



DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 11

Meeting Date: 06/29/06

Issue Date: 07/06/06

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

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY-EMT #11

Project: I-5 to 99W Connector Project
Purpose: Executive Management Team Meeting
Location: Metro, Room 501

Attendees:

EMT	Kathy Busse	Washington County
	Andy Cotugno	Metro
	Danielle Cowan	City of Wilsonville (alternate)
	Rob Dixon	City of Sherwood
	Fred Eberle	ODOT
	Jeff Graham	FHWA
	Mike McKillip	City of Tualatin
	R. Scott Pemble	Clackamas County

PMT	Barry Hennelly	Washington County
	Mark Turpel	Metro
	Tim Wilson	ODOT
	Vaughn Brown	JLA
	Jef Kaiser	DEA
	Scott Richman	DEA

Others Tom Moes
Kristi Halvorson

Distribution: EMT, PMT, SWG, File

The meeting began at 9:30 AM. Agendas and other materials were provided prior to and at the meeting. The agenda items are represented in "bold" headings.

- **Welcome**

- Barry welcomed those in attendance and summarized the agenda. EMT meetings are project staff meetings. Members of the public are welcome to attend and observe, but there is no public comment agenda item.

- **PSC**

- The PSC provided comments on the staff-proposed purpose statement, including a request of staff to clarify how local access is addressed. Five members of the PSC voted in support of the staff-proposed purpose statement, one (Metro Councilor Hosticka) abstained, and one (Wilsonville Mayor Lehan) opposed.
- The PSC tabled a decision on the screening criteria until their next meeting, and provided feedback for staff to address.
- Barry has contacted Mayor Lehan to arrange a meeting for the purpose of addressing her concerns with the purpose statement, but has not been able to connect with her. Mark and Andy have talked with Councilor Hosticka.
- The staff report presented at the PSC meeting describes how local access is addressed in the Needs Statements and in the Goals and Objectives. Based on feedback from the PSC, the PMT will provide a response that may be a revised staff memo.

- **Screening Criteria**

- Jef referred to a table showing screening criteria that has been subject to review by the PMT, EMT, SWG and PSC.
- Both SWG and PSC discussed the need for a screening criterion related to project cost under Goal 4. The PMT proposes no criterion for Goal 4, and instead recommends that this be considered under the alternatives evaluation process.
- The EMT agreed that applying such a criterion could eliminate solutions prematurely, and that other screening criteria would address Councilor Hosticka's request to expedite dropping unreasonable alternatives.
- Jef referred to the application of screening criteria. Only the first two criterion lend themselves to a quantitative metric. All criteria will need to be applied such that a "reasonable person" will be able to reach a clear conclusion about whether or not the alternative "passes" or "fails" without need for detailed analysis. If this conclusion cannot be made under all criteria, then an alternative may stay on the table.
- The travel demand model for the future (2030) no-build condition will provide measurable information about demand, operations, travel patterns/trip types, and modes that will serve as the basis for screening alternatives using the first two screening criterion. The model will provide the ability to break out demand for regional and through travel. Regional trips have one trip end (origin or destination) within and one trip end outside the project area. Through trips pass through the project area, and originate and terminate outside the project area.
- A measure for demand of vehicles/lane/hour (V/L/H) could be converted to persons/lane/hour and other equivalent measures, including for consideration of freight traffic could be used. Truck traffic and different types of transit could also be converted to passenger vehicle equivalents.
- Andy said Metro uses peak hour traffic volumes of 700, 900 or 1,200 V/H/L for major facility capacity thresholds. 900 = Major arterial with major intersecting traffic nodes. 1,200 = major arterial with predominant priority vs. intersecting routes. He would use 1,200 for the connector.
- Danielle inquired about the type of through trips (i.e. freight vs. commuter), and whether or not this would have bearing on the screening process. Her

understanding is that the project was originally conceived as a freight route. Would a connector route's primary function as a commuter route vs. a freight route affect the location selection?

- Jef responded that, at this phase of the process, we are looking at a very general corridor location. The fourth criterion addresses access to I-5 and 99W for freight traffic.
 - Andy noted that all trips entering and/or exiting the project area pass through two or three interchanges. Relying on one route considering all entering/exiting traffic at multiple interchanges will result in failure.
 - Andy suggested, and the EMT agreed, that for the screening level we use a cut line approach to address threshold travel demand.
 - Metro sets PM peak and mid-day demand thresholds, sufficient mid-day capacity needs to be available for trucks to move with less congestion. Andy suggested comparing peak demand versus LOS E and mid-day versus LOS C. If we must use one or the other, go with the peak period demand.
 - Fred noted that we may need to re-think this if there are locations where the mid-day demand is the peak. Andy suggested we need to consider picking up non-peak anomalies.
 - The EMT agreed that we will need to look at the 2030 demand results before we settle on measurable thresholds to use. The EMT agreed to seek guidance from the project transportation technical experts on appropriate threshold and equivalent measures.
 - Jef said if there is any question about how an alternative would stand up against the criteria, it would stay on the table. Alternatives must meet all nine screening criteria. The results should be evidently high or low enough for a reasonable person to be able to easily judge whether an alternative would be over or under a threshold. Once we have all initial alternatives screened, we anticipate refining to "representative" set of solutions.
 - Mark said that the Metro Council may have concern about not using persons/hour/lane as a metric.
 - Barry said subsequent evaluation criteria can address modal variables in greater detail.
- **Alternatives Development Process**
 - The PSC is scheduled to meet again on August 28th, and the project staff will bring back a proposed purpose statement and screening criteria to the PSC for their approval. The PMT will provide the EMT with advance materials for briefings with respective PSC members.
 - Scott R. referred to a flow chart handout and walked through the major activities proposed through the process to get to a selected corridor.
 - Scott P. inquired about how the project staff is addressing input from the CETAS committee since their involvement is a courtesy under this pre-NEPA process. Barry responded that we intend to respond to their concerns if they are raised, and to go back to the PSC if the CETAS committee does not agree with a PSC decision.
 - Andy said that SAFETEA-LU has added a requirement for increased coordination during the planning portion of project development processes.

- Fred commented that the process chart indicates that the process is linear. He asked if there are concurrent activities that would actually overlap. Scott responded affirmatively. There will be concurrent/overlapping activities.
- Danielle said that the Wilsonville Mayor wants more hands-on involvement in the process. She realizes that technical data is influenced by policy, and that policy is largely derived from technical results. She is interested in being engaged in technical discussions, and does not want the project team to separate technical versus policy items for the PSC.
- **Travel Forecasting**
 - Mark said Metro and consultant staff are working in tandem to complete the 2005 base year and 2030 no-build travel demand modeling. The project team agreed to utilize Metro's new modeling application (VISUM) as the modeling tool for the project. VISUM has more functionality with higher quality, and more reliable output.
 - Model results (post-processed) are anticipated by mid-September.
 - Mark showed a regional model map and a network map for a sub-area that includes the transportation analysis area for the I-5 to 99W Connector Project. 800 TAZs, including areas in Yamhill County, were added to the regional model, and land use data and transportation networks were updated through an extensive and coordinated multi-jurisdictional review process. Metro has maintained coordination with the ODOT team working on the Newberg-Dundee Bypass project to make sure the two projects are using consistent assumptions.
 - Danielle asked if the new RTP is to be "outcome" versus projects-oriented, how do we account for roads that will not likely be built out?
 - Andy responded that the no-build network reflects the financially constrained system, which is based on projects that are likely to be funded.
 - In addition to Yamhill County, Mike M. inquired as to how we are coordinating with forecasting north and south of our analysis area. These external network links are being addressed in the larger regional model context and scrutinized during model post-processing.
 - Barry said that at this point, we are looking at late fall 2007 for getting to a selected corridor.
- **Public Involvement**
 - Vaughn referred to alternatives development workshops plan handout and summarized the proposed process.
 - Fred suggested that others, including the CETAS agency representatives, be invited to an alternatives development workshop.
 - Andy anticipates that "alternatives" need to be allowed to include other parts of the transportation system in addition to the "connector". Prototypes should feature other components. Other parts of system may be needed to be addressed in addition to connector.
 - Danielle agreed, noting that means of traveling to and through future industrial land needs to be addressed. The perception in Wilsonville is that Tualatin-Sherwood Road should be the connector, but that it was not built to serve regional/through travel. There is perception that this project is being promoted

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 11

Meeting Date: 06/29/06

Issue Date: 07/06/06

as "the solution", when other needs will not be addressed by a new connector. Whatever solution is selected should not encumber Wilsonville.

- ❑ Scott P. said it will be incumbent upon the corridor selection process to guide the development of alternatives. The system plan should be a secondary outcome of the connector location and type decision, and the supporting system needs are more likely to come later through alternatives refinement. The EMT agreed with this perspective.
- ❑ Mark said for 2030, we did not assume UGB expansion beyond what has been approved.
- ❑ The EMT agreed that workshop participants will need guiding parameters, including identification of alternatives we know we will need to consider (e.g., improvements to Tualatin-Sherwood Road and other existing roads).
- ❑ Fred said the second workshops provide a chance to show results of refinement on "representative alternatives" derived from the first workshops.
- ❑ The EMT provided some suggestions for map sizing and features to show, including showing the project area on one large map, with constraints including the National Wildlife Refuge and jurisdictional wetlands identified.
- ❑ Rob asked about Area 48 and area south of Sherwood – is there any way to identify areas where connector will not be located prior to Fall 2007? Sherwood staff needs to be responsive to development inquiries and demands to proceed with planning and development in these areas recently brought into the UGB.

• Action Items

Action Items from EMT mtg #10	Responsible Party	Target Date
Provide EMT with draft maps and proposed materials for alternatives development workshops	PMT	8/3
Solicit input from transportation team on screening criteria threshold metrics and communicate with EMT	PMT	8/2
Provide EMT with advance materials for PSC briefings prior to 8/28 PSC meeting #6	PMT	8/17
Refine alternatives workshop plan and identify materials	PMT	8/3

• Upcoming Events

8/3 - SWG meeting #9. 6:00 - 8:00 PM (Sherwood Police Training Center)

8/10 - EMT meeting #12. 9:30-11:30 AM (Metro, location TBD)