



Task Force Meeting #5

ATTENDEES:	Russ Beaton/Land Use, Mark Becketl/Salem Public Works, Betsy Belshaw/Parks, Tom Clark/West Salem businesses, Bob Cortright/DLCD, 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, Sam Litke/City of Keizer, Doug Parrow/BTA, Tim Potter/ODOT, Darlene Strozut/Highland Neighborhood, Lorraine Pullman/Grant Neighborhood, Cindy Schmitt/Marion County Public Works, Mitch Teal/Economic Development
UNABLE TO ATTEND:	Warren Bednarz/Downtown Business, Mark Brown/natural resources, Scott Erickson/West Salem residents, Ismael Perez/Hispanic interests,
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:	Moya McKeehan/alternate for Darlene Strozut
DATE:	December 13, 2006

Welcome, Introductions, Public Comment

Tim Burkhardt welcomed the group and reviewed the agenda for the evening. It consists of an update on public and agency involvement and a review and discussion of the revised evaluation framework.

There were no public comments.

Public and Agency Involvement Update

- Agency Scoping Meeting, November 30th: Tim explained that this is a required step as part of the NEPA process and all affected agencies are to be invited. He said that very little happened at the meeting as there were only a few agencies who attended and who were not already involved with the project.
- Public Open Houses, December 6th and 7th: Over 130 people attended the two meetings combined and provided input on the purpose and need as well as other comments regarding the project. Tom Clark commented that the presentations and displays were great, and Julie noted that the presentation made on the second evening (in council chambers) can be seen on CCTV/government meetings/Salem City Council.

-
- Web site comments: Tim noted that there have already been 67 responses to the latest survey including additional comments and directed the Task Force to the handout which summarizes the responses.
 - CETAS, January 16: Staff will present the Purpose and Need Statement and goals and objectives to the CETAS group on the 16th.

Evaluation Framework

Tim introduced the threshold criteria explaining that these are “yes/no” criteria which are directly linked to project needs and serve as a set of minimum requirements for project concepts before they can be developed into alternatives. Tim also noted that concepts must “pass” all 6 threshold criteria.

Considerable discussion ensued about the use of specific percentage criteria to screen for reduction of VHD during the p.m. peak hour. Mark asked if we shouldn’t capture a certain percentage of the travel shed on either side of the river as well as on the bridges. Mike asked what was meant by “west Salem traffic district” and Darlene wondered how the boundaries of downtown are defined. Staff responded that they will append a map to the document to help clarify these questions.

Staff explained that the 70% reduction of VHD refers to the whole system while the 25% reduction of V/C applies to the bridge only and are based on 2030 P.M. peak hour modeling data.

Concerns were voiced about using specific numerical values which might rule out some concepts “too soon” in the process and that we needed some room for flexibility – it’s all right to have benchmarks but not hard and fast numbers at this point. We also need to clarify a multi-modal concept (transit and traffic). Staff said that the criteria are set up to accommodate changes to existing bridges, not just point to a new bridge. The NEPA process is trying to say here’s our problem and here’s how it can be solved. Do we need to establish a V/C minimum? (no, just deviation from standards).

Staff explained that they could not come up with measurements for Needs #5 and #6 at this point and suggested that they would be more appropriately evaluated during the goals and objectives process. They also explained that the reference to regulatory mandates is an attempt to flag them for future consideration as there could be fatal flaws (in relation to regulatory mandates) in some alternatives but we can’t tell until we start developing them.

The Task Force agreed that #6 should not be a threshold criterion but some felt that there should be a threshold criterion for #5 (emergency vehicle access), perhaps identifying outcomes in 5 year intervals (not just in 2030). Staff will work on wording for #5 and bring it back to the January 10th meeting. The Task Force approved, by consensus, the adoption of threshold criteria # 1,2,3,4,6. Criterion #5 will be discussed further at the January 10th meeting.

Next Meeting

The next meeting's agenda will involve concluding work on the evaluation framework and in particular, discussing the goals, objectives, and measures as modified based on previous meetings. It will be **Wednesday, January 10, 2007, from 5:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m. in the Anderson Rooms at the Salem Public Library**

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