



DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 50

Meeting Date: 01/08/09

Issue Date: 01/21/09

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 #50

Project: I-5 to 99W Connector
Purpose: Executive Management Team Meeting
Location: Metro, Council Chamber
Attendees:

EMT

Mark Brown	Washington County
Michael Bowers	City of Wilsonville
Andy Cotugno	Metro
Fred Eberle	ODOT
Jeff Graham	FHWA
Mike McKillip	City of Tualatin
R. Scott Pemble	Clackamas County
Tom Pessemier	City of Sherwood

PMT

Vaughn Brown	JLA
Jennifer Danziger	DEA
Jim Evans	Moyano Leadership Group
Amy Gibbons	ODOT
Angie Jones	DEA
Jef Kaiser	DEA
Russ Knoebel	Washington County
Chris Maciejewski	DKS
Scott Richman	DEA
Mark Turpel	Metro
Tim Wilson	ODOT

Others: Brian Altman
Tom Aufenthie
Gus Duenas (City of Tigard)
Mike Feves

Distribution: PMT, File, project web site

The meeting began at 9:30 AM. Mark Brown led the meeting. The summary generally follows the order of the 1/8/09 EMT agenda.

Welcome and Introductions

- Mark welcomed the group and started introductions

Agenda Additions and Deletions

- none

Alternative Recommendation

- Scott Richman gave an overview of the elements that comprise Alternative 7. Alternative 7 is comprised of multiple project elements that could be sequenced to be completed in short, mid, and long-term phases.
- Scott used a Powerpoint slide show to summarize the supplemental analysis results for Alternative 7.
- Mark B. asked if this is the same presentation that will be presented to the PSC. Scott replied that there is a SWG meeting next week – on January 15th, and that we plan to use a similar presentation for the SWG and the PSC at their meeting on January 28th.
- Jeff G. asked Chris M. to describe the the transportation performance “life expectancy” modeling approach. Chris said that it was a broad look at volume/capacity ratios for future conditions using straight-lined land use growth. It is a very high level analysis of life expectancy.
- Mark B. suggested that we note that it is a broad level analysis on the table that breaks the projects into possible phased packages.
- R. Scott P. said that it was a very positive presentation and questioned “what is the downside?” (of Alternative 7).
- Scott said that there are impacts to the built and natural environment; however, in the evolution of this project, this alternative seems to have the least overall adverse impacts and most favorable transportation system benefits over the other alternatives previously analyzed.
- R. Scott suggested that it should be added into the memo’s conclusion that this alternative meets the project purpose and needs, while some of the other alternatives do not. We have not made this conclusion clear to date.
- Mark B. asked about putting that into the beginning of the memo text, describing the history of the project and the conclusion of the other alternatives
- Gus asked about air quality and noise impacts. If the traffic is spread over three arterials that is slower moving, how can it be said that it will be less impacting than a higher volume expressway that flows freely?

- Jef replied that the slower moving traffic is less noisy than a higher speed expressway. The air quality is the same for the same amount of traffic; spread over three arterials or more restricted to one expressway.
- Mike M. said that Table 1 should be changed about the widening of Lower Boones Ferry near Bridgeport to match the map
- Michael B. referred to Table 2 – the impacts comparison summary table. He is not able to tell from this table how we are meeting the purpose and needs for reducing congestion on the existing arterial system. He requested information to clarify this, and Scott said that we would provide this more detailed information prior to the PSC meeting.
- Jef said that the intent was to either build new facilities that would draw the traffic away from the arterials as the Connector alternatives (4-6) would do, or to build up the existing arterials to accommodate the future traffic demand as Alternative 3 would do. Alternative 7 distributes traffic more evenly between three primary east-west arterial corridors.
- Chris said that the short term projects are meant to address travel demand in an interim period.
- Michael B. expressed concern that the short term projects are going to make conditions worse on existing arterials than the no-build. He wants to make sure we have the right projects for the short term phase so that we are not making things worse.
- Russ said that if we only do the short term projects by 2030, then the situation could be worse in some locations. However, the alternative includes other projects to address the long-term demand.
- R. Scott said that we morphed from the original purpose of searching for an ideal alignment for connecting the highway system to improving the local traffic system to keep it from mis-using the highway system to serve local needs.
- Tom P. suggested that proposed new road segments on the map (e.g. Herman Road extension to OR 99W) should be labeled to show that the alignment has not been defined.
- Jef asked if the EMT is ready to recommend Alternative 7 to the PSC, and Mark B. posed that question to the EMT members.
- Mike M. said that he presented this alternative at the last City Council meeting and they said this was on the right track. While there was discussion centered around the arterial extension through Tualatin Park, they did not reject this project element.
- Tom mentioned that the workshop showed that there does need to be an order to the phasing of these projects to cause the least impact and the most benefit. There needs to be local jurisdiction coordination of TSP projects

- R. Scott suggested the memo should be amended to take the life expectancy dates off of Table 1.
- R. Scott made a motion to recommend Alternative 7 to the PSC for approval as the preferred alternative
- Michael B. said he accepts this recommendation; provided he gets the information he requested about the impacts to the arterial system including the impacts of only doing short-term projects upon existing arterials.
- The EMT moved unanimously to recommend Alternative 7 to the PSC.

Project Steering Committee

- R. Scott asked if we are going to plan to have two PSC meetings to close out the alternative selection process: the next meeting to present and discuss, and then allow for a vote on Alternative 7 at a follow-up meeting.
- Mark B. said that we are going to be there on the 28th and have the presentation much like we had today and see if there is consensus from the PSC.
- Andy said that he would like to see two meetings; roll out the recommendation and then allow for time to go back to the jurisdictions and take a vote at the following PSC meeting for a decision. Andy said that it needs to be made clear that this is a RTP recommendation from Clackamas County, Washington County, and local TSPs for the portion that is outside of the Metro jurisdictional boundary
- R. Scott confirmed that Charlotte Lehan will be the new representative for Clackamas County as appointed by the Chair of the Clackamas County Commission. The EMT agreed that it would be appropriate to get a letter of this appointment from Clackamas County's chair and from Wilsonville's new mayor about the new PSC representatives.
- Mike M. asked about the partnering agreement rules on having the actual PSC members at the decision meeting, alternates are not allowed to represent them.
- Scott confirmed that the PSC partnering agreement does stipulate that the designated PSC representative is to be present for key milestones including the alternative selection.

Public Involvement Update

- Vaughn said that the SWG meeting next week is noted on the website; they are also mailing out an update to interested parties that provides a project update and directs people to the website for more information.

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 50

Meeting Date: 01/08/09

Issue Date: 01/21/09

- Andy inquired about what we might expect from the SWG. Scott replied that based on our experience with the SWG to date, we expect that most SWG members will support Alternative 7 and a smaller group will continue to have concerns that will cause them to oppose it.
- Russ noted that some SWG members do not support a new road in any form between I-5 and OR 99W in the southern alignment corridor.
- Gus asked about getting the supplemental analysis for Alternative 7 available the way the AA Report was made public – placed in libraries, etc.; Vaughn said we can do that, and that this information will also be on the web site.

Other Business

- The next EMT meeting (#51) was tentatively scheduled to be held Thursday February 12th.