



Oversight Team

ATTENDEES:	Dan Clem/City of Salem, Sam Brentano/Marion County, Lloyd Chapman/Salem-Keizer Transit District, Richard Walsh/City of Keiser, Cathy Clark/City of Keizer, Jeff Scheick/ODOT, Emily Laughton/FHWA, Tom Richey/Polk County, Bob Cortright/DLCD
STAFF PARTICIPANTS:	Dan Fricke/ODOT, Rod Thompson/ODOT, Adam Torgerson/ODOT, Julie Warncke/City of Salem, Richard Schmidt/SKATS, Mike Jaffe/SKATS, Dave Simmons/CH2M HILL, Tim Burkhardt/CH2M HILL, Marcy Schwartz/CH2M HILL, Ed Chamberland/W&H Pacific
GUESTS:	Darlene Strozut/Highland Neighborhood Association; Chuck Bennett/Salem City Council; Mickey Hayes/West Salem resident
DATE:	December 19, 2007

Introductions and Agenda Review

Following self-introductions, Marcy Schwartz indicated the key meeting objective was to select alternatives for analysis in the draft environmental impact statement (EIS).

Public Comment

Chuck Bennett indicated that he is the Salem City Councilor who represents the CanDo and Grant neighborhoods. He doesn't want an alternative in the Green corridor to be advanced, and has problems with the Yellow corridor as well.

Darlene Strozut represents the Highland neighborhood on the Task Force. The neighborhood association has not made official recommendations at this time.

Mickey Hayes is a West Salem resident who feels that none of the alternatives are acceptable, although those including the Red corridor are more acceptable. He is concerned that any of the alternatives will worsen the existing bottleneck at Wallace Road and Highway 22. He feels the project team should be considering the beltway concepts developed in 2002 studies.

Public Outreach Results

Tim Burkhardt presented written summaries of the November 8 and 14 open houses, the on-line survey, and comments received by e-mail and posted mail. He indicated that there was good participation at the open houses. Participants were asked which three alternatives they would like to see advanced. The White "family" of alternatives was selected most often. On-line survey comments and e-mail comments to the website included a broad

range of perspectives, from “all the alternatives are too big,” to “be sure to connect the alternatives to Highway 43 and the Parkway.”

Oversight Team (OT) members who attended the open houses made the following observations:

- Many people voiced opposition to the Green alternative because of impacts to Wallace Marine Park.
- West Salem residents seemed to appreciate connection to the Parkway and a direct connection to Hope rather than Wallace Road as a way to spread out the impacts.
- Many participants were eager to “get something done!” The existing situation represents a hardship for West Salem residents.

Narrowing of Alternatives

Tim Burkhardt presented a PowerPoint presentation summarizing the Project Management Team’s current thinking about the alternatives. Recommendations included carrying forward a broader range of alternatives than had been previously discussed including categories of improvements to the existing bridges, new bridge only, new bridge plus improvements to the existing bridges, and new bridge plus connection to Highway 22. (A No Build option also will be studied.) The Yellow and White alternative “families” were recommended for inclusion in the latter three categories. The three corridors recommended are Widen Existing Bridge, Yellow, and White. The Task Force recommended adoption of these staff recommendations by consensus with one abstention.

OT members asked the following questions (staff responses follow in parentheses):

- What does the new bridge only category include? (These alternatives would connect at Wallace Road on the west and Liberty/Commercial on the east).
- What is the level of service of the No Build alternative? (The volume to capacity ratio in year 2031 is over 2.0 in some intersections, over 1.0 in all key intersections)
- What are the advantages of having so many categories? (It is a way to manage risk because we can document the performance of these alternatives in more detail. This level of detail will enable us to better respond to stakeholders with interest in these lower build alternatives, and make the project more robust against potential challenges. It also provides more options at the lower end of the cost spectrum in the event lack of funds dictates the preferred solution).
- What improvements are included in the “existing bridge” alternative? Does it include ramps on the west side to Beaumont? (Each of the bridges would be expanded by 2 or 3 additional lanes. Ramps extend to Highway 22, similar to the “Red” alignments without the north/south piece. This is not the same as a No Build, but represents the “low build.” It is the low end of what ODOT is willing to consider with respect to mobility; it does not meet the mobility standards, but is responsive to requests from the public. It will likely cost about \$270 million, less than the others.)

- Do any of the alternatives include extension of Pine Street to the east? (No, that project is included in the unconstrained Salem TSP).
- What are your sources of information for your conclusions about 4(f) impacts? (We consulted FHWA environmental specialist on 4(f) issues.)
- Who indicated the Yellow alternative would be considered “inside the UGB?” (The DOT’s Department of Justice attorney and a land use consultant who specializes in goal exception issues advised us about the goal exception issues. Bob Cortright, representing DLCD, concurred. It might be possible to amend the UGB rather than take a goal exception).
- Is it possible to bring the White alignment inside the UGB? (It would be very hard to justify that UGB expansion.)
- How would acceptance of these recommendations affect the cost of the draft EIS? (We have not determined that yet, but even though there are eight build alternatives, the analysis cost would not be double the cost of the four alternatives originally budgeted – many of the elements are the same across the recommended alternatives). The OT requested additional information on project costs and encouraged the PMT to identify ways to limit study costs and to be more proactive in communicating with them about costs of the study.

Following discussion, the OT approved the TF recommendations by consensus. One member requested a minority opinion be expressed as non-support for the “Yellow” corridor. The group requested that staff present the alternative refinements at a future OT meeting for review. They also suggested investigation of the “Yellow” alternatives to ensure sound documentation of its impacts, but consideration of early elimination if impacts were determined to be “fatal flaws.”

Next Steps

Finance Strategies

Marcy Schwartz reviewed plans for the finance workshops and asked the group for comments on the timing and invitation list. Staff will send out the draft invitation list to the OT for review. Because it will require personal contacts on the part of OT members to get some invitees to participate, and because many of the invitees will be engaged in the February legislative session, they agreed that the workshop should be postponed until March. A preview of the workshop materials will be provided at the next OT meeting.

The formal financial plan, required prior to issuance of the Record of Decision, can only be prepared after the preferred alternative has been selected. Discussion of funding options for the bridge is complicated by planning for funding initiatives of OTIA IV, Connect Oregon 3, and other City and County transportation measures.

Dan Clem, Richard Walsh, and Cathy Clark volunteered to lead a discussion at the end of the finance workshop about next steps for community action on bridge funding.

Bridge Types

The next decision relates to selection of bridge types for analysis in the draft EIS. OT members felt the key considerations in bridge type are functionality and cost. It is critical to consider which types can be accommodated within the costs already presented. Because the choice of bridge type seems so constrained, it probably does not make sense to engage in a large public outreach effort on this topic.

Next Meeting

The next OT meeting will be on January 18.