



**DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY**

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 39

Meeting Date: 10/16/08

Issue Date: 11/4/08

*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 #49**

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

**Attendees:**

<b>EMT</b>	Michael Bowers Andy Cotugno Gus Duenas Fred Eberle Mike McKillip Kathy Lehtola R. Scott Pemble Tom Pessemier	City of Wilsonville (alternate) Metro City of Tigard ODOT City of Tualatin Washington County Clackamas County City of Sherwood
<b>PMT</b>	Vaughn Brown Jim Evans Leslie Howell Jef Kaiser Chris Maciejewski Scott Richman Tim Wilson	JLA Public Involvement Moyano Leadership Group Howell Consulting David Evans and Associates, Inc. (DEA) DKS DEA ODOT
<b>Others</b>	Ben Altman Tom Aufenthie	

**Distribution:** PMT, EMT, Interested Parties, File

Kathy Lehtola called the meeting to order at 9:30 AM.

**Washington EMT Transition**

- Kathy said that Lawrence Odell has left Washington County, and Mark Brown is returning on an interim basis to serve as the acting Assistant Director of the Department of Land Use and Transportation until a new Assistant Director is hired. He will be the primary person working closely with Russ and Kathy, and will be the EMT alternate for Washington County. Kathy is attending today and she will attend the PSC meeting next week (October 22<sup>nd</sup>).

**SWG Update:**

- Scott gave an update from the October 9<sup>th</sup> SWG meeting. That meeting was well-attended with a few members absent.
- Several SWG members repeated concerns they had stated at other SWG meetings regarding transit service or lack thereof, as well as shifting modes and other methods of getting people to stay out of their cars. They are seeking an aggressive increase in transit options as well as policies encouraging alternatives modes of transportation and reducing the number of single-occupancy vehicles.
- Scott and Chris reminded the SWG of the transportation demand management and transportation system management (TDM/TSM) elements that were included in Alternatives 2 and 3, and which the PMT is proposing to advance under the "hybrid" alternative to study further.
- Chris also updated the SWG on a pending report regarding the commuter rail and its feasibility study. Sketch-level planning and a commuter forecast between Sherwood and Tualatin was presented. Some SWG members showed strong interest in moving this forward.
- Several SWG members reiterated their desire for the PSC to have a policy discussion before reaching a decision on a preferred alternative, and again questioned the project purpose.
- Several SWG members repeated questions regarding the reliability of information used in the Metro travel demand model. Chris indicated that the main concern was on how scoping was conducted 10 years ago. Scott and Chris emphasized to the SWG that Metro's information and modeling software is up-to-date, is being applied to other projects in the region, and has earned national recognition for being a state-of-the-art regional travel forecasting model.

**Scenario Modeling Debrief:**

- Scott introduced a table showing a summary record of the modeling scenario workshop held on October 2<sup>nd</sup>.
- Chris reminded the EMT that one goal of this workshop was to test refinements to the Three Arterial Concept, including connections near the I-5 interchanges. The other goal was to text packages of projects for potential phasing between short-, medium- and long-term periods.
- Michael B. asked if we were presenting this workshop summary to the PSC next week, and Scott responded that we are not due to limited time and intent to focus on the refined alternative. Scott said that this table was being provided to the EMT as a tool for them to use in discussions with their PSC members prior to the October 22<sup>nd</sup> PSC meeting.
- Michael B. requested that more information be provided in the summary table, particularly in the "results" column. He requested each over-crossing option tested shown separately in the table. On page 2 of the table, he's listed as the proposer for some of the scenarios, when it was DKS that suggested them.
- Mike M. said that it seems to indicate that we're not interested in looking at alternatives that have some negatives but could also provide benefits. It looks like all we're trying to do is decide if the RTP line is the northern or southern alignment, then it seems that we're not interested in solving I-5 and interchange traffic problems. According to the table, we show some local connection improvements that remove local traffic from the

nearest interchanges and some look like legitimate solutions, but we're dismissing them. Where the table indicates a concern, it seems we also need to identify benefits.

- Scott said that some of the projects, in terms of the project's overall purpose and direction from the PSC, led us in this direction. In addition to reducing congestion, we're attempting to come up with packages that can be phased and that are less costly than the build alternatives previously studied. Scott reminded that a project objective is not to worsen conditions on I-5, but not necessarily to solve future problems on I-5. One benefit of the workshop was that it tested viability of actions that local agencies could consider for their TSPs.
- Tom observed that some scenarios listed seem to be ones that have yet to be studied.
- Mike M. said that the workshop seemed to look into smaller-scale projects and not widening freeways, for example.
- Scott said that is correct and that it was more focused on a traffic analysis perspective.
- Jef K. said that the table was supposed to be a record of the workshop and that concerns and issues identified in the table were brought up in the workshop.
- Fred suggested that what was brought up at the workshop vs. information from studies be clarified. Mike B. suggested that we work at keeping opinion out of it—keep it factual.
- Kathy recommends more detail in the 'results' column. Indicate what the impacts of the scenario are, but also why they might be an effective option.
- Andy pointed out that the bigger picture of the process is to bring a package together that we all can agree to. How does this table help this process? What scenarios don't seem to work, but should be considered further - maybe in a more-detailed design process? He suggested that the outcome of this RTP amendment process could be to develop a core group of recommendations with potential related actions and unresolved issues in some locations. Our recommendation should include identification of additional analysis that may be warranted.
- Scott observed that there is a tie between the purpose of the workshop and the next step we take. It might be helpful to talk about the tiered/phased packaging.
- Kathy asked if the October 2<sup>nd</sup> workshop summary table could be revised and sent out again to the EMT. Scott requested that the EMT provide suggested edits to him by tomorrow (Friday) and said that DEA would send out a revised version to the EMT as quickly as possible.

### **Response to PSC request for short-, medium-, and long-term project packages**

- Andy observed that some of the traffic consequence models were powerful & effective visual conclusions, and should be used for the PSC to help explain how we got to the refined alternative with phased project packages.
- Chris said that while the whole presentation is not together yet, they have the information of the scenarios tested to show today.
- Scott noted that the packages are all based on the 2030 model. We do not have interim year model data.
- Jef observed that the workshop was intended to be informal, and the table was not intended to be a refined definition of the scenarios. It was a tool to develop a table of components for a refined solution.
- R. Scott asked what the timelines are for the various phases. Chris said that they haven't done the analysis to see when an approximate trigger period would be to

expand upon the short-term and medium-term packages, but the general thought is that the short-term could be approximately 5-7 years, the medium-term could be 8-14 years out, and the long-term could be 15 years or more.

- R. Scott wanted to know where the funding might come from and what the costs are. It seems that we're jumping into the elements and is unsure about why the elements are packaged in this short-mid-long term way.
- Jef said that he wasn't sure that the finances were defined in this method. In terms of traffic, they tried to keep 'flow' in mind: to keep the traffic in an area from growing out of control.
- Scott said that they hoped to have cost estimates soon, but wanted to engage in conversation first, to see if the packages seemed reasonable.
- Jef reminded the group that when this exercise started, the mission was to identify a potential solution that could be phased over time. We wanted to try this idea, pass it by the EMT/PSC, and then do more modeling. The modeling may tell us that tweaking needs to occur or that timing of the improvements may need to change.
- Scott added that we're responding to direction from the PSC members and attempting to come back with a package of projects that could provide similar benefits with less impacts and cost than the earlier alternatives. This refined concept includes some promising elements from EESA and the connectors. Some of this information is from the public open houses and the modeling sessions. We have not asked the PSC to agree to this concept. This is the technical team's attempt, but we may seek agreement from them on short-term projects.
- Jef and Chris went on to show the short- vs. medium- and long-term packaged projects. Chris suggested starting with the big-picture options and refining down through the short- and medium-term phasing. Key slides and images from the model will be important in illustrating this concept and the potential phasing.
- Chris clarified that we're not asking the PSC if this is the preferred alternative—we're finding out if this deserves further study. Scott added that we promised to come back with some short-term solutions that the PSC could agree to advance.
- Andy would like to see it emphasized that the model shows growth that hasn't happened yet. Therefore, it would be good to show short-term solutions in the 2005 model, rather than for 2030 alone. It would be good to nail down the short-term, but let the mid- and long-term be conceptual. Half the growth of the area isn't here yet, but can be shaped now. This might also create more buy-in for the short-term. He also suggested that acquiring ROW for the entire southern arterial be initiated in the short term rather than the mid-term.
- Chris said that DKS will begin by showing the 2030 year model volumes compared to 2005 to illustrate forecast growth.
- Mike M. said that some PSC members will also want to show who we're serving – where the trips are coming from.

### **Project Steering Committee**

- Kathy noted that the only PSC action item on the agenda is the approval of the summary minutes.
- R. Scott suggested that we should find out if they want to advance the refined alternative package as "Alternative 7". This conversation should be at #5 on the agenda. We need to make sure that it's clear that we're asking for them to agree to

## DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 39

Meeting Date: 10/16/08

Issue Date: 11/4/08

part of this now – the short-term list, and not the whole alternative. We also need to get them into conversation that explains that we would be farming out the majority of this package and decide which parts we would put out for RFP.

- Mike B. asked what we are handing out for #6, policy discussion. We've passed out platform documents before, but the discussion never occurred.
- Scott reminded the group that the PMT and EMT had reviewed and provided a packet that includes list of policy issues and supporting materials that the PSC had for their last meeting on August 13<sup>th</sup>. The PSC members could refer to this same packet for the October 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting.
- Kathy said that she would work with Scott to revise the PSC agenda, and Scott will send a revised agenda to the EMT and PSC prior to the October 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting.