

Salem Area Mass Transit District  
Board of Directors

~ SPECIAL MEETING ~

Monday, October 10, 2016  
5:30 p.m.

Courthouse Square - Senator Hearing Room  
555 Court Street NE, Salem, Oregon 97301

**MINUTES**

(This meeting was audio-recorded)

- BOARD Present:** Vice-President Steve Evans; and Directors Marcia Kelley, Jerry Thompson, John Hammill, Kathy Lincoln, and Colleen Busch
- Absent:** President Bob Krebs (due to work-related conflict that took him to Switzerland)
- STAFF** Allan Pollock, General Manager; Steve Dickey, Director of Transportation Development; Linda Galeazzi, Executive Assistant/Recording Secretary; Ben Fetherston, SAMTD Legal Counsel
- GUESTS** Dan Clem, CEO, Salem Area Chamber of Commerce; Julie Warncke, Transportation Planning Manager, City of Salem Public Works Department; and citizens - John Gear, Laura Doherty, Jim Scheppeke, and Marion Burns

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

**5:30 PM**

Vice-President Steve Evans called the meeting to order. A quorum was present.

Allan Pollock was asked to review the history of actions taken by the Board (on pages 1-22 in the agenda) as it relates to the Salem River Crossing (SRC) Project. Mr. Pollock explained that the Board felt the City was rushing their action, the technical reports were not complete, and the Salem River Crossing (SRC) Oversight Team should have been reconvened so that Salem-Keizer Transit's Board could continue to be a part of the SRC project conversation. Since the Board's action on September 22, Board members received feedback from former members of the Oversight Team, the Chamber of Commerce and from citizens. As a result, President Krebs called for a special meeting of the Board to consider retraction of their action taken at their September 22, 2016 regular meeting<sup>1</sup> to:

*"...oppose the City of Salem's current land use action<sup>2</sup> to expand the City's urban growth boundary and amend the Transportation System Plan; and authorize Director Lincoln to testify on behalf of the SAMTD Board of Directors at the Public Hearing at the October 12, 2016 Special Joint Meeting of the City of Salem, City of Keizer, Marion County and Polk County."*

## 2. PUBLIC TESTIMONY

**Daniel Clem**, representing the Salem Area Chamber of Commerce, explained why the Chamber fully supports the City of Salem's proposed land use actions and the plans for the SRC project. He asked that the Board rescind their action from the September 22, 2016 meeting.

**Jim Scheppke** (1840 E. Nob Hill, Salem) representing a grass roots group called *No 3<sup>rd</sup> Bridge* was supportive of the Board's action on September 22. He said the City of Salem posted 63 reports one week prior to the public hearing on their website and at the public library for citizen review prior to the public hearing process. He said the City's process does not conform to State land use law. Citizen involvement is to be to the scale of planning in an understandable form. It would not be possible for citizens to absorb all of the information posted in one week's time. It is important to follow the land use process.

**John Gear** (161 High Street SE, #208B, Salem 97301) referenced the recent presentation of *Strong Towns, Part Two*, that offered insight into how city projects are selected, and whether they are building a hole that is deeper financially. He asked that the Board stand firm; there is no need to support an amendment to allow for a bridge that will not be built.

**Laura Doherty** (coordinator for 350 Salem OR) hoped the Board would maintain their position. She spoke about Cherriotics service being a solution to greenhouse gas emissions that will increase over time if the City continues to work on the SRC.

**Marion Burns** (1911 Park Avenue NE, Salem 97301) asked that the Board stand firm. She spoke about a state legislative meeting on the transportation plan that she attended. The first hour was devoted to ODOT's finances, and the afternoon session was devoted to an SRC financial workshop to show how funding could be arranged. Many people walked out of the meeting during the public session when they realized how that money would come out of their taxes. Ms. Burns did not think the bridge would ever be built. The state and federal governments have no money to support it. She added that she supported the District's ballot measure and knew the Chamber worked hard to make sure the measure did not pass.

Written testimony (pages 43-55 of the agenda) was entered into the public record from **Roberta Cade, Susann Kaltwasser, Michael Wolfe, Cindy Culpovich, Sarah Deumling, Bill Cummins, Les Margosian, Evan White, Loreen Wells, Mary Ann Backawski, and Jim Scheppke** in support of the Board's September 22 action.

## 3. ACTION ITEM

### a. City of Salem's Urban Growth Boundary Expansion Action

Board members considered retraction of their action on September 22, 2016<sup>1</sup> to oppose the City of Salem's proposed land use actions as stated in Resolution No. 2016-35<sup>2</sup> to:

*"...initiate major comprehensive plan amendments pertaining to the Salem River Crossing preferred alternative to amend the Salem Transportation System Plan, modify the urban growth boundary (UGB), take an exception to Statewide Planning Goal 15 (Willamette River Greenway), and an amendment to Chapter 64 of the Salem Revised Code to amend the definitions of the Salem Transportation System Plan and the Urban Growth Boundary."*

Discussion ensued about the purpose of the amendments to the land use actions for the Marine Drive project that will be the topic of the public hearing at the joint meeting in order to bring Marine Drive into alignment with the Salem River Crossing project. There was discussion about where funding for the SRC project would come from. A gas tax, tolls, and vehicle registration fees are being considered and an allotment of funding through the Area Commission on Transportation (ACT); and state and federal funding for maintenance of the bridge. There was discussion also about how this would affect funding for the District's transit projects for years and how it would have a huge impact on the community financially by uprooting 50-60 residences and businesses while people passing through Salem would not even pay for use of the bridge. Future generations would be tasked with paying for the decisions made today.

Mr. Clem explained that the Chamber and the City have considered a ten-year bond measure package. The Governor has also been working on a transportation package at the state level. This is the best plan for expansion of Marine Drive that supports the SRC. It is about urbanization.

Julie Warncke was invited to speak about the City's process, the timing and the challenges they have faced to get the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) finalized and published. She spoke about the SRC being a regional project with all of the jurisdictions being involved. The federal government requires the development of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) consistent with the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) in order to qualify for federal funds for bridge construction. ODOT requires a land use decision before the EIS is published. Work to purchase the property along Marine Drive cannot begin until the EIS is approved by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). She referenced the State Agency Coordination Rule that ODOT adopted (Oregon Administrative Rules Chapter 731, Division 015).

Director Thompson spoke in support of the Marine Drive project and about the importance of being a good partner. He asked Ms. Warncke about the impact the Board's decision would have on the process. Ms. Warncke said the District has no role in the decision. Other than political, there is no approval the District has to make. When the project goes before the Salem-Keizer Area Transportation Study (SKATS), the District does have a vote on the funding.

Director Lincoln spoke about the City of Salem's release of the 63 staff reports to the

public on October 5 for the October 12 public hearing. Prior to these staff reports, there was nothing in the plans or the design of the bridge that would benefit transit service such as a park and ride, bus stops or express lanes. There are hundreds of pages of information that the Board has not yet had an opportunity to review to see how it will impact transit service. Documents referenced were recently posted on the City of Salem Planning Department webpage under "*Land Use Action CA-16-04.*"

Director Kelley was not ready to change her decision. She spoke about how changes to the City's UGB also affect transit's service area that coincides with the City's UGB. It seemed irresponsible of elected officials to go into land use planning actions without having a concrete way of paying for the project. She would like a financing plan to be laid out so that citizens can see what they are being asked to pay for.

Director Hammill said it was not clear to him what action the Board should take, if any. The transit district needs to have a say in the process and he needed time to review the recently posted documentation to see what the amenities are and to make an informed decision.

Director Busch took time to read up on the project. She wanted clarification about the process and how we got out of order. She shared from the OMPOC meeting she attended on October 7 where they discussed the MAP21/FAST Rule, OMPOC's potential support of the 2017 Transportation Package, road usage fees or tolls balancing the decreasing gas tax revenue, congestion and higher mpg vehicles. She said the Final Rule for the Risk Based Transit Asset Management Plan was published Oct. 7, 2016. The Rule for bridges and pavements will be published Dec. 14, 2016; and on or after May 27, 2018, a State or MPO may not adopt a transportation plan that has not been developed in accordance with the provisions of the Transportation Planning Final Rule.

Director Evans said he was not intent on destroying the bridge project with the Board's action on September 22. The Board's action was meant to call attention to the fact that transit services have not been included in the process. The Board wants this to be an open and inclusive process.

There was further explanation about ODOT requiring a land use decision prior to the EIS being published and the City's need to have a record of decision in order to get their plans in place. There has been work on a financing concept with potential sources to phase in the project but these cannot be explored without a record of decision. Further, the Board would like to have alternative modes and transit considered in the plans. Putting that into perspective, millions of dollars in funding could be used for extended and evening transit service. It would cost less and would help to reduce congestion.

**Motion      Move to rescind the Board's letter expressing their opposition to the City of Salem's process to expand the UGB through the proposed land use decisions.**


Made by: **Director Jerry Thompson**  
Second: **Director Colleen Busch**  
Vote: **YES - Thompson, Busch, Evans (3);**  
**NO - Lincoln, Hammill, Kelley (3);**  
**ABSENT - Krebs (1)**

Because this was a tie vote with the absence of President Krebs, the action taken at the September 22, 2016 meeting stands and Director Lincoln will testify on behalf of the Board during the Public Hearing at the October 12, 2016 Special Joint Meeting with the cities of Salem and Keizer, the Planning Commissions and Marion and Polk counties.

#### 4. SPECIAL MEETING ADJOURNED

7:00 PM

Respectfully Submitted,



**Robert Krebs, President**  
**SAMTD Board of Directors**

#### Referenced Materials:

1. Minutes of the September 22, 2016 SAMTD Board Meeting (pages 4-5 Potential Action on Issue Related to the Salem River Crossing Project): <http://cherriots.org/sites/default/files/MINUTES%20BD%2009-22-16.pdf>
2. City of Salem City Council - Resolution No. 2016-35 Under regional procedures, all of the governmental entities must concur according to the Statewide Planning Goal 15, Willamette River Greenway  
[http://www.cityofsalem.net/Departments/CommunityDevelopment/Planning/CurrentPlanning/CA16-04/Documents/Resolution%202016-35%20\(Initiating%20Land%20Use%20Actions\).pdf](http://www.cityofsalem.net/Departments/CommunityDevelopment/Planning/CurrentPlanning/CA16-04/Documents/Resolution%202016-35%20(Initiating%20Land%20Use%20Actions).pdf)
3. Minutes of the SAMTD Board SRC Subcommittee Meeting (page 23-26 in the agenda):  
<http://cherriots.org/sites/default/files/PDF%20AGENDA%20BD%20Mtg%2009-22-16%20%281%29.pdf>
4. Preferred Alternative selected in February 2014: <http://www.salemrivercrossing.org/alternatives/>
5. SRC FAQs: <http://www.salemrivercrossing.org/faq/>
6. SRC Schedule: <http://www.salemrivercrossing.org/schedule/>
7. ODOT NW Region - Region 2 "Get Involved" <http://www.salemrivercrossing.org/involved/>
8. [ftp://ftp.lcog.org/lcog/Outgoing/OMPOC/October\\_2016/OTF\\_ODOT-Tolling-and-Congestion-Pricing-final.docx](ftp://ftp.lcog.org/lcog/Outgoing/OMPOC/October_2016/OTF_ODOT-Tolling-and-Congestion-Pricing-final.docx)
9. [ftp://ftp.lcog.org/lcog/Outgoing/OMPOC/October\\_2016/](ftp://ftp.lcog.org/lcog/Outgoing/OMPOC/October_2016/)