

Stakeholder Advisory Committee
February 9, 2010 2:00-4:00
Keizer Fire Station
661 Chemawa Road NE Keizer, OR 97303

Meeting Summary

Members in Attendance

Cathy Clark
Eric Scott
Jerry Lelack
John Shaad
Pat Erlich
Randy Jackson
Sam Brentano
SuAnn Reddick
Tim Potter

Staff in Attendance

Rick Kuehn, CH2M Hill
Larry Weymouth, CH2M Hill
Terry Cole, ODOT
Eryn Kehe, JLA
Kelly Skelton, JLA

Members of the public:

None

Meeting Goals:

- Review the first sections of the Draft IAMP document and receive comments
- Discuss Next Steps

Eryn reviewed the agenda and introduced Kelly Skelton from JLA. Kelly is filling in as notetaker because Adrienne is on vacation.

Eryn asked if anyone on the committee had comments or changes to the October meeting summary. SuAnn wanted clarify that Sharlayne Garcia should clearly be identified as the school board chairman, on page 4 in the last paragraph. SuAnn also clarified that the school board wanted to let people know that they did not specifically support the resolution that Siletz had brought forward. Eryn will make the modifications to the October summary.

Meeting summary accepted.

Terry introduced Larry Weymouth from CH2M Hill as the person responsible for compiling all of the technical memos into one document. Larry is here to track the discussions today as his part of this process. Terry commented that today Rick is going to review sections 1-5. Sections 6-7 are policy issues that will be reviewed next time.

Before Rick started Eryn clarified there isn't a reason to wordsmith this document during this meeting, Eryn asked that people send Eryn detailed comments or changes within the next week after today's meeting or via email. Today's discussion should be

bigger picture. Rick is going to go over each section and committee members can ask questions and make comments as we go along.

Rick said this is mostly old information that we have seen before but there are a few new items, including one or two items brought up at the PMT meeting. Rick pointed out that there is some redundancy in here, this is a resource document that hopefully planners and agencies will use in the future, it isn't meant to read like a novel, and things will show up more than once. Hopefully this allows each section to stand alone and have context away from the rest of the document.

Section 1

Page 1.4 - this section, the Interchange Classification Function Statement, has not existed previously, and describes what the classification is for the mainline freeway, main crossroad, and also several of the other major routes as well as other routes in the study area. The land use is described for both cities and Marion County, and it talks about how the function of this interchange is to serve those land uses, if it is not intended to serve greatly expanded land use over what is already in the plans.

Cathy asked if Chemawa Road from the Interchange to Portland Road is in fact considered a parkway. Rick said he'd have to go back and check Salem's rules. Terry thinks Salem's definition is a higher level road with more limited access.

The PMT requested changing the verbiage on page 1.5, 3rd bullet down, from "expected to develop commercially" to something that better explains the current property owner's desire to modify the zoning in the future.

The PMT commented that the introductory statement on page 1.4 should include the date so someone reading the document years down the road knows that this was the situation as of a specific date.

The PMT also commented that if maps are printed in black and white they need to be legible and usable.

Eric commented that on page 1.5, the last two bullets are no longer accurate. Rick agreed and will make the modification.

Section 1.5 IAMP goals and objectives –

Rick said this is not new information, but it is important and will provide the basis for the evaluation. Rick asked if everyone is still ok with it. Rick shared that one member of the PMT felt the last bullet of mobility goal, "avoid the situation....area" should be reworded to clarify that we were going to look at other solutions and not think of this interchange as the only solution. Terry suggested using "evaluated" instead of "avoid". Cathy commented that her original concern was to avoid solutions that would artificially draw traffic to the interchange rather than disperse it to the other options available. If

we don't look broadly enough and we end up making it the sole focus, we will make the situation worse by not having looked at the other options. Don't make it so good that people will not use other routes. Terry will rework this text and bring it back to group at the next meeting.

Rick pointed out that there will be a design exception application in the appendix for the recommended alternative. Although he doesn't think there will be any specific design exceptions, Rick does think there are some issues with spacing between interchanges and intersections that do need to be documented with a design exception. Eryn asked who receives a design exception. Rick said it goes to the approving agency, in this case FHWA.

SuAnn requested deleting the words "where practical" in the 2nd bullet goal in goal five on page 1.7. She thinks it should be implied as it is in the rest of the document. Terry thinks it's a fair point and it could be added anywhere in the document on anything that hasn't been done yet. The point of this document is to be very high level. The group agreed it can be deleted. Cathy has suggested wording that she will give to Eryn.

Section 2

This is where all existing conditions are laid out. There are a couple of new issues brought up by the PMT. One new addition is that, as a result of the Keizer Station plan, a different mobility standard was established for the intersections along Lockhaven and Chemawa that is not reflected yet in the tables. These new standards need to be reflected in the document and CH2M Hill will go back in and make that clarification.

Eric asked to back up to section 1.6, which ties into table 2.1. He understands that this is the initial IAMP study area, and it looks at the three existing jurisdictions, and table 2.1 looks at existing roadways and those jurisdictions. His issue, and he thinks the tribes will be sensitive to this issue as well, is that we are talking about impacting trust lands on the east side with that lane extension and tribes are also a jurisdiction over those land pieces and he thinks at some point the tribes should be listed as a jurisdictions, perhaps not here, but somewhere else in the document. Rick commented that these maps are looking at roadway jurisdictions, not land use jurisdictions. Eric wanted to ensure that clarification needs be made somewhere in document, perhaps not in this specific section.

Rick commented that there still seems to some confusion about what lands are sovereign. Rick's understanding is that all property east of I-5 is owned by the federal government and the Chemawa Indian School is a lessee. Eric replied that you cannot really "broad brush" it all, some pieces are trust, and held by the Federal Government for the tribes but some was also deemed surplus and he is not really sure what the status of those portions is. According to SuAnn the current status is that the land is owned in its entirety by the Federal Government, there is a small portion on the north side of Chemawa road that is not within the jurisdiction. All of the property that was

purchased was deeded during the last 100 years to the federal government, current efforts are in the works to place that surplus land in some sort of trust status.

SuAnn asked for clarification on pages 2.4 and 2.5. The sentence “Southeast of the interchange, the land within the City of Salem is mostly owned by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (Chemawa Indian School is a primary tenant)” ; she feels this is not really true. The next line “The land was the historic site of the school’s campus and is currently fenced-off and undeveloped, although some evidence of structures and street lighting remain” is true but it should be clarified that it is the area between the railroad and the freeway.

To clarify, Eryn confirmed that the land owned is owned by the Federal government, managed by the BIA, and the school is an education institution that is owned and operated by the BIA. It would be more accurate to say that the Chemawa Indian School *operates* under the jurisdiction of the BIA, on land that owned by the federal government. There needs to be some clarifying language about the 5 acres that is north of Chemawa road as well. The text should refer to the entire campus, not just the older section of the campus along Chemawa Road. Terry said that text will be clarified in the IAMP.

Rick mentioned that a simple request made by the PMT was that the map on page 2.5 is confusing and to clarify they will highlight the north arrow to better help people orient themselves on the map.

The PMT also suggested that any time we are grouping together traffic conditions or traffic numbers, to address them on I-5 first before the rest of the system since this is an I-5 IAMP.

Pat requested updated maps for maps 2-2a and 2-2b. They are very outdated. Rick and Terry agreed.

Section 3

Rick didn’t get any comments on Section 3 from PMT. No one on SAC did either.

Section 4

Initially 15 alternatives were considered, the team applied the six project goals to those 15 alternatives. Out of those 15, there were five alternatives that the team agreed needed further investigation with the future traffic models. After a period of modeling and refinement the team came up with four new alternatives called 21, 22, 23, and 24.

The PMT asked that evaluation notes for the new alternatives (21-24) be added to Appendix C and also includes the keys on each sheet.

At the previous meeting Pat had mentioned that we need to use new terminology to differentiate the sections of Tepper because it causes so much confusion and people mistakenly think the road is going to be reopened. Terry agreed that has happened over time as the document has grown, and asked for recommendations on what it should be called. SuAnn suggested East Tepper Drive to differentiate the Radiant from Tepper Drive and Tepper Lane. The group agreed, and Terry suggested that some text needs be included in a special section that says “for consistency, we are calling this Radiant ... for this reason”. The group agreed and Larry will make changes will be made throughout the body of IAMP document except in historical documents and appendices.

On page 4.2 the 2nd paragraph has the phrase “mathematical score”. Pat commented that it was her understanding that we are not using scores and this is misleading. She suggested that instead it should say “best five ratings” instead of scores. The group agreed.

Section 5

This section identifies the recommended alternative and provides findings about interchange function, the local street network, existing and planned land uses in the interchange management area, and access management.

Section 5.1 lays out what the recommended alternative is. All comments from the PMT were that full widening and half diamond interchange need to be moved to future consideration.

Section 5.2 is new information for the SAC, where we describe what we are doing about circulation as well as access management related to individual driveways. ODOT has already purchased access management rights along Chemawa from the east side of the Ulali/Stadium intersection over the freeway basically to the Union Pacific railroad. The new information is that Terry has asked that at some point in the project when the eastside improvements are done that access rights need to be purchased further to the east to the new Tepper intersection. The PMT asked for a clarification that private access from Keizer Station Blvd to McLeod could be possible, if it falls under location jurisdiction, but there could be the potential for some access in the future.

Cathy asked about the right turn pocket at 14th, she did not see it in IAMP. Rick and Terry weren't sure if it is in the language of the document, Rick thinks it is included on the drawing.

Sam commented that he is concerned about leaving future widening decisions up to the local government, he thinks people will regret the compromise to only widen by one lane and that we should have gone a step further and made it a wider road. Cathy said one of the considerations in the TSP was how wide they could go before they'd get push back. Part of the concern was that it would be over-building if they same goal could be

accomplished by using right turn pockets to relieve pressure at Lockhaven and River. Cathy said it is in their TSP and can be a future consideration.

Eryn brought up the issues of pedestrian safety near the schools in the plan, she isn't sure where it belongs and it needs to be in the IAMP somewhere. Terry said they will add it at section 5.2.2. He will also double-check to make sure the right of way research is discussed in section 5.2.

Next Steps

The next meeting will focus on Sections 6 & 7. Terry is working on a policy action adoption responsibility matrix which will outline who is doing what between all of the jurisdictions involved.

The next meeting has not been scheduled yet because the IAMP document has to go to the staff and DOJ, and the PMT. Most likely the next meeting will be in March and will possibly be the last meeting for this group. The local adoption process will follow after the full document is approved by the committees.

Pat cannot attend in March but could come in April

Eryn adjourned the meeting at approximately 4:00 PM.