



DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

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

Meeting Date: 06/12/06

Issue Date: 06/15/06

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 #5
Date/Time: Monday June 12, 2006 / 11:40 AM – 1:40 PM
Location: Tualatin Police Station

Attendees:

PSC	Tom Brian David Cox Bill Kennemer Charlotte Lehan David Luman Jason Tell Lou Ogden Carl Hosticka	Washington County (PSC Chair) FHWA Clackamas County City of Wilsonville City of Sherwood (PSC Alternate) ODOT Region 1 City of Tualatin (via telephone) Metro
Executive Management Team (EMT)	Fred Eberle Mike McKillip R. Scott Pemble	ODOT City of Tualatin Clackamas County
Project Management Team (PMT)	Vaughn Brown Barry Hennelly Jef Kaiser Jeanne Lawson Scott Richman	Jeanne Lawson Associates Washington County David Evans and Associates, Inc. Jeanne Lawson Associates David Evans and Associates, Inc.
Stakeholder Working Group (SWG)	Tom Aufenthie Mike Feves Dave Volz Ron Johnson	CPO 5 Far West Ass'n of Neighborhoods Tualatin CCI Washington County Farm Bureau

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

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

Meeting Date: 06/12/06

Issue Date: 06/15/06

Others	(From Sign-in sheet):	Tim Knapp
	Dorothy Alto	Tom Moes
	Laura Doll	Rebecka Reed
	Stacy Hopkins	Stacey Rumgay
	Hope Howard	David Shettles

Distribution: Kathy Busse, Andy Cotugno, Jeff Graham, Rob Dixon, Mark Turpel, File

The meeting began at 11:40 AM. Agendas and other materials were provided prior to the meeting and copies of these materials were provided at the meeting. The agenda items are represented in "bold" headings.

Handouts included:

- Agenda
- I-5/99W Purpose Revision Memo (June 5, 2006)
- PSC May 8th meeting summary
- Screening Criteria Memo

• **Welcome/Introduction**

- PSC members agreed to allow Barry to serve as temporary Chair until Chair Brian arrived.
- Barry Hennelly opened the meeting and welcomed the PSC members and other meeting attendees. All attendees introduced themselves.
- Barry summarized the agenda.
- Barry announced that in response to requests from members of the SWG and public, that EMT meetings are open to the public. EMT meeting schedule information will be posted on the project website.
- Travel demand modeling is resulting in a project schedule delay, and the PMT will likely hold on some committee meetings in order to be able to present modeling results as they have bearing on the need for the project and development of potential solutions.

• **Staff Report – Project Purpose Statement Refinement**

- Fred referred to the staff report memorandum distributed in advance of and handed out at the meeting. This memorandum identifies problems with the purpose statement that the PSC adopted at PSC meeting #3 (March 13, 2006) and provides a staff-proposed purpose statement for the PSC to consider for adoption today.
- Commissioner Brian arrived and assumed his role as Chair
- At PSC meeting #3, members of the PSC indicated that the project title (I-5 to 99W Connector) could function as a surrogate for the purpose statement. Staff later confirmed, however, that the project title is non-binding and that the purpose statement is the basis for developing the project.

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

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

Meeting Date: 06/12/06

Issue Date: 06/15/06

- The staff recommendation is to focus on the intent of the project as identified in the adopted Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) to serve as the basis for the purpose statement. The purpose statement previously adopted by the PSC makes it very difficult to focus on a potential solution that meets the RTP intent.
 - Commissioner Kennemer stated that he would prefer to keep the purpose statement relatively broad, but he acknowledged the project staff's concerns with the PSC-adopted purpose statement. He suggested that the PSC move to adopt the staff-proposed purpose statement. This suggested motion was tabled until the PSC could hear public input and have further discussion on the topic.
 - Jeanne Lawson summarized feedback on the purpose statement voiced by the the SWG at their last meeting held on June 1st. Some SWG members expressed concerns regarding the process to revisit the previously adopted purpose statement, including presenting the topic as a "project update" item at their meeting. The SWG members who have concerns about the staff-proposed purpose statement indicated that their original concerns expressed and identified in a memo dated February 27th still stand.
 - Chair Brian asked the project staff to clarify how goals and objectives addressing local access and transportation system issues are integrated into the process with the staff-revised purpose statement.
 - Fred responded that some of the adopted Needs Statements, Goals and Objectives, and proposed screening criteria alternatives identify and weigh impacts and benefits to local communities and to local travel. Separating local travel within the area from traffic traveling through the area is considered a benefit to local travel and to the larger transportation system.
 - Mayor Lehan questioned why we would not include "local" in the purpose statement if we are considering local impacts and benefits.
 - Fred responded that the purpose of the project is to provide a route for regional and through travel between I-5 and 99W.
 - Councilor Hosticka remarked that it seems that part of the PSC charge is to determine the purpose of the project. Metro is reviewing and will be updating the RTP, and Metro Council does not feel that Metro's thinking about the future should be constrained by the RTP. He suggested that the PSC should discuss and agree to what the purpose statement should be.
 - David Cox said he was initially concerned about leaving "local" out of the purpose statement. However, he has come to understand that the staff-proposed Purpose Statement allows for a solution that would enhance local travel and benefit the broader transportation system.
- **Screening Criteria**
 - Jef Kaiser reminded the PSC that the screening criteria are tools (along with Purpose Statement and Goals and Objectives) to guide development of alternatives. The PMT developed draft screening criteria, and received input from the EMT and the SWG. The staff-proposed draft screening criteria were displayed on screen. He referred to a table summarizing the evolution of the draft screening criteria. This table was distributed to the PSC and SWG prior to the meeting. EMT member Mike McKillip made copies of this table and distributed it to meeting attendees.

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

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

Meeting Date: 06/12/06

Issue Date: 06/15/06

- Jef summarized SWG and EMT input and PMT recommendations brought to PSC.
- Chair Brian stated that it was not his intent for the PSC to act on the screening criteria today. He invited questions and comments on the draft criteria from the PSC.
- David Cox suggested adding "from" to the first and fourth draft criterion.
- Councilor Hosticka suggested addition of a criterion that specifically addresses Objective 4D with a more specific definition of "clearly infeasible", considering technical, financial, and political considerations of project feasibility. He re-emphasized his interest in eliminating infeasible from consideration options as soon as possible.
- Mayor Ogden suggested that, where possible, we use an empirical approach to applying screening criteria.
- Chair Brian suggested moving refined Objective 4D language to a new screening criterion.
- Councilor Hosticka asked if we could agree to no criterion under Goal 4 if the issue of eliminating infeasible options quickly is sufficiently addressed in the PSC decision process.
- Jason Tell reminded the group that we will not have reliable cost information for the initial range of alternatives. Therefore, it would be difficult to measure this as a criterion from a cost basis.
- Councilor Hosticka stated that whatever it takes, whether or not it is included in the screening criteria, we need to dismiss alternatives that have no realistic chance of being implemented in an expeditious manner. The PSC supports an expedited process to eliminate options that are clearly not feasible.
- David Cox said at some point, the PSC will need to decide whether or not to invite private sector funding to be able to advance the project.
- Chair Brian inquired about the schedule for development of alternatives.
- Barry said that we know we will have to carry forward a no-build alternative, alternatives that consider improvements to Tualatin-Sherwood Road sufficient to meet state highway needs, and other transportation system alternatives that may or may not include a new connector. New connector alternatives and everything else are on the table. By this coming Fall, we plan to develop initial alternatives, screen and refine the initial alternatives by the end of this year, and present the initial range of alternatives to the PSC in January or February 2007.
- Mayor Lehan asked what is meant by "everything else" is on the table. Are we narrowing the range of alternatives to a limited access corridor? Are we really looking at the Tualatin, Wilsonville, and Sherwood "triangle"? Are we just looking at a corridor, or are we also considering alternatives that could include other transportation network improvements? Future growth in this area will be generating huge amounts of local traffic.
- Barry said we will look at what has been called "the kitchen sink" which will be a comprehensive package of transportation system improvements that do not include a new limited access connector.
- Mayor Lehan suggested that absent the modeling results, it seems that we are ahead of ourselves. Without modeling results, we have already made assumptions (i.e. Purpose and Need). It seems to her that the basis of the project need is largely intuitive. She is concerned about dropping "local" from the

purpose statement when she does not know what the forecast volumes and split between local and other traffic will be.

- **Public Comment Period**

As summarized below, eight people in attendance provided testimony.

- Tom Aufenthie (Sherwood Rep CPO 5)
 - SWG was surprised by the effort to make changes to the previously adopted Purpose Statement. The existing transportation conditions report shows mostly local traffic. Sherwood and Tualatin populations have increased substantially. Data is from year 2000 and population has doubled since that time. Tom handed out figure 3-9 from the existing transportation conditions report.
 - No suggestion has been made to update needs statement and referred to ODOT purpose and need guidance, including intermediate solutions.
 - Keep an open mind to changing the RTP in 2008.
- Mike Feves (Far West CPO)
 - Sent letter to PSC last week
 - Thanks for opening EMT meetings
 - A lot of time has gone into Purpose and Need. If PSC approves the recommended changes, it sends message that SWG is a sham.
 - Screening criteria make it clear that the object of project is to build a 4-lane expressway. It is disingenuous to present the process as open to other actions. This is a local problem. We are putting the cart before the horse until we have reliable data.
 - There remains a need to quantify criteria measurement (e.g. LOS) as much as possible to have concrete quantifiable basis for screening.
- David Volz (Tualatin)
 - Congestion will only continue to get worse. The longer we wait, the worse it will get.
 - Wait for modeling results to see what would happen. It will show us whether we should move forward or stop
 - Do not preclude options in the Purpose and Need that will kill project from the start.
- Hope Howard (Tualatin Chamber Executive Director)
 - Hope represents the Tualatin Chamber Board which passed resolution in support of I-5/99W Connector.
 - This project needed to maintain economic viability of region
 - Congestion relief is essential for viability of tourism and businesses in the 2040 Town Centers associated with the project.
- Dorothy Alto (Clackamas County)
 - Thanked Mayor Lehan for comments on local vs. through traffic.
 - If project is to build a corridor, just tell us that. If we know what we're going to build, don't try to misrepresent.
- Dave Shettles (Beaverton)
 - Briefly read documents on Metro site
 - Do not shy away from tolling as consideration. Creative financing may be crucial to this ever happening but have set period to end tolling.

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

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

Meeting Date: 06/12/06

Issue Date: 06/15/06

- Keep needed infrastructures progressing.
- Tim Knapp (Wilsonville City Council)
 - Is primary traffic local or through?
 - Jennifer Danziger's presentation suggests large portion is local.
 - Decision-making needs to follow a fact-based approach which means getting the modeling information before moving much farther.
 - Until we have the modeling, we don't know whether or not new limited access package of system improvements needs to be considered.
 - The Purpose Statement should not be focused on specific action.
 - Many objectives are not addressed in Screening Criteria.
 - Taking excess capacity for regional/through traffic will kill Wilsonville.
- **PSC Discussion and Actions**
 - Councilor Hosticka noted that facts as they apply to 2030 are largely what we want them to be. He knows that the modeling assumes massive residential growth around Sherwood. Metro is hosting a regional "New Look" forum on June 23rd, and he brought brochures that he set on the sign-in table.
 - Chair Brian reiterated his earlier suggestion that the PSC table action on screening criteria to their next meeting.
 - Mayor Lehan requested that staff provide a clear definition of "addresses" where it is used as a verb in some of the draft screening criteria.
 - Jason said there is not a one project "silver bullet" to fix problems of congestion and access in this area. Regardless of projects, there are still system needs, and he suggested that this process should resolve the question of whether or not regional and through travel, and local travel needs are mutually exclusive.
 - Mayor Lehan emphasized that, with limited funding for transportation projects throughout the region, we want to make sure we are advancing the project that will have the most "bang for the buck" compared to other improvement needs.
 - Barry said Washington County is looking carefully at local system needs and priorities through the County's MSTIP process. A proposed extension of 124th has been identified through the County's land use transportation planning, but the County wants to see what comes out of this project process to guide the prioritization and development of the local system.
 - Chair Brian noted connector vs. local projects are likely "different colors of money". This project may be eligible for federal funding, whereas the County is struggling to make smaller system improvements without federal funds. We still need to determine if and how effectively a connector project will work as a solution.
 - Jason noted that the staff-recommended Purpose Statement that includes the Needs Statements and Goals and Objectives supports and does not preclude the ability to address other system needs.
 - Councilor Hosticka asked what we mean by "the project". He assumes that the project is a solution for traffic problems in the SW part of the Metro area. Language that drives us to only one solution is premature.
 - Mayor Lehan said that this is the first she has understood that the purpose of the project is narrowly focused on a freeway connection.

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

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

Meeting Date: 06/12/06

Issue Date: 06/15/06

- Mayor Ogden said he thought this is a "corridor analysis" and that the RTP identifies the project as a "connector". Nowhere in the background documents or RTP does it suggest that the project is trying to address other transportation problems in the area. There should not be any question that local traffic uses I-5, I-205, or other freeway-type facilities in the region. The location and size of the connector need to be determined through the process, but the connector is the project. If we are looking at a transportation system-level project, we don't need NEPA. We need to keep the process going in order to answer the question of whether or not a connector is needed.
- Fred said ODOT has historic data that sufficiently support the need for a connector, but we want to use the best and most updated data through this process. The RTP fundamentally is asking us to find the primary connector location.
- Mayor Lehan noted that the staff-proposed purpose statement does not even identify "connector", and suggested that "it is a statement that only a bureaucrat could love." If we want to be more focused, she suggested that we more specific.
- Jason noted that the staff-proposed purpose statement does include "regional and intrastate travel access toI-5 to 99W"
- Chair Brian agreed that this process was to study a connector, and he agreed that the PSC-adopted purpose statement causes us to lose this focus. If data shows that the project is not justified then there will be no project, but the purpose of the project must be clearly stated.
- Commissioner Kennemer moved to approve the staff-recommended Purpose Statement identified in June 5, 2006 memo. Jason Tell seconded this motion.
- Five PSC members voted in favor of Commissioner Kennemer's motion. Mayor Lehan opposed the motion, and Councilor Hosticka abstained from voting.
- Councilor Hosticka said before the next PSC, we need to resolve the issues related to the purpose statement that have been raised, including how the connector would fit into the larger transportation system. He thinks he understands what we are doing, but with the purpose statement, are we communicating to the FHWA or to the public?
- Chair Brian asked staff to provide the PSC with clarification as to how and the extent to which local issues and needs are considered and addressed. What is and what is not going to be considered at the local level?
- Lou Ogden questioned how the staff-recommended Purpose Statement precludes us from looking at local system.
- **Other Business and Next PSC Meeting**
 - Chair Brian announced the next PSC meetings are scheduled for August 28th and September 25th.
 - Commissioner Kennemer will not be available, and he will designate an alternate for the August 28th meeting.
 - Chair Brian noted that the figure referred to by Tom Aufenthie is not clear by itself and without supporting explanation. He requested that for future work products, that staff provide clarifying text along with figures that show quantitative information.