



The contents of this summary are assumed correct unless our office is notified in writing within five calendar days of receipt.

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

Project: I-5 to 99W Connector Project
Purpose: Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting #21
Date/Time: Wednesday January 28, 2009 / 12:30 PM – 2:30 PM
Location: Sherwood Police Training Center
Attendees:

PSC	Tom Brian	Washington County (PSC Chair)
	Monique Beikman	City of Tualatin (PSC Alternate)
	Carl Hosticka	Metro
	Tim Knapp	City of Wilsonville
	Emily Lawton	FHWA
	Charlotte Lehan	Clackamas County
	Lou Ogden	City of Tualatin
	Jim Patterson	City of Sherwood (PSC Alternate)
	Roy Rogers	Washington County
	Jason Tell	ODOT
	Rian Windsheimer	ODOT (PSC Alternate)

Executive Management Team (EMT)	Michael Bowers	City of Wilsonville
	Mark Brown	Washington County
	Andy Cotugno	Metro
	Fred Eberle	ODOT
	Mike McKillip	City of Tualatin
	R. Scott Pemble	Clackamas County
	Tom Pessemier	City of Sherwood

Project Management Team (PMT)	Amy Gibbons	ODOT
	Tim Wilson	ODOT
	Mark Turpel	Metro
	Vaughn Brown	JLA Public Involvement
	Jim Evans	Moyano Leadership Group
	Leslie Howell	Howell Consulting
	Angie Jones	DEA
	Jef Kaiser	DEA
	Scott Richman	DEA
	Randy McCourt	DKS

Stakeholder Working Group (SWG)	Tom Aufenthie	CPO 5
	Ray Phelps	Wilsonville Chamber

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

I-5 to 99W Connector: PSC Mtg. #21

Meeting Date: 01/28/09

Issue Date: /09

Others (sign-in sheet)	Ben Altman	SFA Design Group
	Cheryl Dorman	Tualatin Chamber
	Jim Dougherty	
	Linda Moholt	Tualatin Chamber
	Julie Nader	
	Mark Ottenad	City of Wilsonville
	Patrick Stihge	Wilsonville Spokesman

Distribution: PSC, EMT, PMT, SWG

The meeting began at 12:30 PM. Agendas and other materials were provided to the PSC members prior to and at the meeting. The agenda items are represented in "bold" headings.

• **Welcome/Introduction**

- Chair Brian led introductions

• **Additions and Deletions to the Agenda**

- Mayor Knapp requested more time for discussion of Alternative 7.
- Chair Brian asked Scott Richman if this agenda item would provide time for discussion, and Scott replied that he would do a brief presentation to allow time for Q & A and discussion.

• **Approve October 22, 2008 PSC Meeting Summary**

- PSC motioned and approved their previous meeting summary without comments

• **Presentation of Alternative 7 as recommendation for PSC action**

- Scott R. spoke about what is currently in the RTP, and what we have done in this process to refine the location and type of improvement. Alternative 7 is a network that consists of three major arterials, rather than one expressway facility. He said that this is by no means a "silver bullet solution", but it has been shown to be more cost effective than the previously studied connector alternatives, and provides flexibility to be phased. We are focusing on three corridors; a northern corridor between Tualatin and Herman Road, a central corridor of Tualatin-Sherwood Road, and a southern corridor that would be a new arterial roadway. Another element would be an extension of 124th Avenue south. Enhanced transit goes hand in hand with this increased network of mobility. Increased bus service, and commuter rail extension to Sherwood are a few examples. Auxiliary lanes on I-5 between I-205 and the North Wilsonville Interchange are included.

• **Public Comment**

- Public comments were provided by four individuals: Tom Aufenthie on behalf of Mike Feves (attached), Linda Moholt, Michael Bowers, and Ray Phelps. Additional

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

I-5 to 99W Connector: PSC Mtg. #21

Meeting Date: 01/28/09

Issue Date: /09

comments for the record were submitted on the project's website prior to the meeting and were distributed at the meeting.

- Tom Aufenthie – Tom came to represent Mike Feves, not himself. He read a statement from Mike that was submitted to the group for the record, and this written statement is attached.
 - Linda (Tualatin Chamber of Commerce) – in talking with the community and businesses, they have expressed a desperate need to increase transportation mobility in the area. She requested that the PSC seriously consider this Alternative in their vote, and see letters already submitted in support.
 - Michael Bowers – he handed out a folder of comments covering three basic points: he challenged that the EMT recommended Alternative 7; he questioned cost assumptions, and questioned capacity need. There has been very little time to dialogue on Alternative 7. There needs to be sufficient time for the EMT and the SWG to vet information before the PSC makes a decision. He asked about phasing information – no matter which phase we implement over time, it should not do damage or make matters worse, the short-term collateral damage is unacceptable. He made reference to the map and connectivity of the southern arterial. There is no interchange onto I-5, rather it dead ends. The interchange at Elligsen is going to be significant (split diamond, etc.), and he does not believe that this has been costed out. He believes that this is a billion dollar project, which is roughly the same amount as the other build alternatives. Based on environmental issues and design issues that are unresolved; there is about a 10-year execution time line. This has been shown a cost of today's dollars, which will be significantly more. There are no interchange improvements given the increase in traffic on the southern arterial into Wilsonville. He believes the capacity goal can be met even if the southern arterial is eliminated.
 - Ray Phelps – provided the PSC with a resolution from the Wilsonville Chamber which provides support for Alternative 7 from the Chamber with the condition that the I-5 corridor study in the RTP is completed.
 - Vaughn also mentioned that comments have been received via the web, and have been submitted for record.
 - Commissioner Rogers asked Ray if the new Wilsonville Chamber resolution supercedes their support of Alternative 7 along with the Tualatin and Sherwood Chambers. Ray replied that it does not – they stand by their joint support of Alternative 7.
- **Action Items**
 - Councilor Hosticka asked if an amendment of the RTP is needed at this time or if it could just be rolled into the existing RTP.
 - Andy Cotugno said that it could be done either way. We are not as constrained under state requirements as we are under federal requirements for funding. Councilor Hosticka asked if we do not make a recommendation to amend the

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

I-5 to 99W Connector: PSC Mtg. #21

Meeting Date: 01/28/09

Issue Date: /09

RTP, do the same two lines referring to the project remain? He would rather see Alternative 7 in there than what is in there now.

- Commissioner Lehan asked whether the cost of the I-5 over-crossing is included in the \$700 million estimate, and Scott replied that it is. Everything shown on the map is included in the cost estimate. She said that there is a lot to consider in recommending a network as opposed to a single connection. Phasing will be important, and needs to be done correctly as to not cause adverse impacts. The County's primary concerns are the function of I-5 and I-205, as well as the urban reserves in Clackamas County. The data is based on the whole thing getting done. What pieces are we going to do sooner rather than later, and given the economic climate, what projects are we going to decide to construct and acquire ROW for? We need to focus on getting projects done in the here and now. Not knowing what will happen with the phasing is a factor. She has an objection to how it is phased, and wants a commitment on the phasing plan before a decision is made. Chair Brian said that it needs to be determined what each phase will accomplish. It needs to be shown as a benefit and a positive impact. Chair Brian said part of determining what each of our jurisdictions feel is going back to them with this information as early as we can.
- Mayor Ogden said that if there is an objection, he wants to know about it now and not wait until next month to find out.
- Commissioner Lehan said that it is important to Alternative 7 that Elligsen is not left to be improved last if all the traffic is diverted in that direction. She also said that ROW acquisition needs to be done now and in a place where we know we are going to do something. She thinks that protective ROW acquisition should be prioritized.
- Commissioner Rogers said that we need to reflect back over the PSC meetings and determine what we have accomplished. For a long time, a corridor looked feasible, and now with growth, it is more difficult. He is concerned that we are never going to come to a conclusion on where we are going to end up with everyone's priorities. Circumstances continue to change and evolve. When is the product as good as we are going to get it and move on? He doesn't want to be here in a year still trying to queue up; at some point we need to say "thank you for the effort" and move forward.
- Mayor Knapp said that he concurs with Commissioners Lehan and Rogers. From internal discussion in Wilsonville, there is concern about impacting I-5, and interest in developing industrial lands before long term development of major transportation projects. Interest in developing projects with the best short term benefit. At this point, Wilsonville supports the TDM/TSM improvements, the transit improvements, the auxiliary lanes on I-5, and the northern corridor and central corridors. He said even with the improvements through Tualatin and west of Sherwood he would support it, and it would be a more feasible cost. He said the I-5 corridor study needs to be done. If we can come to a 2/3 solution and then move onto the third piece later (southern corridor), we would be in a better place.
- Chair Brian updated cost estimates for the project elements.
- Jason Tell said that ODOT has a preservation project on I-5 that goes to bid this spring. They have looked at adding southbound auxiliary lanes on I-5 since it is in the same area. They have some OTIA funds and federal funds that could pose

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

I-5 to 99W Connector: PSC Mtg. #21

Meeting Date: 01/28/09

Issue Date: /09

an opportunity for the preservation project including southbound auxiliary lanes to construct very soon.

- Mayor Ogden said that he is not happy with the implication that all the traffic will be forced through Tualatin with only Herman and Tualatin Road widening and extensions, and Tualatin-Sherwood Road widening. That is not the spirit of Alternative 7 to place disproportionate burden on one city. Tualatin has said from the very beginning that not forcing more traffic through Tualatin is a key component. They are supportive of Alternative 7, recognizing that they will still be impacted from increased traffic. Everything that Mayor Knapp pointed out does nothing for Tualatin.
- Mayor Knapp said that it would be of benefit because it would still split the traffic, but into two pieces rather than three, and it would have the ability to be constructed sooner. He sees it as getting a 2/3 improvement and being of benefit to Tualatin.
- Monique said that it is not a benefit to bring all the traffic into Tualatin.
- Tom Pessemier said that it is not just about dollars, but about the communities that are being impacted as well. Councilor Hosticka asked if the purpose of the next meeting is to work out the phasing or to accept Alternative 7 as is. He proposes accepting Alternative 7 and working through phasing later.
- Chair Brian said that we cannot figure out the phasing issues, we can recommend component pieces and stress that timing is important.
- Commissioner Lehan said that if we are all supposed to buy into the whole package, we do not have the data to do that. 124th needs to answer the Elligsen question of interchange type if it comes all the way south. She cannot sign onto the whole package until there is a list of phasing particulars and more data. Chair Brian said that he is not sure how much more "chewing" this committee needs to do over this. Commissioner Rogers said that the language that is in the RTP now is not the right language. He said he liked Commissioner Lehan's comments and perhaps what we do is put a wrap on it and come back to the more specific issues. Chair Brian suggested we come back to the next meeting and see what we can agree on.
- Councilor Hosticka said that if we get down to a project list, we will need a full day meeting; we should not be getting down to that level of discussion, it is not productive.
- Commissioner Rogers said that he would rather move a partial list forward than nothing at all.
- Mayor Ogden said that there is a history of transportation solutions that are in the RTP today that are not specified to the design level. He does not want to advance Alternative 7 with the parts excluded that some might find a little prickly.
- Commissioner Lehan said that how we got to Alternative 7 was the other connectors fell apart because of their connection to I-5. That was a fatal flaw, and she wants to make sure that is not the case with Alternative 7.
- Scott said that we have information to show that either an over-crossing or tight split diamond are feasible.
- Chair Brian said that what he would ask of staff is to meet with folks who have concern of "does this thing work?" Get more information out there to try to resolve those questions as much as possible in preparation for the next meeting.

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

I-5 to 99W Connector: PSC Mtg. #21

Meeting Date: 01/28/09

Issue Date: /09

- Mayor Ogden said that when we started meeting, we agreed to a unanimous vote on this project. If we do not get a unanimous vote about Alternative 7 being the project, you still have an RTP problem. That does not take the existing corridor off the RTP, and it does not take Alternative 7 away from being accepted into the RTP. Chair Brian said it strengthens the effort to get unanimity, but whatever the PSC action is will be forwarded to Metro.

Testimony before the I5/99W Project Steering Committee, January 28, 2009
By Michael Feves, SWG member.

Alternative 7 has some very attractive elements that I believe will improve the transportation system in the project area. However, at the last Stakeholder Working Group meeting I did not support bringing Alternative 7 to the PSC at this time. I listed a variety of reasons for this position. You can read about them in the minutes of the SWG meeting. I still do not support advancing Alternative 7 to the RTP phase.

The main concern that I wish to bring to your attention today is that there has been a breakdown in processes and procedures that have been adopted by the PSC and other groups involved in this project. Specifically:

- The SWG was asked to provide recommendations to you with very limited data. Additional data have since been provided, but the additional data are incomplete, and they do not conform to the adopted evaluation criteria.
- Public input on Alternative 7 has been limited to one SWG meeting, and a posting on the project website. There have been no open houses, e-mailings, postcard mailings or other widely disseminated distribution of Alternative 7. Alternative 7 is sufficiently different from the other alternatives so that there should be a complete public review of the alternative.

One of the elements of Alternative 7 that is attractive to me is that it can be implemented in a phased approach. However, I am concerned that various phases of this project may have undesirable impacts to I-5, 99W, Tualatin-Sherwood Road and other arterials in the project area. The data provided thus far only looks at the final impacts after all elements of the project have been completed. Volume to capacity (V/C) data at various "choke" points on I-5, 99W and TSR for each of the major phases of Alternative 7 should be provided. It is imperative that Alternative 7 be phased correctly. If not done correctly, the proposed arterial improvements may make things even worse.

Traffic data in the Air Quality tech memo by HDR indicate that when completed, Alternative 7 will produce significant increases in car and truck traffic on I-5 and on 99W south of Bell Road. Compared to the "No Build", Alternative 7 produces increases in V/C on I-5 southbound throughout the project area and I-5 northbound at Elligsen.

Finally, I am concerned that all of the work that has been done so far is fatally flawed because the land use and economic assumptions that are used in the traffic models are no longer valid. It is clear that our current economic situation is far different than what was anticipated only a few months ago. Residential development is virtually at a standstill. There is at least a two year supply of housing in the Portland area. Many economists anticipate that it may take up to ten years before we realize significant growth in housing and jobs. The cost of gasoline has a significant impact on travel patterns. When gas was \$4.00+ per gallon, there was a noticeable decrease in automobile travel.

In summary, Alternative 7 should not be advanced to the RTP amendment process until various phases of the alternative have been evaluated using more realistic assumptions and models.