



## Oversight Team

- ATTENDEES:** Sam Brentano/Marion County, Lloyd Chapman/Salem-Keizer Transit District; Cathy Clark/City of Keizer; Eric Havig /ODOT; Emily Laughton/FHWA, Tom Richey/Polk County
- STAFF PARTICIPANTS:** Dan Fricke/ODOT, Julie Warncke/City of Salem, Rod Thompson, ODOT, Mike Jaffe/SKATS, Ray Jackson/SKATS, Aaron Geisler/Polk County, Tim Burkhardt/CH2M HILL, Marcy Schwartz/CH2M HILL; Ed Chamberland/W&H Pacific
- GUESTS:** Richard Schmid/SKATS
- DATE:** July 27, 2007

## Action Items

Number	Action	Responsibility	Completion Date
1			

## Introductions and Agenda Review

Following self-introductions, Marcy Schwartz indicated the key meeting objective was to provide an update on the preliminary concepts as well as feedback from the public open houses in June and Task Force meeting in July. No decisions are required at this meeting; we are convening in response to the OT’s request at the last meeting for closer involvement in the process.

## Public Comment

No public comment was provided.

## Open House Summary and Debrief

Tim Burkhardt provided a summary of the two open houses held on June 26 and 27. The mailing list of nearly 1,000 households received the newsletter announcing the meetings, and 300 people on the e-mail list received an electronic invitation to participate. Attendance was approximately the same as the last open houses, with about 100 attending the West Salem meeting and about 50 attending the east side meeting. The question posed to attendees was “do you have any suggestions for solutions we haven’t thought of, something to add to the list?” We received some new ideas, but mostly ideas to refine concepts already on the table.



## Status of Preliminary Concepts

Tim reviewed the table of alternatives currently under consideration. These included the alternatives that meet the adopted mobility standard as well as a group that are designed to meet an alternative mobility standard. The latter group was developed in response to Task Force and public comments asking for alternatives with lower cost and fewer impacts. Tim also reviewed the concept tracking spreadsheet that details all the suggestions raised during the process and their status. Project staff have reviewed most of these ideas and made recommendations for their advancement or elimination; other ideas have yet to be reviewed. Staff recommendations will be provided to the Task Force, but they can make independent recommendations to the Oversight Team.

Ed Chamberland presented the revised concepts, including the “white” concept that is an updated version of the I-305 concept originally developed in the 1970s. One change from the last meeting is introduction of an interchange rather than an at-grade intersection at Glen Creek and Wallace Road as part of the Green concept. New concept maps also include the “off project” system improvements necessary to meet the mobility standards, which in most cases extend well beyond the new bridges.

Comments from the Oversight Team members included:

- Concepts from the “alternate mobility standard” column could be viewed as early phases of a bigger project, although the entire project must be within the 20-year financially constrained Regional Transportation Plan to be approved.
- Searching for a “less expensive” project is a red flag. We must seek the project with the “biggest bang for the buck” which shouldn’t be based solely on cost, but rather on long term performance. We must think long range, and not try to do the project “on the cheap.”
- The alternative mobility standard concept is valuable and should be considered
- Why cut the connection to Highway 22? It is a critical part of the solution. *(Staff indicated it not part of the “alternate mobility standard” concepts because it is very costly, will likely have high environmental impacts, and is an element that can be cleanly severed from the bridge elements.)*
- We need realism in this effort. We have to be able to afford to build the solution we select. At this point in the project, it is critical to keep a broad range of alternatives because we don’t want to back ourselves into a corner. An improvement is still an improvement, even if it doesn’t include all of the desired elements.

## Updated Meeting and Milestone Schedule

Marcy presented an updated schedule. It indicated that the Task Force is expected to make a recommendation on the Range of Alternatives on August 15. The next Oversight Team meeting is scheduled for August 17 to make a decision on the range of alternatives to be considered. Only those alternatives will be evaluated against the evaluation criteria

adopted earlier in the project to provide information for further narrowing down the number of alternatives to be studied in the draft EIS.

Both the Task Force and Oversight Team will reconvene in October to receive the evaluation results. Open houses will be held in November and a decision on the alternatives to study in the draft EIS is expected in late November or early December.

Marcy pointed out that several Task Force members indicated a reluctance to make a recommendation during the August 15 meeting because they would be receiving new alternatives for the first time and might not have enough opportunity to consider them. As a fall back, we are scheduling a date for a second meeting in August in the event that the group cannot adopt its recommendation at the August 15 meeting.

Staff encouraged Oversight Team members to communicate with their representatives on the Task Force to ensure more thorough understanding of information and perspectives at all levels within their organizations.

## Funding for EIS Process

Dan Fricke distributed a memo explaining what has been spent so far on the EIS process and how much additional funding remains under contract. Scoping and budgeting for the next phase of work is underway. When that effort is complete, we will know how much additional funding is needed to complete the draft EIS (Phase 3). The final phase of the EIS process (Phase 4) includes preparation of the final EIS. In light of potential funding shortfalls, Dan will ask the consultants to estimate the cost of all the remaining work (Phase 3 and Phase 4) at this time to facilitate financial planning.

## Next Steps

The next meeting is scheduled for August 17.