



DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 51

Meeting Date: 02/12/09

Issue Date: 02/27/09

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 #51

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

Attendees:

EMT	Mark Brown	Washington County
	Andy Cotugno	Metro
	Fred Eberle	ODOT
	Michael Bowers	City of Wilsonville (alternate)
	Jeff Graham	FHWA
	Mike McKillip	City of Tualatin
	Tom Pessemier	City of Sherwood
	Mike Stone	City of Wilsonville
PMT	Russ Knoebel	Washington County
	Mark Turpel	Metro
	Tim Wilson	ODOT
	Vaughn Brown	
	Jim Evans	
	Angie Jones	
	Chris Maciejewski	
	Randy McCourt	
	Scott Richman	
Others	Gus Duenas	City of Tigard
	Ben Altman	
	Tom Aufenthie	

Distribution: PMT, File

The meeting began at 9:30 AM. The summary generally follows the order of the 2/12/09 EMT agenda.

Welcome and Introductions

- Mark Brown welcomed the group, started introductions.

Agenda Additions and Deletions

- Michael B. asked if comments from Wilsonville will be addressed as part of this meeting. Mark said we can cover that under other business. Mike McKillip requested that we cover this first, and the EMT agreed.

Other Business

- Michael B. handed out a draft packet of information to be presented to the Wilsonville City Council next Thursday evening. He extended an offer to the PMT to attend or even have time to present to the Council. He summarized Wilsonville's concerns. He believes that we are not giving sufficient attention to how we are going to interface the three arterials, particularly the southern arterial at I-5. If the southern arterial is adopted, it is almost 100% dependant on I-5 working successfully and whatever type of facility we have connecting to I-5 working successfully. We have not put enough time into solving that.
- There has been a development proposal for two years in the area directly east of I-5 and north of the Mercedes dealership that directly impacts the area where the Alternative 7 maps shows an over-crossing. He provided a map showing this proposed development.
- Wilsonville has concern that Sherwood and Tualatin's transportation system plans are largely helped by the three arterials proposal; some of their projects are incorporated in Alternative 7, or they receive benefit in that lots of their congestion on their existing system is alleviated. However, Wilsonville feels that just the opposite is occurring for them; Wilsonville has the third arterial coming in on the Elligsen interchange, and it creates an incompatibility problem and a burden on Wilsonville's TSP to create a host of projects to get to Wilsonville's city limits.
- Michael B. said has been working with a couple of consultants that are giving him advice and counsel along with his staff on their opinion of a split diamond interchange between now and the PSC. Some of the potential layouts using FHWA and ODOT standards to overlay the split diamond, has lead them to the conclusion that we could be looking at a cost estimate of \$50-\$150 million dollars, and could also need a braided ramp system on the east side of I-5; and there are some ODOT and FHWA standards of spacing that might not allow that split diamond interchange.
- Michael B. did some cost estimates on the stretch of arterial from Canyon Creek to the over-crossing on I-5. Surprisingly, from a lane mile perspective, it is almost exactly the same cost estimate the consultants are using for the entire southern arterial. The cost is \$49

million dollars without blasting the rocky hill east of I-5. The cost of blasting bedrock does not appear to be included in the Alternative 7 cost estimate, therefore it will most likely be put on to Wilsonville's TSP as an additional burden.

- He also raised concerns about impacts to natural resources, including blasting risks and that impacts to a significant wildlife corridor is minimally addressed in the entire environmental report for the southern arterial. There are also challenges for constructing the 124th extension, including topography and that the soil is very soft in many places. If we are serving new industrial areas by building new facilities; he believes that 20-40% of that acreage is unusable for new facilities due to topography, wetlands, and other factors.
- He compared the recently constructed Boeckman Road that is a little less than 1 mile long to the southern arterial that would be 15 times that of Boeckman in terms of footprint (length and width). Based on their permits, they impacted 4.4 acres of wetland on a road 1/15th the size of the southern arterial, and there are 4-5 acres of impact estimated for Alternative 7.
- He spoke about town centers – the purpose and needs statement talks about alleviating congestion caused by regional and through traffic. Based on the transportation technical exhibits, the through and regional traffic contribution as a percentage of total volume in the Sherwood and Tualatin town centers increases over No-Build.
- Michael B. and Mayor Knapp met and could not find much benefit for Wilsonville from Alternative 7. He is refining his report in addition to some consultant's reports and will present this information to the City Council on February 18th.
- Russ noted that costs for tying the southern arterial into I-5 and Elligsen Road has been included in Alternative 7, and that these planning-level costs were estimated by a retired ODOT engineer. The estimate for a tight split diamond interchange is \$50 million.
- Mike M. asked if ODOT and FHWA are comfortable with the impacts to I-5 and appropriate mitigation. Fred said that ODOT does not view a split diamond interchange as ideal, but they do not see any fatal flaws; we could make it work. Randy said that the center of the I-205 interchange to Elligsen is 2 miles. It does fall within the target zone for required spacing; it is not perfect, but workable with flexibility in design.
- Fred said that the bottom line is the traffic is going to be worse in 20-30 years, it seems like people in Wilsonville are in denial that traffic through Wilsonville is going to increase without doing anything. Alternative 7 is not perfect; the best for I-5 would have been the braided ramps and CD roads, but there was resistance to that.

- Randy asked Michael B. what he wants. Michael agreed something needs to be done, and there are lots of options that need to align with Frobase Road and connect to Stafford Road. His recommendation was for an over-crossing between Tualatin and Wilsonville. As you crunch that split diamond closer to Elligsen, you have to move bedrock with cut and fill. He is surprised that the interchange has not gone to a more detailed level of design to confirm feasibility.
- Michael B. would like to review the meeting minutes from the last couple of meetings – there is a difference in opinion of what we voted on. He questioned what the issue date of the EMT meeting minutes means. Scott replied that has typically been the date they are placed on the website. Michael said that he had his IT specialist check the website and they were not loaded until February 6th, but perhaps they were loaded and then taken off, but according to the electronic record, it says February 6th.

Alternatives Recommendation

- Scott said that Metro met a couple of days ago and there was support for Councilor Hosticka to select Alternative 7. He went through the Alternative recommendation memo, including removal of phased packages and inclusion of draft conditions.
- Mike M. asked if the condition regarding project phasing would take place of the short-, mid-, and long-term table that had been shown in the past. Scott answered that the table had been revised to show the projects geographically, not to indicate that a specific phasing plan is already in place.
- Michael B. asked to modify point three on page 2 to add ROW acquisition, and also adding an extension to Stafford Road to the last sentence. Scott said that the extension to Stafford Road is outside of the scope and not tied to the purpose of this project. The ROW would not be acquired until the alignment of the southern arterial is determined. Mark suggested we add another condition to address ROW.
- Tom said that he is concerned about the Brookman concept plan not being able to move forward as the related draft condition indicates. There is a possible lawsuit pending with the County and the City of Sherwood about this concept plan not moving forward in a timely manner.
- Michael B. asked about point 6 (Goal Exception processes) – doesn't it require a state process? Scott replied that the amended RTP (to establish the connector location) has to be reviewed and acknowledged by DLCD.

- Russ questioned the need for draft condition 7 (on going coordination with TRNWR) since this would be done anyway. The EMT agreed to have this as a sub point of draft condition 4 (NEPA).
- Gus said that Tigard does not feel that the three arterials will function as well as one expressway connection; they still have concerns about the mobility of 99W. Randy said that it should be noted that the southern arterial will need to be a limited access facility. There will not be driveways onto the facility and intersections would be limited.
- Mark T. made a suggestion to draft condition 5 – add “that are a) within the Metro UGB, and b) are within the project area and are not incorporated, and c) for which concept planning has not yet commenced.”
- Mark B. asked about ROW; should we add another draft condition to the list? Fred said that ROW is addressed in the cost estimate table. We need to get through the NEPA process on the alignment before we can start to acquire ROW. We need to do the concept plan. Scott suggested putting something after point 4. Mike S. said that until the NEPA process is complete, you would have to have a willing seller in order to buy property. In the meantime, you could require ROW setbacks from a proposed road. This would work for the roadway, but not the interchange.
- Michael B. asked if the area between Boones Ferry Road and I-5 was included in the UGB expansion of 2002 and 2004. Andy said that it was.
- Andy said that we should add something about protecting ROW from future development.
- Mike M. said his concern is large churches and church/schools being developed in the path of a planned arterial; Tom said that schools are looking more at moving out to rural County lands, and that is a concern.
- Randy suggested adding “Strategic protection of right-of-way should be considered for Alternative 7 elements within the UGB and along potential alignments where development may interfere with implementation, including aspects such as dedication of right-of-way setbacks, specific acquisitions, and NEPA process to require right-of-way.”
- Mike M. said he is worried about requiring it before we have an alignment. Randy said that is why we need the concept plan; that defines where the corridor is.
- Mark B. asked about the package of the memo, tables, and map – is there anything else to go over before it goes to the PSC?
- Mike S. asked how we get to the refinement alignment phase. Mark B. said that is part of one of the conditions on the list – acknowledging that there needs to be follow-up refinement of the “bands” on the

map. Mike S. asked if there is money to do the refinement work, and Mark B. replied that there may be.

- Randy said that ROW for 124th is not a two-lane road to Tonquin, but a five-lane and this should be formatted in Table 1 similar to the southern arterial.
- Michael B. asked about two left hand turn lanes on Day Road going west – should “add accommodating intersection” be a part of the improvements? Randy said that there are certain improvements in the area that will be needed.
- Mike M. asked if Wilsonville’s concern about this package is because it adds projects to their TSP; wouldn’t they be eligible for the same type of federal funding that these projects are? Andy agreed. Scott said this is all intended as information that would inform local TSPs.
- Michael B. said that the Sherwood and Tualatin TSPs have somewhat incorporated a southern arterial. Wilsonville’s TSP has not been updated since 2001, therefore was before the planning of this connector. Randy said all the communities have substantial infrastructure planning impacts, and Chris said that the Sherwood TSP does not include a connector corridor.
- Mark B. asked the EMT if we are in concurrence with the additions and minor edits as discussed, is this the package that we want to recommend to the PSC for approval?
- Andy moved that the EMT recommend this proposal as edited by the EMT today for consideration of approval by the PSC. Fred seconded the motion.
- Michael B. said he was all for moving it forward, but not going across the point of saying he would recommend it. Vote of the EMT was all in favor with the exception of Mike Stone, he voted no.
- Andy asked for an explanation of the vote from Wilsonville, and Michael B. said he had already laid that out earlier [Andy was absent at the beginning of the meeting] as summarized under “Other Business”.
- Michael B. said that we have very little information on the split diamond and ROW impacts. He is concerned with increased regional and through traffic using arterials and I-5, and he would prefer that the southern arterial extend east to connect to Stafford Road and I-205.
- Randy said that this project creates a 50% reduction in congestion duration, and it is on level or above par with other transportation projects in the region from a cost effectiveness standpoint. If the intent is to completely reject Alternative 7, then it needs to be clear why.
- Mike S. said that this is a political decision too big to leave to the engineers, and numbers are not the entire issue here.

- Fred said that the packet from Wilsonville does not give two sides to the story; it only presents a negative position, and it is a distortion to give to the politicians to make a decision. It seems disingenuous to only chop Alternative 7 to pieces without any positive input.

Project Steering Committee

- The EMT discussed the February 25th PSC agenda. Mark B. asked about the public comments – Scott said that we have received some comments via the website; Mark B. said that he expects that more written comments will come in also.
- Fred asked Michael B. if there was going to be a presentation from Wilsonville at this PSC meeting. If so, he would appreciate advance notice to the EMT about this instead of springing this on everyone at the PSC as Wilsonville has done before. Michael B. said that is dependant on the outcome of the City Council meeting. Mike S. corrected that the day of the Wilsonville Council meeting is Wednesday February 18th (not Thursday as Michael B. had earlier noted).
- Mark B. asked about the possibility of another EMT meeting – if we have a great deal that needs to be dealt with from the PSC meeting. The EMT agreed to hold Thursday, March 12th on their schedule.
- Randy asked Wilsonville that if there are issues to be solved, let's do that before the PSC meeting and not drag out the process.
- Mark B. asked Tualatin and Sherwood if they have had discussions and have gotten all the information they needed. Mike M. said that there was a discussion this week. Tom said that while there has not been an official presentation, he is keeping the mayor up to date on the progress.
- Mark T. clarified the action item on the February 25th PSC agenda is expected to be a recommendation of Alternative 7 to Metro to be incorporated into the RTP.

Public Involvement Update

- Scott said that the website has been updated and we have received public comments via the website plus some phone calls. There have also been some briefings including the Metro Council and Westside Economic Alliance Transportation Committee last week.
- Vaughn said that offers are out there for updates to interested parties. They have also asked for comments that need to be received prior to the Feb. 25th PSC meeting.
- Mike S. said that there were a few citizens that sat through a late running Tualatin City Council meeting. They were expressing surprise that this project is moving forward, and they wanted to know about

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 51

Meeting Date: 02/12/09

Issue Date: 02/27/09

when there would be more public comment. Mayor Ogden encouraged them to attend the PSC meeting.