

## **PMT Meetings Summaries**

## PMT Meeting 1: OR 22(W) Expressway Management Plan

ATTENDEES: Austin McGuigan, Polk County  
Aaron Geisler, Polk County  
Mark Bechtel, City of Salem  
Kelly Amador, ODOT  
Dan Fricke, ODOT  
Rod Thompson, ODOT  
John Lucas, ODOT  
Stephen Wilson, ODOT  
Jamie Hollenbeak ODOT  
Dorothy Upton, ODOT

Haregu Nemariam, CH2M HILL  
Kent R. Belleque, ODOT  
Sumi Malik, CH2M HILL  
Matt Hughart, Kittelson & Assoc.  
Brian Ray, Kittelson & Assoc.  
Mike Jaffe, Mid-Willamette  
Valley COG  
Dick Reynolds, ODOT  
Larry Weymouth, CH2M HILL

FROM: Sumi Malik/CH2M HILL  
Larry Weymouth/CH2M HILL

DATE: March 15, 2007

Meeting Date: March 6, 2007

### Purpose of Meeting

The purpose of the first meeting is to reconstruct history of previous planning efforts, obtain guidance on where the project team needs to go and to develop resources for the consultant team.

Many attendees have worked on project before:

Aaron Geisler	Dorothy Upton
Mark Bechtel	Kent Belleque
Kelly Amador	Mike Jaffe
Dan Fricke	

### Project Background

The consultant team will validate previous analysis, alternatives, and make changes as necessary. Thus far, traffic counts have been requested. Those who have worked on the project before were asked to share about previous efforts and their thoughts on the project going forward.

**Aaron** – Board of Commissioners is interested in OR-22. Issues facing the project are access points, creating an interchange to access Independence, and moving the project towards construction.

**Mark** – the project needs to be integrated with plans eastward to the bridges; the existing at-grade intersections, for example at College, need to be made better; and there is interest in

an interchange at Eola Drive and closing Rosemont; in the past ODOT has had difficulty with siting an interchange at Eola Drive.

**Kelly** – Public open house participation

**Dan Fricke** – the project has had a long history. Originally ODOT tried to do the project with all in-house resources, but the plan couldn't be finalized. The region is committed to finishing the process.

**Dorothy** – she looked at area when working on the Rickreal Interchange. Thanh Nguyen did most of the previous analysis on OR 22, and Dorothy updated it in 2006.

**Kent** – he thought the project extent should be Greenwood to Doaks Ferry. His office has been supportive, and has provided resources and support.

**Mike Jaffe** – the project has been assigned to various people at the MPO. They have maintained a stakeholders list. Mark did land use modeling work with Dorothy. SKATS' interest is in the OR 22/51 interchange. They want it to go into RTSP, which must show fiscal constraint. SKATS would like OR 22/51 of the project to be an "included" project. Oak Grove Road on the west side is the MPO boundary.

Polk County has the most current aerial which is from June 2004.

Previous alternatives development assumed a design year of 2025. The current planning effort will use a design year of 2030.

## OR 22/51

Reviewing previously developed alternatives, Option 1, for OR-51 was the best interchange option in terms of how it served traffic; the WB-SB movement has the heaviest traffic.

Option 2, OR 51 had no connection to Doaks Ferry Road. Previous efforts looked at many options for Doaks Ferry Road, but couldn't make it work. Previous alternatives tried to use existing County roads as much as possible. A weigh station and RV park access on the south side are difficult to connect using a frontage road due to topography.

For the OR 22/51 intersection an at-grade solution that met Highway Design Manual (HDM) standards could not be found. Grade separation is needed for safety.

## Doaks Ferry Road

It is likely, due to topographic constraints, that Doaks Ferry Road will be left alone and at the most would be made right-in/right-out only for safety reasons.

The State park, which was the site of a weigh station, is a constraint because it is a section 4f resource.

## Greenwood Road

Five options were developed for Greenwood Road: leave as is; closed to right-in and right-out only; build an overpass; build an overpass with eastbound access limited to right-in and right-out only, and farmers wanted a full interchange, but volumes do not warrant, nor does

the crash history support a full interchange. Sight distances are okay at the intersection and there is a half mile gap in the median divider. Farmers' desire to get farm equipment across the highway is the greatest concern. All options except for closing the intersection are okay to move forward.

## Access drives

A fruit stand has two deeded accesses on OR 22. Hanson concrete pipe place has a deeded access because their yard was split by the highway. Eola Florist has two deeded accesses; however the flower shop is now closed. On the north side of OR 22, most accesses are off of County roads. Private accesses are mostly east of 51, in unincorporated areas of Eola.

## Land Use

There has not been much development along OR 22 in the past few years. Eola is now connected to 55<sup>th</sup> and homes have been development off of 55<sup>th</sup>. At Aster and 55<sup>th</sup> the land owner has planted a vineyard and has plans to construct a winery.

Residential land uses have grown on Doaks Ferry Road and Eola Drive, with more homes, apartments, and lots of duplexes. The City is improving S of Eola Drive, making Eola property owners willing to give up property for right-of-way (ROW), which may enable the closing of Doaks Ferry Road access to OR 22 and an interchange could be built at College Drive instead. Significant land use changes are north of the study area, and previously developed alternatives are still valid and do not impact the new developments.

## Previous Traffic Counts

Based on previous traffic counts, no left turns were made during the PM peak. Left turns were only observed during the non-peak hours. Drivers have modified their driving behavior recognizing that turning left on OR 22 during the peak is a safety risk.

Eola Drive and 55<sup>th</sup> are now connected which brings more traffic.

## Project Statement & Goals

The existing project statement and goals are four years old. The consultant team will revise the project statement and goals and ask for PMT feedback and revisions. The project statement and goals do not need to be a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) purpose and need statement.

## Goals

Previous goals relate to the refinement plan. This project is an Expressway Management Plan (EMP) which is new and less defined than an Interchange Area Management Plan (IAMP).

## Project Overview

We are looking forward to the next phase, an Environmental Assessment (EA) and an IAMP.

The alternatives will have planning level cost estimates. No formal decision document from previous planning efforts exists. The best available information is from a Public decision meeting – the decision document is very rough and mostly has comments.

## Public and Stakeholder Involvement

Stakeholders were on board at the drop off point. Updating on the alternatives, evaluation, and soliciting feedback on preferred alternative needs to be done.

## Responsibilities of the PMT (TAC)

The PMT will also act as a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). The PMT will likely have a role at the stakeholder meeting, and will be included to answer questions. The PMT will recommend one or more alternatives to forward to IAMP/EA process. Floating meetings poses a problem for most, and a standing meeting is easier to schedule around.

The existing evaluation framework could be improved. The consultant team will revise the evaluation criteria, suggested a new structure. The existing criteria use consumer report style measures, and the consultant team is not sure if this is the best approach.

## Process Goals & Change Management

The PMT needs a plan for change management. If the PMT sees problem or concern, let Dan and/or Larry know so they may develop a plan to address it and to share at the next PMT meeting.

The EMP process goals relate to Statement of Work. The Environmental constraints map is to raise any red flags with respect to environmental permitting, access management, land use actions and other constraints mapping.

The County is to give information for local plan amendments and Comprehensive Plan changes made with the Rickreal Interchange. The Comprehensive Plan had findings that made land use permitting smooth.

If the press asks any questions, please refer them to ODOT's Public Information Officer, Lou Thomas.

The eastern boundary includes Doaks Ferry Road; however, possible solutions can extend to College Drive. Traffic counts for College Drive will also be collected.

Polk County has the most recent aerial (2004). Polk County has an inventory of land use, building size. Dean Anderson is the GIS contact. Aaron can obtain board approval for the data to be shared.

Kittelson and Associates wrote a traffic impact analysis (TIA) for a gravel pit at OR 22/51, J.C. Compton, River Bend Sand & Gravel. Wally Lean was the attorney. ODOT approved a conditional use permit for large parties for Rancho Nuevo. An access permit may be issued on event by event basis. A subdivision was built on 55<sup>th</sup> and a TIA was done at that time (2003) for 55<sup>th</sup> Street and OR 22, which may be helpful.

There is an automated traffic recorder station on OR 22 by the pedestrian bridge west of OR 51.

## Project Boundaries

Greenwood Road is the west terminus, or more specifically a quarter mile west of Greenwood Road to the railroad overpass where the Rickreal IAMP study area ended. The cemetery, golf course and Brunk House (section 4F) are sensitive areas.

The eastern terminus of the study area is at College Drive, but project solutions will be considered only as far as Doaks Ferry Road.

ODOT does not want an interchange at College Drive right now, but will look into the possibility in the future. Polk County is interested and expects pressure from growth there in future.

Ideally an interchange would be sited at the Eola arterial and not Rosewood.

## Next Steps

Review the problem statement/purpose and need, analysis methodology and draft evaluation criteria. Set a regular meeting time. The best time is the 3<sup>rd</sup> Tuesday of the month, 1:30 to 4:00 PM.

Also get an ODOT right-of-way representative for the PMT.



## PMT Meeting 2: OR 22(W) Expressway Management Plan

ATTENDEES: Austin McGuigan, Polk County  
Aaron Geisler, Polk County  
Kelly Amador, ODOT  
Dan Fricke, ODOT  
Rod Thompson, ODOT  
John Lucas, ODOT  
Stephen Wilson, ODOT  
Jamie Hollenbeak ODOT  
Dorothy Upton, ODOT  
Haregu Nemariam, CH2M HILL  
Kent R. Belleque, ODOT  
Dave Warrick, ODOT  
Matt Hughart, Kittelson & Assoc.  
Thanh Nguyen, ODOT  
Ray Jackson, MWVCOG  
Julie Warnecke, City of Salem  
Larry Weymouth, CH2M HILL

COPIES: Brian Ray, Kittelson & Assoc.  
Mark Becktel, City of Salem  
Dick Reynolds, ODOT  
Roxanne Hanneman, ODOT  
Sumi Malik, CH2M HILL  
Mike Jaffe, Mid-Willamette  
Valley COG

FROM: Larry Weymouth, CH2M HILL

DATE: March 15, 2010

Meeting Date: April 17, 2007

### Purpose of Meeting

The purpose of this meeting was to review the revised draft problem statement, collect information about OR 22/51 alternatives development history, review revised draft evaluation criteria, report on project progress, discuss stakeholder involvement plans, and raise change management issues. Handouts were provided to support agenda topics.

### Draft Problem Statement

Comments included adding references under EMP goals to meeting applicable design and mobility standards of the Highway Design Manual.

Additional written comments are to be submitted to Dan Fricke by May 1<sup>st</sup>.

### OR 22/51 Alternatives Development History

The consultant team needs to have a list of the interchange forms already considered, and the rationale for screening/evaluation (if available). Dan still has a few more places to look



to find the drawings used in previous public involvement efforts. Dave Warrick, Dorothy Upton, Thanh Nguyen, and Kent Belleque will look to see what they can find, too.

## Evaluation Criteria

Discussion centered on providing a range of quantifiable measures for each level of effectiveness for each criterion, as appropriate. The criteria will be most effective in revealing differences among the alternatives if ratings do not include absolutes that few if any alternatives could meet (e.g., all standards are met; no displacements).

The Mobility criterion should address the HDM and County Road Standards.

The Connectivity criterion should de-emphasize local trips. Quantify system travel time and mainline travel time.

The Phasing criterion should include being fundable. Cost must address the financial constraint requirement (identify a reasonably foreseeable funding source). Include the SKATS plan in Plan Consistency criterion.

## Transportation Operations Report

Table 3 (handout) provides the unsignalized intersection analysis results and those intersections exceeding the 0.80 mobility standard. Results of Table 4 (handout) are based on SKATS model, ODOT future volumes tables data base, growth rate for 2030 conditions. Volumes are higher than what ODOT's previous effort showed because the latest data are 5 years since then; however, conclusions remain consistent with previous data. There is a need for a 6-lane section. The prudent action would plan to accommodate six lanes if not build them in the foreseeable future.

## Crash Analysis Report

Severity and type of crashes (handout) was based on two OR 22 segments and one quarter-mile segment of OR 51. It was decided to also gather data for the most western portion of OR 22, Derry Oxing to Greenwood Road, in the study area. A check of the crash-rate calculations after the meeting revealed that the actual crash rates are:

MP 18.61-21.19 69 crashes; 2.58 mile section; ADT = 29,000; yields a 0.50 crashes per MVM

MP 21.19-22.15 38 crashes; 0.96 mile section; ADT = 35,900; yields a 0.60 crashes per MVM

The comparable statewide rates for Other Freeways/Expressways for 2001-2005 ranged from 0.76-0.87 with a 5 year average of 0.80. Therefore these sections are lower than comparable sections of other state highways.

## Environmental and Land Use Constraints

GIS maps depicting existing land use and zoning have been produced to date.

## Stakeholder Involvement

The scope and schedule calls for ODOT to re-engage the stakeholders in April/May, looking toward an open house in mid-June, when alternatives will be presented. Primary contacts will be with the Farm Bureau and the Polk County Committee for Citizen Involvement (Austin to give contact info to Dan). Another group to involve would be the West Salem Neighborhood Association.

## Change Management

Need to add a representative from ODOT ROW to PMT (Roxanne Hanneman). Distribute meeting handouts as file attachments, when possible, to PMT meeting announcement/agenda.

## Next Steps

Review the problem statement and draft evaluation criteria and send comments to Dan Fricke by May 1st. Next meeting will focus on approving those documents, reviewing the applicable plans and policies tech memo, reviewing the analysis and refinement of alternatives, and making plans for the open house. Meeting date is May 15<sup>th</sup>, 1:30 to 4:00 p.m. at ODOT Region 2 Planning, Rm. 116.



## PMT Meeting 3: OR 22(W) Expressway Management Plan

ATTENDEES: Austin McGuigan, Polk County  
Aaron Geisler, Polk County  
Dan Fricke, ODOT  
Rod Thompson, ODOT  
Dick Reynolds, ODOT  
Roxanne Hanneman, ODOT  
Jamie Hollenbeak ODOT  
Kent R. Belleque, ODOT  
Dave Warrick, ODOT

Thanh Nguyen, ODOT  
Kathi McConnell, ODOT R2  
Anthony Boesen, FHWA  
Ray Jackson, MWVCOG/SKATS  
Julie Warncke, City of Salem  
Sumi Malik, CH2M HILL  
Larry Weymouth, CH2M HILL  
Matt Hughart, Kittelson & Assoc

COPIES: Brian Ray, Kittelson & Assoc.  
Mark Bechtel, City of Salem  
John Lucas, ODOT  
Stephen Wilson, ODOT

Dorothy Upton, ODOT  
Kelly Amador, ODOT  
Mike Jaffe, MWVCOG  
Haregu Nemariam, CH2M HILL

FROM: Larry Weymouth, CH2M HILL

DATE: March 15, 2010

Meeting Date: May 15, 2007

### Purpose of Meeting

The purpose of this meeting was to review/comment on the final Problem Statement, final Evaluation Criteria, Environmental Constraints tech memo, Plans and Policies Review tech memo, and Traffic Operations tech memo. The meeting also included a discussion of previously identified and newly proposed alternatives, stakeholder involvement plans, and change management issues.

### Document Review/Comment

Some participants had difficulty downloading documents from ODOT's ftp web site. Dan will e-mail files to those that need them. Additional figures to accompany the environmental constraints report will be coming from the consultants.

The Problem Statement will be revised to insert "statewide" before "expressway" and insert "and freight route" afterwards. Mobility of the Evaluation Criteria will be revised to read: "Relevant ODOT OHP mobility standards are....." And add, "Relevant ODOT HDM mobility standards for the expressway are 0.60 outside the MPO and 0.75 inside the MPO."

The Environmental Constraints and Plans and Policies Review tech memos need to mention the Willamette River Greenway Plan and show boundary on the map. Parcels in the greenway are already developed.

Additional written comments on Transportation Operations and Plans/Policies Review are to be submitted to Dan Fricke by June 1<sup>st</sup>.

## Previous Alternatives and New Ideas

Dan gave an overview of the previous alternatives. There is a working document he and Larry are preparing as a summary. The alternatives will be for Greenwood Road intersection, OR 22/51, OR 22 access and frontage/backage roads, and Doaks Ferry Road intersection. Figures of the previous alternatives were reconstructed by Kent Belleque, and copies were distributed. The EMP will need to include an access management plan. Dan will identify the interchange forms previously considered, and provide a brief rationale for screening.

A consensus was acknowledged that an all-PMT evaluation of alternatives would be cumbersome, and an initial evaluation would be performed by Dan and the consultant team. The next PMT meeting will be for input on their draft evaluation of alternatives.

## Stakeholder Involvement/Change Management

Stakeholders will be re-engaged in the process by Dan. An Open House will be held in late June (instead of May) after the next PMT meeting to review the evaluation criteria and alternatives.

## Next Steps

Review the Environmental Constraints and Plans/Policies Review tech memos and send comments to Dan Fricke by June 1<sup>st</sup>. Next meeting will focus alternatives evaluation and preparations for an Open House. The next PMT meeting date is the regularly scheduled third Tuesday of the month: June 19<sup>th</sup>, 1:30 to 4:00 p.m. at ODOT Region 2 Planning, Rm. 116.

## PMT Meeting 4: OR 22(W) Expressway Management Plan

ATTENDEES: John Lucas, ODOT  
Dan Fricke, ODOT  
Rod Thompson, ODOT  
Dick Reynolds, ODOT  
Roxanne Hanneman, ODOT  
Dave Warrick, ODOT  
Kelly Amador, ODOT

Thanh Nguyen, ODOT  
Ray Jackson, MWVCOG/SKATS  
Jerry Sorte, Polk County  
Dave Battz, City of Salem  
Larry Weymouth, CH2M HILL  
Matt Hughart, Kittelson & Assoc

COPIES: Brian Ray, Kittelson & Assoc.  
Mark Bechtel, City of Salem  
Julie Warncke, City of Salem  
Stephen Wilson, ODOT  
Austin McGuigan, Polk County  
Aaron Geisler, Polk County  
Kathi McConnell, ODOT R2

Anthony Boesen, FHWA  
Dorothy Upton, ODOT  
Jamie Hollenbeak ODOT  
Kent R. Belleque, ODOT  
Mike Jaffe, MWVCOG  
Haregu Nemariam, CH2M HILL  
Sumi Malik, CH2M HILL

FROM: Larry Weymouth, CH2M HILL

DATE: March 15, 2010

Meeting Date: June 19, 2007

### Purpose of Meeting

The purpose of this meeting was to review/comment on the draft Previous Public Involvement Timeline, draft EMP Outline, draft Alternatives Evaluation Matrix, and draft Preliminary Recommendations. The meeting also included a discussion of progress to date, stakeholder involvement plans and change management issues.

### Progress Report

Last call for revisions to previously discussed/reviewed technical memoranda: Purpose and Need, Environmental Constraints, Traffic Operations, and Plans, Policies, and Standards.

CAD single-line diagrams of the interchange alternatives and frontage/backage roads alternatives on top of aerials are being drawn. Ready around the Fourth.

### Document Review/Comment

Written comments on the following documents are due in 2 weeks to Dan Fricke.

No revisions to the Previous Public Involvement Timeline.

The draft EMP Outline indicated that the EMP will contain chapters typical of a facility plan; very similar to the Rickreall Junction Transportation Facility Plan. Dick Reynolds noted that Chapter 8, Next Steps, should include a schedule/timeline for future activities. Dan will send the electronic file to the PMT.

Discussion of the draft Alternatives Evaluation Matrix was largely focused on business access and impacts. Several evaluation criteria (i.e., connectivity, business, built environment) relate in various degrees to the viability of existing businesses along the highway frontage. Some tweaks to wording of the evaluation criteria might be needed. Additional notes in the matrix are needed to clarify ratings for the "Business" criterion. It would be helpful to list under the criteria a summary of the performance measures and impacts considered. The frontage/backage roads evaluation was simplified to the quadrants and focused on phasing, as there was little differentiation between alternatives/elements within each quadrant. However, the NE quadrant will receive further evaluation comparing existing and new roads use, and business and residential access.

Specific changes to be made to the matrix include:

- DFR-6: Mobility, change to empty circle, because the intersection is very near the mobility standard now.
- DFR-2: Connectivity, add "and businesses" to note.
- DFR-6: Connectivity, add "Better than DFR-5" to note
- INH-5: Change description to "Single Quadrant Parclo B Interchange"
- INH-6: Change description to "Parclo B Interchange"

Matt Hughart passed around a handout that presented findings of the interchange alternatives operations analysis. The PARCLO "B" (two loop ramps in the northwest and southeast quadrants – INH-6) will accommodate the projected 2030 volumes the best under unsignalized ramp terminals when access to/from OR 22 / Doaks Ferry Road is restricted. If the ramp terminals are signalized, then any of the interchange configurations will function at or at least close to the 0.70 mobility standard (depending upon lane configurations). If access to/from OR 22 / Doaks Ferry Road is not restricted, then the Single Quadrant PARCLO "B" (loop ramp in the northwest quadrant – INH-5) will function the best under unsignalized ramp terminal conditions. Overall, the findings don't differ much from the previous ODOT analysis; 2030 projected volumes are a little higher, partly related to the additional 5 years on the plan's horizon year, and the Doaks Ferry Road volumes are higher. Thanh noted there was a turning volume that seemed inconsistent, which wouldn't change the conclusions, but Matt will double check to see if a number was copied wrong.

Discussion of the Draft Preliminary Recommendation was put in the context of getting ready for the stakeholder meeting next month. This document will be revised per comments received from the PMT during the next two weeks, reviewed again at the next PMT meeting, and then presented at the Open House for public comment. Suggested revisions included beginning the document with an introduction that sets the overall context (purpose and need) for the EMP, and beginning each recommendation with a topical

heading; for example, "1. Mobility and Safety." Recommendation #4 should address access rather than economy in the first line. OK to discuss providing alternate access for businesses. Need to get list of Permitted/Unpermitted Accesses. Recommendation #5, regarding left-in and left-out barrier options at Doaks Ferry Road, will receive more study by ODOT (Dave Warrick and John Lucas) and reported on at next PMT meeting. Recommendation #8 should note that many of the proposed improvements would be in the MPO.

## Change Management

Dave Battz will be attending PMT meetings as the City of Salem representative instead of Julie Warncke. Some PMT members now have a scheduling conflict with another project's meetings that are scheduled to begin at 3 pm. We will try to set the agenda so we can adjourn by 3 pm in the future.

## Next Steps

Review the documents (above) and send comments to Dan Fricke by July 6. Next meeting will focus on redrafts and decisions regarding the alternatives evaluation matrix, preliminary recommendations, and preparations for the Open House. The next PMT meeting date is the regularly scheduled third Tuesday of the month: July 17<sup>th</sup>, 1:30 to 3:00 p.m. (target adjournment) at ODOT Region 2 Planning, Rm. 116.





## PMT Meeting 5: OR 22(W) Expressway Management Plan

**ATTENDEES:**

Dan Fricke, ODOT R2 Planning  
Rod Thompson, ODOT R2 Env  
Austin McGuigan, Polk County  
Aaron Geisler, Polk County  
Rox Hanneman, ODOT R/W  
Dave Warrick, ODOT Tech Serv  
Jamie Hollenbeak ODOT R2 Acc  
Chris Bailey, ODOT Roadway

Thanh Nguyen, ODOT TPAU  
Ray Jackson, MWVCOG/SKATS  
Anthony Boesen, FHWA  
Dave Battz, City of Salem  
Larry Weymouth, CH2M HILL  
Matt Hughart, Kittelson & Assoc

**COPIES:**

Brian Ray, Kittelson & Assoc.  
Mark Becktel, City of Salem  
Julie Warncke, City of Salem  
Stephen Wilson, ODOT  
Kathi McConnell, ODOT R2  
Dorothy Upton, ODOT  
Jerry Sorte, Polk County  
Dick Reynolds, ODOT  
John Lucas, ODOT

Kent R. Belleque, ODOT  
Kelly Amador, ODOT  
Mike Jaffe, MWVCOG  
Haregu Nemariam, CH2M HILL  
Sumi Malik, CH2M HILL

**FROM:** Larry Weymouth, CH2M HILL

**DATE:** March 15, 2010

Meeting Date: July 17, 2007

### Purpose of Meeting

The purpose of this meeting was to review/comment on the alternatives evaluation matrix and alternatives single-line drawings and discuss upcoming public involvement. The meeting also included a progress update and related activities. Time expired before change management issues could be raised, if any.

### Progress Report and Related Activities

The Holman State Wayside is OPRD property; it is being considered for closure and perhaps disposition. This could alleviate any future 4(f) issues if the property were sold or exchanged/transferred to ODOT. Work has begun on drafting chapters of the plan.

## Document Review/Comment

Written comments (again) on the following documents are due in 2 weeks to Dan Fricke. Not many comments were received this past month.

The draft Alternatives Evaluation Matrix was revised to include a list of features and performance measures. Some minor formatting errors will be corrected in the final version. A new Greenwood Road alternative, GWR-6 Offset Dual "T" Intersections was added. Concerns were raised that the GWR-6 alternative would not be feasible for farm equipment without some lane widening and fairly immediate access to the turn lane refuge. This would provide some improved safety if the overcrossing alternative were not soon funded for construction. A similar concept from the HDM (p. 9-63) was presented by Chris Bailey for a non-freeway interchange example (Figure 9-29).

Matt Hughart passed around a handout that presented findings of the interchange alternatives operations analysis. The PARCLO "B" (two loop ramps in the northwest and southeast quadrants – INH-6) will accommodate the projected 2030 volumes the best under unsignalized ramp terminals when access to/from OR 22 / Doaks Ferry Road is restricted. If the ramp terminals are signalized, then any of the interchange configurations will function at or at least close to the 0.70 mobility standard (depending upon lane configurations). If access to/from OR 22 / Doaks Ferry Road is not restricted, then the Single Quadrant PARCLO "B" (loop ramp in the northwest quadrant – INH-5) will function the best under unsignalized ramp terminal conditions.

There was further discussion about connectivity issues associated with closing access to OR 22 from Doaks Ferry Road. DFR is a major arterial. If not there, then perhaps a connection farther east near College Drive is needed. Drivers on DFR could be inconvenienced by shunting traffic west to the proposed interchange on a new road.

Discussion shifted to the color-coded drawing of the frontage/backage road alternatives. The backage road (dark and light blue) is a better alternative than the frontage road (purple) in the NE quadrant. Parts of the backage road could follow an old right-of-way. If OR 22 were widened as proposed, there would be inadequate R/W for the frontage road and multiuse path. It was noted that the backage road would likely be needed as a detour during construction of the interchange; if extended east to DFR, it would be an alternative for west Salem traffic.

The dark blue backage road (NE) would cut through recently constructed houses that don't show on the aerial, and in the NW through the middle of the filbert orchard on an existing private farm dirt road. It also would come out too close by standards to the ramp end. The land owner has shown some receptivity in the past to the purple backage road even though it would sever existing vineyard trellising, whereas the light blue road would not.

In the SE quadrant, the light blue alternative would go through a blueberry orchard, whereas the purple alternative would follow existing McNary Road until meeting up with Rickreall Creek and the old railroad right of way.

Access permits need to be researched. This is something Dan will do or perhaps the consultant could if the work order were amended. The plan will include an access management plan. The long-term goal is to close all direct private access to the expressway. Policy would be to not eliminate access until an alternative access was made available.

It was decided to resurrect consideration of the feasibility/constructability of the DFR flyover alternative, considering the possible acquisition of land now set aside for the Holman State Wayside.

## Change Management

No time. Adjourned before addressing.

## Next Steps

Review the documents (above) and send comments to Dan Fricke by August 3. Next meeting will focus on decisions regarding the alternatives, review of draft plan chapters, and preparations for the Open House in September. The next PMT meeting date is the regularly scheduled third Tuesday of the month: August 21st, 1:30 to 3:00 p.m. (target adjournment) at ODOT Region 2 Planning, Rm. 116.



## PMT Meeting 6: OR 22(W) Expressway Management Plan

**ATTENDEES:**

Dan Fricke, ODOT R2 Planning  
Rod Thompson, ODOT R2 Env  
Austin McGuigan, Polk County  
Aaron Geisler, Polk County  
Dave Warrick, ODOT Tech Serv  
Jamie Hollenbeak ODOT R2 Acc

Dick Reynolds, ODOT  
Thanh Nguyen, ODOT TPAU  
John Lucas, ODOT  
Dave Baltz, City of Salem  
Larry Weymouth, CH2M HILL  
Matt Hughart, Kittelson & Assoc

**COPIES:**

Brian Ray, Kittelson & Assoc.  
Mark Bechtel, City of Salem  
Julie Warncke, City of Salem  
Ray Jackson, MWVCOG/SKATS  
Stephen Wilson, ODOT  
Kathi McConnell, ODOT R2  
Dorothy Upton, ODOT  
Jerry Sorte, Polk County

Anthony Boesen, FHWA  
Chris Bailey, ODOT Roadway  
Rox Hanneman, ODOT R/W  
Kent R. Belleque, ODOT  
Kelly Amador, ODOT  
Mike Jaffe, MWVCOG  
Haregu Nemariam, CH2M HILL  
Sumi Malik, CH2M HILL

**FROM:** Larry Weymouth, CH2M HILL

**DATE:** March 15, 2010

Meeting Date: August 21, 2007

### Purpose of Meeting

The purpose of this meeting was to review/comment on previous plans for access management, current alternatives for the intersections and frontage/backage roads, draft recommendations, other chapters of the draft plan, and make plans for the open house. The meeting also included a progress update and related activities. Time expired before change management issues could be raised, if any.

### Progress Report and Related Activities

Dan Fricke and Aaron Geisler made a presentation to the Polk County Commissioners (sans Commissioner Mike Probst, who was ill) on August 14<sup>th</sup> at 9 a.m. regarding progress on the plan. Copies of the drawings of alternatives were given to the commissioners and reviewed by Dan.

## Document Review/Comment

Access Management Plan: Figures 7-1 and 7-2. These drawings are based on a field survey done by Dan Fricke and others back in 2001. What is shown is a short-term closure plan. However, as relevant for the current plan, access closures would be medium-term and after the frontage/backage roads were constructed. The long-term plan would be to close all private accesses to the expressway, unless and perhaps access could not be provided.

Dick Reynolds commented that whatever this plan proposes, it should be concrete, with definite actions, clarity about the sequence of events, and local commitments being made.

In Appendix L, the tble should be renumbered L-1 (not 6-1).

Alternative GWR-6 needs to accommodate farm vehicles if it is to be feasible. However, for safety, there's no beating the overcrossing if it can be funded. If the median is closed, so there is only right-in/right-out, drivers will adjust to a longer trip accessing the future proposed Independence Highway or Rickreall interchange to get to where they need to go. If that were done short-term, the long-term solution of an overcrossing may not be necessary later.

The NE-4 f/b road alternative should be dismissed because of it joins 55<sup>th</sup> St. opposite the end ramps. ODOT regulations do not allow that configuration because of the danger of wrong way entry onto the ramps by impaired drivers. Moving the intersection farther north would require use of 55<sup>th</sup> St. as a frontage road to the overpass and moving the interchange into the orchard more. The prevalent direction of travel is likely to be to/from the north hills residential areas, according to Aaron Geisler. The house near the corner of 55<sup>th</sup> St. and the highway may need to be taken for the interchange, so providing access to it is probably not an issue. The frontage road (labeled NE-1 on the drawing adjacent to the highway) would be taken when the highway is widened. Should renumber these alternatives differently (suggest NE-5 and NE-6). The little stub roads off of the SE backage roads should be deleted – add note that exact location will be determined later in cooperation with landowners. SE-2 would have to be a viaduct because of the change in elevation.

Dave Baltz mentioned that the City's is opposed to closing the Doaks Ferry Road approach to OR 22, even with a backage road connection to the interchange (DFR-2). A left-in is needed as well as a right-in/right out. Dave Warrick and John Lucas said visibility would be impaired by the barriers needed for DFR-6, the channelization alternative allowing a left-in. They suggested perhaps DFR-6 would work better if the access point were moved farther west, around the curve to the upland and straight stretch of highway, using the new backage road for an extension of Doaks Ferry Road. ODOT also will look again at the possibility of flyover ramps for OR 22 eastbound off/on traffic at the location. A better long-term solution might be to plan for an interchange in the vicinity of College Drive and make a connection to Doaks Ferry Road. ODOT also has some previously prepared conceptual plans for an interchange there. These drawings will be retrieved by ODOT and Dan will send them to the city and county. Discussion about the alternatives and possible new ones continued for the remainder of the meeting.

The PMT needs to decide on the Doaks Ferry Road and other recommended intersection alternatives and access controls at the next PMT meeting. Therefore, the Open House will be

postponed for a month. A draft Open House meeting announcement was distributed for comment at the next meeting.

Written comments on the draft EMP chapters are due in 2 weeks (Sept. 7) to Dan Fricke. Not many comments were received so far, as the files were just distributed late Friday.

## Change Management

No time. Adjourned late at 3:45 p.m. before addressing.

## Next Steps

Review the documents (above) and send comments to Dan Fricke by Sept. 7. Next meeting will focus on selecting a preferred alternative, review of draft plan chapters, and preparations for the Open House in October. The next PMT meeting date is the regularly scheduled third Tuesday of the month: September 18th, 1:30 to 3:00 p.m. (target adjournment) at ODOT Region 2 Planning, Rm. 116.





## PMT Meeting 7: OR 22(W) Expressway Management Plan

**ATTENDEES:**

Dan Fricke, ODOT R2 Planning  
Austin McGuigan, Polk County  
Aaron Geisler, Polk County  
Dave Warrick, ODOT Tech Serv  
Jamie Hollenbeak ODOT R2 Acc  
Anthony Boesen, FHWA  
Mike Jaffe, MWVCOG

Kelly Amador, ODOT  
Kathi McConnell, ODOT R2  
Dick Reynolds, ODOT  
John Lucas, ODOT  
Dave Baltz, City of Salem  
Larry Weymouth, CH2M HILL

**COPIES:**

Brian Ray, Kittelson & Assoc.  
Mark Bechtel, City of Salem  
Julie Warncke, City of Salem  
Ray Jackson, MWVCOG/SKATS  
Stephen Wilson, ODOT  
Dorothy Upton, ODOT  
Jerry Sorte, Polk County  
Rod Thompson, ODOT R2 Env  
Chris Bailey, ODOT Roadway

Rox Hanneman, ODOT R/W  
Kent R. Belleque, ODOT  
Thanh Nguyen, ODOT TPAU  
Matt Hughart, Kittelson & Assoc  
Haregu Nemariam, CH2M HILL  
Sumi Malik, CH2M HILL

**FROM:** Larry Weymouth, CH2M HILL

**DATE:** March 15, 2010

Meeting Date: September 18, 2007

### Purpose of Meeting

The purpose of this meeting was to discuss closure and acquisition options for access management, alternatives and recommendations for the intersections and frontage/backage roads, the draft plan, and make plans for the open house. The meeting also included a progress update and related activities. Time expired before change management issues could be raised, if any.

### Progress Report and Related Activities

Dan Fricke reported he had a conversation with Bob Cortright/DLCD regarding land use issues. Bob thought some of the TPR issues had received short-shrift. Dan explained that more details and analysis would be included in the IAMP, as the EMP was not intended to provide land use findings. Dan will review the draft EMP to see if some additions would be appropriate.

## Alternatives Comments

Greenwood Road: There is not much support in ODOT for the offset dual T alternative because of the design issues associated with accommodating farm equipment. ODOT's consensus is to dismiss it at this point. In the future, when increased traffic flow causes safety problems and there are no funds available to construct the overpass, this would leave few options but to close the intersection entirely or restrict movements to RI/RO. This would require significant out of direction travel via the Rickreall interchange.

Independence Hwy: The analysis indicated a grade separation is needed. Ramp performance depends on what happens at Doaks Ferry Road (access closed so all traffic must use interchange, or access remains).

Frontage/Backage Roads: NE-1 (frontage) is not feasible if the highway eventually is to be widened. NE-2 (backage) is preferred. Using the existing county roads, such as Aster, is favored. NW-1 would be the most direct route, although NW-2 also would work. SE-1 (McNary Road) is preferred over SE-2 because of no blueberry farm impacts. However, SE-1 is not very cost effective. A connection between the north and south sides would be good (tunnel) and an access to the expressway around 50<sup>th</sup> Avenue would provide more direct travel.

Doaks Ferry Road: Polk County and the City of Salem met to discuss the alternatives. Entirely closing DFR is not acceptable. Prohibiting/preventing the left-out movement is acceptable. ODOT presented a new alternative using Mill Street as a relocated access connected to the proposed backage road (NE-2) and then to DFR. Dave Baltz would like to have a drawing of this. Long-term the preferred solution for the city-county is a new connection (interchange) between the BPA station and College Drive. An interchange at DFR is not feasible due to topographic constraints. At either location, there could be geotechnical issues to deal with.

As the PMT lacked consensus on some alternative, the Open House will be postponed. Scheduling should be such so as not to conflict with the Salem River Crossing public meetings coming up (dates to be determined).

Written comments on the draft EMP chapters are due by the end of the month to Dan Fricke. Not many comments have been received so far.

## Change Management

Larry Weymouth will be on vacation for two weeks in October 1-12.

## Next Steps

Next meeting will focus on getting consensus on favored alternatives and preparing for the Open House in late October. The next PMT meeting date is the regularly scheduled third Tuesday of the month: October 16th, 1:30 to 3:00 p.m. (target adjournment) at ODOT Region 2 Planning, Rm. 116.

## PMT Meeting 8: OR 22(W) Expressway Management Plan

**ATTENDEES:**

Dan Fricke, ODOT R2 Planning  
Austin McGuigan, Polk County  
Darrel James, ODOT R2  
Dave Warrick, ODOT Tech Serv  
Anthony Boesen, FHWA  
Mike Jaffe, MWVCOG  
Rod Thompson, ODOT R2 Env

Thanh Nguyen, ODOT TPAU  
Kelly Amador, ODOT  
Kathi McConnell, ODOT R2  
Dick Reynolds, ODOT  
Brent McCall, ODOT  
Dave Baltz, City of Salem  
Larry Weymouth, CH2M HILL

**COPIES:**

Brian Ray, Kittelson & Assoc.  
Mark Bechtel, City of Salem  
Julie Warncke, City of Salem  
Ray Jackson, MWVCOG/SKATS  
Stephen Wilson, ODOT  
Dorothy Upton, ODOT  
Jerry Sorte, Polk County  
Chris Bailey, ODOT Roadway  
John Lucas, ODOT Rox

Hanneman, ODOT R/W  
Kent R. Belleque, ODOT  
Jamie Hollenbeak ODOT R2 Acc  
Aaron Geisler, Polk County  
Matt Hughart, Kittelson & Assoc  
Haregu Nemariam, CH2M HILL  
Sumi Malik, CH2M HILL

**FROM:** Larry Weymouth, CH2M HILL

**DATE:** March 15, 20107

Meeting Date: November 20, 2007

### Purpose of Meeting

The purpose of this meeting was to discuss closure and acquisition options for access management, alternatives and recommendations for the intersections and frontage/backage roads, the draft plan, and make plans for the open house on November 28. The meeting also included a progress update and related activities.

### Change Management

Aaron Geisler, Polk County Public Works Director, will be leaving his position at the end of the month to take a position with W&H Pacific. Austin McGuigan and Greg Hanson, Chief Administrative Officer, will be splitting Aaron's work until a replacement is hired. Tim Gerling, Salem Public Works Director, is retiring.

## Progress Report and Related Activities

Plans are set for the Open House next week and newsletter/invitations have been mailed. Should bring drawings of alternatives, topo of area, and spacing standards graphic from OHP.

## Alternatives Comments

A summary of the current recommendations was distributed.

The DFR short-term alternative should be to stripe and sign the intersection for no left-out. Medium-term would retain the right-in only but add a deceleration lane. Other movements would be relocated farther west in the vicinity of Mill Street. A tunnel/undercrossing at Spring Street would provide connectivity for the north and south sides of the highway and would be a long-term option along with an interchange at College Drive. Access east of the weigh station would provide a connection to the undercrossing.

The GWR medium-term would be ROW acquisition, and the long-term alternative would be an overpass, with addition of the north frontage road as a long-term alternative, if needed.

The INH alternative will be decided during the EA, but a grade separation is needed.

Frontage/Backage Roads: NW-1 is not feasible because of the vineyard trellising impacts. NE-1 (frontage) is not feasible if the highway eventually is to be widened. NE-2 (backage) is preferred. Using the existing county roads, such as Aster, is favored. SE-1 (McNary Road) is preferred over SE-2 because of no blueberry farm impacts. However, SE-1 is not very cost effective.

Dave Baltz distributed a copy of a letter from Scott Erickson, Chair of the West Salem Neighborhood Association, which invited an ODOT representative to the association's next meeting. Dan said he would look into scheduling it. The association is most interested in the DFR intersection and possible College Drive interchange.

Reboot: Written comments on the draft EMP chapters are due by the end of the month to Dan Fricke. Not many comments have been received so far.

## Next Steps

Distribute Open House summary. Revise EMP and produce Final Draft. Complete project by end of March. Initiate EA project. The next PMT meeting date is the regularly scheduled third Tuesday of the month: December 18, 1:30 to 3:00 p.m. (target adjournment) at ODOT Region 2 Planning, Rm. 116.