



DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 48

Meeting Date: 09/18/08

Issue Date: /08

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 #48

Project: I-5 to 99W Connector
Purpose: Project Management Team Meeting
Location: David Evans and Associates, Inc.

Attendees:

Russ Knoebel	Washington County
R. Scott Pemble	Clackamas County
Fred Eberle	ODOT
Tim Wilson	ODOT
Mark Turpel	Metro
Gus Duenas	City of Tigard
Mike McKillip	City of Tualatin
Tom Pessemier	City of Sherwood
Mike Stone	City of Wilsonville
Alex Dupey	DEA
Jef Kaiser	DEA
Chris Maciejewski	DKS
Vaughn Brown	JLA
Jim Evans	Moyano Group

Others: Tom Aufenthie SWG

Distribution: PMT, File

The meeting began at 9:00 AM. Fred led the meeting. The summary generally follows the order of the 9/18/08 EMT agenda.

SWG Debrief

- Vaughn gave an debrief from the 9/11 SWG meeting
- There was a lot of concern that commuter rail and transit should be considered on the same footing as road improvements
- Some SWG members asked how far the project needs to go for providing additional transit services
- During and after the meeting, SWG members stated that the project is going in the right direction that a PSC policy discussion still needs to occur prior to selecting a preferred alternative

Alternatives Refinement

- Jef Kaiser led a discussion on the alternatives refinement that proposed modeling two transportation scenarios
- Both scenarios include all TSM/TDM improvements
- Under Scenario 1, 124th would be a 5-lane facility as opposed to a 3-lane facility as proposed in EESA
- The PMT will attempt to provide a life expectancy of the improvements under Scenario 1.
- Scenario 2 is the PMT's best attempt to meet the purpose and need
- Tom P. asked about TS Road. Doesn't the RTP already show that TS Road will be 5 lanes?
- Chris M. said that the RTP identifies it as 5 lanes but doesn't have any funding attached to build it.
- Fred said it looks like you're not getting much extra capacity with the additional lane on TS Road
- Tom reiterated that he thought the Alternatives 4-6 included 5 lanes along all of TS Road. (AA only shows improvements to TSR from 124th-west for the Connector Alternatives)
- Mike McKillip said that the mayors are going to ask about why we're expanding Herman between Cipole and Teton.
- Scott Pemble said that we need to show Scenario 1 on the table. He said that this is fine to look at capacity, but it isn't telling us about demand and doesn't support a decision.
- Fred said that we wouldn't be taking just this to the PSC, but also the results.

PSC Feedback

- Scott Pemble said Commissioner Peterson organized a meeting with Mayor Lehan, Mayor Ogden, Mayor Mays, and Ray Phelps. They had the following comments:
 1. The preliminary hybrid as proposed by the PMT should be analyzed but in conjunction with analysis of other packages
 2. Other packages would include separating out specific components of the hybrid so that they can be viewed in an additive way. As an example, one analysis might include showing what would happen if only the east/west Herman arterial were added to the system without the other two proposed east/west arterial alternatives in the preliminary hybrid alternative. Then a second analysis might include adding the TS Road improvements along with Herman Road.

3. In addition to TSM/TDM, as many of the EESA element should be included as part of the baseline improvements regardless of proposed hybrid improvements. If some of the EESA elements are not part of the package, why not?
 4. Baseline system should include transit service to the Newberg Dundee area.
 5. The southern alignment should be evaluated using the following three scenarios:
 - Extend the southern alignment from OR 99W to Baker Road and stop.
 - Extend the southern alignment to Elligsen
 - Third option would be to have an overpass on OR 99W and connect to Kruger. Connects to Elligsen interchange.
 6. If the south alternative ultimately requires a collector/distributor (on I-5) then that is a critical flaw. I-5 auxiliary lanes are not a CD system.
 7. Not all of these project components would be federally fundable.
 8. 124th should be modeled with the following two options:
 - Take 124th to Tonquin and then stop. No connection to Boones Ferry
 - Take 124th as depicted on Scenario 2 to the Elligsen interchange
 9. The need to have a policy discussion
- Mike M. asked that if 124th doesn't connect to I-5 then why do it?
 - Mike Stone said in his conversations with Mayor Lehan that he is not sure it is accurate that the south arterial should go away if it just needs aux lanes. He thought she was also against the connection to OR 99W.
 - Russ asked if the study to come out shortly that shows minimal growth in Yamhill County would change people's minds about supporting growth in that area with the southerly connection to OR 99W.
 - Scott Pemble thinks that some people would like to revisit to original tenants of how the RTP decisions were made.
 - Amy asked how many people would like to revisit the JPACT level decision.
 - Scott Pemble said 50 percent of those at the meeting definitely and all of the participants possibly thought it should be revisited.
 - Tom P. said there was no consensus at the meeting with Lyn
 - Jef said the reason we're going back to the RTP for a possible amendment is to check to make sure the decision is still correct.
 - Tom P. said in his conversations with Mayor Mays that we need a project that meets the purpose and need. Mayor Mays:

1. Is skeptical that Scenario 2 will meet the purpose and need but will wait and see
 2. Limited access on TS Road is not acceptable
 3. Overpass at TS Road and OR 99W is not acceptable
 4. No widening of TS Road to Borchers
 5. Tonquin Road could be widened
 6. 124th extension and how it interacts with TS Road and impacts to town centers needs to be evaluated
 7. There is a need to talk about quiet centers for commuter rail
 8. There is a need to talk about access control and how we'll provide access to existing users
 9. There need for clarification on Federal and funding
- Mark Turpel (from Carl):
 1. Mark expects Carl will not have problems with modeling
 2. He recognizes there is a transportation problem and something needs to be done
 3. One of the solutions could potentially be something like OR 224 (Milwaukie Expressway)
 4. Access to recently designated industrial lands very important (such as with 124th)
 - Mike McKillip (input from Mayor, City Manager et al):
 1. Mayor is ok with modeling scenarios
 2. Not really interested in seeing routes through cities being throughways.
 3. Show what the differences are with various links
 4. Need to be thinking about some other measure beside PM peak etc. Maybe look at it over a 24 hour cycle and how many hours are ok versus congested.
 5. Recognize that a solution won't last over the long term. Need to make sure we don't close the door on future projects
 - Mike Stone (input from Mayor Lehan):
 1. Supportive of either of the two scenarios for modeling
 2. Establishing a southern corridor is a deal killer.
 - Gus Duenas:
 1. Doesn't see why we're doing Scenario 1
 2. Concern that you're going to get three congested arterial corridors and still have traffic on OR 99W
 3. If we're no longer talking about expressways, tolls would no longer be on the table and that is a loss of a potential funding source.
 4. Don't preclude southern alignment as an expressway
 5. Concerns about Durham Road. Modeling needs to take that into account.
 - Russ (Input from Tom Brian and Roy Rogers):

1. Concerned that another county commissioner met with Washington County Mayors without notifying Washington County
 2. Neither are interested in another two years of modeling
 3. Need to see something happen soon
 4. Supportive of modeling, to a point
 5. Willing to start building Scenario 1 now
- Fred (input from Jason Tell):
 1. Model two scenarios and what's in between those two
 2. Get EMT to come to some conclusions and then have the PSC meet.

Other Comments

- Fred asked about how many scenarios should we consider modeling.
- Chris proposed having a work session to get to couple of proposed scenarios. This could be a day-long session where the EMT could do see some basic modeling and make some decisions about what should be included in the scenario.
- Jim and Russ said that his PSC members said don't want to waste time. If the hybrid is a deal killer, then what are we going to do? They're willing to do that at next week's meeting.
- Russ asked how long the model runs will take.
- Chris said we won't get the results by the October PSC. The results need to be vetted.
- Jim said maybe run scenario 1 and see what that gets us.
- Jef proposed modeling scenario 1 as a base and then incrementally adding individual projects.
- Scott P and Fred said we need to model these incrementally and show what you need to do to meet the purpose and need.
- Tom P. said the public needs to see that we're making the right decision
- Jim recommended EMT getting together to identify caveats and then get that to the PSC in October
- Have the next EMT meeting (10/2) devoted to the scenarios.
- October PSC meeting will discuss the Yamhill County and commuter rail study.

Next EMT Meeting

- EMT #49 – October 2nd - Metro