

Stakeholders Advisory Committee Meeting #2

May 27, 2:00 – 4:00 p.m.

Keizer Fire Station

611 Chemawa Rd. NE, Salem, OR

DRAFT Meeting Summary

Members in attendance:

Fred VanNatta, Keizer Station owner, Northwest Natural
Cathy Clark, City of Keizer City Council
Diana Dickey, Northgate Neighborhood Association
Christine Dieker, Keizer Chamber of Commerce
Tim Potter, ODOT Area 3 Manager
SuAnn Reddick, Chemawa Indian School
Alan Roodhouse, Keizer Station owner
John Schaad, BPA
Scott Lawrence, Keizer Station owner, Donahue Schriber
Larry Epping, Property owner
Kate Tarter, City of Salem City Council
Jerry Lelack, Keizer Bikeways Committee

Staff in attendance:

Terry Cole, ODOT
Rick Kuehn, CH2M Hill
Tony Woody, CH2M Hill
Eryn Kehe, JLA
Laura DeGraw, JLA

Meeting Goals:

- Review project work underway
- Engage SAC in identification of project goals

Welcome-Eryn Kehe

Eryn Kehe opened the meeting at 2:00 p.m. She thanked everyone for attending and asked the group for any changes to the meeting summary. There were no changes made to the summary and the group approved the April 21st meeting summary.

Eryn went over the committee membership and asked the committee members to go around and introduce themselves. She welcomed the new members as well as the alternatives.

Eryn discussed the draft meeting protocols and asked the group if they had any changes or questions. She then asked the committee to sign an agreement for meeting protocols.

Fred VanNatta noted that he had concern with the protocols, specifically consensus building and explained that despite his concerns he recognizes he can write a minority report.

Transportation Analysis-Tony Woody

Tony Woody from CH2M Hill went over the transportation analysis presentation. During the presentation the committee had many questions:

Christine Dieker asked for clarification regarding the existing intersections. Tony Woody explained that the existing intersections do not include plans for 2031.

Alan Roodhouse asked if there is any pre-determined classification for Chemawa after Lockhaven, and if there is there a solution?

Tony Woody explained that he was not sure of the classification. Terry Cole said that it can be a recommendation.

Alan Roodhouse pointed out that the multi-use trails shown on the presentation do connect.

Christine Dieker asked if there are more possibilities on Cherry Rd and Parkway vs. Portland? Is it as heavy as Portland or 99w? She expressed concern about intersections not selected for analysis. Tony explained that they collected data from intersections that directly affect the interchange. He explained that the intersections on Cherry as well as the intersections on the parkway further away than Verda and Hyacinth were not counted, but they are along the same routes as those that were counted closer to the interchange. The closer intersections tell the story about what the impact on the interchange is.

Cathy Clark and Kate Tarter clarified that there is a school and railroad crossing on either side of the Parkway/Verda/Hyacinth intersection which may affect the numbers. Cathy also explained that trying to turn left from Verda north of the Parkway in the afternoon is an issue because of the school. Kate Tarter and Cathy Clark both pointed out that the train may cause traffic to come to a dead stop and cause a back-up, especially on the eastside.

John Schaad pointed out that when considering trains, consider whether they are moving or stopped, he also recommended getting a train schedule in order to see if it conflicts with the peak traffic times. Terry Cole explained that it is very difficult to get that information and the trains may not have that information available.

Cathy Clark asked to confirm that the unincorporated UGB will be part of the alternatives for 2031. Tony explained that for a baseline scenario alternative, they look at land use within the total UGB. They will also look at the "what if" scenarios as well as threshold testing.

Stakeholder Interview Summary -Eryn Kehe

Eryn explained the interview purpose, and went over the complete comments received as well as the interview summary.

Eryn explained that the stakeholder interviews reported a general satisfaction with the way the intersection is working today. The interviewees from both sides of the interchange expressed the importance of the interchange. The interviewees on the east side expressed a concern with what the future will bring and the changes and possibilities to happen along the interchange. She also heard concerns that whatever happens with east side should be equitable to whatever has occurred on the west side. There was a concern that the same kind of energy and investment should happen on the east side. Eryn explained that growth and future growth of Keizer was a concern. Interviewees were concerned about what would happen if something goes wrong in the Brooks interchange being that a large amount of traffic goes through the intersection.

John Schaad pointed out that he would like to especially look at electric lines for 2031, especially for facilities that have not been built that need to be taken into account. He explained that the project should look at PGE because they have long term plans for transmission lines. John expressed that Salem electric should be looked at as well being that they have a lot of facilities in the SW area. John also mentioned that it would be beneficial to go through an interview process with him because he has more information that would be helpful for the project. Terry Cole agreed that it would be important to meet with PGE.

Eryn explained that the public meeting will be another area to collect input, but the project team will use the Stakeholder interviews for now for the basis of information.

Problem Statement/Purpose & Need Statement-Rick Kuehn

Rick Kuehn discussed the problem statement as well as a purpose and needs statement and explained that because they are not doing a formal NEPA document (EIS) the purpose and needs have a different purpose, but will still be used in this project.

Rick explained that the problem statement explains what the problem is. The purpose statement explains what the desired situation is and it relates only to transportation function that they are dealing with. The needs part of statement is all of the factual information that demonstrates that if nothing is done the desired situation will not be realized. Rick explained that the needs statement quantifies what the short term and long term needs are. Rick pointed out that the goals and objectives will discuss all the other things you want to do with the project (environmental, transportation, safety, etc).

Rick explained that the step after the goals and objectives is an evaluation framework, which will look very similar to the goals and objectives. After the evaluation framework Rick explained that they will evaluate the alternatives in the evaluation framework, which is a way to test the alternatives against the goals and objectives.

Cathy Clark clarified that the evaluation framework is a tool and to remember that the evaluation is one item is toolbox, and will not cover everything. She explained that other things should be looked at as well.

Rick pointed out that the purpose and need are still a work in progress and the project team will bring some ideas to the PMT and see what they think.

Eryn went over the initial draft goals and objects, and focused on the Issues and concern record. She also discussed how she categorized the issues and concerns. Eryn explained that she categorized the issues and concerns into 6 draft goals. Rick pointed out that these goals are very common for a project of this type. Eryn asked the committee if they feel that the goals reflect the summary of the interviews and concerns.

John Schaad suggested adding electric utilities as part of economic development and to make sure the electric plans are coordinated with interchange work, long range planning. He informed the SAC and the project team that there should be Inter-jurisdictional coordination.

The group agreed that the objectives should list specifics.

Rick asked the group to send comments regarding the goals and objectives and the purpose and needs statement to Eryn, and they will be brought up at the next meeting.

Christine asked that sustainability, efficiency, and alternative forms of transportation be brought into the goals and objectives.

Draft Project Goals-Rick Kuehn & Eryn Kehe

Rick pointed out goal #1 and emphasized the area in the IAMP. He asked the group to think about not just the interchange but the area as well. He also asked the group that when focusing on mobility, to keep in mind that it is not just about the interchange. Terry Cole emphasized that the project team will be differentiating between function and operations, and the role the interchange plays in the overall interchange area. He explained that they are looking at a way to keep operations and function separate. Terry pointed out that defining the function of the interchange is different than defining how we want it to operate.

SuAnn pointed out that they have not seen any future function of the railroad, and wondered if it has been brought into the mix? She wanted to know what information the team has on the existing functions, and if they know anything about them. SuAnn was interested in knowing the Interaction between the interchange and the railroad, and wants to look into the long-term future.

Terry Cole explained that they will look at the expectation of the future railroad function. He explained that in general they separate roads and railroads as much as possible. The project team has not gathered the train schedule, and Terry explained that it is difficult to pin the schedule of rail roads, but they will try their best to get frequency information, and hope to find out the railroad's future plans.

Rick and Eryn talked through the project schedule and explained the occurrence of PMT and SAC meetings. They noted that the recommended solution is scheduled for January/February of next year.

Tony summarized that the project team will continue to work on the goals and objectives and problem statement. The project team is also working on a public meeting in July, they are looking to get feedback from the general public on the SAC and PMT goals and objectives and see what other ideas come up.

Cathy Clark mentioned that it may be a good opportunity to bring information to the Marion County Fair which occurs the 2nd weekend in July. She also pointed out that the River Fest in Keizer, may be a good opportunity as well. She was concerned that it may be difficult to get people together in the summer, and that they should try and think of other venues to bring information to people instead of bringing people to the information

Eryn asked the committee to send any other ideas of how to get feedback and engage people in this process.

Next Meeting:

June 24th, 2:00pm-4:00pm, Location to be determined.