



Task Force Meeting #4

ATTENDEES:	Mark Becketl/Salem Public Works, Warren Bednarz/Downtown Business, Betsy Belshaw/Parks, Tom Clark/West Salem businesses, Bob Cortright/DLCD, Scott Erickson/West Salem residents, Leon Fisher/Freight, Aaron Geisler/Polk County Public Works, Glenn Gross/City of Salem Community Development, Glen Hadley/Salem-Keizer Transit District, Mike Jaffe/SKATS, Doug Parrow/BTA, Tim Potter/ODOT, Darlene Strozut/Highland Neighborhood, Mitch Teal/Economic Development
UNABLE TO ATTEND:	Russell Beaton/Land Use, Mark Brown/natural resources, Sam Litke/City of Keizer, Ismael Perez/Hispanic interests, Lorraine Pullman/Grant Neighborhood, Cindy Schmitt/Marion County Public Works.
STAFF PARTICIPANTS:	Dan Fricke/ODOT, Julie Warncke/Salem, Rod Thompson/ODOT, Tim Burkhardt/CH2M HILL, Linda Girard/CH2M HILL, Marcy Schwartz/CH2M HILL, Dave Simmons/CH2M HILL
GUESTS:	Anthony Boeson/FHWA, Moya McKeehan/alternate for Darlene Strozut,
DATE:	November 29, 2006

Welcome, Introductions, Public Comment

Tim Burkhardt welcomed the group and reviewed the agenda for the evening. It consists of a brainstorming session and workshop to develop goals, objectives, and performance measures for the evaluation framework. Tim also announced that the open house on December 7, originally scheduled for the Anderson Rooms at the Library, has been moved to the City Council Chambers

There were no public comments.

Purpose and Need Statement Update

Julie Warncke provided an update on the Statement of Purpose and Need that the Oversight Team had reviewed at their November 21 meeting and reminded the Task Force that the Purpose and Need is an evolving document which is reviewed not only by the Task Force and Oversight Team but also by CETAS, FHWA, agencies participating in a resource agency scoping meeting, and by the public at the open houses. The following changes were made by the Oversight Team:

- In the purpose statement, the words "...to and across..." were confusing and seemed to imply part of the purpose was to get people to the river's edge to recreate, etc. "to

and..." were struck leaving the statement "...through travel across the Willamette River..."

- Also in the purpose statement the word "minimizing" was changed to "alleviating." The Team was concerned that saying "minimize" could necessitate choosing an alternative that did the most to minimize congestion but did not help in other ways.
- Several grammatical changes were made in the needs statements. In statement six the word "feasible" seemed too subjective hence the rewording which reads, "...financial strategy for implementation."

Julie also pointed out that meeting notes from the Oversight Team which reflect the discussion around the changes are posted on the web site.

Evaluation Framework

Tim then introduced a group brainstorming session to identify goals and objectives for the evaluation framework. In response to several questions Tim clarified that "air quality" should be under the "natural resources" goal; that impacts to agriculture and urban growth boundary issues would be considered in "consistency with local/adopted plans;" bridge aesthetics would probably best be dealt with during the design phase; "impossible" alternatives would be removed from consideration during the threshold criteria evaluation; and "commercial impacts" should be placed under the "quality of life" goal. One member suggested that it would be wise to be sensitive to community and political support in the evaluation of alternatives.

The team then identified the following objectives:

1. Mobility and Safety

- Traffic congestion
- Emergency services
- Long term solution
- Connectivity to system
- Connectivity to I-5 (nb and sb)
- Connectivity to Hwy 22
- Avoid/minimize railroad conflicts
- Local/regional through trips
- Bike and ped connectivity to systems and destinations
- Bike and ped safety as it relates to vehicle traffic
- Injury crashes - vehicles
- Comprehensive solution - short term and long term (not just in 20 years)

-
- System redundancy

2. Natural and Cultural Resources

- Air quality
- Wetlands
- Flood plain
- Archaeological
- Historic

3. Community (quality of life)

- Residential
- Parks
- Environmental justice
- Commercial implications
- Neighborhood impact/integration
- Displacement of existing structures (adverse impact/opportunity?)
- Traffic in neighborhood
- Neighborhood cohesion (don't create barriers that bisect neighborhoods)
- Impacts on parks
- Access to river - enhance/don't make worse
- Increased walkability and bikeability (quality of life)

4. Regulatory compliance

- UGB
- Consistent with local plans
- 4(f) resources - parks/recreation

5. Cost and financial feasibility

- Implementability
- Complete solution
- Financially feasible
- Cost of design/construction
- Timeliness - as soon as possible - time value of money

-
- Maintenance costs
 - Funding source(s)

6. Design and Aesthetics

- Usable land under bridges (not a concrete wasteland)
- Function vs. icon

After the brainstorming session and a brief break, the team broke into small groups to continue to develop objectives and performance measures which follow:

1. Mobility and Safety

- Reduce through freight traffic in the downtown area
- Reduce overall vehicle traffic in the downtown area
 - Measure for objective 4 - use injury crashes not just v/c
 - Measure for objective 6 - do measure distance as it relates to directness

2. Natural and Cultural Resources

- Preserve or maintain riparian areas (measure - net area of riparian loss)
- Preserve or maintain existing trees in urban areas (measure - net loss of urban trees)
- Protect native plant species/habitat (measure - net loss of native species/acres of habitat loss)

3. Community/Quality of life

- Minimize negative impact to residences and businesses and schools, parks
 - Measure - Number of relocations
 - Measure - Access (residences - less traffic, number of residences affected by higher traffic count; Businesses - more traffic)
 - Noise
 - Air quality
- Neighborhood cohesion
 - Measure - number of existing routes
 - Measure - change mode - auto dependency
- Minimize negative impact to property values
 - Measure - market value
 - Measure - appearance - vegetation removal, blight

-
- Stimulate economic development
 - Measure - visibility
 - Measure - access
 - Measure - connectivity
 - Measure - address blighted areas
 - Maximize the potential to improve existing residences, businesses, parks and schools
 - Address environmental justices
 - Measure - maximize the potential to enhance underprivileged areas
 - Measure - Transit access
 - Measure - social service providers
 - Minimize construction duration
 - Measure - time (months) that an area is impacted
 - Measure - magnitude of the impact
 - Measure - number and size of staging areas
 - Access to the river (public)
 - Measure - number of access points
 - Measure - amount of river frontage
 - Maximize alternate mode connectivity and access
 - Measure - number pedestrian walkways
 - Measure - number of bike paths
 - Measure - number of bus stops

4.Regulatory compliance

- Meet City and County planning requirements
 - Measure - Qualitative scale of the likelihood that alternative can comply with city and county planning requirements

5.Change goal to read “Provide a cost effective, financially feasible and timely solution

- Change objective 3 to financial feasibility (delete “assure”)
- Minimize completion time
 - Measure - qualitative estimate of time to implement solution (project completion) after record of decision.

-
- Measure – incremental measurement of benefit over entire planning period?

6. Aesthetics

- Provide constructive use of the land under the structure
 - Measure – qualitative scale considering land use under the structure (e.g. park, recreation fields, skate park, nursery stock propagation, Saturday Market)

Check In

At the conclusion of the small group report out, Tim suggested the team take a few moments for a “check in” – an opportunity for members to express how they are feeling about the process, the progress, and anything else that was positive or negative about the experience:

- Glen Gross – process is going well; there’s a delicate balance between input and direction. Don’t hesitate to lead.
- Bob Cortright – (1) there is tension about what the scope of solutions is (just a bridge or other solutions as well) (2) it would be helpful to have some of the resource agencies talk about what their issues/concerns are, (3) it would be helpful to know what the funding realities are.
- Doug Parrow – appreciates written material to react to.
- Mark Bechtel – things are going well; open houses may or may not be successful. We need to get the word out.
- Mike Jaffe – public involvement needs to be part of the long term process – hope the public feels like they’re being heard all the way through the process. Would like to see a survey open all the time. Maybe we should post website comments and responses.
- Betsy Belshaw – it’s difficult to get people to an open house.
- Darlene Strozut – tonight made up a lot for last meeting. Each of the Task Force members should get their constituencies to attend a meeting.
- Aaron Geisler – appreciates the accessibility of the consultants.
- Leon Fraser – you’re getting us going in the right direction.
- Tim Potter – need focus on what group needs to do.
- Tom Clark – what is the open house agenda? The newsletter had too much information, too much detail. Let the Task Force know what questions come from the public and what the responses to them are.
- Scott Erickson – this part of the work (purpose and need and evaluation framework) is necessary because it is a mandated process and we will be sent back to square one

if we skip a step. Please e-mail the Task Force with information regarding updates on the website.

Next Meeting

The next meeting's agenda will involve concluding work on the evaluation framework. It will be **Wednesday, December 13, 5:30 – 7:30 p.m., at ODOT Region 2, Building B, Room 116 (Mt. Jefferson Room), 455 Airport Road SE.**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.