



## Task Force Meeting #14

- ATTENDEES:** Mark Becketl/City of Salem Public Works, Warren Bednarz/Downtown Business, Betsy Belshaw/Parks, Tom Clark/West Salem businesses, Bob Cortright/DLCD, Leon Fischer/Freight, Aaron Geisler/Polk County Public Works, Glenn Gross/City of Salem Community Development, Glen Hadley/Salem-Keizer Transit District, Brandy Humphries/Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde, Mike Jaffe/SKATS, Sam Litke/City of Keizer, Doug Parrow/BTA, Lorraine Pullman/Grant Neighborhood, Cindy Schmitt/Marion County Public Works, Darlene Strozut/Highland Neighborhood.
- UNABLE TO ATTEND:** Russ Beaton/Land Use, Mark Brown/Natural Resources, Scott Erickson/West Salem residents, Fred Harris/North Salem Business Association, Ismael Perez/Hispanic interest, Tim Potter/ODOT.
- STAFF PARTICIPANTS:** Dan Fricke/ODOT, Julie Warncke/City of Salem, Rod Thompson/ODOT, Tim Burkhardt/CH2M HILL, Ed Chamberland/W & H Pacific, Linda Girard/CH2M HILL, Kristin Hull/CH2M HILL, Marcy Schwartz/CH2M HILL, Dave Simmons/CH2M HILL, Dan Speicher/CH2M HILL
- GUESTS:** Diane Peterson (Highland resident), Edna and John Annard, Nomi Pearce (Highland resident), Eunice Kim (Statesman Journal), Diana Delacerna (Grant neighborhood), Rick Tobias (Highland resident), Pat Block (Northgate), Kate Tarter (Ward 5 City Council), Brent DeHart (Ward 7 City Council).
- DATE:** October 17, 2007

## Welcome and Agenda Review

Tim Burkhardt welcomed the group and invited the guests to introduce themselves. He then reviewed the agenda which will provide project updates and schedules but be mostly devoted to presenting the evaluation results.

## Public Comment

Rick Tobias noted that he had forwarded his comments via e-mail (which were included in the packet of comments distributed to the task force).

## Project Updates and Schedule

Tim said that the project team is continuing to develop and define assumptions for the TSM/TDM concepts and will share those at the December meeting. He said the low-build option is also still a work in progress and that its development hinges on resolution of the threshold criteria discussion between ODOT and DLCD.

Tim reviewed the schedule for the rest of the year:

- October 17 - understand
- October 24 - narrow down
- November 8 and 14 - Open houses (Roth's and Highland Elementary)
- December 5 - decide

## Evaluation Results

Tim stressed that the evaluation results were to be viewed as an evaluation tool, not a final answer and should be considered iterative – there is quite a ways to go to the ultimate decision. Kristin did a PowerPoint presentation of the alternatives evaluation results also stressing that these are reflections or impressions of the model. The Task Force will make the final decisions about recommendations. The evaluation score of each alternative based on the 5 goals was presented, then the contributions by criteria.

Project cost estimates included construction costs, allowance for engineering and design, right-of-way acquisition, and contingency. The costs are in 2012 dollars and the amount of structure and length of crossings significantly influenced costs. Dave Simmons noted that the costs are not just for the bridge alone, but represent the whole package of system improvements.

A number of Task Force questions and comments followed, with significant discussion around a number of them:

- Mark Becktel observed that the green alternative goes through a park, an urban renewal area, an elementary school, a major food processing plant and yet receives high rankings on several of the goals. This does not seem intuitive!
- How was the methodology developed to measure the various criteria? Bob Cortright noted there was only a 1% variation in air quality measurements and yet some alternatives received four points and others one.
- What about the methodology for the traffic intrusion criterion? Does it show an absolute increase?
- Did business impacts in Red capture the Edgewater area?
- How do business impacts show up in the +Red alternatives? Kristin said that there were more right-of-way impacts than expected.

- Betsy Belshaw said that she doesn't dispute the criteria or the work done but is having difficulty understanding the impacts that would result. It seems like we've worked so hard on the criteria but "look what we have done!"
- In goal one, what do travel times measure? There is very little difference – travel time wasn't a differentiator. What does 2.0 second travel time mean?
- This seems to allow us to group and then make choices based on values. We need to use our judgment and use this as an elimination tool, not a selection tool.
- Are we in danger for a lawsuit if we select something that doesn't rank as high?
- Did you model railroad/traffic interaction i.e. frequency of trains, duration of time traffic is backed up?
- How did neighborhood cohesion impacts measure on the west side versus the east side.
- Access to the river was measured by looking at the total footprint then assigning qualitative measures.
- Can we do a sensitivity analysis of air quality, bike/ped, traffic intrusion, and travel time (railroad interface)?

After the discussion of the alternatives results and recording of key issues for follow-up for the next meeting, Tim asked each task force member how the team was doing with the process and where they were in terms of eliminating some of the alternatives:

- Warren Bednarz – wants to keep an open mind, take a second look at sensitivity results.
- Leon Fischer – this is a lot to absorb – wants to keep an open mind.
- Mark Becktel – orange as an example only.
- Sam Litke – need more time.
- Bob Cortright – would like to go through the criteria and see how many are like air quality (no significant difference).
- Darlene Strozut – a lot to absorb still. From the Highland Neighborhood perspective, the definition of cohesion is a bit different. Streets are a part of it, but also school and park and the access to them. The project may not touch them but if it cuts off access that ends neighborhood cohesion.
- Aaron Geisler – look forward to next week and new information.
- Betsy Belshaw – need to read the material.
- Glen Hadley – tonight represents what was assumed from the beginning – build a new bridge – time has not been spent on TDM/TSM or Low Build. Good modeling was not used. All the alternatives are only directed towards traffic. Do we start narrowing down next time? How do we think about those in the "middle?" Need help with those.

- Brandy Humphreys – are you eliminating TSM/TDM?
- Mike Jaffe – we’re focusing on a highway bridge when we need to consider all modes. Would like to create separate column – “here are things that didn’t get evaluated”, i.e. railroad interaction, costs, schools (public vs. private). What if there is additional information we want to have taken into account that can’t be quantified? (Tim responded that Task Force members should e-mail the project team with their questions).
- Cindy Schmitt – the project team has done a thorough job and she is impressed with the process. She is taking “on faith” that the work done so far is valid. At this point we should be looking for the red flags – a lot of details will come out in the next step.
- Doug Parrow – the team looked at factors without significant impact – you should zero those out and see how they rank. ODOT mobility standard is leading us to a result where we’ll do nothing or find ½ million dollars to do something. ODOT mobility standard is yielding the result that we can’t do a little bit to make things a little better.

## Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m. The next meeting will be October 24 at Pringle Hall for a continuation of the discussion of the evaluation results, including responses to comments about the methods or results.