



## Task Force Meeting #13

- 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, Kevin Hottman/City of Salem Public Works, Mike Jaffe/SKATS, Sam Litke/City of Keizer, Jeff Nepstad/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, Linda Girard/CH2M HILL, Randy Johnson/PTV America, Marcy Schwartz/CH2M HILL, Sam Seskin/CH2M HILL, Dave Simmons/CH2M HILL.
- GUESTS:** Peter Courtney, Diane Peterson, Steve Emerson, Edna and John Annard, Nomi Pearce, Lenard Jaecks, Adam Torgerson (ODOT), Eunice Kim (Statesman Journal), Diana Delacerna, Rick Tobias, Nancy Donaldson, Don Ferguson, Don and Elaine Wiley, Bill Drumheller, Jim Chesley, Eric Havig (ODOT).
- DATE:** August 15, 2007

## Welcome and Agenda Review

Tim Burkhardt welcomed the group and invited the guests to introduce themselves. He then reviewed the agenda and materials, including the TSM/TDM analysis, updates on concepts under consideration, a traffic data summary, and a review of the Task Force and Oversight Team decision process for the range of alternatives.

## Public Comment

Nancy Donaldson said that she has lived in her home in the Pine/Tryon area for 20 years and that the alternatives in that area would ruin her neighborhood. She asked that the Task Force consider using the existing bridges so as not to dislocate people.

---

Peter Courtney noted that the orange alternative would adversely affect his property and that there were huge right-of-way impacts on the east side as well as wildlife impacts on the west side.

## Range of Alternatives – Overview of Decision

Tim reminded the Task Force that, in anticipation of making a recommendation about the range of alternatives, please keep in mind that the choices relate to ways to solve the purpose and need statement and to try to identify anything that was missing. He also reminded them that we are far from picking an alignment and that it wouldn't be until December that a small range of alternatives would be selected to go into the draft Environmental Impact Statement.

## Concept updates

Sam Seskin presented the TSM/TDM Concept analysis and preliminary results saying that the intent of the concept is to meet the project Purpose and Need without adding "general purpose" system capacity. The concept proposed four elements:

- New high capacity transit service which would consist of two new routes, one on Highway 22 and one on Wallace Road, each serving downtown, each offering premium express service, and crossing the river in a dedicated lane. However, increasing the level of transit service in the model did not produce a significant shift in total trips across the bridge and the biggest effect in choice of mode was the price of the trip (see below).
- A lane of capacity across the river dedicated to transit, with supportive improvements to the roadway, pedestrian, and cycling system.
- A set of demand management policies that would complement the roadway and transit elements of the TSM/TDM concept. The principal strategy tested was the application of user charges for motorists working in Salem, including but not limited to the Capitol Mall area. Parking fees were used as the example and the results showed that increasing the area where parking charges were applied in the downtown area and tripling the average amount charged could reduce auto trips by 10%, double transit use, and double other trips such as car pools.
- A set of changes to comprehensive plan designations in west Salem. Changes would be adopted into the City's Comp Plan that accommodate more employment in west Salem (i.e. adding 2,000 additional jobs above the current Regional Transportation Plan base forecast). However, the model showed only a small reduction (2%) in westbound PM peak hour bridge crossings compared to the RTP base scenario.

Sam cautioned that TSM/TDM is not a stand alone concept (it doesn't meet the Purpose and Need) but will be included in the other concepts. Glen Hadley said that he didn't think the results of the transit study seemed to align with the reality of increasing transit frequency in Salem, increased ridership, and increased use of park and ride lots. He feels that transit can do better than the model shows.

---

Bob Cortright said he didn't think TSM/TDM should be considered as a free-standing alternative but should be considered as part of a combined package of modest improvements (i.e. the low build option). If we simply add TDM/TSM to all the other build alternatives it is difficult to determine how much of the benefit is associated with different elements of the alternative.

Glenn Gross asked the authors if they really looked at whether another bridge was needed – the memo needs to be clearer especially in its conclusion that TDM/TSM would not be proposed as a stand-alone concept. Russ Beaton asked about what travel behavior theories were incorporated in the study and Steve Perone responded that it was based on surveys of travel behavior throughout Oregon. Cindy Schmitt asked whether the TDM/TSM measures would be refined when the alternatives were narrowed. Warren Bednarz expressed concern about using parking charges as a user fee and referred to the Leland report which recommended lowering or getting rid of parking charges in the downtown area in order to help stabilize and revitalize it.

## Concepts Under Consideration

Ed Chamberland provided updates on the concepts under consideration based on some further technical work and the previous Task Force comments. Randy Johnson of PTV provided traffic details.

- The purple alternative begins at the Salem parkway on the east, extends south to Tryon Avenue, and connects to Wallace Road and Brush College Road on the west. Because it is so far north its connectivity is not as good and it also has no connection to Highway 22.
- Orange with red – not many changes. Begins at the Salem Parkway on the east, extends south to Tryon Avenue, and connects to Wallace Road and Hope Avenue on the west. Orange without red meets the alternate mobility standard. This concept would also require improvements on existing bridges.
- Pink with red – similar to before. Pink without red has no connection to Highway 22 and thus meets the alternate mobility standard. Pink begins at Pine and Broadway Street on the east, extends slightly south to cross the river, and then connects to Wallace Road and Hope Avenue on the west.
- White – begins at the Salem Parkway and Pine Street on the east, crosses the river and connects to Hope Avenue and Wallace Road on the west. Three variations advanced for further study, one with a connection to Highway 22 (Red), one without, and a third includes the connection to Highway 22 but that does not connect to Pine Street.
- Blue – same as before. Begins at Academy and Broadway Streets on the east, extends over the river, then turns south to connect to Wallace and Orchard Heights Roads on the west. With red it includes direct connection to Highway 22. Darlene Strozut commented that the design team needs to take into consideration railroad backups especially with the original blue.

- 
- Yellow begins at Hood Avenue and Broadway Street on the east, crosses the river and connects to Wallace and Orchard Heights Roads on the west. Yellow with red is same as before. Yellow only loses the Highway 22 connection.
  - Green begins at Market and Broadway Streets on the east, crosses the river and connects Glen Creek and Wallace Roads on the west. Green with red reflects some significant changes from the previous concept. The previous concept showed an eleven lane cross section at Glen Creek and Wallace Road. This design includes an interchange at Glen Creek over Wallace. This alternative only meets the alternative mobility standard because of three large intersections which still show considerable congestion.
  - Forest is made up of two new bridges (at the pink and green alignments), each serving as an independent bridge but developed at a smaller scale. Ed was asked why red wasn't included in this concept and he said the concept reflected the desire by some to do something smaller, less expensive, arterial not regional.

Marcy reminded the Task Force that mobility standards in the threshold criteria still needed to be defined by ODOT and DLCD. At an earlier meeting the two agencies agreed to put together a Low-Build concept that would take into account any improvements currently programmed, include common elements (i.e. Marine Drive, Wallace Road), include some additional improvements to existing bridges, and TSM/TDM. A key question to be answered is how such a concept would perform against the purpose and need. Bob Cortright further explained that it was an attempt to identify what we can do short of building a new bridge.

Concepts including a tunnel, double decking, the teal alignment, and making two 2-way bridges at the location of the existing bridges as well as several hybrids were recommended to be removed from consideration by the Project Management Team and the explanations were detailed on the Concepts Under Consideration sheet which was distributed prior to the meeting.

## Range of Alternatives Decision

Tim asked if the range of alternatives looked appropriate and comprehensive and asked for comments from each member of the task force:

- Tim Potter – finds the range still a “little dry” but doesn't know what to suggest to fix some of the “lacks.” It helps to have mobility flexibility; he is comfortable with the range.
- Mike Jaffe – feels white has good connections on both sides of the river. However, we're only suggesting white with red so what happens if red were eliminated. Would like to add a white only alternative.
- Betsy Belshaw – concerned about right-of-way impacts; appreciates all the work that has gone into the process so far.

- 
- Bob Cortright – thinks the range is good, he tends to be open to more alternatives so feels we need to make a clear case for concepts eliminated. He would have appreciated more explanation of rejected concepts.
  - Glenn Gross – range is okay, is concerned about east side impacts.
  - Doug Parrow – we need to think more about no build. None of these meet the Purpose and Need – all are detrimental to the bike/ped communities.
  - Aaron Geisler – thinks we’ve done a good job of looking at what the possibilities are. He is concerned, however, that almost all the options are extremely expensive and might delay construction thus continuing to funnel traffic into and through the downtown. If the alternate mobility is higher than 1.0 would that change the perception of other alternatives?
  - Sam Litke – good staff work. It would help to know some of the negatives. He’s looking forward to seeing the low-build scenario.
  - Jeff Nepstad – good range.
  - Russ Beaton – good job. Would like to see a little more aggressive move towards street car over the railroad bridge. Good range.
  - Fred Harris – appreciates the numbers. Would like to see a slight modification in the white alternative –
  - Darlene Strozut – Highland Neighborhood Association would like to propose an additional alternative that would be the white concept plus the red concept but without the Pine and Hickory Street couplet. This would allow traffic to exit from the bridge onto Pine Street, but leaves pine and Hickory Streets as they are today.
  - Glenn Hadley – wouldn’t want to close the door on other new ideas. The problem with most of the alternatives is that they still demonstrate no relationship to what TSM/TDM can do when incorporated into the alternatives. How much footprint reduction can be achieved by combining them? He added a caution about modeling assumptions. Be sure transit modeling uses up to date assumptions – many studies under forecast ridership. He also observed that in order to be a transit rider, one has to be a pedestrian first - make sure pedestrian mobility is not hurt and we need to be cautious that we’re not hampering transit’s ability to help.
  - Cindy Schmitt – range is good. She’s interested in TDM. It would be nice to have the options depicted in the graphics at the meeting posted on the web.
  - Leon Fischer – range is good. He’s worried that concerns about cost will reduce what we do. We’re continuing to grow, need to make plans for the future; we’ve got to move goods and services.
  - Warren Bednarz – what about the cost of a no-build? Would like to see red option with forest; would like more detail on bike/ped movements; would like to see the cost per percent reduction on each structure; cost per reduction in neighborhood impacts. (Marcy said that is exactly what the next step will do).

- 
- Tom Clark - appreciates all the information, good range. Curious about the impact of commuter rail and what it does to the assumptions.
  - Scott Erickson - would like to get rid of purple. Would like to see forest with red phased. Would like to see phasing in other alternatives too. (Tim commented that there will be a phasing component in each one).
  - Kevin Hottman - likes options. Hopes the project can keep moving forward and hopes that the task force doesn't adopt something so huge that it isn't feasible and/or too costly. Interested in alternate mobility - something that's feasible that can be built.
  - Lorraine Pullman - feels some of the alternatives are not only too costly but also too emotionally expensive. She doesn't feel it's good to have all the bridges so close together; she likes the white option

Tim responded to a question about a street car system saying that our TSM/TDM concept includes the possibility of street car.

Based on the Task Force discussion, two additional alternatives will be included for further evaluation:

- (1) White without red
- (2) White with red but without couplet

With these additions, the total number of concepts to be evaluated is 13.

The Task Force asked that the TSM/TDM concept include consideration of commuter rail - Burlington Northern (north/south); a street car system on an existing bridge or the railroad bridge with circulation in west Salem and downtown.

## Public Comment

- You are making the assumption that we're dealing with east/west traffic. However, most traffic is northbound. The east/west traffic would be best served by the existing bridges - you need a concept going way north (i.e. Keizer).
- What about incentives to live downtown? (i.e. high density housing, TSM/TDM).
- You need to model the railroad traffic interaction with the proposed alternatives as there could be some serious flaws in the efficacy of the analysis without it.

## Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m. The next meeting will be October 17 at Pringle Hall.