



## Oversight Team

- ATTENDEES:** Sam Brentano/Marion County, Lloyd Chapman/Salem-Keizer Transit District, Cathy Clark/City of Keizer; Dan Clem/City of Salem, Jeff Scheik /ODOT; Emily Laughton/FHWA, Tom Richey/Polk County; Richard Walsh,/City of Keizer
- STAFF PARTICIPANTS:** Eric Havig/ODOT, Dan Fricke/ODOT, Julie Warncke/City of Salem, Rod Thompson,/ODOT, Mike Jaffe/SKATS, Tim Burkhardt/CH2M HILL, Dave Simmons/CH2M HILL, Kristin Hull,/CH2M HILL, Tim Potter/ODOT;
- GUESTS:** Richard Schmid/SKATS, Darlene Strozut/Highland Neighborhood Association, Brandon Smith/City of Keizer
- DATE:** October 26, 2007

## Introductions and Agenda Review

Following a round of introductions of Oversight Team members, staff, and guests, Tim Burkhardt reviewed the agenda and described the meeting materials. The primary purpose of the meeting is to continue the previous week's discussion of the preliminary evaluation results of the alternatives and to discuss whether the group is ready to eliminate any of the alternatives from further consideration.

## Public Comment

There were no public comments.

## Evaluation Results

Kristin Hull summarized adjustments to the evaluation scores made in response to requests from the Task Force, including better incorporating impacts to elementary schools, bicycle and pedestrian needs, and the base results for the mobility scores. In general, there were concerns that for some objectives the difference shown in the scores greater than they should have been. For air quality and transit, the alternatives now all received the same scores because there was not enough difference among the alternatives to justify the different scores. For other scores – mobility, freight travel, congestion – alternatives received either a 2 or a 3, to make sure that the differences among the alternatives were not overstated.

The changes above did not change the overall rankings much, except for the Forest alternative, which went from a rank of 6<sup>th</sup> to 11<sup>th</sup> because so much of its benefit was tied to the mobility score. Others changed by just one position up or down.

Kristin highlighted several other items in follow-up to the previous week's meeting. These included requests to run the scoring using only the mobility-related criteria and to show the scores with all objectives carrying equal weight. For the latter model run, the results were similar to when they were weighted, just with less differentiation as would be expected.

Dave Simmons responded to the previous week's question about improvements on the existing bridge. He handed out an illustration to show the extent of the improvements that would be needed – new through lanes, ramps, etc. In response to the question about how the alternatives would perform without improvements to the existing bridge, Dave said that for White (as an example), the alternative reaches a 0.85 mobility standard with improvements to the existing bridge, and a 1.84 without them. There was some discussion about whether the improvements to the existing bridge would be structurally feasible. Dave indicated a separate structure might be needed and that at least some of the existing lanes would need to be closed during construction. Merge/weave movements on the bridge would be workable but there would be considerable friction.

## Narrowing of Alternatives

Tim handed out a summary sheet showing preliminary staff recommendations on narrowing alternatives and the results of the recent Task Force discussion on the same topic.

Tim then asked each Oversight Team member to indicate (on the sheets posted on the wall) up to 7 alternatives that they were ready to eliminate from further consideration, based on the discussion to date. If anyone was not ready to suggest eliminating that many they only needed to identify the ones they were ready to eliminate. The results were as follows:

### Number of dots to eliminate from further consideration (6 members participated):

Purple	2
Orange + Red	1
Orange	4
White + Red	0
White + Red light	0
White	2
Pink + Red	1
Pink	4
Blue + Red	5
Yellow + Red	2
Yellow	5

Green + Red	3
Forest	6

Tim then led a discussion of the results, focusing on the alternatives that got the most preliminary indications for elimination. (Not all alternatives were discussed due to time constraints; discussion is to be continued at the next meeting.) The Oversight Team members noted the following advantages and disadvantages of the alternatives, as recorded on flip charts.

### **Purple**

- Not realistic

### **Orange**

- Lack of 22 connection
- Poor mobility scores
- Prefer orange over white because of fewer impacts to NE Salem
- + Improves Wallace, Marine and existing bridges to create regional connections (best non-red alternative)

### **Pink**

- Long bridge
- Improvements to existing bridges
- No connection to 22
- Neighborhood and residential impacts
- Improvements to Pine would be extensive over time to make it work (all the way to Portland)
- Neighborhood intrusion
- Bad eastern connection
- Too much structure for what it accomplishes
- No Parkway connection
- Closes Front Street
- + Gets closer to Parkway than some others

### **Blue + Red**

- Same as yellow (lack of connections to Parkway, neighborhood impacts)

### **Yellow**

- Impacts on existing bridges seems too bad
- Against all without direct connection to Parkway
- Neighborhood and school impacts
- Moderate and low income households
- Urban renewal area
- Eastern and northern connections weak
- + Not enough compelling reasons to eliminate it now

### **Green + Red**

- Neighborhood impacts, structures
- Not regional - near existing bridges
- Bisects Wallace Marine
- Would not get funded
- 4(f) impacts might be an issue
- + Might be funded because it is cheapest (better than nothing)

### **Forest**

- Expense
- Park
- Neighborhood intrusion and impacts
- Existing bridges + 2 new bridges
- Not enough benefit for cost

Based on this discussion, the group made the following preliminary conclusions:

**X** = remove from further consideration

**?** = not sure

**✓** = keep for further consideration

**blank** = discussion pending

**(5-1-0)** = 5 in favor of removing; 1 not in favor of removing; 0 abstaining

<b>Alternative</b>	<b>Oversight Team (10/26/07)</b>
Purple	<b>X</b>
Orange + Red	
Orange	<b>X</b>
White + Red	
White + Red Light	
White	
Pink + Red	
Pink	<b>? (5-1-0)</b>
Blue + Red	<b>X</b>
Yellow + Red	
Yellow	<b>? (5-1-0)</b>
Green + Red	
Forest	<b>X</b>

The group will continue discussion of the remaining alternatives at the next meeting, with the intention of moving toward a formal recommendation on which alternatives to carry forward.

## Next Steps

The next Oversight Team meeting is tentatively scheduled for Nov 30 or Dec 7, following the public open houses on November 8 and 14. Tim encouraged the Oversight Team members to attend at least one of the open houses, the purpose of which is to present the range of alternatives to the public and solicit their comments.