

Salvation Army Kroc Center Access Feasibility Study Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #2 Meeting Summary

Date: Tuesday July 17th, 2012

Time: 6:00 pm

Location: Salvation Army Kroc Center -- 1865 Bill Frey Drive NE

Attendees:

Stakeholder Advisory Committee Members

Diana Dickey, City Councilor City of Salem

Robert Fox, Keizer Bicycle Community Representative

David McKane, City Councilor City of Keizer

Tim Potter, ODOT Area 3 Manager

Mr. Bill Puntney, Business Owner

Maria Salazar, Citizen and Salvation Army Kroc Corps Community Center

Kenji Sugahara, Salem Citizens Advisory Traffic Commission

Ms. Kate Tarter, Salem-Keizer Transit Board of Directors

Project Management Team

Nate Brown, City of Keizer Community Development Director

Mike Jaffe, Mid-Willamette Valley Council Of Governments

Judy Johnduff, City of Salem Transportation Planning

Clifton Serres, City of Salem Engineering

Consultant Project Manager

David Simmons, CH2MHILL

Meeting Summary

This meeting summary documents the major questions, comments and concerns discussed at the Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting. This summary follows the order of the meeting agenda.

Agenda Overview and Introductions

- Nate Brown opened the meeting, welcomed the Stakeholder Advisory Committee Members and gave an overview of the purpose of the meeting. The purpose of the meeting is to review and approve the Evaluation Framework and to introduce the six initial concepts to the SAC for initial feedback.

Follow-up of SAC Meeting #1

- Meeting #1 Summary—No changes to the summary were noted.

- Communications—Clifton Serres noted that staff received two items:
 - An e-mail from Bill Puntney regarding the study
 - A copy of a memo from Salem-Keizer Transit regarding the cost to add service to the existing Route which serves the Kroc Center. Kate Tarter noted that Route 14 is a one way loop route which currently provides service between Keizer and the Kroc Center. The Committee asked for more information regarding ridership. Staff will follow-up.
- Staff provided follow-up information on questions asked by the SAC at Meeting #1.
 - Counts on Eugene's Bike/Pedestrian Bridges. Mike Jaffe contacted a city of Eugene planner and they provided the following counts for the Delta Ponds and I-5/Beltline bike/pedestrian bridges:

2012 counts- late May

Delta Ponds Bridge over Delta Highway - opened last summer

7-9 AM 44 pedestrians and bicyclists

4-6 PM 117 pedestrians and bicyclists

I-5/Beltline Bridge -opened a few years ago

4-6 PM 87 pedestrians and bicyclists

Judy Johnduff noted that a count taken on a weekday in April 2011 on Salem's Union Street Bike/Pedestrian Bridge showed 930 bicycle/pedestrian trips during the morning, noon and evening peak hours.

- How does the Willamette University Bridge Compare in length to the proposed initial concept bridges? Judy Johnduff passed out an aerial photo of the Willamette University Bridge over 12th Street and noted the length of the entire bridge is approximately 700' including the built-up portions of the ramps. It was also noted that this facility does not meet the current standards for slope/grade relative to the ADA.
- Park Master Plan for Claggett Creek Conservation Area—Judy contacted the Parks Division. The Parks Master Planning effort for the Claggett Creek Natural Resource Area is conceptual and is consistent with the conceptual plan contained in the Kroc Center Access Feasibility Study Opportunities and Constraints Report.
- 1-mile walk and 3-mile bicycle travel areas. MWVCOG staff created maps showing the area reachable in a 1-mile and 3-mile distances based on the current road system and the areas reachable with a hypothetical new bridge over Salem Parkway and the railroad tracks. The maps don't project usage of the bridge, just the population in those areas. With a new bridge, over 3000 additional people are within a 1-mile walking distance, and over 9,000 people are within a 3-mile biking distance.
- It was noted that Google Maps indicates that, based on the current roadway system, it takes approximately 25 minutes to walk from Hallman Elementary School to the Kroc and approximately 40 minutes to walk from Claggett Creek Middle School to the Kroc Center.

Evaluation Framework

Dave Simmons stated that the purpose of the next SAC meeting in September will be to narrow the six initial concepts down to four Alternatives for further consideration. The Evaluation Framework will be used to compare and contrast these four remaining Alternative

Alignments. Dave asked the SAC to consider the following questions for discussion purposes:

- Are there any additional subject-areas that would help differentiate between the alternative alignments that are not represented in the framework now?
- Are there any that could be eliminated or modified?
- Are some of the criteria more important than others? Should they be given more weight?

Dave reviewed the evaluation criteria which are organized into 8 objectives:

1. Safety for Users of the Facility
2. Directness of Route
3. Facility integrates with the larger multi-modal system
4. Property and Environmental impacts
5. Transportation and utility impacts
6. Public Support
7. Cost
8. Ability to Phase the Project

Discussion included revisions to Objective #3 regarding integration with the larger multi-modal system. The SAC suggested revising the wording included in Criterion 3 to read: "Facility ties in with existing and planned bicycle, pedestrian, transit and roadway system." In addition it was suggested that the description be revised as follows: "One purpose of the study is to identify facilities that tie-in with the larger existing and planned bicycle, pedestrian and roadway systems." This criterion will assess how well each facility meets this objective.

The wording of Objective 5 *Transportation and Utility Impacts* was discussed. The SAC recommended revising the wording in Criterion #5 to state the positive. For example: "Positive-to-no impact to existing and planned transportation facilities and utilities during construction or as a permanent impact." The point descriptions would also change to "Positive or no impact to transportation or utilities"

Objective #6 regarding Public Support was discussed. It was noted that the listening stations at the Kroc Center might be too narrowly focused to provide a community wide opinion regarding the alternative alignments. Dave asked if the Committee had any other recommendations for listening station locations. Nate Brown noted that the study includes holding an open house to gather additional information. SAC members noted that it would be helpful to understand the source of comments.

Dave Simmons discussed weighting the Criteria and the SAC members participated in a weighting exercise. Results Below:

Number	Description	Weight
1a	Vehicle Conflicts	21.3
1b	Design Criteria	1
1c	Personal Safety and Security	18.8
2	Directness of Route	6.5
3	Integrates with Larger System	16.4
4a	Property and Environmental Impacts	9.8
4b	Possible Natural Resource Impacts	3.2
5	Transportation/Utility Impacts	4.9
6	Public Support	9.0
7	Cost	9.0
8	Ability to Phase	1

Six Initial Concepts

Dave Simmons handed out the six initial facility alignment concepts and provided a description of each facility.

- Concept “H” extends from the Kroc Center with a crossing of Bill Frey Drive and extends north-easterly along the future extension of Salem Industrial Drive to Hyacinth Street NE.
- Concept “M” is located on the south side of Mainline Drive and extends from Cherry Avenue NE to Hyacinth Street NE. This concept is shown with potential alternative alignment options (either an undercrossing or overcrossing of the railroad tracks) to the Kroc Center.
- Concept “SL” is the southernmost crossing alignment and extends from the Salem Parkway shared use path near Brooks Avenue NE with a bridge over Salem Parkway, a built-up section between Mainline Drive and the BNSF railroad tracks, a bridge over the railroad, a loop ramp with an at-grade crossing of Bill Frey Drive.
- Concept “SK” extends from the Salem Parkway shared-use path near Pleasant View Drive NE, with a bridge across the Salem Parkway, a built-up section between Mainline Drive and the railroad tracks, a bridge over the railroad tracks and a ramp ending on the south side of the Kroc Center grounds.
- Concept “PV” extends from the Salem Parkway shared-use path with a loop ramp leading to an elevated bridge over the Salem Parkway, the railroad, and Bill Frey Drive,

extending to the Kroc Center Property and ramps down on the north side of the Kroc Center property.

- Concept “UC” extends from the Salem Parkway shared-use path, with a loop ramp leading to a bridge over Salem Parkway, then ramps down to an undercrossing of the BNSF railroad tracks and then heads south along the east side of the railroad tracks to an at-grade crossing of Bill Frey Drive at the Kroc Center.
- During the presentation of the concepts, Dave Simmons showed photos of other bike and pedestrian bridges to illustrate the concepts.

Questions/Comments from the Committee

SAC members indicated that they would like to see a rough estimate of the costs of the alignments and a rough unit cost of the difference between a bridge section and a built up section of pathway.

Next Steps

- Project Site Tour for interested SAC Members –Judy will send out Doodle Poll
- Kroc Center Listening Stations – July/August – Staff will provide questions to the SAC for review prior to the Listening Stations
- SAC Meeting #3—September (Narrow from 6 concepts to 4 Alternatives for further consideration)
- SAC Meeting #4 – November (Review Alternatives and initial Evaluation Results)
- November - Public Open House on the 4 alternatives
- SAC Meeting #5—December (Select Preferred Alternative)
- Next Meeting Date—6:00 - 8:00 September 18th @ Kroc Center

Adjourn