

Meeting Summary
IAMP: I-5 at Chemawa Road
April 16, 2008 1:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.
Oregon Department of Transportation Region 2
455 Airport Road, Building B

In attendance:

Terry Cole, ODOT

Dorothy Upton ODOT

Eryn Kehe, JLA

Rick Kuehn, CH2MHill

Tony Woody, CH2MHill

Kirsten Pennington, CH2MHill

Sheri Wahrgren, City of Salem

Karen Odenthal, Marion County

Dave Baltz, City of Salem

Les Sasaki, Marion County

Nate Brown, City of Keizer

Steven Dickey, Salem-Keizer Transit

Matt Crall, DLCD

Goals:

Review of project work underway

Eryn Kehe, Jeanne Lawson Associates, opened the meeting and asked everyone at the table to introduce themselves. She asked for corrections to the PMT contact information and if there were any changes for the March meeting summary. Two changes were noted—change Glen Gross to Cecelia DeSantis Urbani, and a format change to fonts. The meeting summary was approved with those changes.

Ms. Kehe then asked the group for final approval of the PMT team protocols document by indication of their signature to the document. It was noted that since the Chemawa Indian School representatives will now serve on the Stakeholder Advisory Committee that those names should be removed from the agreement.

Eryn provided an update of her work to organize the Stakeholder Advisory Committee. She had spoken on the phone to most of the organizations represented and was able to discuss their concerns and ideas. She asked for feedback from the group about what other concerns there may be about the intersection. The following comments were shared by PMT members:

- Future Commuter Rail (Portland Western line, west of I5)— increase traffic demand, needed transit (park and ride).
 - Timing? There is a perception of an immediate need. Could take some time to realize.
- Recognize that Kuebler to Cordon to Chemawa is I5 alternate route
- Relationship between the process and Keizer TSP update
- Balance between land use decisions and interchange function
 - New homes planned east of Portland Road, for instance.
 - Just because it works well now, and part of the future development is considered, the area is continuing to develop.
- BIA property – what are the future plans?
- Working relationship between the owners of Area D (west side)?

- Colson property – “jug handle” concept to provide access relies on new road through BIA property.
 - Property was annexed in 2006, effective 2007.
 - Zoned PS and RA, Comprehensive plan designation of Community Service.
 - 5-year hold on rezoning starting in 2007.
 - Property is large and has visibility from I5, which makes it very attractive for development.
- The terms “reasonable, worst case” and “buildout analysis” are subjective and mean different things to different people.
 - How do we define the assumptions of what could/might happen?
 - Look at identifying thresholds?
- Keizer is looking at expansion of the Urban Growth Boundary (this is not considered in SKATS model)

Rick Kuehn provided the group with an update of the plan/policy review work underway. He provided a list of plans and policies that will be part of the review.

Tony Woody explained that they have completed existing conditions work and conducted traffic counts. He reviewed the preliminary Existing conditions report with the group and asked for feedback on the projects identified for the “no build” analysis. He asked if SKATS includes it all. Dave Baltz explained that SKATS considered financially constrained projects. Dave asked about the land use assumptions that would be used. Tony explained that the forecast, no-build assumptions used in SKATS will provide the base model. Dave said that he felt this study area needs to use SKATS and consider creating smaller zones and conducting micro-modeling. Terry and Tony responded that intersection level analysis will take place through a NCHRP 255 method post-processing exercise. Dave followed-up asking about the 16-hour counts discussed in the report. Terry clarified what those were. Nate asked how existing conditions research would lead to input regarding possible future development. Tony explained that the analysis will begin with the current, “no-build” scenario and identify alternatives to reasonably anticipate. The “no-build” assumes everything that is currently funded and approved (on the books). Matt Crall asked about redevelopment—they want to look at all assumptions in the model.

Rick Kuehn introduced Kirsten Pennington from CH2MHill. She was at the project area that morning working on the environmental scan to pinpoint red flags in the expanded study area. She asked if there were any questions, but there were none.

Eryn announced that the next meeting scheduled for the full PMT is at ODOT Region 2 offices, Building B on April 30, 2008. The group discussed an interest in beginning at 1:30 p.m. Eryn said that an email will be sent to the membership with an agenda prior to the next meeting.