



Task Force Meeting #15

ATTENDEES: Warren Bednarz/Downtown Business, Betsy Belshaw/Parks, Russ Beaton/Land Use, Tom Clark/West Salem businesses, Bob Cortright/DLCD, Scott Erickson/West Salem residents, Leon Fischer/Freight, Aaron Geisler/Polk County Public Works, Glenn Gross/City of Salem Community Development, Glen Hadley/Salem-Keizer Transit District, Fred Harris/North Salem Business Association, Mark Becktel/City of Salem Public Works, Mike Jaffe/SKATS, Sam Litke/City of Keizer, Mike Karnosh/Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde, Doug Parrow/BTA, Tim Potter/ODOT, Lorraine Pullman/Grant Neighborhood, Cindy Schmitt/Marion County Public Works, Darlene Strozut/Highland Neighborhood.

UNABLE TO ATTEND: Mark Brown/Natural Resources, Ismael Perez/Hispanic interest,

STAFF PARTICIPANTS: Dan Fricke/ODOT, Julie Warncke/City of Salem, Rod Thompson/ODOT, Tim Burkhardt/CH2M HILL, Ed Chamberland/W & H Pacific, Kristin Hull/ CH2M HILL, Dave Simmons/CH2M HILL.

GUESTS: Nomi Pearce, Les Gilbert, Rick Tobias, Diana Delacerna, Eunice Kim.

DATE: October 24, 2007

Welcome and Agenda Review

Tim Burkhardt welcomed the group. He then reviewed the agenda and meeting materials, including the evaluation results memo and results table, ranking of alternatives by goal, cost table, existing bridge graphic, and copy of the powerpoint presentation.

Public Comment

Tim invited the public audience to introduce themselves and any organizational affiliation and then address the group if they had any comments.

Evaluation Results (continued from last week)

Responses to Task Force Questions

Kristin Hull summarized the memo sent to Task Force members (“Responses to Questions from October 17, 2007, Task Force Meeting”) and presented a PowerPoint on the same topics, including: 1) response to requests from Task Force, 2) Revised evaluation results, and 3) Sensitivity Results.

Kristin 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 6th to 11th because so much of its benefit was tied to the mobility score. Others changed by just one position up or down.

“Sticky Dot” Exercise

Tim provided each Task Force member with 7 colored dots. Members were asked to place one dot on each alternative (listed on flip chart paper posted on the wall) that they were ready to eliminate from further consideration, understanding that this was just a preliminary indication of their opinions. Members were not required to use all 7 dots but rather only as many as they were ready to eliminate. Only one dot per alternative per Task Force member was allowed. The results were as follows:

Number of “Sticky Dots” to eliminate from further consideration

Purple	13
Orange + Red	7
Orange	11
White + Red	0
White + Red Light	1
White	3
Pink + Red	3
Pink	6
Blue + Red	14
Yellow + Red	7
Yellow	10
Green + Red	12
Forest	14

Discussion of Narrowing of Alternatives

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 Task Force members noted the following advantages and disadvantages of the alternatives, as recorded on flip charts.

Purple

- High cost
- Flood plain impacts equals high mitigation costs
- Doesn't create regional connection to 22
- Doesn't relieve congestion on existing bridges
- Would only serve 29% of projected traffic
- Too far from existing bridges to serve traffic on bridges
- Least cost effective
- Alternative least achieves purpose and need
- Would not start the "right" beltline if that is your aim
- + Least impact to existing infrastructure, ROW, houses, etc.

Orange + Red

- Major intersection with Wallace Road – neighborhood impacts
- Other red options are better red options
- Doesn't serve east side well
- Residential impacts on east side
- White + red does what orange + red is trying to do but better and costs less
- + Good for regional freight traffic but probably get with white
- + Has red to relieve impact to Wallace and Hope
- + Less impact on Eastside neighborhood
- + Direct access to Parkway
- + Tryon might be a good connection even if orange option isn't good?

Orange

- Expensive
- Doesn't serve anything on west side
- Build structure for no good reason, white is better for similar function

-
- Residential impacts
 - Elevated roadway on eastside seems “dumb,” “no common sense.”
 - Serves only Parkway, not rest of system
 - Prefer with red – too much infrastructure if not with red
 - Destructive structure to neighborhood (aesthetics)
 - Business impacts
 - Too far north on west side
 - Flood plain impacts
 - Existing bridge impact would be disruptive to downtown
 - + Good for freight? Maybe not without red

Blue + Red

- Destructive to neighborhoods, would never be supported. School, park and neighborhood impacts. Lack of east connection; potential railroad conflict
- East terminus doesn’t go anywhere – dead end at Highland.
- No obvious eastern connections – only neighborhood
- Railroad conflict
- Highest impact on business and residences
- Significant impacts to existing streets
- Disruptive to neighborhood cohesion
- Waste to consider further
- Tree canopy impacts
- + Could relieve issues related to railroad breakdown
- + Likes that it serves trips in middle

Yellow

- Doesn’t address E-W issue
- High traffic intrusion
- Same as green (neighborhood, Commercial/Liberty impacts)
- Traffic makes it worse than green (Hood)
- Would impact school (Hood)
- Traffic congestion and safety on Fairgrounds Road

-
- Divides neighborhood
 - Takes nice affordable housing
 - Wallace Marine Park (affects future park development)
 - Railroad conflicts (so close)
 - Doesn't solve truck issue or regional traffic – not a regional solution
 - Little for transit
 - Impacts Broadway corridor
 - L/R Commercial
 - Hood/Broadway building impacts
 - Downtown impacts
 - High impact, low connectivity
 - Dumps traffic onto Fairgrounds without providing good route
 - Impacts Liberty/Commercial
 - + Similar to pink, so should evaluate both. Pink has similar, maybe worse, impacts
 - + Both regional and local bridge:
 - Local – close to downtown
 - Regional – couplet connection
 - + Good connection to Orchard Heights
 - + Fairground connection good
 - + Close enough to existing bridge to benefit downtown
 - + Might be a good option – between Grant and Highland neighborhoods
 - + Freight movement – moves traffic off existing bridges freeing up capacity on them for trucks
 - + Traffic on Portland Road might be good for revitalization

Green + Red

- Park and neighborhood impacts
- Urban renewal and commercial/employer impacts
- Urban renewal impacts
- Can't see Market connecting to regional road
- Both bridgeheads in congested areas

-
- Through park
 - Impacts food processing plant (\$)
 - Grant neighborhood, school impacts
 - Impacts Broadway – designated as pedestrian street, improvements planned for transit
 - Market street widening would have impacts
 - Employer impacts
 - Green would not make sense for transit – area already served by existing bridges
 - Intersection of Glen Creek and Wallace is already bad – almost impossible to fix
 - Marine Drive improvements would have impacts to buildings
 - Noise impacts to park
 - Elevated ramps and flyover would impact part entrance
 - New construction on Market and Broadway would be impacted
 - No regional component. Keizer might back out
 - Park impacts
 - Cheapest, not best
 - + Most cost effective
 - + Should honor evaluation and agreed upon structure
 - + Should keep a “middle” concept in
 - + Uncomfortable dismissing top ranked alternative and best C/B ratio
 - + Might be worth studying further to see if negatives can be overcome
 - + Low cost
 - + Bridge over park could be okay
 - + Can’t base regional decision on one business – might not be a great location
 - + Links E/W corridor
 - + Near other bridges so would relieve traffic on existing impacts

Forest

- Poor performance/twice the impact
- Park impacts
- Two bridges

- Park impacts – Marion Square, Wallace Marine
- High cost
- Addresses Salem needs not regional ones
- No 22 connections
- Natural resources impacted

Based on the discussion, the group reached the following preliminary conclusions:

X = remove from further consideration

? = not sure

✓ = keep for further consideration

blank = discussion pending

(15-2-0) = 15 in favor of removing from further consideration; 2 not in favor of removing; 0 abstaining

Alternative	Task Force (10/24/07)
Purple	X
Orange + Red	? (15-2-0)
Orange	X
White + Red	
White + Red Light	
White	
Pink + Red	
Pink	
Blue + Red	? (16-1-0)
Yellow + Red	
Yellow	? (14-3-0)
Green + Red	? (10-5-2)
Forest	X

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.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m. The next meeting had been scheduled for December 5 but there is a City-sponsored event that night that is in conflict. Tim asked the group to consider alternate dates, including Nov 27, 29 and Dec 4. Linda will poll the group to establish the next meeting date.