same time.

For documentation purposes, Dorothy suggested that the other projects be called out to indicate what they are.

### **Construction Phasing – Tony Woody, CH2M**

Tony presented several slides that discussed the potential construction phasing of the recommended alternative. He mentioned that phase 1 would include construction phasing on both sides of I-5. He also stated that the project team was currently looking at creating some improvements to accommodate through movements and signal operations at OR 99E. He explained that these modifications would be included in the final recommended alternative.

Tony went on to describe the limited widening option as well as the full widening option. The group discussed McLeod widening and other local system improvements and access control/median control options. Tony continued with the presentation – discussing the construction phasing associated with Phase 2 improvements. He explained that discussions are still taking place to determine a final realignment location for 35<sup>th</sup> and the Tepper overcrossing. At this point, the team has set up this alignment to maintain design speed, but also to accommodate BPA power station access and mobility needs. He explained that there are some constraints there, and the project team would spend more time refining that design. Rick mentioned that he met with BPA managers and key staff and that generally they are OK with the current set of options. Essentially, BPA is concerned about that the turning radii of the 35<sup>th</sup> improvements continue to accommodate the large power line poles they sometimes transport.

Tony moved on to discuss the realignment of the Chemawa on and off ramps. The project team proposes to extend these ramps to the north to accommodate the Tepper half diamond in the future. Tony suggested that this realignment would help with overall operations related to the close spacing of the Chemawa and Salem Parkway ramps. Tony also described the Portland Road to Chemawa Auxiliary lanes, which would extend the on ramp to the off ramp between Chemawa and Portland Rd.. Tony also described the Tepper Half Diamond concept.

Regarding the Tepper extension, Rick explained that the project team would need to have a discussion with the individual property owners, and mentioned that Eryn was in

the process of organizing that conversation. Rick explained that the current property owner would like to see a signalized connection at a location that would be too close to the interchange ramps to meet spacing guidelines. Rick raised the discussions with Keizer Station, and their interest in ensuring that future development of the east side of I-5 are treated similarly in their conversations pertaining to property access.

Tony continued to describe the additional improvement options – including the Parclo B Ramp. He explained that while this improvement does have a lot of benefit to the project, the team would need to continue to focus on refining details from an operational standpoint.

Eryn asked Tony to describe the property lines on the PowerPoint slides that highlight the recommended alternative. She asked if he could describe if and where acquisition may be required later in the process. Dorothy suggested that it would be fairly minimal to accommodate the grades. A committee member asked if there would be any impact on the Salem-Keizer Parkway in terms of merging or connection. Tony confirmed that there may need to be a little bit of acquisition – but that the project team would flush out those details as they continue to refine the recommended alternative components.

The group discussed left turns and other loop ramp benefits. Tony explained that current options could be modified, and reminded the group that the Parclo B option would still not meeting ODOT mobility standards. He explained that while these alternatives do not fix everything – it does suggest a major improvement.

### **Traffic Analysis: Intersection delay– Tony Woody, CH2M**

Tony described key findings of the traffic analysis, specifically in regards to intersection delay findings. Tony mentioned that in general, Phase 1 presents an overall delay improvement. In total, you would see 140 seconds of delay improvement between Phase 1 and Phase 2. Tony explained that adding the Tepper ramps increases delay slightly because you are drawing more traffic onto the facility – essentially providing more access options. With Parclo B, the delay improvement reappears.

Eryn asked if the findings suggested that there is not a lot of difference between the full widening and the limited widening. Tony explained that this evaluation does not take into consideration queing in order to provide an “apples to apples” comparison. Tony explained simulation modeling will give the team a better idea of how well these improvements work together as a system – creating compounding effects. He explained that the project team was still in the process of running this analysis.

Tony also walked through a discussion of high level data, freeway operations and mobility standards. He stated that overall, the numbers were a little misleading because they are just barely below mobility standards, but do suggest an improvement over the baseline.

Tony described the analysis process and design that would be required in order to accommodate the phasing of the Tepper diamond.

### **Next Steps**

- Finalize 10% design drawings for recommended alternative
- Finalize traffic analysis and queuing
- Develop Draft IAMP
- Open House

Terry suggested that the last 2 bullet points should be switched.

Eryn asked Terry to talk about the meeting structure and timing of the next PMT meeting.

Terry suggested that the SAC and the PMT get together before the Open house to discuss the expectations and material for this open house. Following that meeting, he suggested that the project team would be pulling together the input from that open house, and would distribute that information to the PMT through email to receive input from the committee. Terry suggested that the PMT get back together in October or November to review a draft document.

Eryn mentioned a tabling event at the Keizer River Fair – set for August 8<sup>th</sup>. Eryn also confirmed that she would email out information regarding the next PMT September meeting date. She also told the group to expect materials about one week prior to that meeting.

Tony said that he would put maps on the project website, or on project pier. He explained that the next set of design papers would be in more detail (around the 10% mark). Eryn said she would send a link out and a reminder of when these maps would be posted to Project Pier.