

Appendix C1

I-205 Toll Project Mitigation Workshop Summaries

I-205 Toll Project

Meeting Summary

Subject	I-205 Mitigation Workshop
Date and Time	August 19, 2022, 11 a.m.
Location	City of Canby Council Chambers

Attendees	Organization
Brian Hodson	City of Canby
Don Hardy	City of Canby
Jerry Nelzen	City of Canby
Ryan Potter	City of Canby
Todd Wood	CAT
Joseph Marek	Clackamas County
Karen Buehrig	Clackamas County
Mike Bezner	Clackamas County
Nathaniel Price	FHWA
Mandy Putney	ODOT
Ted Miller	ODOT
Andrew Bastasch	ODOT
Nicole McDermott	WSP
Chris Wellander	WSP
Ken Zatarain	WSP
Abby Caringula	WSP
Dwij Dave	WSP
Casey Balmes	WSP
Josh Mahar	KW
Gillian Garber-Yonts	KW

1 Materials Presented

- Workshop Agenda
- Potential Mitigation Table
- Synchro results for 4 intersections to be discussed at the workshop – No Build and Build for the impacted period and Build with the mitigation improvement
- Transportation Technical Report (Discussion Draft) and Attachments
- Mitigation Improvement Layouts (Exhibits)

2 Meeting Summary

The following includes a summary of the comments, questions and responses from the mitigation workshop. Comments, questions and responses are not written verbatim, but instead are summarized to

capture the primary intent and key points from the discussion. Some comments did not receive a direct response during the meeting, but will be considered as the analysis and EA are finalized.

Transportation Analysis Presentation

Question [Canby]: Does the no build assume improvements where there are bottlenecks from Oregon City to I-205? I know funding was sought to alleviate that issue.

Response [Project Team]: The No Build Alternative assumes only Phase 1A of the I-205 Improvements project is constructed. Phase 1A includes improvements to the Abernethy Bridge, which are currently under construction. The addition of the third lane between Stafford Road and OR 213, as well as upgrades to other bridges along this stretch of I-205, is included in the Build Alternative.

Question [CAT]: Do you have a breakdown of the benefits and impacts of adding a third lane versus tolling?

Response [Project Team]: They are paired together in the analysis since you cannot have the lane addition and other improvements without the tolling component. They are included as part of a single project.

Question [Canby]: Can you explain why the traffic analysis is for 2027 but tolling will begin in 2024. Why is there a discrepancy?

Response [Project Team]: 2027 is the year for the traffic analysis because that is the assumed opening year for the Improvements. We also used 2027 as the analysis year for the pre-completion tolling scenario (end of 2024 to 2027 when tolling would be implemented and the improvements would still be under construction) because it captures the highest potential traffic volumes for that period, essentially showing the worst-case scenario.

Comment [Clackamas County]: I am very interested in 2025 and 2026 to see what things will look like. We need to know how bad it is going to be to give feedback.

Response [Project Team]: The 2027 pre-completion tolling scenario analyzes tolling without the full improvements. 2027 would have higher volumes than 2025 or 2026 and therefore is a better year to use for the analysis. That analysis is included in the Discussion Draft of the Transportation Technical Report and will be in the EA.

Question [Canby]: Canby will be updating our comprehensive plan this year. It is critical to know what the impact will be. We need to know level of service. If we see failure in 2027 and not now, that matters. We are looking at the level of service the city needs, or if there is a standard differentiation. In Canby, we are looking at an Urban Growth Boundary expansion. This has an implication on incremental changes. Cumulatively, it will make a significant difference. If they are failing, will there be analysis on adjacent roads? We are looking at city streets as well.

Response [Project Team]: That is helpful context and timing. We will talk about next steps today as well and we can schedule a follow up discussion to get into the details associated with your plan updates and how they might be affected by the Project.

Comment [Clackamas County]: In reality, this could all look very different because this analysis does not take into account the larger RMPP tolling project. If we find that rerouting and traffic get worse due to RMPP, will that mitigation be part of RMPP?

Response [Project Team]: That is correct, RMPP is a separate project and the NEPA process for that is just beginning. It will include its own analysis of traffic impacts and mitigations.

Question [Clackamas County]: When you are saying we will monitor in the future, it will be quite different. What is the pot of money that will be set aside in case we have it wrong?

Response [Project Team]: The mitigation commitments that are included in the EA will become part of the Project and ODOT will be responsible for funding those commitments, either with toll revenue or other sources.

Comment [CAT]: CAT service goes to Woodburn, and there doesn't seem to be analysis south of Aurora. Aurora is a hard place for large vehicles to get off. I think you will see more people coming northbound get off in Woodburn and go up 99E that way to get to the Canby area. I think that will be an impact and I haven't seen that analysis.

Response [Project Team]: We will confirm if this area was considered in our initial screening to determine the area of potential impact.

Comment [CAT]: I think you are missing the fact that Canby's industrial area is growing. These are companies using large vehicles. We are building an extension out to 99E to get them there. They won't use the Aurora exit unless there are major improvements. They will take the Woodburn exit. You might be missing growth plus traffic. I understand that was going to happen anyway, but you will get all of the commuter diverted traffic as well.

Response [Project Team]: We will be following up to make sure we looked at that in the regional model. We will also look at what projects and background growth were considered to make sure we account for the growth you are talking about.

Comment [Canby]: Does this evaluation look at market estimates? If day one is wrong, it could have a huge bearing on our expansion and restrict our growth. It is a pretty big issue for us. Is there testing that will happen once this is up and running?

Response [Project Team]: We will have a monitoring program. We can follow up on what was included in the modeling. For NEPA, we use what is in a documented and approved plan. Things that are in motion, but not well-defined might not be included.

Comment [Canby]: We are receiving additional unanticipated traffic and not necessarily receiving the benefit. Sequoia and Pine were not included in mitigation conversations because they didn't go over the volume/capacity threshold.

Comment [CAT]: You have Lone Elder, but not Barlow. Barlow is the main intersection and backs up all the time.

Response [Project Team]: We will consider this input as we finalize the analysis and determine if we need to look at other intersections. We did look at Barlow and 99E and it did not warrant mitigation.

Comment [Clackamas County]: It is challenging to use the multimodal analysis results to indicate whether the project is creating a worse situation. It doesn't show if it gets worse than 4. I don't think there are any bike projects as a mitigation because there are no existing bike facilities. We are adding volume which does impact conditions for the cyclists. I would like further conversation on this. I know there was a multimodal strategy for how we can better define and coordinate impacts to the bicycle network.

Question [Clackamas County]: I am looking at safety over the life of the intersection. I don't know if NEPA uses that lens. Does NEPA look more at capacity over time, or does it also look at safety? When we look at intersections, we evaluate capacity and safety over time, along with cost of project and cost of safety over time. We have seen projects look different when you compare those two metrics.

Response [Project Team]: We do look at safety; I don't think NEPA is in conflict with those goals. For intersections on local systems, we want a mitigation project that will work for the long term. We would like to hear other proposed ideas, but we want to make sure there is interest before we do a lot of detailed analysis.

Comment [Canby]: We are talking about traffic impacts, but these also intersect with lots of other potential impacts. Are those also being analyzed?

Response [Project Team]: Yes, the traffic analysis is a big section of the EA analysis, but we will be looking at impacts and benefits on a whole list of topics. We will send you the list of topics we are studying in the EA.

OR 99E / SOUTH END ROAD

Comment [Canby]: Major industrial growth in Canby from Amazon and the OLCC are not looked at here. It is important that these projects are included.

Comment [Clackamas County]: When ODOT did improvements last time, it was too expensive to get into the rock wall.

Comment [Clackamas County]: ITS measures could help mitigate high speed crash patterns. ITS treatments along the whole corridor should be considered to help with changes in traffic.

Comment [Clackamas County]: It will be important to make sure there is fiber is included during construction of mitigation projects. When we put in a signal at the bridge, we heard from people coming from Estacada that it impacted them.

Comment [Canby]: Queues back to Hanes and New Era are important.

Comment [CAT]: It is important to look at 2nd and High Street too.

Comment [Clackamas County]: You have to look at this as an entire corridor.

Comment [Clackamas County]: The left turn lane is constrained by the rock wall. It is very tight.

Comment [Clackamas County]: I would look at this in terms of the safety performance. Look at things in detail, not just overall. When you are looking at the signals, look at the safety of each. The current intersection configuration is unique. Anytime we add signals in rural areas it makes us nervous.

Comment [Canby]: The number of accidents on South End Road is a concern. Accidents we are seeing are not just fender benders. When we look at the turn bays, I think narrowing there is okay because it will slow traffic. Widening and collapsing creates more accident potential as well. If you can remove the rock that would be great, but if it doesn't happen, I don't think that is bad for the speeds there.

Comment [CAT]: I think additional analysis of South End Road is needed. Highway 99E backs up, then people take South End Road. We have to shrink South End bus sizes because traffic backs up onto the highway. When you add more traffic, you are looking at mitigating the intersection.

Comment [Clackamas County]: If there are any other things to do to make the road feel like you need to drive slower, that might add to an improvement.

OR 99E & NEW ERA ROAD

Comment [Clackamas County]: We are looking at signaling Sequoia, New Intersection, Territorial, and South End. To signal New Era would be odd. A roundabout might work there.

Comment [CAT]: Westbound from New Era turning south onto 99E is the issue.

Comment [Clackamas County]: Either a roundabout or a signal makes it better.

Question [Canby]: What if you just close the left turn? You can go down Haines to get into Canby.

Comment [CAT]: There is quite a bit of ridership from the mobile home development.

Comment [Clackamas County]: There is a lot of development happening here. Territorial is not good either.

Comment [Canby]: If the left turn lane coming from Oregon city would be closed, it would push us to go on Territorial and make a left. The left coming off 99E is bad.

Comment [Clackamas County]: A signal or a roundabout will take care of the issue without closing the left turn

Comment [CAT]: I think signals increase run times.

Comment [Clackamas County]: Bus lanes or bus priority are potential solutions.

Comment [CAT]: We don't currently have that technology. Every minute delay is expensive.

Response [Project Team]: What if there was a signal on the highway, but a roundabout on New Era and Haines. We built one like that on 99 out to Sunset and it seems to be working fine.

Comment [Canby]: If we close the offshoot from New Era to 99E, you could add a merge lane onto 99E.

Comment [Clackamas County]: I am a fan of not restricting access or movements.

Comment [Canby]: The objectives here are to facilitate truck and bus traffic. There could be analysis on clearance of the queue. Whatever solution is selected should be the least disruptive to the delay. Signal timing is critical here and it needs to clear a lot of that queue.

Comment [Clackamas County]: From South End to Aurora, the signals are going to be impacted as a system.

Comment [Canby]: The shaded area to left of the signal is going to be an area that will be developed for housing. It is private access right now but could become a city road at some point. The stretch of 99E between Territorial and South End Road becomes a racetrack.

Comment [Clackamas County]: You could look at extending the 45mph area to the north. It goes from 45mph to 55mph here.

Comment [Canby]: The Walnut Street connection to 99E is in between New Era and Sequoia. Design is scheduled to be complete by January, and out to bid eight months after that. We are shooting for next summer for construction. There is no signal planned. We will share plans with the project team.

OR 99 E & IVY STREET

Comment [Clackamas County]: We have a joint City/County project (OR 99E down to 13th). We are adding a signal at Township Road, but not activating it. It is a big sidewalk project. We will be doing some bump-outs and ADA, but truck routes will mostly stay the same. We will share those plans.

Comment [Canby]: The challenge is that 10 years ago, the building on the left (glass company) was interested in selling the building. The city was going to buy it to put in a right turn lane. Now it is an O'Reilly's. There is also a new development with a telephone company on the Southeast side.

Comment [Canby]: I don't think you can get a right turn Northbound on Ivy. Trucks are supposed to go on Sequoia. They get hung up there. Trucks come north on 99E and turn right on Ivy.

Comment [Clackamas County]: Are you taking away a bike lane on Ivy?

Comment [Canby]: This is adjacent to our downtown. In the future this could be an extended area of our city center. I would hope that improvements would take into account that people walk and bike here.

Comment [Canby]: Right now, people don't feel safe on the north leg. I think the idea is that improving the pavement might help. The other option is to have to reestablish alternative mobility targets for the intersection. The goal would be to have it function appropriately. As the TSP goes forward, we will need help from ODOT on that issue. There have been conversations about pedestrian bridges around that intersection. We have had that come up in a couple of different conversations. If we do look at lengthening the crossing, we have considered a pedestrian bridge.

LONE ELDER ROAD

Comment [Clackamas County]: Building a roundabout will be difficult because of the grading. Look at stormwater retention. That could double the price.

Comment [Clackamas County]: I think for any of these, we want to look at ITS measures.

Comment [Clackamas County]: We are adding a northbound left turn lane to get onto Lone Elder.

Comment [Canby]: I think a signal is going to be needed at some point.

Comment [Clackamas County]: We are going to be talking about how you get to I-5 easily. Clackamas County has looked at Barlow. Kittelson is working on this. The focus is on Barlow and 99E instead. We have some preliminary solutions at Barlow and 99E, but they are not part of adopted plans.

Response [Project Team]: We did look at the Barlow and 99E intersection, but it was not determined to need mitigation. We can provide further detail on results for the analysis conducted at the Barlow and 99E intersection.

Comment [Clackamas County]: As we have diversion onto rural roads, driveways are impacted. When we looked at building a bridge at the Canby ferry, people were worried about getting out of their driveways. I know that is not something you are modeling. For certain routes that could be a big deal.

Comment [Canby]: We are happy to share committed and buildable lands. We want it to be clear that there are a lot of changes that were not addressed in the model.

Comment [Clackamas County]: It is worthwhile to look at roads that had a large jump, but still stayed within capacity. That is what we want to look at. That goes back to the driveway point.

3 Action Items

Project Team Action Items

- Confirm whether Canby's expected industrial growth is included in regional traffic modeling. Follow-up with City of Canby staff as needed.
- Confirm whether intersections that are affected by traffic leaving Woodburn and headed to Canby were analyzed to determine if they should be included in the Area of Potential Impact.
- Share the Regional Transportation Plan project list. *Complete*
- Share I-205 improvements construction schedules as they are available.
- Provide a list of all topics to be studied in the EA, in addition to traffic.
 - *In addition to traffic, the EA includes an analysis of the following:*
 - *Economics*
 - *Air Quality*
 - *Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emissions*
 - *Social Resources and Communities*
 - *Environmental Justice*
 - *Noise*
 - *Visual Quality*
 - *Land Use*
 - *Geology and Soils*
 - *Hazardous Materials*
 - *Historic and Archeological Resources*
 - *Vegetation and Wildlife*
 - *Wetlands and Water Resources*
 - *Cumulative Effects*
- Analyze delay on 99E from a signal at 99E and South End Road.
- Confirm impacts of the proposed mitigation to the bike lane on Ivy Street.
- Provide further detail on results for the analysis conducted at the Barlow/99E intersection.

Local Jurisdiction Action Items

- Canby to share Walnut Street Connection designs with Nicole for distributing to the project team.
- Clackamas County to share plans for Ivy Street Improvements with Nicole for distributing to the project team.
- Clackamas County to share prior analysis work for Barlow/99E with Nicole for distribution to the project team.

I-205 Toll Project

Meeting Summary

Subject	I-205 Mitigation Workshop
Date and Time	August 22, 2022, 1 p.m.
Location	Oregon City Engineering & Operations Center

Attendees	Organization
Dayna Webb	Oregon City
John Lewis	Oregon City
Carl Springer	DKS
Luke Norman	TriMet
Tom Mills	TriMet
Jamie Stasny	Clackamas County
Joseph Marek	Clackamas County
Stephen Williams	Clackamas County
Nathaniel Price	FHWA
Shaneka Owens	FHWA
Mandy Putney	ODOT
Ted Miller	ODOT
Andrew Bastasch	ODOT
Nicole McDermott	WSP
Chris Wellander	WSP
Ken Zatarain	WSP
Edith Victoria	WSP
Abby Caringula	WSP
Dwij Dave	WSP
Casey Balmes	WSP
Madeline Kane	KW
Gillian Garber-Yonts	KW

1 Materials Presented

- Workshop Agenda
- Potential Mitigation Table
- Synchro results for 4 intersections to be discussed at the workshop – No Build and Build for the impacted period and Build with the mitigation improvement
- Transportation Technical Report (Discussion Draft) and Attachments
- Mitigation Improvement Layouts (Exhibits)

2 Meeting Summary

The following includes a summary of the comments, questions and responses from the mitigation workshop. Comments, questions and responses are not written verbatim, but instead are summarized to capture the primary intent and key points from the discussion. Some comments did not receive a direct response during the meeting, but will be considered as the analysis and EA are finalized.

Transportation Analysis Presentation

Comment [Clackamas County]: We noticed that the Sunrise Corridor is not on the project map. That is a priority project.

Response [Project Team]: That has been previously noted to us and it will be added to the project map.

Question [Clackamas County]: Does the process start with the consideration and development of potential mitigations then area monitoring? In other words, there are no mitigations at the beginning?

Response [Project Team]: For the 2045 locations, there is a lot that could change before 2045, so we need to monitor the system to determine if the forecasted impact occurs and to determine the timing of mitigations.

OR 99E / I-205 Interchange Area

Question [Clackamas County]: What happens when the dual right from 99E gets onto the freeway on I-205 northbound?

Response [Project Team]: There is a meter light there. On the map, white lines indicate what would be constructed during Phase 1A of the Improvements Project, and black lines are what we are proposing. We should be able to use the shelf that is being constructed for the additional lane here.

Comment [Oregon City]: The couplet was planned and is creating diversion issues onto 14th Street and 12th Street. In past analysis we have run into bridge clearance issues and the couplet was an attempt to remedy that. We found that 15th Street would exit onto 99E. A single right turn pocket would impact the ability to get out as well as create grade and sight distance issues. In 2015 we decided not to look at the couplet because of the dual right issue.

Response [Project Team]: We need dual rights to meet our mobility targets at that intersection. We didn't look at signaling the intersection, that might address the sight distance issue. With the improvements we may not need the couplet.

Question [Oregon City]: Is there a way to use the area between the car lot and the existing travel lane so that there could be a dedicated lane that merges with the on-ramp? There is a lot of confusion for cars trying to get out there. Cars would have to cross one lane so there would be one dedicated lane that would be nearly free flowing.

Comment [TriMet]: There was a ballot initiative put together several years ago. Under consideration was the bus-on-shoulder shown in white. We discussed turning that into two lanes, but the concern is reducing capacity from four lanes. We propose turning one of those lanes into a bus-only lane. That would reduce the amount of traffic merging and give busses priority to create a more attractive alternative. We have information that we can provide from our analysis a few years ago.

Comment [Oregon City]: That would work until we need the dual left turn lanes onto I-205. 99 southbound needs dual lefts, which is what that extra pavement was holding space for.

Comment [TriMet]: That doesn't solve the problem of merging lanes. If we return the lane to a through lane, there will be an impact to downtown. You could use that space for transit until the left turn lane comes in.

Comment [Oregon City]: We would get a lot of complaints about OR-213 southbound. We receive regular complaints about the merge there.

Comment [Clackamas County]: Safety needs to be considered in this area. 99E is a heavy fatality corridor and anything that impacts the safety of pedestrians needs to be considered carefully. There is a houseless population that uses the facilities in this area that needs to be considered. Are you considering a traffic adaptive system though this area? There are ITS improvements we could do here to increase efficiency.

Comment [Oregon City]: If you look at the memo, the couplet at 14th and 15th presented issues for parking. There are some intersections on Main Street that are a challenge.

Comment [Oregon City]: Dual lefts on 14th Street would work better than the proposed solution on 10th Street.

Comment [TriMet]: Is there any room to do a transit priority lane there? We have several busses that use that route and SMART operates through there as well. Thinking beyond congestion, if we think transit is going to be a mitigation, we need to make transit attractive for the area. Adding a queue bypass lane where congestion isn't showing a complete failure is still adding to the attractiveness of transit and is mitigation.

Comment [Oregon City]: I know the Oregon City Shuttle uses this area as well.

Response [Project Team]: We can work with SMART and the Oregon City Shuttle to understand their use in this area.

Comment [Oregon City]: The transit center is a point of congestion in our downtown that needs to be solved.

Comment [TriMet]: All of our busses are using the southbound lane to get to the transit center.

Comment [Clackamas County]: I think there needs to be a larger conversation about a mobility hub in this corridor. We would like to have Clackamas County transit staff involved in that conversation.

7th STREET & MAIN STREET

Comment [Oregon City]: Main Street has been a focus for the city with many iterations. We have struggled to prohibit left turns in this area. There are pedestrian improvements that are at a 30% design spanning from 10th to the tunnel. 10th Street and 9th Street are part viaduct, meaning we would have to build a separate structure. That project would need to go through an alternatives analysis. We are also considering widening the sidewalk on the river side. The bridge is restrictive with everyone trying to get to Lake Oswego.

Comment [Clackamas County]: Following previous improvements to Main Street, we saw growth in downtown. There is a social component that needs to be balanced with through trips.

Question [Clackamas County]: If you have a traffic problem and are unable to fix the issue, how do you get a FONSI?

Response [Project Team]: It becomes about discussing whether we can come to a solution that addresses mobility in the area. If Oregon City and others come to a solution looking more broadly at the issue, then that is an approach to get a FONSI. It is about making sure we have mobility.

Response [FHWA]: If there is not a operational mitigation solution, we will need to figure out what fits best.

Comment [Oregon City]: Downtown has a special transportation area designation. We adopted a Multimodal Mixed-Use Area (MMA) acknowledging that we prioritize movements other than vehicles in the area.

Question [Oregon City]: Did you talk about 99E and South 2nd Street, where 99E goes down to one lane?

Response [Project Team]: That is not a study intersection. We can go back and look at it, but it didn't meet our previous criteria. We looked at 99E as a whole so we may not have the intersection metrics. Let us know if you have recent counts there.

Question [Oregon City]: How did you model the gantry locations, and did you look at different locations? The current location has a high impact on diversion. Could the placement of that gantry be moved?

Response [Project Team]: We have an alternatives analysis that we can share.

OR 99E & 10th STREET

Comment [Oregon City]: We could extend the queue storage here as TriMet does not access the transit center from the left on 99E anymore. The four-way stop on Main Street backs up to 99E and a longer queue would work during some hours.

Comment [Oregon City]: For the queue on 99E, you can see the storage that exists. They have a bus only left turn lane. The future reroute of the transit center doesn't use that route in the future. This won't solve the delay but will get cars out of mainline traffic to avoid blocking through traffic.

Comment [TriMet]: We have a design we can share. We are looking at reconfiguring the transit center to go from Main Street to McLoughlin. Looking at impacts to 10th Street and 15th street would be helpful. We have a bus line that runs frequently on McLoughlin. The more attractive that line is, the less cars we have in circulation. Those bus lanes are attractive beyond the intersection.

82nd DRIVE & I-205 NORTHBOUND RAMPS

Question [Clackamas County]: We have a through lane that turns into a left turn lane and have had side swipe crashes. From a safety performance lens, this will not work well. The elevation coming onto the structure makes navigation of the corner tough for the left turn lane. We have had several semis that have flipped and also have bike lanes coming across that need to be considered. What is driving this project?

Response [Project Team]: The volumes increased with the project. We can follow-up with what is driving the increase of volume.

Comment [Clackamas County]: It looks like the widths are wider on the east end of the structure. The eastbound lane is wide. Can you do any adjustment of the striping?

Response [Project Team]: We did look at that, it doesn't create enough room for additional lanes. Does signage help?

Comment [Clackamas County]: We have tried that in the past and it has not been successful.

TRANSIT DISCUSSION

Comment [TriMet]: Main Street from 10th Street to 15th Street is the most critical.

Comment [Oregon City]: 10th Street to 12th Street is most of it. A couple of routes will go up to 14th Street.

Question [Clackamas County]: Where did we land on the bus bypass lanes through the interchange area. Did we come to a decision?

Response [Project Team]: We talked about using the space for a bus bypass lane before the second left turn is added. Another option would be to make another lane and keep the two southbound left turn lanes. That would include a transit right. We don't know how that would affect traffic patterns, but we could do some analysis and follow-up. That would be without the addition of another lane.

Question [Clackamas County]: Did you look at bus priority through the signals?

Comment [TriMet]: We support that as an option. We do not currently have any bus priority.

Comment [TriMet]: Most of our routes are turning north and continuing down McLoughlin. I would like to hear if the gridlock impacts busses getting to the transit center.

Response [Project Team]: We thought about carving out transit bypass lanes during peak periods. Most intersections are stop controlled in this area and queues back up at the four way stops. A transit lane to bypass the congestion in this area could work but would require getting rid of parking through the peak. Two lane on-ramps require meters. We would need a third lane to bypass the meter. Is some sort of transit bypass worth pursuing?

Comment [Oregon City]: Taking away parking would be tricky.

Comment [Clackamas County]: A mobility hub could be an option here. The parking lot next to the courthouse could be an option.

Comment [Oregon City]: The Agnes connection to Main Street provides another through connection to 99E that might reduce traffic on 14th Street. ODOT didn't previously support the project. It connects from OR 213 on the other side of I-205. It used to exist.

Comment [Clackamas County]: Going from 99E to OR 213 could pull traffic from I-205.

Comment [Oregon City]: The I-205 project is using that area for staging. That interchange has problems on that side, and ODOT was concerned about it safety-wise.

Comment [TriMet]: In order for transit to be a mitigation, transit service needs to be improved.

Question [Oregon City]: With regard to the transit center, has TriMet looked as something broader for this part of the region?

Comment [TriMet]: Separate from this project, we are doing a service review and redrawing the map to reallocate service levels. Results of that project will be coming in September. There will be some changes to service in Oregon City, but downtown Oregon City is still a destination.

We are hoping to have more service in downtown Oregon City and going up the hill to serve other parts of the area. We are focused on the existing transit center site. We have a \$5 million earmark we are looking to include in the next transportation package.

3 Action Items

Project Team Action Items

- Add Clackamas Sunrise Corridor Project to the UMO map. *Complete.*
- Share the Screening Alternatives Analysis Technical Report with workshop attendees. *The report is available online at the following location*
(https://www.oregon.gov/odot/tolling/Documents/FINAL%20I-205%20Comparison%20of%20Screening%20Alternatives_wAddendum_090121.pdf)
- Schedule a follow-up meeting to discuss transit and pedestrian specific mitigations. *Complete.*
- Share analysis explaining increased volumes at 82nd Drive & the I-205 Northbound ramps.
- Consider SMART and shuttle operations at the OR 99E & I-205 interchange area.
- Consider a possible dedicated transit lane at the OR 99E & I-205 interchange area.
- Consider adaptive management of signals at intersections to increase efficiency.

I-205 Toll Project

Meeting Summary

Subject	I-205 Mitigation Workshop
Date and Time	August 31, 2022, 1 p.m.
Location	Tualatin Police Department

Attendees	Organization
Cody Field	City of Tualatin
Mike McCarthy	City of Tualatin
Susie Lahsene	City of Rivergrove
Luke Norman	TriMet
Dwight Brashear	SMART
Carl Olson	Clackamas County
Jamie Stansy	Clackamas County
Mike Bezner	Clackamas County
Stephen Williams	Clackamas County
Dyami Valentine	Washington County
Matt Dorado	Washington County
Stacy Shetler	Washington County
Nathaniel Price	FHWA
Shaneka Owens	FHWA
Mandy Putney	ODOT
Matt Freitag	ODOT
Ted Miller	ODOT
Andrew Bastasch	ODOT
Nicole McDermott	WSP
Chris Wellander	WSP
Ken Zatarian	WSP
Edith Victoria	WSP
Abby Caringula	WSP
Dwij Dave	WSP
Casey Balmes	WSP
Rachel Haukkala	WSP
Josh Mahar	KW
Gillian Garber-Yonts	KW

1 Materials Presented

- Workshop Agenda
- Potential Mitigation Table
- Synchro results for 4 intersections to be discussed at the workshop – No Build and Build for the impacted period and Build with the mitigation improvement

- Transportation Technical Report (Discussion Draft) and Attachments
- Mitigation Improvement Layouts (Exhibits)

2 Meeting Summary

The following includes a summary of the comments, questions and responses from the mitigation workshop. Comments, questions and responses are not written verbatim, but instead are summarized to capture the primary intent and key points from the discussion. Some comments did not receive a direct response during the meeting, but will be considered as the analysis and EA are finalized.

Transportation Analysis Presentation

Question [Clackamas County]: Can you explain how you arrived at the v/c threshold of 0.05 for your analysis?

Response [Project Team]: This threshold has generally been used as a standard on projects like this. We also looked at other big projects around the region to see what they used, and it was often the 0.05 v/c threshold. For example, it was used in the NEPA analysis for the Southwest Corridor Project. We believe it is a good threshold for identifying impacts.

Comment [Washington County]: Every ODOT project we have been a part of used a 0.05 threshold.

Question [Clackamas County]: In situations where the project has an impact on the intersection, it says mitigation will be “considered”. Can you clarify what “considered” means?

Response [Project Team]: For the case where the intersection would meet local standards without the project but fails with the project, the project would be responsible for full mitigation. In the second case, where the intersection is not expected to meet local standards without the project, but the project makes it worse, the project would be responsible for a proportionate share of the mitigation.

Question [Clackamas County]: How is that proportionate mitigation determined?

Response [Project Team]: That is something that would have to be agreed upon between the project and the local jurisdiction. The Build and No Build comparison would help us determine how much impact was due to increased traffic from tolling on I-205. First, we want to determine the locations for potential mitigation, then we will have additional conversations about funding and implementation.

Comment [Clackamas County]: Everything is shown as impacts to v/c, and I am not seeing how safety impacts will be mitigated at these intersections. In the safety section, everything was shown in current conditions. I am interested in seeing what effect volume increases have on safety.

Response [Project Team]: We have a safety analysis in chapter 5 of the Transportation Technical Report (TTR). We didn't see a big difference in the Build vs No Build Alternatives. Safety is key to any mitigation, but we didn't see the project causing notable safety impacts when compared to the No Build.

Comment [Clackamas County]: We know that tolling is going to start in 2024, but the intersection analysis is for 2027 and 2045. We are interested in understanding the analysis between 2024 and 2027.

Response [Project Team]: That can be found in the TTR in the section on tolling during construction.

Question [Clackamas County]: Are the intersections from Borland Road and Stafford Road south to Ek Road impacted?

Response [Project Team]: Our analysis did not indicate notable impacts on those intersections.

Comment [Washington County]: On the Southwest Corridor Project, we were involved in the process for modeling so we could share comments. I don't think Washington County is comfortable with the intersection of 65th Ave and Borland Road. There is a movement missing in the eastbound direction. That is a through left and is shown as a through left/right.

Response [Project Team]: We have had monthly modeling meetings with the local and regional agencies. If you need more information about those, we can share that. 65th Ave and Borland Road were interesting because of how traffic changed, we will talk more about that one today.

STAFFORD ROAD / ROSEMONT ROAD

Question [Rivergrove]: It would be helpful to understand the impacts to the intersection at Childs Road and Stafford Road.

I-5 NORTHBOUND RAMPS AND NYBERG STREET

Comment [Washington County]: Tualatin is leading an effort to come up with bicycle and pedestrian solutions across the interchange. The plans are currently in review.

Comment [Washington County]: We are interested in a signal for the bike crossing. There is the possibility of merging the bike lanes in-lane, before the turn lanes, so they are inside the turn lanes.

Comment [Washington County]: I think you have to look at that area as a whole as opposed to just the intersection. 65th Ave and Borland Road backs up to Nyberg Street under current conditions, and it doesn't take much for it to back up to the freeway.

Comment [Clackamas County]: You are gaining a bit of queue storage, but it might not perform better than the current build.

Comment [Tualatin]: We have a one-pager on the city's projects leading to the southbound onramp on our website. Right now, all traffic ends in the right lane. Striping and construction is planned for Summer 2023. In the plan, the right lane and the Cabela's signal goes onto I-5 South. In the current condition the right lane is a straight/right turn lane. The plan is to make the right lane a right turn only lane. We will be adding a bike lane between the retaining wall and the signal. The lane will go to the railing side.

Comment [Tualatin]: We have a lot of questions about whether the long-term assumption works well or not. We have concerns about the southbound ramp intersection. We have heard concerns about allowing an apartment complex to be built because it added trips here.

I-5 SOUTHBOUND RAMPS AND NYBERG ST

Question [Clackamas County]: Could you touch on how these two intersections are being impacted by I-205?

Response [Project Team]: Our analysis, as shown in the TTR, shows the volume changes from people avoiding the toll by staying on local streets traveling westbound.

Comment [Clackamas County]: The toll is located at Tualatin River. We are not seeing people get back on I-205, we are seeing them stay on Borland Road and Nyberg Road.

STAFFORD ROAD & CHILDS ROAD

Comment [Rivergrove]: For Stafford Hamlet, what were the assumptions? Was it developed or not under this scenario? My assumption is not.

Response [Project Team]: Our assumptions include growth under the current land use plan.

Question [Rivergrove]: What if City of Rivergrove is not in favor of a mitigation? I could see our city not wanting a 30% traffic flow increase into neighborhoods. The city is not excited about the project in general.

Comment [Clackamas County]: Clackamas County and Lake Oswego own the roads here.

Response [Project Team]: That is a follow-up conversation. For NEPA we need to mitigate our impacts, but that can be done in a lot of ways. The meeting with Lake Oswego is tomorrow.

Comment [Clackamas County]: This will be expensive and difficult. Depending on the proportionate share issue, we might not be interested. We don't know how practical it is. I wouldn't invest too much conversation in this now. We will want to know more about monitoring for 2045.

Comment [Washington County]: The optics are not great due to the recent work at that roundabout.

Question [Clackamas County]: In the No Build, we had a v/c of 1.01, in the Build it was 1.22. When we looked at the crash prediction, we had crashes going down in the Build. Can you share why the crashes would go down?

Response [Project Team]: We will doublecheck the safety analysis at this location.

Question [Clackamas County]: Does the modeling assume that the projects in our TSP are built?

Response [Project Team]: Yes. If it was a committed project, we included it.

Comment [Clackamas County]: Assuming all of these projects are built is a long shot. This is why the constrained projects list is important and not just an exercise.

Response [Project Team]: This is how NEPA works. They look to the RTP as the backbone for the model. This is the approach for projects in the region.

BORLAND ROAD & 65TH AVENUE

Comment [Washington County]: There was a missing movement. The right turn movement northbound is as heavy as the left.

Comment [Tualatin]: The northbound right is mostly going off of 2nd Street. It is a heavy southbound movement there.

Comment [Washington County]: If you have an issue on I-5, that northbound direction will not do well. I am curious about the proposed mitigation.

Response [Project Team]: On the northbound approach, we have identified adding a short right-turn storage lane. It is about adding a bit of overall capacity.

Comment [Washington County]: Queuing will be a key consideration on the northbound right.

Comment [Tualatin]: I think we need a longer northbound turn lane here.

Question [Clackamas County]: Does the Synchro consider the mitigation you considered?

Response [Project team]: It should. We need to look at this intersection more because of the right turn overlap issue. We need to look at why we don't see an impact here.

Comment [Washington County]: If the toll is at the river going westbound, there is no easy way to get to this intersection before the river.

Comment [Clackamas County]: People from Lake Oswego and West Linn might just stay on Borland Road instead of going on the highway. Electronic GIS directions will probably route you on the highway.

Comment [Washington County]: We can provide the signal timing for 65th Ave and Borland Road. In general, it runs free. This area changes if the Stafford Hamlet development happens, which has not been approved yet.

Comment [Tualatin]: If there is an issue on I-5, 65th Ave is one of the diversion routes and it gets backed up in both directions.

Comment [Clackamas County]: There is a new shuttle in this area that Ride Connection is working on. I am interested to see if there are ways to prioritize transit in this area.

Comment [TriMet]: Mitigation for tolling would run through this area. Line 76 would go here. The Wilsonville service is east of here.

Comment [SMART]: The SMART line would operate between Clackamas and I-205. We have ordered busses for that service. The busses take the Stafford Road exit, then connect with Ride Connection. We are working with the school to see if we can use it as a turnaround.

Comment [Tualatin]: We see a lot of value in transit, but we need to be realistic about how much mode shift we expect.

Comment [SMART]: I think it is dependent on how much you prioritize transit. Every bit of priority helps a lot. There is a lot of transit running through this corridor.

STAFFORD ROAD & MOUNTAIN ROAD

Comment [Clackamas County]: We need to be looking at intersections that are just below the threshold. The crash decrease on the highway will have a corresponding increase off the highway. Over 10 years ago we did a big project on this intersection to improve safety, so it is hard for me to accept this decrease in safety here. Crash risk on Stafford Road went up in multiple locations and we haven't talked about the mitigation for safety. We are definitely impacting safety for Stafford Road. We are applying for the federal safety grants on the corridor. It is a fast rural road without a lot of shoulder. It will be difficult to mitigate.

Comment [Clackamas County]: I am not concerned about the roundabout as a mitigation, I am just concerned that it is not sufficient mitigation here. There will be some concerning left turns here. The 2027 Build will cause a significant safety concern. We haven't seen what this

looks like yet, but it is something we should talk about with West Linn. Willamette Street near the primary school, and the park stand out in particular.

Comment [Clackamas]: I am concerned about Ek Road. That is a much quicker bypass than Borland Road, if you are looking to avoid Borland Road. Ek Road is a common bypass route for I-205. The increase in volumes makes me more concerned. These roads have crashes that are going to go up. We are improving safety on I-5 but making it worse on Stafford Road. We need to consider safety broadly.

Comment [Tualatin]: The Metro arterials study found that crashes are seven times higher on arterials and collectors than on highways. It seems like those have higher fatal crash rates as well. We have concerns about diversion causing more crashes. That figure came from a Metro safety report.

Comment [Clackamas County]: I know NEPA isn't focused on financing, but to make these commitments it feels like we need to discuss the allocation of toll revenue.

Response [Project Team]: Those would be commitments of ODOT, not the local jurisdictions. The financing plan is a next step as we work with FHWA. We are not going to commit anyone else to do mitigations. If the impact is caused by the ODOT project, it is paid for by ODOT. For ODOT's part, we will commit to doing the project which could be funded in a variety of ways. Mitigation is not necessarily toll revenue funded. We are committing to what is going to be built. The financial conversation comes next.

Question [Clackamas County]: How does that work with proportionate share?

Response [Project Team]: We would want to document what potential solutions there are and have a monitoring approach as we get closer to 2045 to understand the project impacts. We can work with jurisdictions to apply for grants.

Comment [Clackamas County]: It is hard to think about how we can do that without talking about revenue.

3 Action Items

Project Team Action Items

- Share more details for the 65th & Borland analysis.
- Schedule a follow-up transit discussion. *Follow up meetings are scheduled.*
- Share a list of intersections just below the 0.05 v/c threshold (ex. Mountain Rd).
- Confirm why v/c ratio goes up, but crashes go down in the Build Alternative at Stafford and Childs intersection. *Project team reviewed the safety analysis and the crashes were calculated incorrectly for the Build versus No Build. This has been addressed and the number of crashes goes up slightly in the Build Alternative at this location.*

Local Jurisdiction Action Items

- Tualatin to share plans for the Tualatin Interchange & Nyberg improvements project with Nicole McDermott (nicole.mcdermott@wsp.com)
- Washington County to share information on signal timing at 65th & Borland with Nicole McDermott (nicole.mcdermott@wsp.com)

I-205 Toll Project

Meeting Summary

Subject	I-205 Mitigation Workshop
Date and Time	September 1, 2022, 1 p.m.
Location	West Linn Adult Community Center

Attendees	Organization
Erich Rooney	City of Lake Oswego
Will Farley	City of Lake Oswego
Daren Weiss	City of West Linn
Erich Lais	City of West Linn
John Williams	City of West Linn
Luke Borland	City of West Linn
Carl Olson	Clackamas County
Jamie Stansy	Clackamas County
Mike Benzer	Clackamas County
Steve Williams	Clackamas County
Luke Norman	TriMet
Tom Mills	TriMet
Nathaniel Price	FHWA
Shaneka Owens	FHWA
Mandy Putney	ODOT
Carol Snead	ODOT
Andrew Bastasch	ODOT
Ted Miller	ODOT
Chris Wellander	WSP
Heather Wills	WSP
Rachel Haukkala	WSP
Dwij Dave	WSP
Edith Victoria Lopez	WSP
Nicole McDermott	WSP
Josh Mahar	KW
Ariella Dahlin	KW

1 Materials Presented

- Workshop Agenda
- PowerPoint Presentation
- Impacts and potential mitigation summary table
- Synchro results and mitigation exhibits
- Discussion Draft I-205 Toll Project Transportation Technical Report

2 Meeting Summary

The following includes a summary of the comments, questions and responses from the mitigation workshop. Comments, questions and responses are not written verbatim, but instead are summarized to capture the primary intent and key points from the discussion. Some comments did not receive a direct response during the meeting, but will be considered as the analysis and EA are finalized.

Transportation Analysis Presentation

Question [Clackamas County]: To clarify, the No Build Alternative includes the Interstate Bridge Replacement Project and Regional Mobility Pricing Project tolls?

Response [Project Team]: All projects that are included in the RTP are included in our No Build Analysis for 2045. The Interstate Bridge Replacement Program is in the RTP. The Regional Mobility Pricing Project is not.

Question [City of West Linn]: How is the Project improving conditions at Hidden Springs and Santa Anita? It's a small intersection and that finding seems odd.

Response [Project Team]: We will review the specific results for this intersection and follow up with you.

Question [Clackamas County]: On Identification of Area of Potential Impact (API), I'm surprised that the criteria is greater than 100 vehicles per hour; that is not many. Is this related to intersections or road segments? Was a sensitivity analysis completed?

Response [Project Team]: It is related to road segments, which intersection approaches. The change in peak hour volumes would have to meet all three criteria, not just one. It's a relatively standard approach. The methodology used was reviewed by participating agencies before the analysis was completed and there was concurrence. We can share the methodology memo.

Question [City of Lake Oswego]: Regarding the mitigation approach for intersections, is the 10 seconds or greater delay criteria by approach or intersection?

Response [Project Team]: Intersection. We can provide information on how the approaches performed as well.

Question [Clackamas County]: Ek Road is not included in the model but is an important high-volume one-mile road. Can ODOT complete an analysis here? Our StreetLight data is showing significant rerouting in total daily volumes to Ek Road. It would be helpful to have numbers for Ek, Borland, and Turner Roads.

Response [Project Team]: Yes, we can include that in the final draft TTR. We will send our Streetlight Data Report.

Comment [City of West Linn]: There is a new roundabout connected to Athey Creek Middle School. There will also be pedestrian improvements on Willamette Falls Drive. We can send you more information on these projects.

Comment [TriMet]: For the multimodal analysis, in the data you provided, it shows bus travel times get worse in the morning, while they improve in the afternoon. On the slides you use the average, so it looks like an overall net positive. If it takes people longer in the morning and service is worse, you should indicate that.

Response [Project Team]: We will consider breaking out the AM and PM data.

Stafford Road / Rosemont Road

Comment [Clackamas County]: I suggest keeping two lanes between this intersection and Stafford/Childs, since it was mentioned that there could be two southbound lanes at that intersection as well.

Comment [City of Lake Oswego]: If we don't keep two lanes between those intersections, it will just push crashes and congestion south. I remember there was a different design for this intersection, but trucks would have had to take up both lanes, so it was changed.

Question [City of Lake Oswego]: What about a northbound right slip lane up Stafford and right on Rosemont?

Comment [Clackamas County]: That would be the exact diversion route. It looks like the southbound queue increased, is that why we are adding that other lane?

Response [Project Team]: Yes, if you can get more vehicles through, you reduce queues. I agree that we're moving the issue from northbound to the south, and we can look at that.

Question [City of Lake Oswego]: We currently get complaints about cut-through traffic. Have you done an origin-destination study to identify how much is through traffic?

Response [Project Team]: We did a user analysis study about two years ago to look at origins and destinations of I-205 users and found that there was a difference in traffic patterns between peak and off-peak trips. During peak trips some users took Stafford to Rosemont. During off peak hours, trips were staying on I-205. That report is on the website, and we will send it to you.

OR 43 / McVey Avenue

Comment [City of Lake Oswego]: The southbound merge is busy; I don't think it would be good to move that as the queues are already extending back. The traffic goes to Oak where there is a small intersection. Both lanes go to that point and then zipper merge.

Comment [City of Lake Oswego]: It's packed in the afternoon and evening from B street downtown to here. I think the merge is efficient where it's at. The backup is caused by the timing of the signals and speed, it's just a congested area.

Comment [City of Lake Oswego]: We used to have a left turn going northbound, but then we removed it and the right bound slip lane since they were high crash problems.

Response [Project Team]: Are those six signals coordinated?

Comment [City of Lake Oswego]: I think they have communication. There are 20,000 cars and railroad, and the train always comes during the peak. It's the whole corridor that's the problem.

Response [Project Team]: Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) solutions can be effective with adaptive signal controls, it's something worth considering.

Comment [TriMet]: Transit signal priority would be a valuable improvement and something we are using in other areas.

Comment [City of Lake Oswego]: The traffic on this corridor consists of divergent traffic going down to McVey towards Rosemont to OR 43 to West Linn. People from Wilsonville take this route to avoid highway traffic on their way to Portland.

OR 43 / A Avenue

Comment [City of Lake Oswego]: There is a red left turn that is also northbound, there are only a few locations where this happens, and we receive complaints. But we need two left lanes and two through lanes. The pedestrian crosswalk here is unique but it is one of our safest ones.

Stafford Road / Childs Road

Comment [Clackamas County]: Moving that wall will be a big undertaking and very expensive.

Comment [Clackamas County]: There is a catch that to address the impacts is to attract more vehicles. We will be back here having the same mitigation conversations once traffic reaches equilibrium.

10th / I-205 Northbound Ramps

Question [City of West Linn]: We have a 10th street corridor project that includes this intersection. I believe Phase 1 would be everything to the north of the roundabout ramp. I'll have Lance Calvert reach out to you to confirm.

Comment [Clackamas County]: We have 2,000 vehicles wanting to make the right turn to 10th Street. We will only be able to move 500 vehicles at a time and then they hit that roundabout. You need to look at queue storage downstream. It's so closely spaced it can't handle offloading.

Question [City of West Linn]: With the current location of the toll gantry, people could get off Stafford and come through Willamette and get off at OR 43. Why not move the gantry to eliminate this diversion?

Meeting Summary: I-205 Mitigation Workshop, September 1, 2022, 1 p.m.

Response [Project Team]: We've analyzed different gantry points. Because this tolling is for the I-205 bridge improvements, the gantries must be within a certain distance of the bridge. Also, no matter where we put the gantries, they induce some rerouting. These gantry locations were chosen as the best options for limiting impacts. We can share this analysis.

Question [City of Lake Oswego]: Why not use a Single Point Urban Interchange (SPUI) instead of a roundabout? This addresses pedestrian and traffic needs.

12th / Willamette Falls

Comment [Clackamas County]: I highly doubt the City of West Linn would want additional capacity in this area, they have a vibrant downtown and this could impact that.

Comment [City of West Linn]: We already call this "the third lane of I-205" and this design would perpetuate that by facilitating vehicle flow. Many people partake in outdoor dining and other pedestrian activities here, there is a primary school and park right here, this is not ideal for high vehicle traffic. It's not intended to be throughway; this is a bad idea.

Comment [City of Lake Oswego]: The common theme is routes that will have people rerouting due to the toll will require larger facilities to accommodate more traffic. It's a dilemma because we want to have less traffic, not more. These mitigation strategies are good ideas for throughways, but that is not what people want. Safety is the number one priority. Some of these proposed mitigations won't make it safer for pedestrians and bicycles, and drivers. For example, we will have more crashes on Stafford and less on the freeway. The important message we want to push is to mitigate for safety impacts and meet our vision zero goals.

Comment [Clackamas County]: I noticed at the 10th Street ramps and at this intersection, the predictive crashes get worse. Having safety as a mitigation factor is important.

Response [Project Team]: The pedestrian analysis includes ways to increase pedestrian safety, such as by using signage, raised crossings, and pedestrian signals. We will look into these improvements as part of mitigation.

Question [Clackamas County]: How is safety measured in the mitigation criteria?

Response [Project Team]: While intersections have very clear mobility standards through the v/c ratios, safety does not have identified standards or thresholds. It is more of a discussion.

Question [Clackamas County]: Have you looked at the air quality analysis? With the length of queues and additional traffic on local streets, I think there will be an air quality impact in neighborhoods.

Response [Project Team]: It is hard to localize air quality impacts to specific locations but overall, the data is showing an improvement in air quality.

3 Action Items

Project Team Action Items

- Share more details on the project benefit to the Hidden Springs / Santa Anita intersection.
- Share Screening Alternatives Analysis Technical Report with workshop attendees.
The report is available online at the following location:
https://www.oregon.gov/odot/tolling/Documents/FINAL%20I-205%20Comparison%20of%20Screening%20Alternatives_wAddendum_090121.pdf
- Provide more details on the impacts to approaches to intersections.
- Consider sharing transit impacts as AM and PM instead of combined average.
- Share I-205 Corridor User Analysis.
The report is available online at the following location:
<https://www.oregon.gov/odot/tolling/Documents/I205%20Corridor%20User%20Analysis%20Final.pdf>

Local Jurisdiction Action Items

- City of West Linn to share Willamette Falls Drive mini-roundabout design and timeline.
- City of West Linn to share 10th Street Corridor Project design and timeline.

I-205 Toll Project

Meeting Summary

Subject	I-205 Toll Project Mitigation Follow-up Meeting
Date and Time	Tuesday, November 29 1-2:45pm
Location	Oregon City Engineering & Operations Center 13895 Fir Street, Oregon City 97045

Attendees	Organization
John Lewis	Oregon City
Dayna Webb	Oregon City
Kevin Chewuk	DKS - Oregon City
Mike Bezner	Clackamas County
Joe Marek	Clackamas County
Carl Olson	Clackamas County
Jamie Stasny	Clackamas County
Luke Norman	TriMet
Andrew Bastasch	Project Team - ODOT
Mandy Putney	Project Team - ODOT
David Gitlin	Project Team - WSP
Rachel Haukkala	Project Team - WSP
Edith Victoria Lopez	Project Team - WSP
Chris Wellander	Project Team - WSP
Heather Wills	Project Team - WSP
Ken Zatarain	Project Team - WSP
Ellen Palmquist	Project Team - Kearns & West

1 Materials Presented

- Meeting Agenda
- Mitigation Materials:
 - Mitigation table
 - Exhibits
 - Safety mitigations

2 Meeting Summary

The I-205 Toll Project mitigation follow-up meetings provided an opportunity for the I-205 Toll Project Team and partners to follow up on summer workshops. Meeting objectives included:

- Providing an update on mitigation planning in advance of the early 2023 Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) publication.

- Describing how jurisdiction feedback was incorporated into additional safety analysis and mitigation planning.
- Sharing next steps on the project EA and future coordination opportunities.

The following meeting summary includes comments, questions and responses from the mitigation follow-up meeting. Comments, questions and responses are not written verbatim, but instead are summarized to capture the primary intent and key points from the discussion. Some comments did not receive a direct response during the meeting but will be considered as the analysis and EA are finalized.

Timeline

Question [Oregon City]: Is the federal review process for I-205 similar to the Regional Mobility Pricing Project (RMPP)?

Response [Project Team]: There is ongoing federal oversight for both projects. The I-205 Toll Project will not require a cooperative pricing agreement. This requires federal review and is only required for RMPP.

Question [Oregon City]: How is membership determined for the Equity and Mobility Advisory Committee and the Regional Toll Advisory Committee?

Response [Project Team]:

- *For the Equity and Mobility Advisory Committee, ODOT worked closely with partner organizations to identify members. [More info [here.](#)]*
- *For the Regional Toll Advisory Committee, ODOT looked to regional partners for recommendations. [More info [here.](#)]*
- *For the Statewide Toll Rulemaking Advisory Committee, ODOT accepted applications for membership. [More info [here.](#)]*

Intersection Safety Analysis Results

Question [Oregon City]: Why is 7th Street and Main Street not on the list for mitigation?

Response [Project Team]: No traffic operational mitigations are proposed at this location because of physical constraints and because this is only an impact in 2027. The impact goes away by 2045. However, pedestrian improvements are proposed for this location to improve overall mobility in the area.

Question [Oregon City]: Can you describe the location information for 7th Street and label these locations differently (example: Main Street Overpass)?

Response [Project Team]: The 7th Street location includes the curve from under the Arch Bridge to Main Street & OR 99E.

Comment [Oregon City]: Please include all locations in the table even if they are not included on the list due to other mitigations.

Proposed Safety Mitigation – OR 99E and SE Jennings Avenue

Question [Clackamas County]: Did the project team consider opportunities for pedestrian improvements at OR 99E and SE Jennings Avenue? Clackamas County has a federally funded project to add a sidewalk to the north side of SE Jennings Avenue in 2023. This project could increase the number of pedestrians at this signal.

Response [Project Team]: We can look further into bike and pedestrian improvements at SE Jennings Avenue.

Question [Oregon City]: Has the project team looked into improving illumination along OR 99E? This is one of the highest crash corridors in Clackamas County.

Response [Project Team]: The crash reduction factor is only applied when existing illumination is absent, so improving existing illumination would be hard to measure for crash reductions. However, we can still consider this as a potential improvement.

Question [Oregon City]: Is mitigation recommended for OR 99E and SE Jennings Avenue to address vehicle capacity?

Response [Project Team]: This intersection was not shown as an operational impact; therefore, no operational mitigations are proposed.

Question [Clackamas County]: Why are safety and operational mitigations separated in the materials?

Response [Project Team]: The project team wanted to focus on new information, including safety-specific mitigations. Operational mitigations can be included in the same table as safety mitigations in the future and reported together.

Proposed Safety Mitigation – OR 99E – SE Glen Echo Avenue to W Dartmouth Street, and W Arlington Street to Main Street

Question [Project Team]: Is a crossing along OR 99E worthwhile for this area?

Response [Clackamas County]: Yes, we would support this.

Comment [Clackamas County]: A median with room for U-turns could be recommended for this corridor. This could include strategically-spaced left turns and a raised median. Access control along the roadway would need to be shared with ODOT Region 1.

Other Safety Improvements

Question [Oregon City]: The southbound off-ramp for OR 99E backs up onto I-205 during the afternoon and lunch hour. There is also a lot of lane swapping along this stretch. Was safety off of the local network considered?

Response [Project Team]: An extra auxiliary lane would be added to I-205 for the northbound on-ramp between OR 99E and OR 213. The southbound section will include three lanes and the lane that is backing up will be removed. The proposed mitigation to increase the lanes on OR

99E may also help alleviate this issue. We can take a closer look to see if backups would still occur and can also monitor this section.

Question [Oregon City]: What years were considered for SPIS? Which percentage?

Response [Project Team]: We considered 2020 (2017-2019) and the top 15 percent.

Question [Clackamas County]: Why are trees recommended as a mitigation for OR 99E – Main Street and OR 99E – SE Jennings Avenue?

Response [Project Team]: Trees provide a 10% traffic reduction along that corridor. Treatments include adding trees, installing a raised median, adding signal backplates, and installing adaptive signal timing.

Comment [Oregon City]: Trees need to be removed from the improvements list for Main Street Overpass to 14th Street because we have added trees there already.

Question [Clackamas County]: Did forecasting for the safety analysis include the operational mitigations?

Response [Project Team]: Forecasting included geometric changes on ODOT's list. Most of the changes were adding a dual left which counts as a crash reduction factor. The project team can discuss operational mitigations that may impact safety.

Comment [Clackamas County]: Speed feedback signs may not be effective on a multi-lane facility. There may be a benefit in specific scenarios for operations.

Question [Oregon City]: Are there specific locations for speed feedback signs?

Response [Project Team]: These are recommended further north along the 8-lane wide section.

Mitigation Exhibits

Comment [DKS]: DKS conducted analysis on this section from 15th Street to 12th Street. Trucks do not have enough clearance on 12th Street and would need to re-route to OR 213.

Response [Project Team]: Please share that analysis with the project team.

Question [Clackamas County]: Will dedicated pedestrian-only phases be recommended at 14th Street or will the crosswalk be removed? There is an existing crosswalk that provides direct access to the waterfront trail.

Response [Project Team]: We will check if that was accounted for in the analysis and get back to you. The idea to make this exclusive came out of the last workshop.

Question [Clackamas County]: Are the dual lefts on OR 99E in place to mitigate an increase in vehicles bypassing the toll on the Abernethy Bridge?

Response [Project Team]: There is an increase in traffic on OR 99E which causes the intersection to go over the mobility standard. To fix this and provide more through movement, one of the options was a dual left.

Comment [Oregon City]: The dual lefts off OR 99E would create a problem with everyone stopping at Main Street.

Comment [TriMet]: TriMet would like to see something in the EA to show that the segment of OR 99E at the interchange is being considered for a bus lane.

Question [Oregon City]: Would the mitigation at Dunes Drive require removing the plaza?

Response [Project Team]: No, there's a wide right turn lane and this mitigation does not involve taking out the plaza. The bus would use the right turn pocket.

Comment [Oregon City]: 10th Street and Main Street moves a lot of traffic and is an efficient four-way stop. Signalization of this intersection may not improve operations given proximity to the railroad.

Question [Oregon City]: Is this proposing to widen sidewalks along OR 99E? The City is doing a planning effort to determine if it's feasible to do this and estimate the cost. Is there a commitment?

Response [Project Team]: The project team looked at Oregon City's plan for the sidewalks and our intention was for the mitigation to be the project the City has planned. Once there is a mitigation commitment (included in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) decision document), the mitigation becomes part of the I-205 Toll Project. We would not be able to move forward with the mitigation project until the NEPA decision.

Action Items

- Project Team: Relabel some of the segments for OR 99E and Main Street to clarify locations
- Project Team: Look into Clackamas County's bicycle and pedestrian improvements for SE Jennings Avenue at OR 99E
- Project Team: Include safety and operations mitigation results in the same table
- Project Team: Discuss operational mitigation that may impact safety
- DKS: Share transportation modeling from 2015 for 14th/15th Streets

Meeting Summary

Subject	I-205 Toll Project Mitigation Follow-up Meeting
Date and Time	Tuesday, November 29 3:15-5:00pm
Location	Oregon City Engineering & Operations Center 13895 Fir Street, Oregon City 97045

Attendees	Organization
Will Farley	Lake Oswego
Erica Rooney	Lake Oswego
Lance Calvert	West Linn
John Lewis	Oregon City
Mike Bezner	Clackamas County
Joe Marek	Clackamas County
Carl Olson	Clackamas County
Luke Norman	TriMet
Andrew Bastasch	ODOT
Mandy Putney	ODOT
Carol Snead	ODOT
David Gitlin	Project Team - WSP
Rachel Haukkala	Project Team - WSP
Edith Victoria Lopez	Project Team - WSP
Chris Wellander	Project Team - WSP
Heather Wills	Project Team - WSP
Ellen Palmquist	Project Team - Kearns & West

1 Materials Presented

- Meeting Agenda
- Mitigation Materials:
 - Mitigation table
 - Exhibits
 - Safety mitigations

2 Meeting Summary

The I-205 Toll Project mitigation follow-up meetings provided an opportunity for the I-205 Toll Project Team and partners to follow-up on summer workshops. Meeting objectives included:

- Providing an update on mitigation planning in advance of the early 2023 Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) publication.

- Describing how jurisdiction feedback was incorporated into additional safety analysis and mitigation planning.
- Sharing next steps on the project EA and future coordination opportunities.

The following meeting summary includes comments, questions and responses from the mitigation follow-up meeting. Comments, questions and responses are not written verbatim, but instead are summarized to capture the primary intent and key points from the discussion. Some comments did not receive a direct response during the meeting but will be considered as the analysis and EA are finalized.

Intersection Safety Analysis Results

Comment [Lake Oswego]: Raising the crosswalk at Stafford and Rosemont may have impacts that have not been considered. Adding a raised crosswalk to an arterial doesn't make sense here and there is only pedestrian activity on the north side.

Question [Lake Oswego]: Why are safety and operational mitigations separated in the materials?

Response [Project Team]: The project team wanted to focus on new information, including safety-specific mitigations. We will combine operational mitigations in the same table as safety mitigations in future reporting.

Segment Safety Results

Comment [Clackamas County]: Adding another lane to the roundabout at SW Stafford Road and SW Johnson Road may not be realistic.

Response [Project Team]: In 2045, this intersection may go over the mobility threshold. This will be monitored. The safety improvements Clackamas County is making along this segment remove it from the list for 2027.

Proposed Safety Mitigation

Comment [West Linn]: We may be interested in tolling on/off ramps to mitigate diversion from I-205.

Question [Clackamas County]: How were these gantry locations determined to have the least impact?

Response [Project Team]: High-level modeling was conducted for gantry locations. This information can be shared again with jurisdictions and was shared following the mitigation workshops in the summer.

Question [West Linn]: Can you explain the amount of funding that will be available for mitigations, because a lot of things can change between now and 2045.

Response [Project Team]: Final mitigation recommendations will become part of the I-205 Toll Project. ODOT will not be able to move forward with construction in 2024 without moving

forward with the design phase for mitigation. The timing for implementation of the mitigations is still being worked on.

Question [West Linn]: Is ODOT responsible for constructing the mitigation or will ODOT provide funds to jurisdictions to complete the projects?

Response [Project Team]: ODOT is responsible for making sure that the mitigation happens, but is open to discussing implementation with local jurisdictions if they want to have more control over specific projects.

Question [Oregon City]: Could the NEPA process result in a decision to prohibit tolling?

Response [Project Team]: The state has the authority to implement tolling when constructing bridges or tunnels. ODOT has been working with FHWA during the NEPA process on concurrence. If ODOT is able to mitigate all the tolling impacts, the I-205 Toll Project will move forward. If ODOT is not able to mitigate all the impacts, the project will go through an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). This involves minimizing and mitigating impacts, and disclosing any impacts that cannot be mitigated. The Final EIS receives a Record of Decision from the federal government. In the event of an EIS, local jurisdictions may receive less mitigation for diversion.

Question [Lake Oswego]: How much will this effort cost?

Response [Project Team]: The full cost of the Project is not known until mitigation commitments have been finalized. If revenue is not available from tolling to pay for all aspects of the project, including mitigation, these funds will come from other sources.

Question [Lake Oswego]: Why can't the state just raise the gas tax?

Response [Project Team]: The gas tax isn't enough and was raised in 2017. ODOT hopes to work with local jurisdictions to identify mitigations that improve outcomes.

Comment [West Linn]: It's important to consider how to keep volume to capacity at or below current levels with the widening of I-205. Local jurisdictions will be compensated for diversion, but mitigation will not solve existing problems.

Question [Clackamas County]: Will the cost of the mitigation influence the tolls?

Response [Project Team]: ODOT will pay for the mitigation, this would not be the responsibility of the jurisdictions. Toll revenue can be used for most of the mitigation that has been discussed. ODOT is required to complete the mitigation in order to move forward with the project.

Mitigation Exhibits

Question [TriMet]: Why wasn't transit signal priority included as a mitigation for OR 43?

Response [Project Team]: Once TriMet's service plan is finalized, the project team will have additional conversations to determine how this will interface with the EA. The Draft EA will be published for comment and additional changes will be made before the Revised EA.

Question [Lake Oswego]: Lake Oswego was denied a crosswalk at McVey Avenue and OR 43 by ODOT multiple times because the corridor is over capacity. Why is it now being recommended as a mitigation?

Response [Project Team]: For this corridor, adaptive signal control will help make a better connection between the signals. We will look into why the request was denied by ODOT Region 1 in the past.

Comment [Clackamas County]: The 41% reduction in fatal/severe and pedestrian/bicycle crashes is misleading because there have not been any fatal crashes along this corridor.

Response [Project Team]: This statistic was revised to 28% and ODOT will correct the figure to state that it is for all crashes and is based on a predictive index model.

Comment [Clackamas County]: Clackamas County received funding for improvements on Willamette Falls Drive from 16th Street to Ostman Road in 2023.

Comment [Clackamas County]: Recommend using a roundabout instead of an all-way stop at SW Borland Rd and SW Ek Rd. There are limited pedestrian users on the road and some cycling traffic.

Comment [Oregon City]: Ek Rd will be a major diversion route and the SW Ek Rd and SW Borland Rd intersection will be backed up.

Comment [West Linn]: Toll gantries could be used at the off-ramp onto SW Stafford Rd to keep people from bypassing the toll.

Comment [Oregon City]: Tolling on I-205 should begin in 2025 alongside tolling on I-5 and I-205 for the Regional Mobility Pricing Project.

Action Items

- Project Team: Share report on gantry locations
- Project Team: Look into why the requests at McVey Avenue and OR 43 were denied by ODOT in the past
- Project Team: Include safety and operations mitigation results in the same table
- Project Team: Correct safety statistic on Lake Oswego exhibit to state that it is for all crashes and based on a predictive index model

I-205 Toll Project

Meeting Summary

Subject	I-205 Toll Project Mitigation Follow-up Meeting
Date and Time	Thursday, December 1 3:00-5:00pm
Location	ODOT Region 1 Office 18277 SW Boones Ferry Rd, Portland, OR 97224

Attendees	Organization
Mike McCarthy	City of Tualatin
Susie Lahsene	City of Rivergrove
Matt Dorado	Washington County
Karen Buehrig	Clackamas County
Mike Bezner	Clackamas County
Carl Olson	Clackamas County
Kelsey Lewis	SMART
Andrew Bastasch	Project Team - ODOT
David Gitlin	Project Team - WSP
Rachel Haukkala	Project Team - WSP
Edith Victoria Lopez	Project Team - WSP
Chris Wellander	Project Team - WSP
Heather Wills	Project Team - WSP
Ellen Palmquist	Project Team - Kearns & West

1 Materials Presented

- Meeting Agenda
- Mitigation Materials:
 - Mitigation table
 - Exhibits
 - Safety mitigations

2 Meeting Summary

The I-205 Toll Project mitigation follow-up meetings provided an opportunity for the I-205 Toll Project Team and partners to follow-up on summer workshops. Meeting objectives included:

- Providing an update on mitigation planning in advance of the early 2023 Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) publication.
- Describing how jurisdiction feedback was incorporated into additional safety analysis and mitigation planning.
- Sharing next steps on the project EA and future coordination opportunities.

The following meeting summary includes comments, questions and responses from the mitigation follow-up meeting. Comments, questions and responses are not written verbatim, but instead are summarized to capture the primary intent and key points from the discussion. Some comments did not receive a direct response during the meeting but will be considered as the analysis and EA are finalized.

Proposed Safety Mitigation

Comment [Clackamas County]: In the report, please note that only fatal and type A injuries were considered for the primary criteria.

Comment [Clackamas County]: Reflective backplating is standard practice so it seems underwhelming as a safety mitigation, since it's likely going to be completed anyway.

Response [Project Team]: Reflective backplating is just one safety mitigation proposed. We will also continue to discuss additional items that could be included in the Revised EA.

Comment [Clackamas County]: Clackamas County is not planning improvements for the Nyberg Street and I-5 northbound ramps, only the southbound ramps.

Response [Project Team]: We will remove this text from the proposed mitigation table.

Comment [City of Tualatin]: Tualatin is not reconfiguring the Nyberg Street and I-5 northbound intersection.

Response [Project Team]: We will update this text in the proposed mitigation table.

Mitigation Exhibits

Question [Clackamas County]: Are you able to share the worksheet for the Tualatin corridor, including the separation for injury reports, and any supporting data for the 2027 mitigations?

Response [Project Team]: Information for each intersection is included in the draft Transportation Technical Report that was distributed to you in advance of this meeting. The distribution of type A and fatal crashes was applied to the Highway Safety Manual analysis. We are happy to go over these steps with you at a future date if you have questions about them.

Comment [SMART]: SMART will potentially increase hourly service with Forward Together to half hour service depending on the availability of funds. SMART will provide service from Wilsonville along I-205 through Tualatin.

Question [SMART]: Will SMART transit vehicles be toll-exempt on I-205? Some SMART vehicles are smaller than a standard bus.

Response [Project Team]: Emergency vehicles and transit vehicles will be exempt from tolls.

Comment [SMART]: Areas where bike and pedestrian mitigation is needed may not qualify because the ranking does not worsen dramatically after tolling is implemented and fails to qualify for mitigation.

Comment [Tualatin]: Improvements at Nyberg Street and I-205 will focus on spreading traffic out through the lanes and not backing up the right lane. These improvements will not add capacity. This project will go to bid in 2023. City of Tualatin is also looking at bike and pedestrian improvements at the eastbound to southbound ramp.

Comment [Washington County]: The southbound queue off of I-205 on SW 65th Avenue backs up to Nyberg Lane every day.

Response [Project Team]: One of the benefits of this project is to improve I-205 operations. Some of the traffic on SW 65th Avenue will end up moving onto I-205. We are focusing on areas where tolling will cause issues, but many areas will improve, especially in PM Peak.

Comment [Clackamas County]: Clackamas County is building a roundabout at Childs Road and SW Stafford Road (discussed during the mitigation workshop). The planned roundabout will likely need an improvement by 2045.

Comment [City of Rivergrove]: Tolling will cause some downstream impacts for the elementary school on SW Childs Road. An increase in traffic would be significant for a collector like SW Childs Road and may need safety mitigation.

Response [Project Team]: We have heard that people are already using SW Childs Road as an alternate route if I-205 is congested and will look into safety mitigation.

Comment [City of Tualatin]: SW Borland Road and SW 65th Avenue is already over capacity. This route is used for diversion from I-5 and has one of the largest PM peak spikes. City of Tualatin has been pushing for funding to fix the capacity issue and is working with both counties to make a project happen in the future.

Comment [Clackamas County]: Clackamas County has a planned sidewalk improvement project on SW Borland Road.

Question [Project Team]: Would it make sense to connect the intersections along SW 65th Avenue by extending the SCATS system?

Response [Clackamas County]: No, due to the distance between the two intersections. It works better to set the signals at SW Sagert Street and SW Borland Road free because they don't coordinate well.

Response [City of Tualatin]: It would make sense to get some communication between the signals, but we do not want to commit to a particular system.

Comment [Clackamas County]: There is fiber on Nyberg Lane out to SW 65th Avenue.

Question [SMART]: What does "acceptable technology" mean for transit improvements at SW 65th Avenue and SW Borland Road?

Response [Project Team]: ODOT will monitor the signal technology implemented on Division Street to see if there are any information technology concerns. This could be used at SW 65th Avenue and SW Borland Road to ensure the bus is not held up at this intersection.

Comment [Clackamas County]: Clackamas County is open to using technology that has gone through PBOT testing. Clackamas County uses the same central signal system, and it would be easy to implement changes. Some coordination would be needed between Clackamas County and Washington County for signals at SW Sagert Street and SW Borland Road because these are operated by each county.

Question [SMART]: Has ODOT considered running bus on shoulder on I-205 to improve transit operations?

Response [Project Team]: Once tolling begins on I-205, we expect transit operations to improve. There would be a current challenge to operate buses on the shoulder while avoiding rumble strips.

Question [SMART]: When will pavement markings and improvements be made to I-205? SMART is planning on having a bus route on I-205 prior to the start of tolling.

Response [Project Team]: Segments on I-205 with rumble strips present a challenge for bus routes and will need to be moved. In addition, two lanes will be open during construction, but the shoulder may be closed. We will take this question back to ODOT staff and follow-up with SMART.

Comment [SMART]: SMART runs service through the same medical facilities as TriMet.

Comment [SMART]: Mitigation should consider hardware that SMART would need for any signal system changes.

Comment [Washington County]: Funds need to be designated for any mitigation needs that arise from monitoring.

Comment [Clackamas County]: Appreciate the changes that were made between the workshops and the follow-up meetings.

Action Items

- Project Team: In the report, note that only fatal and type A injuries were used in the primary criteria for mitigation
- Project Team: Remove “planned Clackamas County pedestrian/bike improvements” from the proposed mitigation table for the Nyberg interchange area
- Project Team: Update text in the proposed mitigation table to reflect that Tualatin is not reconfiguring the northbound intersection at Nyberg/I-205
- Project Team: Follow-up with SMART on timing for I-205 construction
- Project Team: Look into safety mitigation along SW Childs Road
- Project Team: Look into queuing at SW 65th Avenue & SW Borland Road

Meeting Summary

Subject	I-205 Toll Project Mitigation Follow-up Meeting
Date and Time	Friday, December 9 9:30-11:30pm
Location	Canby Council Chambers Room – 222 NE 2nd Ave, Canby OR 97013

Attendees	Organization
Don Hardy	City of Canby
Ryan Potter	City of Canby
Mayor Brian Hodson	City of Canby
Todd Wood	Canby Area Transit (CAT)
Mike Strauch	South Clackamas Transportation District (SCTD)
Joe Marek	Clackamas County
Mike Bezner	Clackamas County
Jamie Stansy	Clackamas County
Kevin Chewuk	DKS
Andrew Bastasch	ODOT
Heather Wills	Project Team - WSP
Chris Wellander	Project Team - WSP
Rachel Haukkala	Project Team - WSP
Edith Victoria Lopez	Project Team - WSP
David Gitlin	Project Team - WSP
Josh Mahar	Project Team - Kearns & West
Gillian Garber-Yonts	Project Team - Kearns & West

1 Materials Presented

- Meeting Agenda
- Mitigation Materials:
 - Mitigation table
 - Exhibits
 - Safety mitigations

2 Meeting Summary

The I-205 Toll Project mitigation follow-up meetings provided an opportunity for the I-205 Toll Project Team and partners to follow-up on summer workshops. Meeting objectives included:

I-205 Toll Project

- Providing an update on mitigation planning in advance of the early 2023 Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) publication.
- Describing how jurisdiction feedback was incorporated into additional safety analysis and mitigation planning.
- Sharing next steps on the project EA and future coordination opportunities.

The following meeting summary includes comments, questions and responses from the mitigation follow-up meeting. Comments, questions and responses are not written verbatim, but instead are summarized to capture the primary intent and key points from the discussion. Some comments did not receive a direct response during the meeting, but will be considered as the analysis and EA are finalized.

Proposed Safety Mitigation – Preliminary Discussion

Question [CAT]: How can the project team know if a mitigation fixes the identified problem without defining the timeframe associated with the date the intersection will meet compliance standards?

Response [Project Team]: ODOT uses *The Highway Safety Manual (HSM)* methodology to predict crash frequency defined as either severe, fatal, or property damage only. The project team looks at how many crashes occur both with and without the project, then the crash reduction factor is added based on the proposed mitigation.

Question [Canby]: Has increased delay been factored into the safety model? The 2027 PM peak increases from 167 seconds to 304 seconds of delay.

Response [Project Team]: Not directly. For safety, we use the Safety Priority Index System (SPIS) and take into account signal measuring and people volume. The delay is from the synchro analysis. This intersection is on our radar because it has operational issues and it is on the SPIS site. The proposed safety mitigations will not necessarily improve operations, but operational mitigation is proposed where warranted based on the operations analysis.

Comment [Clackamas County]: Operation issues are connected to safety.

Response [Project Team]: We have protected turn phases for left turns, and we have talked about adding tactile warning strips for vehicles at OR 99 and Ivy Street. Operationally, once synchro hits a certain level, we cut it off because it becomes inaccurate.

Comment (Clackamas County): Signal timing was redone between Pine Street and Elm Street about six months ago. This section was coordinated as a part of the repaving project and they are interconnected, except for Redwood Street.

I-205 Toll Project

Proposed Mitigation – OR 99E and South Ivy Street

Comment [DKS]: This intersection is protected.

Response [Project Team]: We will confirm our modeling reflects protected left-turn operations.

Comment [CAT]: I am concerned with the mountable treatments. We have had problems with them in the past; people don't see them as curbs.

Response [Project Team]: We will look into this. One option could be to revisit the phasing.

Comment [Clackamas County]: You could run the permissive with the gap phasing and turn it off if there are too many vehicles. Data indicates that there are some access management strategies that could be implemented to reduce crashes between Ivy Street and Locust Street.

Proposed Safety Mitigation – OR 99E – N Redwood Street to SE Berg Parkway

Question [DKS]: Most of the sidewalks are directly adjacent to the roadway. Street trees would require taking parcels and there is limited right of way (ROW) along the highway. Will you include a plan for street tree locations?

Response [Project Team]: We would look at where there are gaps in ROW. We only need to implement one of the proposed safety mitigations to drop the segment from being impacted. Another potential mitigation is to add a median. These are starting mitigations. We are hoping to get more input on what the agencies think about these and whether or not they are viable.

Comment [Clackamas County]: Given the proposed mitigations, I don't know how effective trees would be. There is no bike lane on this segment which means trucks occupy the right lane. Also, with regard to the proposed enforcement mitigation, that isn't something the county can guarantee. Automated enforcement is not legal outside of city limits. If the City did the enforcement, ODOT would have to agree with it.

Comment [Canby]: We have not supported automated enforcement in the past. The Traffic Safety Committee will revisit this and develop a recommendation. City Council is changing on January 1, 2023, and the new council may have more interest.

Response [Project Team]: These mitigations serve as a starting point. Adjustments can be made to select the most viable mitigations for reducing the impact.

Question [Clackamas County]: Can you explain the process for discussing mitigations and determining what will be included in the EA?

Response [Project Team]: We have looked at feasibility, but there is more work to do. Using agency feedback, we will adjust mitigations in the Draft EA. For example, we will look into the viability of street trees. We will also review public comments on the Draft EA and make further refinements to make sure that the mitigations listed in the Revised EA are fully viable.

I-205 Toll Project

Question [Clackamas County]: Will the project team host another workshop to discuss mitigations?

Response [Project Team]: We will discuss how further feedback will be collected. We want to make sure that concerns and questions are responded to.

Question [Clackamas County]: Is agreement between Canby, Clackamas County, and ODOT required to finalize the list of mitigations?

Response [Project Team]: NEPA does not require an agreement. NEPA does require that the project mitigates below the thresholds. We would not rely on any one mitigation and our goal has been to not rule out any potential safety mitigations.

Question [Canby]: Is ODOT considering improvements beyond safety?

Response [Project Team]: We are considering operations improvements as well.

Question [Clackamas County]: Is ODOT obligated to mitigate for 2045 safety impacts in addition to monitoring?

Response [Project Team]: We do not have mitigations for 2045 yet, because we are starting with the near term. Monitoring will be used to determine if/when mitigation is required and we would be responsible for funding any identified mitigations. We did not see as many safety sites show up as failing for the 2045 modeling, but the project would be required to cover those mitigations. Anything we identify as a 2027 mitigation will be checked against the 2045 modeling to make sure that the mitigation works for both the 2027 and 2045 impacts. Some impacts only occur in 2045 and the cost to mitigate those impacts will have to be set aside in reserve.

Comment [Clackamas County]: Not being able to talk about the revenue as we talk about NEPA is difficult.

Mitigation Exhibit: OR 99E and South End Road

No comments.

Mitigation Exhibit: OR 99E and Haines Road

Question [Clackamas County]: Is a fourth leg anticipated due to the Canby development?

Response [Project Team]: A fourth leg could be incorporated coming from the west.

Comment [Canby]: This is outside of Canby's urban growth boundary (UGB). We are going through a UGB expansion and the area on the west side has not been formally included.

Response [Project Team]: We would design to not preclude, but that would not be included in the mitigation.

I-205 Toll Project

Mitigation Exhibit: OR 99E and Ivy Street

Question [DKS]: Will you consider improvements for adjacent intersections? There is a planned improvement at Pine Street and 4th Avenue with capacity impacts. The Redwood Street intersection increases from .66 to .89 and is not listed for the 2027 build scenario. It is running split phasing on the side streets, and I noticed you are not. This is one of the highest growth areas in the city and could have more impacts than what is currently identified.

Response [Project Team]: We are using the RTP, if there is other growth not included in that model it is not included in the analysis.

Comment [Canby]: We are looking at adding 500 acres of commercial development and 400 acres of residential development. 2043 is the horizon for our Comprehensive Plan and TSP.

Response [Project Team]: We will look into the ideas you have shared and try to find some areas for compromise. The EA is prepared with the information we have now and based on the projects included in the RTP.

Comment [Canby]: We anticipate impacts for Redwood Street and Pine Street and would like to see documentation for the diversion impacts in 2027. Streets like Knights Bridge and Township are predicted to have over 1000 daily trips. We might have material impacts on the city that do not fail volume standards.

Response [Project Team]: All of the analysis, including project volumes, are included in the Transportation Technical Report (TTR). We are proposing mitigation for the intersections where the Project causes an impact, which is along OR 99E in Canby. We will take a look at Knights Bridge and get back to you.

Comment [DKS]: There is a new intersection planned at Walnut Street and OR 99E to the north for 2025 that is currently in the design phase. It would be nice to have the volumes with this project. That area could get more movement in the city especially for trucks. There is access control in the area, funding for the project, and an ODOT access permit is in process.

Question [Canby]: Did OR 99E and NE Territorial Road fail?

Response [ODOT]: No, it did not fail.

Comment [Canby]: When OR 99E is congested, NE Territorial Road to Knights Bridge becomes the Canby bypass. The City has lowered speed limits and put in sidewalks. Does the City need to consider impacts to NE Territorial and Knights Bridge Road if Ivy Street becomes congested?

Comment [CAT]: There are improvements already planned for OR 99E and Ivy Street. People become frustrated when we do work multiple times in a short period.

Comment [CAT]: If transit is part of the mitigation, there needs to be more conversations with CAT. CAT will need additional funding to improve the transit system in the area.

I-205 Toll Project

Response [Project Team]: You have made good points. We are not allowed to use toll revenue to fund transit service, but it can be used to fund some types of transit improvements. Please send the project team your list considerations if it has changed since the initial version. Will CAT consider rerouting?

Comment [CAT]: We will consider rerouting if it will not inconvenience the people who use transit. If the reroute does not add time, we are open to it.

Comment [Canby]: Canby has a 25% Hispanic population and a large low-income population. The EA needs to consider impacts to those populations.

Response [Project Team]: We have prepared a Social Resources and Communities Technical Report and an Environmental Justice Technical Report that analyzes the impacts to low-income and minority populations. That analysis, findings, and proposed mitigations will be included in the Draft EA.

Question [Canby]: What is the timing for the EA?

Response [Project Team]: The draft EA is anticipated to be released in early 2023. The revised EA is anticipated to be released in late spring.

Question [Project Team]: Has there been analysis for the intersections at Walnut Street and Pine Street?

Comment [Canby]: My understanding with Pine Street is that we have a railroad issue. There is a signaling project along OR 99E as well. DKS can provide ODOT with that data.

Comment [DKS]: At Walnut we did a future analysis as a part of the TSP amendment. We can share what we have.

Mitigation Exhibit: OR 99E and Lone Elder Road

No comments noted.

Action Items

- Project Team: Correct OR 99E and South Ivy Street intersection to show as unprotected
- Project Team: Look at non-mountable curb treatment for OR 99E and South Ivy Street
- Project Team: Look at viability of street tree mitigations at OR 99E between N Redwood St and SE Berg Pkwy
- Project Team: Review impacts to Knights Bridge
- Project Team: Review design plans for planned improvements on OR 99E
- DKS: Provide analysis and data used for the OR 99E re-signaling project