



Oversight Team

ATTENDEES:	Sam Brentano/Marion County, Hersch Sangster for Lloyd Chapman/Salem-Keizer Transit District, Cathy Clark/City of Keizer, Dan Clem/City of Salem, Dave Cox/FHWA, Jeff Scheick /ODOT
UNABLE TO PARTICIPATE:	Tom Ritchey/Polk County
STAFF PARTICIPANTS:	Dan Fricke/ODOT, Julie Warncke/City of Salem, Rod Thompson, ODOT/Dave Simmons/CH2M HILL, Marcy Schwartz/CH2M HILL
GUESTS:	Richard Schmid/SKATS, Mike Jaffe/SKATS, Richard Walsh/Keizer Council President
DATE:	December 15, 2006

Introductions and Agenda Review

Following self-introductions, Marcy Schwartz indicated the key meeting objective was review and discussion of the Evaluation Framework for input to the Task Force. Although the initial agenda included an action item to adopt the Evaluation Framework, this action will be postponed until January to allow the Task Force time to complete its discussion of the framework and to formulate a recommendation to the Oversight Team (OT).

Public Comment

Richard Walsh expressed the importance of looking at the big picture and avoiding a narrow set of goals for the project. It is critical to consider improved mobility for people traveling from I-5 to the coast, and from I-5 to the Salem Parkway to Highway 22 in addition to travel between west Salem and downtown.

Public and Agency Involvement Update

Dave Simmons described the Agency Scoping meeting held on November 30. All of the potential cooperating and participating agencies were invited, and representatives of three agencies not already involved in the project attended: the Salem-Keizer School District, the Oregon Economic and Community Development Department, and the West Valley Housing Authority. The Coordination Plan proscribes approaches for ongoing communication with them throughout the project.

A total of about 130 people attended the public open houses on December 6 and 7. One of the presentations was recorded on CCTV and is available for replay. A link to the CCTV presentation will be added to the project website. Participants were asked to provide input

on the Project Purpose and Need as well as project issues and concerns. This information will be summarized in a Scoping Report.

The group agreed it is important to respond to public comments within the context of other past and ongoing transportation planning activities related to the project. People are less likely to have a “knee jerk” reaction to project information if they feel connected to the project in between major outreach events. OT members can serve as “ambassadors” of the project to various interest groups within their constituencies. Communications should make clear that the scope of this project includes trips through the community from I-5 to Highway 22 as well as local trips, but the project is not intended to solve all the transportation system problems.

Evaluation Framework

The group discussed the threshold criteria related to need statements #1-4 as revised at the December 13 Task Force meeting. They agreed the criteria should be broad enough to ensure a range of alternatives, but not so broad as to require analysis of all the concepts explored in the previous SKATS study. Members felt it was important to ensure we focus on the options that best meet the project’s purpose and need rather than spending resources on concepts that do a poor job of meeting the stated purpose. FHWA and ODOT both indicated that more specific criteria on volume-to-capacity ratios and vehicle hours of delay (such as the ones proposed by the Task Force) were preferable to more generic statements such as “substantial” improvement. It was agreed that using specific measures associated with the Purpose and Need Statement was also preferable to specifying a geographic area in which alternatives must be located. They agreed that using the terms “approximately 70 percent” and “approximately 25 percent” was acceptable to ensure concepts were not eliminated arbitrarily because they missed the threshold by a few percentage points.

Members asked if these threshold criteria would ensure that congestion under the future Build condition would be less than under the existing conditions. Staff responded that alternatives can be created to improve future conditions in relation to current congestion levels by combining features that reduce demand with those that add capacity. The threshold criteria only guarantee that conditions will be better under the Future Build condition than under the Future No Build condition.

The staff also verified that the threshold criteria concerning future volume-to-capacity ratios and vehicle hour of delay take into account induced demand; the model will factor in the relative ability of the concepts to attract demand in the future.

The group also clarified that the threshold criterion concerning bicycle and pedestrian facilities does not mandate that bicycle and pedestrian facilities be located on a new bridge. Wherever they are located, they would be required to meet the project design criteria.

The group discussed the threshold criterion related to the need statement #5 and agreed that detailed emergency response planning is a function of the emergency response department within the City of Salem and is not directly related to this project. The group reworded the threshold criteria to read “Concept facilitates existing and future emergency response” as a way to recognize the importance of the need statement and to ensure that all

concepts can be shown to address the issue. No detailed emergency response planning is expected to be incorporated into the design of various alternatives.

It was agreed that it is not necessary to include a threshold criteria for need statement #6. The group felt it should remain as a need statement and that it would most appropriately be addressed in the project goals and objectives where various financial strategies could be compared.

The group approved the threshold criteria as revised (see Salem River Crossing Evaluation Framework, Revised 12/15/06) and decided it would not be appropriate for them to suggest revisions to the goals, objectives and performance measures before they had been discussed by the Task Force.

Next Steps

The OT agreed to meet on January 12 from 12:00-2:00. It is assumed the Task Force will complete its work on the goals, objectives and performance measures at the January 10 meeting. If that is not the case, the OT meeting will be rescheduled.