



Oversight Team

ATTENDEES:	Sam Brentano/Marion County, Lloyd Chapman/Salem-Keizer Transit District, Dan Clem/City of Salem, Tom Ritchey/Polk County, Jeff Scheick/ODOT, Richard Walsh/City of Keizer
UNABLE TO PARTICIPATE:	Cathy Clark/City of Keizer (alternate), Dave Cox/FHWA
STAFF PARTICIPANTS:	Dan Fricke/ODOT, Julie Warncke/City of Salem, Rod Thompson, ODOT/Dave Simmons/CH2M HILL, Tim Burkhardt/CH2M HILL
GUESTS:	Richard Schmid/SKATS
DATE:	January 12, 2007

Introductions and Agenda Review

The meeting began with self-introductions. Richard Walsh informed the group that he would be joining the Oversight Team as the permanent member representing Keizer, with Cathy Clark serving as an alternate.

Following self-introductions, Tim Burkhardt reviewed the packet of materials provided, which included the meeting agenda, 12/15/06 Meeting Summary, the Project Evaluation Framework (Revised 1/10/07) and the Project Team Web site Tutorial. The Web site Tutorial was provided again to the Oversight Team members to help address questions any member may have in using the web site to retrieve meeting materials. The web site was set up as a tool to replace sending large email attachments. All meeting materials are placed on the project team web site prior to each Oversight Team meeting. Any concerns or problems with the web site can be directed to Brandy Steffen at CH2M HILL (503) 736-4223.

Dan Clem requested that the project schedule/timeline be easier to find on the public website, ideally not more than one click away from the homepage. Tim Burkhardt noted that this type of feedback is useful and the website will be modified per the comment.

Tim indicated the key meeting objective was to review, discuss and endorse the project goals and objectives described in the Project Evaluation Framework memorandum. The goals and objectives, along with the purpose and need, will be presented to CETAS on January 16th. Tim informed the Oversight Team that the Task Force had not concluded their review and discussion of the Project Evaluation Framework, specifically on the threshold criteria and the performance measures for the goals and objectives. This would require an additional meeting in February for the Task Force and Oversight Team to finalize the Project Evaluation Framework. A question was asked as to whether these additional meetings would delay the project. Tim indicated that the additional meetings would not cause delay in meeting the future project milestone dates.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Evaluation Framework

The Oversight Team reviewed and discussed all six goals and the main points of the discussion for each goal are summarized below.

Goal 1:

There was a good deal of discussion of Objectives 1-3, which deal with local, regional and through travel. There was concern and uncertainty expressed as to whether the measures captured the best cross section of travel patterns. Richard Walsh felt strongly that the travel pattern represented by those beginning their trip northeast of the existing river crossing should be added. After some discussion, a trip origin of Broadway/Salem Parkway was added to Objective 1 and I-5/Salem Parkway was added to Objective 2. This input will be brought to the traffic team and evaluated to determine if the traffic engineers have any suggestions for changes. The locations noted under the objective measures will be plotted on a map and brought back to the Task Force and Oversight Team at the next meeting for their final review.

Objectives 5-8 were modified at the suggestion of Richard Walsh to refer to the “Salem-Keizer area”, rather than “Salem”.

Goal 2:

Dan Clem asked if the wording of several of the objectives could be simplified, which was a comment echoed by other members of the group. Tim Burkhardt suggested that this goal would likely be the focus of CETAS at their upcoming meeting, so the wording for many of the objectives was chosen with that audience in mind. Dave Simmons offered that input from CETAS would likely lead to modifications to these objectives, so discussion of the wording of these objectives could be deferred until after obtaining CETAS input, assuming there were no serious objections.

Sam Brentano asked for clarification regarding the use of the term “impact” in several of the objectives. He pointed out that there could be both positive and adverse impacts and the group agreed that the objectives were intended to address avoiding or mitigating adverse impacts.

Following some discussion, objectives 9 and 10 were reworded to reflect the values of the group to both preserve and mitigate unavoidable adverse impacts.

Goal 3:

Lloyd Chapman expressed concern over the potential negative impacts of Objective 8, possibly spurring unwanted development that would prematurely utilize available capacity of any solution. After some discussion regarding the unknown consequences that come with transportation infrastructure investment, the group agreed that modifying the

objective by adding ...“consistent with adopted land-use plans” would establish the appropriate limitation.

Objective 9, which had been removed by the Task Force, was the subject of some discussion regarding whether it was appropriate to have an objective of reducing truck traffic in the downtown. Several members felt that this objective was important and represented the wishes of many stakeholders. Others were concerned that perhaps this was too specific and as long as truck movement was improved through the area, it was less important to remove them from downtown. The Oversight Team ultimately agreed that this objective should be retained.

Goal 4:

Several members questioned the need for Objective 3, which was added by the Task Force. The general feeling expressed was that environmental justice was simply another federal requirement that needed to be followed and that there are many state and federal requirements that were not listed that would need to be followed in the NEPA process. Tim Burkhardt indicated that several members of the Task Force had asked that this be added to reflect a goal or value that they felt strongly about. The group recommended keeping the objective but changing the wording to be consistent with the other two in this goal (“Meet Environmental Justice requirements”).

Goal 5:

One concern expressed during the discussion of the objectives for Goal 5 was the lack of an objective that considered the best investment, in terms of capital and lifecycle cost, when compared with the performance provided. Richard Walsh suggested that objectives that minimize cost may not result in the best solution in terms of solving congestion problems and moving both local and regional traffic over a long period of time. It was suggested that perhaps the measure for Objective 5, which the Task Force had added, could be developed to capture this concern.

A concern raised by Jeff Scheick was the absence of an objective that considered the need to develop alternatives which could be mated with a viable funding strategy, in other words, to evaluate the “fundability” of a given alternative. It was agreed that a new objective should be added.

Goal 6:

Objective 1 was modified to eliminate the words ...“on the bridge” from the end of the statement, since it was felt that this reference was too specific to a particular solution. The purpose or intent of the objective was felt to be met with this modification.

The group approved the goals and objectives as revised (see Salem River Crossing Evaluation Framework, Revised 01/12/07) for presentation to CETAS.

Next Steps

The next OT will be scheduled for February following the Task Force meeting. It is assumed the Task Force will complete its work on the Project Evaluation Framework at their

February 21 meeting. The next OT meeting is planned for Friday, February 23, from 12:00 – 2:00.