



DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 32

Meeting Date: 2/14/08

Issue Date: 2/26/08

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 #32

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

Attendees:

EMT	Michael Bowers	City of Wilsonville (alternate)
	Fred Eberle	ODOT
	Jeff Graham	FHWA
	Mike McKillip	City of Tualatin
	Lawrence Odell	Washington County
	R. Scott Pemble	Clackamas County
	Tom Pessemier	City of Sherwood
PMT	Amy Gibbons	ODOT
	Russell Knoebel	Washington County
	Mark Turpel	Metro
	Tim Wilson	ODOT
	Angie Jones	DEA
	Scott Richman	DEA
	Chris Maciejewski	DKS
	Vaughn Brown	Jeanne Lawson Associates (JLA)
Others	Tom Aufenthie	SWG
	Gus Duenas	City of Tigard

Distribution: PMT, EMT, Interested Parties, File

The meeting began at 9:30 AM. The agenda and other materials were provided to EMT members in electronic format prior to the meeting and copies were distributed at the meeting. The agenda items are represented in "bold" headings.

- **Welcome/Introductions**
 - Lawrence welcomed the group and asked if there were any changes to the agenda.
 - Lawrence reported that JPACT approved the request that Washington County is taking to Washington D.C. to ask for additional project development funds for this project.

- **Alternatives Analysis**

- Scott went over the latest estimated schedule for the next few months to show how we plan to complete the alternatives analysis. Next month we should have a more complete summary of information for the various disciplines that are subject of the alternatives analysis.
- Referring to the RTP amendment process chart, R. Scott suggested that we need to be clear what we are asking the PSC to adopt for the RTP amendment. Are we talking about lines on a map, or the detail of facility type, etc.?
- Scott said that the RTP amendment will identify location and general facility type, but the detail of facility type could be part of the design level EIS phase.
- Fred said that while the PSC may be able to reach agreement relatively soon on an alignment, there would need to be more analysis to determine the specific facility type, and this could be done through the EIS.
- Lawrence said that the level of detail for the RTP amendment would be as specific as the decision that the PSC agrees upon. They might want to decide what type of footprint, midpoint connection, etc.
- Jef reminded the group that we are emulating a tier 1 NEPA document that will decide a corridor alignment, but we need to be careful that the decision aligns with the information we have to use as its basis.
- Scott said we are planning for community forums in mid-late May. We then anticipate alternatives refinement including some additional analysis work this summer, leading to a PSC corridor recommendation decision by this fall. He referred to the draft "consumer reports" summary in the handout, and noted that there are some blank lines now, but we hope to have the more complete analysis done and the form completed by the next EMT meeting.
- Lawrence said he is concerned that there will be PSC members who will not show up to meetings leading up to a decision meeting, because there will be meetings before that point where they do not have to take action. We need to encourage and confirm their attendance at meetings.
- Scott requested that the EMT members share the schedule and information with their PSC members and encourage their participation to lead to a decision.
- Mike M. said that insufficient PSC meeting attendance could delay a PSC decision, but the PSC has agreed that they have alternates, and that we can still go ahead and have the meetings.
- Lawrence suggested having an agenda item at each PSC meeting to confirm attendance at future meetings. Will we see a change in Wilsonville and possibly Clackamas County representation on the PSC since Mayor Lehan is pursuing a Clackamas County Commission position?
- Michael B. requested that the EMT have opportunity to discuss Goal 1 (Transportation) analysis at the next EMT meeting once the analyses are complete.
- Chris presented a summary of transportation findings in a Powerpoint presentation organized by the Goal 1 transportation objectives in a question and response format. Some traffic data from the alternatives analysis is still under review, and more complete information will be available next month.
- Alternative 6 would substantially reduce travel time between OR 99W south of Sherwood and I-5 or I-205. Alternatives 4 and 5 would also reduce travel time

along the connector route. Alternatives 4, 5, and 6 would provide substantial reductions in total study area PM-peak congestion.

- Michael B. asked about regional trips to the west of the project area – west of OR 99W. He understands that almost 40% of the regional trips originate west of the project area and he would like to see travel times for west of OR 99W.
- Fred said that while data shows that there are trips west to Beaverton and Aloha, for example, from the project area, the purpose of the project is to study and address travel between I-5 and OR 99W.
- Chris referred to travel time data focused on town centers and industrial areas. This information may address Michael's request without needing to add evaluation locations.
- Michael B. is concerned that the Alternative 6 connector would not do anything to reduce the regional freight traffic on other roads in the project area since it would be too far south to conveniently serve most regional freight traffic.
- Fred requested that the project team meet with City of Wilsonville staff to review the traffic analysis data in more detail.
- Chris: Alternative 3 (EESA) would provide substantial increase in transit ridership (+30%) and would serve the most total person trips. Alternatives 2 and 3 would both provide substantial improvements to the bicycle and pedestrian system by increasing connectivity. Bike and pedestrian facilities would also be assumed for each of the connector corridors.
- Alternative 6 would have the lowest estimated crash rate due to the greatest traffic shift from surface streets to higher classification roadways. Alternatives 4 and 5 would also have reduced crash rates compared to no-build. Alternative 3 would potentially increase study area crash rates due to increased traffic on some signalized surface roads.
- Alternatives 4 and 5 would provide the greatest travel time reduction for the Sherwood and Tualatin industrial areas, particularly for access to I-5 south and I-205. Alternative 6 would provide the greatest overall travel time benefits for the Tualatin and Wilsonville industrial areas.
- Alternatives 4, 5, and 6 would provide similar reduction in total project area congestion with a signification reduction in congested lane miles. Alternative 3 would provide signification volume-to-capacity (v/c) ratio improvements at key arterial locations, but would not provide as much system congestion benefit as the connector alternatives.
- Michael B. asked about the specific focus of Objective 1A to the four town centers - can we present information in a subset just focused on the town centers?
- Chris said there will be more information specific to town centers to share at the next meeting. Alternatives 4, 5, and 6 would each reduce both overall traffic and through/regional traffic on T-S Road, and Alternatives 4 and 5 would increase traffic on OR 99W through Sherwood. Alternative 6 would reduce both overall traffic and through/regional traffic on T-S Road and OR 99W in Sherwood
- Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 would provide similarly substantial overall traffic and percentage of freight and regional traffic reduction on rural roads outside the UGB.
- Chris asked the EMT for feedback on this presentation format.

- Scott P. said it takes a little bit of “gymnastics” to go through the questions and have to cross-reference corresponding handout data in tables and maps. He likes this format, but we may want to change to questions slightly to better correlate between goals and objectives and evaluation criteria.
- Tom said it would also be good to correlation between the need statements and the criteria.
- Fred said that it might be good to first present the consumer reports summary format and then go through the powerpoint to make the connection between the analysis results that support the summarized conclusions.

- **Public Involvement update**
 - Vaughn provided a brief public involvement update.
 - We mailed 28,000 flyers to the extended project area to update people on the project, to direct them to the website for information, and to update the project contact database.
 - More than 150 new comments were posted on the website after the mailing. The majority of comments generally expressed frustration and agreement that there is a problem, a desire to move more quickly towards a decision. There were some concerns about land use planning and UGB expansion. Some felt that there was possible over emphasis on transit.
 - The video is posted online, and we have speakers for community briefings that are being scheduled to share results of the alternatives analysis.
 - Vaughn said we will present similar information to the SWG as we are to the EMT.
 - Scott offered the EMT members project team support and resources to help them keep their councils, etc. informed.

- **Other Business**
 - The next EMT meeting was scheduled for March 6th - 9:30 a.m. -11:30 a.m.