

Project Management Team Meeting #14
October 21st, 2009 1:30-2:30
Oregon Department of Transportation Region 2 HDQ
455 Airport Road, Building B

Meeting Summary

Members in Attendance

Dorothy Upton
Anthony Boesen
Derryl James
Rod Thompson
Les Sasaki
Glen Gross
Karen Odenthal

Jill Corcoran
Julie Warncke

Staff in Attendance

Rick Kuehn, CH2M Hill
Terry Cole, ODOT
Eryn Kehe, JLA
Adrienne DeDona, JLA

Meeting Goals

- Review Input Received at the October 14 Open House
- Discuss Next Steps

Welcome

Eryn welcomed the group, reviewed the agenda and explained the meeting goals.

Approve September 9th Meeting Summary-

Eryn asked if there was any feedback or questions about the previous meeting summary. The group had no comments and approved the September meeting summary.

Derryl James requested an addition to the agenda to discuss the design exceptions and the interchange modifications draft request. Eryn suggested adding that discussion to the next steps agenda topic.

Debrief on Open House

Eryn described the following public outreach process leading up to the open house:

- A newsletter was distributed to the project area (approximately 7500 homes).
- A number of organizations suggested by the PMT were contacted, including visiting property owners (about 15 homes).
- A press release was distributed and articles were featured in the Statesman Journal and the Keizer Times newspapers.
- The project website was updated with the following information:
 - Newsletter
 - Open House Materials
 - Online survey

Eryn explained that an online survey was developed in order to gather input from people who were unable to attend the open house. The survey is still available online. A majority of the public input collected has been through the online survey. At this time, approximately 50 people have completed the online survey.

Approximately 30 people attended the open house.

Rick added that he has made two presentations over the last month to the North Gateway Redevelopment Advisory Board and the Northgate Neighborhood Association. He said he will be making a presentation to the Keizer Chamber of Commerce next week.

Eryn asked the PMT members who attended the open house to provide their impression of the meeting.

Terry said that there wasn't as much concern expressed at the open house regarding the Lockhaven widening as he might have thought. He said that it was helpful to have Rick's research that stated there wouldn't be a lot of locations where property acquisition was needed. Terry explained that there were questions about why one lane in one direction and two lanes in the other were proposed. He added that he heard some support for the Tepper over-crossing; although there was some skepticism about whether or not it was needed. Terry said that he heard a good response about the partial cloverleaf B option because people already feel uncomfortable with the double-left. He added that Salem-Keizer Transit was present at the open house and they were able to answer a lot of questions. Terry explained that he heard no negative feedback; although one person inquired about greenhouse gases and sustainability. This person expressed a philosophical disagreement with the State's lack of commitment to alternative modes.

Eryn added that she was able to get the attention of some of the property owners; many either attended the meeting or responded through e-mail.

Terry explained that a Port Commissioner from Cascade Locks attended because he wanted to compare how the region was approaching the interchange spacing with how region 1 was approaching it in Cascade Locks. He said that based on his reaction it looked like we were applying the same principles.

Eryn explained that there is currently a representative on the SAC from the Chemawa Indian School and that the school had met with the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) about the project. Following this meeting, the BIA took it upon themselves to send a notice about the open house to the tribes across the state. Some of the tribes responded by e-mail to join the e-mail list and some who were school board members attended the open house. These people did not have a strong understanding of the project and communicated their feelings of negative impact to the school property.

Anthony said that representatives from the Chemawa Indian School have expressed concern in the past about more of their land being taken away.

Rick replied that it was the Indian School's position early on that the project would have negative impacts to the school, but he doesn't believe that is their position today.

Eryn added that this was not the position of the SAC representative or the School administrator. She said it seemed to be the feeling of those not involved in the project. Eryn expressed that they need to get the information out to the tribal groups. She also explained that the map included with the document prepared by the Tribes was done quickly by only one tribe; however the School believes this discussion is pushing forward with some thought about how the school should grow in the future.

Rod stated the need to coordinate with the Chemawa Indian School and the BIA.

Terry replied that the project team has been coordinating with the School and the BIA. He explained that the School is represented by many tribal councils and that getting information through to these various tribes is not happening. Terry said in the future, the project team will work with the School to do a better job of getting information out to the various tribal groups. He added that not knowing what the long-range plan is for the school property has been a problem.

Eryn said she requested to get on the agenda for the next school board meeting which is next week. Terry added that he had been to a previous school board meeting. Eryn explained that the school board only meets quarterly, so it's been a challenge to get on their agenda. Eryn said that the SAC representative suggested that the project team contact the Oregon Commission on Indian Services to get assistance in reaching the various tribes.

Eryn stated that a representative from the Salem-Keizer School District came to the open house and distributed a letter about safe routes to school, specifically Whitaker Middle School. She said that the project team will send a response.

Rick explained that final design will address the concerns about kids getting across a wider road and that an additional lane in one direction will actually help drivers to exit from the school. He said that another potential is a completely revised access system, which needs to be addressed and has been brought up by Rob Kissler in the past.

Eryn informed the group about a recent article in the paper regarding the consideration of a property just to the west of Volcanoes being a gas-fired power plant. She said these property owners attended the open house. Rick said that hopefully the IAMP can serve as a tool to reserve a corridor through there for the new connection to 35th Street.

Terry asked how many written comments were received at the open house. Eryn said that about 5 comment forms were completed.

She said that the majority of responses stated they traveled through the area or lived in the area. She explained that 64% of the people heard about it in the Statesman Journal and 16% said the newsletter. Eryn explained that people were generally supportive of all three phases; though there were some reservations about cost, safety and property acquisition expressed. Eryn said that the auxiliary lanes on I-5 received the next highest level of support and the Tepper extension had the lowest level of support. Several people didn't think that Tepper was the best place to provide an east/west connection. Some thought that if Tepper was opened to the west (across the railroad tracks), it would be a better east/west connection. A few people said that Tepper shouldn't be open to the west. Some people seemed to be confused as to the purpose of the Tepper extension; though most people didn't express concerns. Eryn explained that the Tepper intersection with Chemawa was fairly widely supported; though few said it was not needed. Eryn thought that its overall purpose for the entire project was likely not understood. Many thought that the Tepper overcrossing should be further north and didn't understand why there would be an interchange to serve only Keizer Station or Volcano stadium.

Terry added that we will have to get through the entire Keizer Comprehensive plan update to better understand the needs of Keizer to the north. This will be noted in the IAMP.

Eryn said that the improved ramps on the east side of the interchange (loop ramp) were widely supported. Primarily people had no concern about this. Any concerns raised were related to cost or traffic. Eryn added that a few people provided their contact information and that will be added to the project contact list. She stated that once the survey closes, all of the comments will be added to the full summary and a copy will be provided to the PMT.

Next Steps

Terry explained that the local policies and ordinances will be reviewed by Angelo Planning Group and they will be identifying anything that might have relevance to the project. He then stated that a meeting will be held soon regarding what policies are currently in place and if any ordinance should be put into place with regard to land use and transportation – specifically with regard to resource protection. Terry said this will determine how to characterize expectations in regards to growth in the area. He added that this work is the last step prior to putting together the draft IAMP document.

Terry said that once the draft document is put together, it will be circulated to the PMT, then to the SAC. At that time the project team will determine if targeted outreach needs to take place.

Julie asked if the policy changes will be similar to those implemented for the Kuebler interchange and if so, she would want to be involved in that discussion.

Terry said that the one item that might need the most additional work is protection of resource land. Keizer is self-constrained because they don't have much room to grow. Terry added that they won't know for sure what might need to be addressed until Keizer completes their long-term comprehensive plan and identifies new areas for growth.

Draft design exceptions and analyzed interchange modifications –

Derryl explained that it was ODOT's policy to require planning documents to include any required design exceptions if there is a possibility of building in 5 years, if not, it requires a draft exception request. He said the process would be to get the design exception draft written, then include in the IAMP. Derryl said that the draft Eight-point Interchange Modification request will need to be developed and sent to FHWA for approval before including it in the IAMP.

Terry asked if that is something CH should take the lead on. Derryl responded that CH should take the lead.

Terry said that the spacing exceptions will need to be part of the design exceptions. Derryl added that if there are questions or concerns that will be addressed through the design details, then they must be included in the design exceptions.

Rick asked about the three local roads being illustrative alignments. Terry said that all of the recommendations should be shown as worst case scenarios. Derryl said that outside of the quarter-mile mark, the design exceptions fall to the City. Julie said that the City's design exceptions for streets are under development right now.

Terry asked if Chemawa Road east of the interchange is in the County. Julie said that if the road is within the city limits, it's under City jurisdiction. Karen said that the road doesn't become County jurisdiction until east of Hwy 99. Terry said that if there isn't formal standard, then that should be noted in the report.

Julie said she would like to determine how to deal with any streets going outside of the UGB because they typically do not like to do that. Terry replied that they will determine how to deal with it, or find a way to avoid it. He added that amending the UGB would be an alternative to a goal exception.

Eryn said that Terry has outlined all of the activities that will be occurring before the next PMT meeting.

Rick said the project team will be working on the draft IAMP during the month of November with the next meeting with the PMT in December to review the draft document. Terry added that it may not be possible to piece the whole thing together by

December. Eryn replied that the December meeting will be set as a tentative meeting since the holidays make it difficult for scheduling. She asked if the 16th worked for the group. She said that if there is flexibility, they might want to meet on the 15th, then meet with the SAC the following day.

Terry said that they may meet with the PMT for technical review, then not meet with the SAC in December.

Eryn closed the meeting and reminded the group that a public comment summary would be sent by e-mail.

Eryn adjourned the meeting at 2:30 p.m.