

1 I-205 LIGHT RAIL PROJECT

2

3

4

5

6

7



8

9

10

11

12 CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

13 11731 Southeast Stevens Road

14 Portland, Oregon

15 TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 2004

16 4:18 P.M.

17

18

19

- - -

20

21

22

23

24

25

IN ATTENDANCE:

- 1
- 2 Jeanne Lawson, Facilitator
- 3 Jerry Schmidt, Chair
- 4 Brenda Carlin
- 5 Rob Wheeler
- 6 Ken Turner
- 7 Wilda Parks
- 8 Jim Chasse
- 9 Harry LawHing
- 10 Ann Becklund
- 11 Elizabeth Davidson
- 12 Jeff Goodling
- 13 Dave Unsworth
- 14 .
- 15 .
- 16 .
- 17 .
- 18 .
- 19 .
- 20 .
- 21 .
- 22 .
- 23 .
- 24 .
- 25 .

1                   MR. SCHMIDT: We probably want to call  
2 together the order of the meeting, today, of the Citizens  
3 Advisory Committee. We're glad that you can be here at our  
4 house today, and we welcome you to New Hope. Jeanne has a  
5 full agenda for us today here, and yet at the same time,  
6 it's one of more informational sharing today as opposed to  
7 previous meetings where we had a lot of decision-making and  
8 recommendations to make. So, Jeanne, with that as a  
9 foundation, if you would like to take it from there.

10                   MS. LAWSON: Great. So, we are going  
11 to - - This is -- As Jerry says, this is primarily  
12 informational sort of, and setting -- setting the stage for  
13 where we need to go from here. We're going to give an  
14 update on the process, and we will also -- We're going to  
15 get an update on the EIS -- on the EIS process. And Dave's  
16 not here yet. And then we're going to talk about where we  
17 go from here in terms of the committee.

18                   We know that there are several committee  
19 members who are not going to be continuing for various  
20 reasons. Ruth Bade submitted a letter because she's got  
21 some concerns about how the process is headed -- where it's  
22 headed and where it's been. Others, it's a time issue in  
23 terms of their ability to make the commitment, so we'll talk  
24 about that later. And I do want to share with you the  
25 concerns that Ruth has voiced as well. So we'll talk at

1 that point about what the committee wants to do, how it  
2 wants to continue, and Elizabeth will lead that piece.

3                   And then at 5:30 we will, as we have  
4 for a few meetings now, stop and transition into open house  
5 format for stationary design. And this is Marta Charles,  
6 and she is going to be doing the recording tonight and she  
7 did ask me to mention to you that it works best for her  
8 when you speak one at a time. And I told her we'll work  
9 on that, but it's most important to me that you guys have  
10 good interchange. So, we'll strive to make it work for  
11 her.

12                   With that, the -- Oh, minutes. We need  
13 to adopt minutes. Right. Yes?

14                   MR. LAWHING: This is a small thing,  
15 but I just -- on page 37 of the minutes, Rob asked the  
16 question and I -- (inaudible) -- give you a good price,  
17 isn't he? This is with regards to property.

18                   MS. LAWSON: Uh-huh.

19                   MR. LAWHING: And my comment was --  
20 Basically, what I said was, it's better, because enough  
21 people have told me that they're going to. And this is  
22 just one incident of where -- This is the minutes from the  
23 last neighborhood association - - And this is just one  
24 incident of where -- You know, my situation is a unique  
25 situation, as I've lived there almost 40 years.

1 MS. LAWSON: Yeah.

2 MR. LAWHING: And so it's not just the  
3 typical, like, "Cash this person out."

4 MS. LAWSON: Right.

5 MR. LAWHING: So anyway, that was not  
6 in the minutes. And so --

7 MS. LAWSON: So did -- Did you note  
8 something down or do you want to give some specific wording  
9 to Elizabeth on how to reword it to get it in the minutes?

10 MR. LAWHING: Oh, no. It's a small  
11 item. It's just that Mr. Wheeler asked, "They're going to  
12 give you a good price, aren't they?" And then there was  
13 nothing -- There was no response.

14 MS. LAWSON: Okay. And there had been?

15 MR. LAWHING: Yes.

16 MS. LAWSON: Right. Right, there was.

17 So --

18 MS. LAWSON: So --

19 MR. WHEELER: Well, they're naming the  
20 station after you, aren't they? I was just kidding.

21 MS. LAWSON: There's an idea.

22 MR. WHEELER: That's what I heard last  
23 meeting. Just kidding.

24 MR. LAWHING: Thank you.

25 MS. LAWSON: Given the amount of time

1 you've put into it, that wouldn't be so bad. So, you  
2 planted the seed, Rob.

3 MR. WHEELER: Naming rights.

4 MR. LAWHING: It's highlighted on the  
5 second page.

6 MS. LAWSON: So, we'll pass that around  
7 to Elizabeth and --

8 MS. DAVIDSON: And because that's in  
9 the transcript, Harry, and not in the meeting summary --

10 MR. LAWHING: It wasn't in the  
11 transcript. I didn't see it in the transcript.

12 MS. DAVIDSON: Oh, you said page 37?

13 MR. LAWHING: Of the minutes. But page  
14 37 in the minutes -- I don't know what page it was on the  
15 transcript. When I went through the transcript, it was the  
16 same way.

17 MS. LAWSON: It wasn't reflected.

18 MR. LAWHING: If you go into the  
19 transcript and you read that part, it's the same thing Mr.  
20 Wheeler asked the question, and then -- and then there's  
21 nothing more.

22 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay. And you're  
23 referring to the meeting --

24 MR. LAWHING: Yes.

25 MS. DAVIDSON: This one? (Indicated.)

1 MR. LAWHING: The 26th of July.

2 MS. DAVIDSON: The 26th. If you want  
3 to circle that or make note of that, Harry --

4 MS. LAWSON: Is that what you're  
5 circulating?

6 MR. LAWHING: Well, that -- No. No.  
7 It would have to be the -- It would have to be --

8 MS. DAVIDSON: The actual transcript.

9 MR. LAWHING: No. Well, is the  
10 transcript the same as the minutes?

11 MS. DAVIDSON: Yes, it is.

12 MR. LAWHING: Oh, okay.

13 MS. DAVIDSON: The transcript, yeah.

14 MR. LAWHING: Okay. Then it is the  
15 transcript.

16 MS. DAVIDSON: It is the transcript.  
17 Okay. Great. Thanks for clarifying.

18 MR. LAWHING: Sorry.

19 MS. DAVIDSON: No. No, that's okay.

20 MR. LAWHING: Because I thought the  
21 minutes were different than the transcript.

22 MS. DAVIDSON: No. I do a meeting  
23 summary just because that would be, for me, too much  
24 duplication of effort. So people can just read through the  
25 transcript and then I -- From the transcript, I make a

1 meeting summary.

2 MR. LAWHING: Okay.

3 MS. LAWSON: So, for the transcript, do  
4 you need that corrected to get something in there that maybe  
5 the two of you --

6 MR. LAWHING: Well, I really don't know  
7 how important it is. But I just thought, you know -- It  
8 wasn't in the transcript, you know, and it should have been  
9 and it wasn't. So, you know, it's --

10 MS. LAWSON: Okay. We'll make a note  
11 of it. Okay.

12 All right. So, any other comments on  
13 the meeting summary or transcript from the last meeting?  
14 Then everybody is thrilled with them and they loved them and  
15 they want to approve them?

16 MR. WHEELER: Do we need to make a  
17 motion?

18 MS. LAWSON: No, you don't need to --

19 MR. WHEELER: I would make a motion we  
20 adopt the minutes, with Harry's --

21 MS. LAWSON: We don't need actual  
22 motions, but we do need to know everybody's okay with it.  
23 Okay. All right. So we'll take that as, "yes,"  
24 everybody's okay with it, with that modification.

25 And so, at the September open house

1 recap, are you --

2 MS. DAVIDSON: Yeah. I just wanted to  
3 briefly mention that, as you know, the CAC meeting for that  
4 particular date was canceled just because we didn't feel we  
5 were quite at the point of sharing some of the results of  
6 the study work that we've done to date. But I did just  
7 want to let you know that -- and I think it's -- Again,  
8 kudos to all of you for letting your constituency know about  
9 some of those things, because we had amazing attendance from  
10 people that, you know, we -- hadn't been seen or heard from  
11 before. So -- And, again, kind of keeping in line what  
12 we've been doing to date is that we did show the five  
13 station area design concepts at that open house. And then  
14 later on tonight, as Jeanne mentioned, we will be showing  
15 the last two station area design concepts, which will be in  
16 Clackamas County, which are the Fuller station park-and-ride  
17 and the Clackamas Town Center station park-and-ride.

18 MS. LAWSON: Okay. So, any questions  
19 before we move on? All right. So what we -- Is there  
20 anyone in the audience that has not been at a meeting  
21 before? So what we do -- The committee adopted some  
22 protocols where they allow for some time for public comment  
23 right now, if there's anybody who has an issue they want to  
24 tell the committee about. And so, did you have anything  
25 you wanted to talk to the committee about? You don't --

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh, wow. Yes.  
2 I did some calculations on the number of bus trips and the  
3 time the buses run down Monterey. And they run an average  
4 every 1.4 minutes, which, you know, sometimes they're like  
5 five -- one after another, and other times it's, you know,  
6 five minutes between, but an average of 1.4 minutes during  
7 the time that buses run. And since, you know, one side of  
8 Monterey is residential, I was -- My question is: Will  
9 TriMet re-route the majority of the buses down Sunnyside and  
10 then 82nd?

11 MS. LAWSON: When -- When the light  
12 rail station -- When the light rail goes in --

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right. You know,  
14 when it's like even -- begin it when the temporary station  
15 is moved over. You know, there's the temporary --

16 MS. LAWSON: Will there be re-routing?  
17 Is there a real little quick answer to that or should we  
18 have you guys work on that together offline, since that's  
19 not an issue the committee's addressing?

20 MR. GOODLING: I think probably both.

21 MS. LAWSON: Okay.

22 MR. GOODLING: Let me -- I think TriMet  
23 typically starts talking more about service planning a  
24 little bit later in the process as we get closer to  
25 establishing this new transit center and new functions. At

1 this point, I haven't heard anything about reductions in bus  
2 service or changes in the routing for the bus service, so I  
3 would be surprised if there's any significant change in  
4 that, you know. But it isn't something that we've talked  
5 about a lot at this point. So it's -- that the routing  
6 changes and scheduled changes occur at a later date. So --

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So it could be  
8 put on the table as a discussion as things move along?  
9 Okay.

10 MR. WHEELER: That transit center is  
11 being moved, though, right? Isn't it being moved closer to  
12 the -- closer to the train station?

13 MS. DAVIDSON: It is.

14 MR. WHEELER: So then perhaps there  
15 would be more access from Sunnyside at that point for buses.  
16 So it might defer traffic away from Monterey because it's  
17 going to be more accessible from Sunnyside, I would think.

18 MS. LAWSON: And it's my understanding  
19 that that move, at least on a temporary basis, is being  
20 done almost -- almost immediately. I mean, it's not like  
21 this week or next, but I think that's being done very, very  
22 soon, as they prepare for the remodeling and the expansion  
23 of Clackamas Town Center. So, I guess, what I think I've  
24 heard -- and I don't know that this is accurate -- is that,  
25 like, by the first of the year that transit center will be

1 in a relocated section of Clackamas Town Center's grounds,  
2 you know, and that. But, it's all -- And I'd like to just  
3 suggest, too, that as TriMet's working on those kinds of  
4 things, that they stay in very close connection with the  
5 Clackamas Regional Center TMA so that we can help be the  
6 voice of the public and get the information out, and also,  
7 to access information back to you on that. So that would  
8 be important, I think.

9 MR. GOODLING: Yeah, I think it's  
10 pretty unlikely that there'd be any significant changes for  
11 the temporary --

12 MR. LAWSON: Yeah.

13 MR. GOODLING: -- farther out as the  
14 light rail system opens, and perhaps there's greater  
15 opportunity for changes.

16 MS. LAWSON: Mm-hm. Okay. So, any  
17 other public comments?

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes. I know you  
19 haven't gotten to the actual design concepts yet, but I also  
20 have a concern about the noise level. Right now, the  
21 transit center is really good with all the berms that they  
22 have and then the corridor area there that has these big  
23 pillars that help with the sound. You know, to help absorb  
24 the --

25 MS. LAWSON: Right.

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- sound. And  
2 I'm wondering if any provisions like that are being made at  
3 the new center.

4 MS. LAWSON: You are at the right  
5 meeting, because at this meeting we have Martha Moore, who  
6 is in the back. Martha is the head of T.W. Environmental,  
7 which is the firm doing noise and air quality on this  
8 project. And, while Martha doesn't have a role on the --  
9 an official role on the agenda tonight, I would encourage  
10 you to -- There may be some initial responses, but that  
11 might also be -- You might want to also capture Martha for  
12 a second to talk about that. Did you have anything  
13 immediately -- sort of short answer, anybody, on that?

14 MR. GOODLING: I don't think that the  
15 noise while buses going in and out of the facility will be  
16 reduced. But our plans, as shown, indicate that the buses  
17 would be laying over, actually, in the basement of the  
18 parking garage, so even more enclosed than they are today.  
19 I don't know if the amount of noise generated by their  
20 actual layovers at the existing facilities -- probably isn't  
21 significant noise. You know, it's further -- The new center  
22 is further away from the residences and - -

23 MS. MOORE: (Inaudible) It's also behind  
24 the Monterey of the crossing ramps -- So --

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Where the

1 residential areas are or would it still be close to that  
2 area?

3 MR. GOODLING: Well, with the buses  
4 going up and down Monterey, that wouldn't, you know, change,  
5 unless the bus services change.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right.

7 MS. LAWSON: And I would just encourage  
8 you guys to maybe talk about that more offline. And we'll  
9 get the committee moving on the other. But thank you. So  
10 -- So, with that process update. Is that -- Jeff?

11 MR. GOODLING: I'm sorry.

12 MS. LAWSON: Okay. I was looking at  
13 you and you didn't --

14 (Multiple speakers. Inaudible.)

15 MS. LAWSON: You didn't know about  
16 that? Okay. I got that wrong. Who was supposed to do  
17 that?

18 MR. GOODLING: I think everybody  
19 probably remembers me from some of the earlier meetings.  
20 I'm sorry. I haven't been able to make it to all of them.  
21 My name is Jeff Goodling, and I'm TriMet's project manager  
22 for the I-205 project.

23 MR. WHEELER: We missed you, Jeff.

24 MR. GOODLING: Now I know where I'm  
25 welcome.

1 MR. SCHMIDT: Anytime.

2 MR. GOODLING: I wanted to tell you a  
3 little bit about where we're at in our process and help set  
4 the stage for what we'll be, hopefully, asking you guys for  
5 in the future. As I'm sure you're all aware, on September  
6 30th we completed preliminary engineering for the I-205  
7 project, and shortly afterwards, completed the FEIS -- the  
8 Federal Environmental -- Final Environmental Impact Statement  
9 for the project. Both of those have now - - Well,  
10 preliminary engineering has been submitted to the Federal  
11 Transportation Administration, and the final preliminary  
12 reviews of the Final Environmental Impact Statement are  
13 underway, and we expect a signed copy to be delivered to  
14 the FTA, the Federal Transportation Administration, shortly.

15 What happens then is, they spend quite  
16 a bit of time reviewing those documents determining that  
17 they believe we've completed preliminary engineering and  
18 we've accounted for the costs. What they're trying to do  
19 during this period of time is determine that their  
20 involvement in this project isn't going to expose them to  
21 liabilities, either financially or environmentally, that  
22 aren't listed in our documents, that we've accounted for all  
23 of the risks to the environment or financial risks  
24 associated with the project. We expect that we will get  
25 what is called a "record of decision" early this winter.

1 That means that they've reviewed those documents and have  
2 determined that we have completed preliminary engineering and  
3 the Environmental Impact Statement satisfactory --  
4 satisfactorily. And that sort of starts the process for the  
5 next phase of the project. We can then begin talking about  
6 doing final design. And we expect that by early summer  
7 we'll have permission to begin final design.

8                               So we enter into this lull, if you  
9 will, at this -- at this time where the process is now in  
10 the Federal Transportation Administration's hands and we're  
11 waiting for their reviews and approvals before we can go  
12 ahead. The issue is, anything we do between now and then  
13 is not eligible to count as matching funds. And we're  
14 putting our local dollars at risk by continuing further. If  
15 we can wait, we can count all of those dollars as matching  
16 funds, which helps extend the reach that the local dollars  
17 have. So it's a prudent financial measure on our part what  
18 to -- to slow down the process as they are in this review  
19 process. That doesn't mean that there isn't anything  
20 happening. We know of some issues that continue to be --  
21 need to be changed, and we're working on several of those.

22                               There are a few very long lead-time  
23 permits, such as the environmental review permit, that we'll  
24 -- We'll be starting that process this winter. Some things  
25 to just make sure that, come June, we're in place to start

1 that final design ball rolling. But I think Elizabeth will  
2 talk a little bit more about the role of the CAC in the  
3 near future.

4 I also wanted to talk just briefly  
5 about the downtown Mall project. I'm sure all of you have  
6 seen things in the paper about the local improvement  
7 district for downtown and how that has been -- negotiations  
8 are indicating that that is going to be scaled back, and  
9 I'm sure, probably, questions in your minds about how that  
10 may affect the I-205 project.

11 We firmly believe -- We firmly believe  
12 that -- Well, let me -- Let me start over. The two  
13 projects are inexorably linked. I-205 and the Mall are one  
14 in the same project in the Final Environmental Impact  
15 Statement. To separate the two projects and move upon them  
16 independently would cause us quite a bit of delay, but we  
17 don't believe that that's going to be necessary. We believe  
18 that the small shortfall on the Mall can be accommodated by  
19 reductions and scope on the Mall so that the two projects  
20 will continue on the same schedule and that the reductions  
21 in the LID in downtown will affect the project downtown but  
22 will not affect the project on I-205.

23 Please don't misunderstand me to be  
24 saying that that doesn't mean we have our financial  
25 challenges on I-205. We've had a tight budget on I- 205.

1 We continue to have a tight budget on I-205, and we're  
2 continuing to make sure that we have a project that we can  
3 afford on I-205. And as we get more an accurate pricing  
4 data, it may be necessary to talk about changes in the  
5 scope on I-205, not as a result of the actions that have  
6 occurred on the LID. Anyone who's involved in construction  
7 may know that there has been huge escalations in steel  
8 prices and other things as of late. Fuel prices going up  
9 affect construction because most materials have to be  
10 shipped. So there continues to be cost pressures that we're  
11 facing on I-205, but those are not as a result of the  
12 actions that are occurring downtown on the LID project.  
13 Those cost pressures are being dealt with through the scope  
14 of downtown.

15 MR. WHEELER: Not knowing the federal  
16 process, what -- At what point do you get a commitment of  
17 federal dollars towards the project?

18 MR. GOODLING: Well, you get ongoing  
19 commitments.

20 MR. WHEELER: Because it's not going to  
21 happen without the federal dollars.

22 MR. GOODLING: It's not going to happen  
23 without the federal dollars. And the next step in the  
24 process really is the record of decision, which is their  
25 acceptance of the work that we've done to date. That

1 allows you to apply for permission to enter final design.  
2 We will then continue the design work that we've done up to  
3 a point where we resubmit to them, and then at that fork,  
4 what's called a "full funding grant agreement" -- So the  
5 permission to enter final design essentially allows us to  
6 continue and to count those dollars that we spend, then, as  
7 local match towards the total project. And then once we  
8 get the full funding grant agreement, which is probably  
9 going to be in 2006, they're fully onboard with  
10 participating in the project.

11 MR. WHEELER: At that point, though,  
12 even if -- If you've given -- been given permission for  
13 final design, there's still no federal dollars.

14 MR. GOODLING: Still no federal dollars  
15 --

16 MR. WHEELER: So you're still in  
17 competition with other national projects.

18 MR. GOODLING: Just a promise to allow  
19 you to count those towards the local match, if and when you  
20 get a full funding grant agreement.

21 MR. WHEELER: Or when.

22 MR. GOODLING: Yes.

23 MS. DAVIDSON: So just to clarify,  
24 Jeff, it's the -- When we get permission to enter our final  
25 design, that we get commitment for federal dollars? Or --

1 MR. GOODLING: No, we get -- When we  
2 get permission to enter final design, which we hope to get  
3 in early summer, then the dollars that we spent can count  
4 as local match towards the project. So if we get a full  
5 funding grant agreement subsequent to that, those dollars  
6 will be matched by federal dollars.

7 MR. WHEELER: I assume there's some  
8 kind of a an encouragement behind the scene saying, "Your  
9 project looks great. You're getting kind of -- top two on  
10 our list for approval." That being in doubts, really,  
11 right? I know John (inaudible) is really pretty familiar  
12 with the funding process. But --

13 MR. GOODLING: As is Dave Unsworth, and  
14 both of them could probably talk to it better than I can.  
15 My understanding is, is that there is a ranking system.  
16 TSUB?

17 MR. UNSWORTH: There's a -- I'm Dave  
18 Unsworth. I work for Metro. And we're part a partner  
19 along with the Clackamas Town --

20 MS. LAWSON: You guys have met Dave  
21 previously. So --

22 MR. UNSWORTH: The Federal Transit  
23 Administration is required by Congress -- because the  
24 discretionary fund, as you noted before, we're competing  
25 against cities all around the United States. And so,

1 Congress requests from the Federal Transit Administration  
2 once a year what we call a "New Starts" report. And so  
3 they've gotten much more sophisticated about what they're  
4 asking. And so they asked us to rank it in a number of  
5 different ways. Some of it is a cost-effectiveness by the  
6 number of new riders that we have. And they're getting  
7 very, very interested in how they look and deal with making  
8 sure there's a level playing field from Florida to Denver to  
9 Portland. And so, each year we report how we're doing to  
10 the FTA. The FTA looks at those documents and reports that  
11 to Congress. That's a good question to answer. I'm not  
12 sure if I answered the right question because I wasn't  
13 listening.

14 MR. GOODLING: Well, no I think -- I  
15 think that's right. The bottom line is that they -- that  
16 there's a whole number of criteria, but the most significant  
17 is probably the TSUB number.

18 MR. UNSWORTH: Yeah, which is a  
19 Transportation System User Benefit, which basically looks at  
20 --

21 MR. WHEELER: And this leg is probably  
22 going to have more ridership than any other.

23 MR. UNSWORTH: This -- This -- There  
24 are rankings that you do. If you get about \$25 per this  
25 utility -- Now, it's not a user, but it's a utility -- then

1 you're not recommended. We are down near about \$14. So  
2 we're very well recommended for the TSUB. Financially,  
3 we're highly recommended, and for land use we're  
4 recommended. So all the categories that they measure in the  
5 New Starts application, we're doing very well in. And it's  
6 part because we've learned how -- what we need to do and  
7 have been very good about getting it done upfront and early.  
8 So we've looked at the questions they've asked and said,  
9 "Okay. What's the best way to answer that question?" And  
10 so I think we're going to rank pretty well. There's no --  
11 There's no -- There's no certainty you're going to get the  
12 money. But once you enter final design -- And every step  
13 along the way, the Federal Transit Administration says,  
14 "Okay" -- Like right now, part of us is getting paid by a  
15 grant that we got from the federal government. So they've  
16 said, "If you're going to go into what we've just done" --  
17 which is preliminary engineering -- they're going to look at  
18 it pretty hard saying, "Yeah, we think you're okay. We're  
19 pretty sure." Once you go to the next step, final design,  
20 to get into final design, they're going to look at it much  
21 harder, saying, "Okay. Are there any issues here? Are  
22 there some risks that you haven't shown us? Are there  
23 costs that are likely to go skyrocketing? Is there a local  
24 match that's really going to be there?" And they've learned  
25 this by looking at other projects around the United States

1 that have blown up for one reason or another. Are there --  
2 Are there political situations that are at play in Oregon  
3 that could make this blow up? So every time we go up, they  
4 get more serious about how we look at funding. And the  
5 final goal -- the golden goose, if you will, is the full  
6 funding grant agreement, where they say, "We're paying for  
7 this, and you're going to pay for that. And we're in this  
8 together, and let's move forward and build this thing." So,  
9 it's -- It's not that we're waiting until the final step  
10 and they're going to say, "no." It's getting that full  
11 funding grant agreement. It's making sure Congress agrees  
12 with it at the same time. And then once they say, "Okay.  
13 Go ahead. We've got a contract with you," there's - - Each  
14 year you have to go through and get appropriations. So you  
15 have to get the money from Congress each year. But then,  
16 on that point, you have a -- you have a contract in hand  
17 that said, "We agreed together to build this project. You  
18 need to make sure that you come through on your contract."  
19 And our congressmen and our senators have pulled some heavy  
20 lifting making sure that happens in an -- the annual  
21 appropriations.

22 MR. WHEELER: When you say, "full  
23 funding," is there potential for partial funding?

24 MR. UNSWORTH: No, it's just the --  
25 That's just the contract name that they give it. They --

1 They have very -- They have wonderful acronyms, and one of  
2 them is the full funding grant agreement, an FFGA, which is  
3 really a contract. "You'll pay for this, we'll pay for  
4 this, and we're in this together. And this is how we're  
5 going to approach the project."

6 MR. GOODLING: Thanks, Dave. Yes?

7 MR. LAWHING: Considering all these  
8 things have gone on, when do you -- When would you think  
9 your best guess would be when you start breaking ground on  
10 this? Because it's supposed to be done by -- First it was  
11 2008, now it's 2009. So, does groundbreaking still look  
12 like 2006? Or --

13 MR. GOODLING: Yeah, I think it's  
14 likely. Given that we're in a design-build atmosphere, once  
15 we get permission to enter final design, there are some  
16 things that they -- that the designers will advance quicker  
17 than others. There's some parts of our alignment -- where  
18 the grading work is required is pretty minimal. So I think  
19 it's quite likely that, given our contracting approach, that  
20 we'll be able to jump onto this project very quickly after  
21 we get a full funding grant agreement.

22 MR. LAWHING: And would they be  
23 starting at like Gateway and working south or do you have  
24 any idea?

25 MR. GOODLING: We -- I can't say that

1 with certainty. One of the things that we will ask our  
2 design team -- our design-build contractor to do early in  
3 the final design process is to develop a conduct of  
4 construction plan, which I'm sure is something that  
5 Elizabeth will want to talk to you guys about, as will our  
6 contractor, and that's to tell us about how they intend to  
7 build the project.

8 MR. LAWHING: Any idea what time frame  
9 you have that this will take place or how long it will be?

10 MR. GOODLING: How --

11 MR. LAWHING: Well, before -- Before it  
12 reaches the --

13 MR. GOODLING: You might see a conduct  
14 of construction plan?

15 MR. LAWHING: Right.

16 MR. GOODLING: Well, if we get  
17 permission to enter final design in early summer, I would  
18 think that it's quite likely that, over the course of the  
19 summer, we could -- we could see something like that.

20 MR. LAWHING: Thank you.

21 MS. LAWSON: Okay.

22 MR. GOODLING: Thank you.

23 MS. LAWSON: All right. Dave, you're  
24 on.

25 MR. UNSWORTH: Okay.

1 MS. LAWSON: So, Dave is going to talk  
2 about the EIS. And do you need any help?

3 MR. UNSWORTH: Sorry I didn't come  
4 earlier, but we've been very busy in getting the  
5 Environmental Impact Statement out. And when I mean "out,"  
6 it's a document that really isn't our document. It actually  
7 is the Federal Transit Administration's document. So we  
8 need to get their approval for this stuff. I'm just going  
9 to wait for a second and get my act together before I try  
10 and do two things at once.

11 Okay. I wasn't sure about the room, so  
12 I plotted these big.

13 MS. LAWSON: I know she would like to  
14 be able to see.

15 MR. UNSWORTH: Well, let me see if --  
16 Let me see what I can do. How about if I stand over here.  
17 Is that better?

18 THE COURT REPORTER: (Nodded.)

19 MR. UNSWORTH: Okay. This is an  
20 Environmental Impact Statement. And so, it's a big, fat  
21 document. And we talked about this a little bit before.  
22 This document really isn't, again, Metro's or TriMet's.  
23 It's really the Federal Transit Administration's document.  
24 We also have the Federal Highway Administration as a -- as  
25 a co-lead. We also have other federal agencies, like the

1 Corps of Engineers and NOAA Fisheries, that have made  
2 significant comments to the document. And so what I want  
3 to talk about today are these lists of areas that we've  
4 talked about here. We're very close to having this  
5 published. And what I mean by "published" -- They agree to  
6 the contents of this. We've negotiated with them. We are  
7 expecting that we'll have one of these in everybody's  
8 mailbox by Christmas. And the nice thing is, though, we  
9 probably aren't going to be mailing out these big things.  
10 We're going to be mailing out CDs. And the CDs probably,  
11 if you do the math on the paperwork, will save us about 37  
12 feet of paper that's not getting mailed out and probably  
13 save us close to about \$12,000. Now, for those people who  
14 don't have a computer -- and there's a lot of people that  
15 don't -- we'll have a card in there where they can either  
16 e-mail or -- either phone us or put the postcard back in  
17 the mail saying, "We want a copy of the Environmental Impact  
18 Statement," or, "We want an executive summary." So, again,  
19 we expect that out in the mail pretty shortly. It's not  
20 complete yet, though, and we're still waiting for a  
21 signature.

22                                   So I'm going to go through this list --  
23 Actually, try and go through these as quickly as I can and  
24 talk about different topics in those. Land use and economic  
25 impacts. What we did through here was, we really described

1 kind of the land-use policies that are in place, both at  
2 the regional -- the state, the regional and, actually, the  
3 neighborhood level. So the outer southeast community plan  
4 is described, Clackamas County's comp plan is described.  
5 And so we try and put that into context, so, what's likely  
6 to happen in the area. We also describe what are the --  
7 What's the population going to be today and what do we  
8 expect the population to be in the year 2025? So, this  
9 being a federal document, they want to make sure that the  
10 investment that the country and the region is putting in  
11 this system works in the future years. So we're comparing  
12 all of our traffic stuff and all our ridership, not just to  
13 today, but 25 years out in the future. So year 2025 is  
14 when we're actually looking at. I know my math doesn't  
15 work; it's actually 21 years. But when we started this, it  
16 was 25 years out. So for each station area, we have the  
17 amount of people that could be expected to live there in  
18 the next 20 years.

19                                   So for economic impacts, we are  
20 describing what are the economic impacts of making this --  
21 this investment into the community. And what we know --  
22 What we expect is that the number of jobs -- and I have  
23 lost it already -- The number of jobs that we expect are  
24 about 7,500-person-a-year jobs. So those are jobs that are  
25 construction jobs that are going to last for at least one

1 year. So those are direct jobs. And then there are  
2 indirect jobs. So those are people that are manufacturing  
3 things that go into the light rail project. And then there  
4 are actually induced economic improvements and odd jobs.  
5 Those are jobs that, you're going to the store and you're  
6 buying a case of milk, you work on the project. That case  
7 of milk or whatever is going to provide more jobs, so  
8 there's a multiplicative effect of those dollars spent. So  
9 those are really what's in the land use and economic. It's  
10 a description of what's out there today, what we expect out  
11 there in the future, what are the jobs that we are going to  
12 see, and how is that going to play out in the community.

13 MR. TURNER: Just a quick question on  
14 the jobs.

15 MR. UNSWORTH: Sure.

16 MR. TURNER: Will they -- What kind of  
17 percentage would be local jobs?

18 MR. UNSWORTH: Well, those jobs are  
19 actually local jobs, because those are dollars that are  
20 spent in the local economy. There's a percentage of the  
21 dollars that aren't accounted for in this, are being spent  
22 wherever we choose to build the light rail cars. So those  
23 vehicles are being potentially purchased down in California  
24 or Vermont or someplace in the United States. Those dollars  
25 are going someplace else. So the use of the dollars that

1 are spent on construction -- I don't know. I think the  
2 rail is included in that capital cost that goes into that.

3 MR. TURNER: But where possible, will  
4 local preference be made?

5 MR. UNSWORTH: I can have Ann talk  
6 about that. I mean, on Interstate, I think, TriMet did an  
7 exquisite job of getting small contractors involved in  
8 hauling stuff back and forth. Ann, you're much more  
9 eloquent than I am on this.

10 MS. BECKLUND: Interstate was the first  
11 light rail project where we really concentrated on involving  
12 the community, not only building in the community but, also,  
13 using the community to help build it and, also, going to  
14 our vendors in the community. And so we anticipate that  
15 we'll develop that same program to work here, and we look  
16 to minority-owned businesses, disadvantaged businesses,  
17 women-owned businesses. And the kind of things that we can  
18 do that this program has really helped is to help the small  
19 local guy. And we do target working in the areas that  
20 impact, of drawing our workforce, when possible, from those  
21 areas is -- For instance, on Interstate, there were -- We  
22 needed a construction company to haul -- to haul gravel.  
23 There were several small guys who owned their own truck, but  
24 independently, had never been able to compete on a federal  
25 job because the contracts are too big, they didn't know how

1 to do the paperwork. I think -- I suspect that many of  
2 these guys weren't certified as DBEs yet.

3 MR. UNSWORTH: What's a "DBE"?

4 MS. BECKLUND: Disadvantaged business  
5 enterprise.

6 MR. UNSWORTH: Thank you.

7 MS. BECKLUND: Yeah. So we have a  
8 program where we have people that help them get certified.  
9 We also help them form a -- form a consortium so that they  
10 can compete for a piece of the pie. Our contractor was  
11 very involved in that so that we had higher representation  
12 in terms of apprentices on the job from people, both locally  
13 in the community and also from minority- and women-owned  
14 folks. So that's all part of what we're going to bring to  
15 how we build I-205, too.

16 MR. TURNER: How will the notice be --  
17 will be given, you know, to the community at large? And  
18 what kind of advantage will that local -- along I-205 --  
19 those people be given?

20 MS. LAWSON: Can I make a suggestion?  
21 Because I think this is something that merits more than a  
22 snapshot response. Would it work for you if we put that on  
23 an agenda? Because I think that gets --

24 MR. TURNER: For a later time?

25 MS. LAWSON: Yeah.

1 MR. TURNER: Sure.

2 MS. LAWSON: If that's okay, because I  
3 think that -- that probably is something that a lot of  
4 people would be interested in -- (Multiple speakers.  
5 Inaudible.)

6 MS. BECKLUND: I think once we get our  
7 design built with a contractor onboard and start to think  
8 about that, that's some of the areas that we can start to  
9 develop the conversation.

10 MS. LAWSON: But maybe for the record  
11 for today, Marta, to make sure that we note it, that is an  
12 area of concern that we'll want to see addressed as we move  
13 forward.

14 MR. WHEELER: That's the first thing  
15 that came to mind for me, too, was, can we favor local  
16 contractors at all?

17 MR. UNSWORTH: Well, I think there's  
18 evidence in Interstate that that's been done. So, how that  
19 works, I think, it's a clear indication.

20 One of the things, this is a -- This is  
21 a comprehensive plan designation. So what we've looked at  
22 is, basically, half-mile circles around where the stations  
23 would be to understand what's happening in the local  
24 vicinity. When our community impacts, it really is a  
25 compilation of many of the topics in here. Kristin was

1 responsible for this. It describes the neighborhoods.  
2 What's the minority make-up? What the income? What's the  
3 amount of rental properties that are in the -- What's the  
4 median price of a house in the area? It gives a flavor for  
5 it. It also gives a flavor from the standpoint of, what  
6 are some of the potential issues that have been raised by  
7 the community? In some of these meetings, "Well, okay.  
8 We're concerned about traffic. We're concerned about noise.  
9 We're concerned about crime." And it describes in each of  
10 those a snapshot of the community concerns -- potential  
11 community impacts in that section.

12                                 Visual impacts. What we want to tell  
13 there is, what's it going to look like? What's it going to  
14 feel like? I've always said people want the scratch net  
15 video. What's it going to look like? We came pretty close  
16 to that. Both in the downtown and in the I-205, we were  
17 able to put together visual simulations that I think have  
18 been really useful in describing to the end-user or the  
19 person that may not be used to looking at plan drawings,  
20 what's it going to look like? How's it going to look and  
21 feel like in the future? And so, when you look at visual  
22 impacts, you're looking at, is there something really  
23 significant that's been added to the landscape? A bridge  
24 may do that. Is it perceived by a lot of people? Is it  
25 in the character of the landscape that you're used to? And

1 that would be, well, it is a new feature. A bridge, say,  
2 over Holgate -- or not over Holgate -- over Woodstock and  
3 Foster. It's a new feature, but it's pretty much in  
4 keeping with the existing landscape. There's a number of  
5 bridges that go over 1-5 or over the streets there. So is  
6 it a high visual impact or a low visual impact? And so the  
7 EIS describes those. For the most part, there aren't  
8 significant new visual impacts with I-205. I think one of  
9 them probably would be Johnson Creek Boulevard because it is  
10 so long going over that area.

11 Air quality impacts. So we looked both  
12 at air shed -- which is misspelled. It should be probably  
13 two words -- and hot spots. So what are we -- What are we  
14 looking for here? We're looking for -- are carbon monoxide  
15 -- is there volatile oxides coming out of -- and I should  
16 probably look at you, and I won't put you on the spot here  
17 -- but we looked at the number of miles reduced or  
18 increased by the alternative. So what -- What I can tell  
19 you is that we lowered the amount of vehicle car --  
20 vehicles that are expected to drive around in the year 2025  
21 compared to if we didn't do anything. And with that, we  
22 find that we're okay. We meet standards for the air shed  
23 for the number of criteria that we look at. There is --  
24 There is specifically three. I'm going to make sure I get  
25 them right in my notes; nitrous oxide, volatile organic

1 compounds, and carbon monoxide emissions. So we also looked  
2 at intersections that have the -- are expected to have the  
3 highest congestion along the alignment. 82nd and Sunnyside,  
4 82nd and Johnson Creek Boulevard, and I think Foster and  
5 92nd. And we looked at those to make sure that we weren't  
6 getting carbon monoxide increases in those locations that  
7 are above the standards. What we found out is that we're  
8 well below the standards for those intersections. So we  
9 don't think we have an issue with air quality impacts.

10 For noise vibration, we heard a lot of  
11 issues about that. We've looked at -- What we have -- What  
12 we looked at was, we did about ten measurements along I-205,  
13 behind berms, all the way up and down to find a  
14 representative sample. And if you look at I-205, you'll  
15 notice on the northern part north of, say, Southeast Harold,  
16 there's a berm or there are noise walls that are provided  
17 in that area when the freeway was built. Similarly, over  
18 the last year, if you look south of Otty, you'll see that  
19 when you have -- ODOT has gone through and constructed a  
20 noise wall in that location. So when we looked at this, we  
21 found that -- We measured what light rail is going to go  
22 by, the number of times per day, and we actually penalized  
23 noise that occurs between 10 o'clock at night at 7 o'clock  
24 in the morning. And what we find is, over an average 24-  
25 hour period, we're adding about 1 to 3 decibels of noise.

1 Generally, 1 to 2 decibels of noise is imperceptible. So  
2 we're adding noise and -- In that case, though, it actually  
3 registers as an impact under the FTA criteria. Let me get  
4 to you -- And so -- And so what we've done is, we've looked  
5 at noise mitigation. And so we've got a proposal on hand  
6 to build about 6,000 -- over 6,000 feet of noise walls  
7 along the alignment. Let me see if I can -- So what you  
8 see is -- This purple area is where the existing berm or  
9 noise wall occurs. Down through here, from Otty Road south  
10 to about Sunnyside, is an existing wall and it actually goes  
11 a little bit further. What we're proposing are two noise  
12 walls, and it's over a mile of noise walls or sound walls  
13 that will be between 8 to 10 feet (height). And they  
14 basically go from -- and these are not to be specifically  
15 here -- but this basically goes from Woodstock down to the  
16 Springwater Trail -- We don't need protection in the  
17 industrial area -- and, basically, north of Crystal Springs  
18 and 92nd down to about Fuller Road. And so those are the  
19 -- that's -- the proposal to be looking at noise walls for  
20 the alignment. That's the good news. The bad news is, we  
21 don't -- We aren't able to fully mitigate all the noise  
22 impacts, and there are a couple of areas where we aren't.  
23 And those are, where we're on bridges, there are some houses  
24 that are going to continue to have some noise exposure,  
25 because even putting up a noise wall there, most of the

1 sound is coming from the freeway. And so it's hard to get  
2 that below the criteria. So there are a couple of impacts  
3 near Harold. There are a couple impacts down in this area  
4 (indicated.) So -- And there are a few through here  
5 (indicated.) We also looked at vibration. And so we're --  
6 One area that we're concerned with is, there's an MRI clinic  
7 down here that is in the Clackamas corner, I believe it's  
8 called, and there will have to be some protection for that  
9 equipment because it's very sensitive to vibration. There  
10 are a couple other switches through here, and we're looking  
11 at doing special treatments for those locations. So that's  
12 what we know about noise.

13 MS. LAWSON: And, Harry, you had a --  
14 What's your question about noise?

15 MR. LAWHING: It was a comment about  
16 sound barrier walls. Foster Road -- or excuse me --  
17 Woodstock southbound ramp was the first ramp approach to 205  
18 freeway when it was first built in the '70s. And at that  
19 time, I told Ed Hart, the superintendent, that we needed a  
20 sound barrier wall there because --

21 MR. UNSWORTH: Right.

22 MR. LAWHING: -- all the traffic onto  
23 205 was --

24 MR. UNSWORTH: Was accelerated --

25 MR. LAWHING: -- (inaudible) -- to the

1 north. All the traffic to the south would be going up from  
2 Woodstock, and we needed a sound barrier wall there. And  
3 he told me there wasn't any money. Consequently, the later  
4 ramps all south of that all had them.

5 MR. UNSWORTH: Right.

6 MR. LAWHING: And I've talked to, you  
7 know, ODOT about it. And, in fact, at one of the open  
8 houses -- this is not your problem -- but when you were  
9 talking about sound barrier walls --

10 MR. UNSWORTH: Right.

11 MR. LAWHING: -- One of the open houses  
12 that we had over at Lutheran up there on this I-205 plan  
13 was, there was a representative from ODOT there of the  
14 Highway Commission and he asked, "Where do you live?" So I  
15 showed him on a map. And I explained to him, "You know,  
16 ODOT has been negligent about -- In fact, they just flat  
17 refused to put up a sound barrier wall there ever since the  
18 '70s." I've lived there since '66, and the vibration and  
19 the noise is so bad that it sets off the alarm on my cars  
20 in the driveway through the vibration of the vehicles either  
21 going up the ramp or going over those plates on 205 --

22 MR. UNSWORTH: Right.

23 MR. LAWHING: -- it sets off the alarms  
24 in my pickup and my car, periodically, when we get a big  
25 rig go over there -- whether those steel plates on the

1 freeway or whatever it is.

2 MR. UNSWORTH: Right.

3 MR. LAWHING: But there's no sound  
4 barrier wall there, and that's something -- It's not  
5 TriMet's problem, but that's something that ODOT needs to  
6 correct to help, like TriMet, mitigate some of their noise  
7 problems around the Woodstock and south area. Because if  
8 there were a sound barrier wall there, it would help to  
9 mitigate some of that noise, even after light rail goes  
10 through there. But that's not TriMet's problem.

11 MR. UNSWORTH: Well, let me say a  
12 couple of things. You're right. What we found out is it's  
13 noisy, certainly, through here. There's -- There's -- It is  
14 very loud. And I will tell you that our noise wall will do  
15 very little to provide protection, probably -- maybe, I  
16 would say almost no protection, as a result of our location  
17 of the sound wall. Our location of the sound wall kind of  
18 in your area is -- the freeway is kind of up here, light  
19 rail is down here, and -- at least a little bit further  
20 south than you -- and our proposed sound wall is going to  
21 be closer; about 9 feet or so away from the light rail  
22 track.

23 MR. LAWHING: Oh, I understand.

24 MR. UNSWORTH: And so, really, to block  
25 that sound from the freeway, you'd want to be higher. So

1 -- So -- But we also know, as we've had conversation with  
2 ODOT -- And it's a state-wide issue. It's not the local  
3 guys. And it's just the way that they go about it is, if  
4 they are -- If they are adding capacity -- So in this area  
5 south of Otty Road, they went through and added what we  
6 call an auxiliary lane. And so as they added that  
7 auxiliary lane and, also, as this frontage road got done on  
8 the opposite side on the east side of the freeway, noise  
9 walls were put in there. So when they look at adding  
10 capacity --

11 MR. LAWHING: They did that on  
12 Woodstock. They added an additional lane and --

13 MR. UNSWORTH: When was that? I'm  
14 sorry.

15 MS. LAWSON: Was that a long time ago?  
16 Or --

17 MR. LAWHING: Oh, no. No. It was  
18 less than a year ago, because they were working on it at  
19 night and they removed the concrete barriers, and they did  
20 it at night. In fact, they had -- They had the  
21 searchlights.

22 MR. UNSWORTH: Yeah, they were -- What  
23 -- What -- What I recall in the conversation, they were  
24 doing some resurfacing and they were redoing some of the  
25 bridge joints, and they don't count that as a --

1 MR. LAWHING: -- There were no joints  
2 there. It was --

3 MR. UNSWORTH: Okay.

4 MR. LAWHING: It was the southbound  
5 ramp that they widened. They removed all the concrete  
6 barriers to keep the cars from going on over the bypass.

7 MR. UNSWORTH: Okay.

8 MR. LAWHING: And then they took them  
9 out, like at midnight, two, three o'clock in the morning,  
10 and they worked in the middle of the night. And then they  
11 went ahead and they widened it. They repaved it. They  
12 widened it. And then they came along again and they put  
13 those things back in there.

14 MR. UNSWORTH: Do you know anything  
15 about that?

16 MR. GOODLING: I think it was the ramp  
17 meter in the project.

18 MR. UNSWORTH: Okay.

19 MR. LAWHING: Yeah, I know, but they  
20 did widen it. And at that time, they well could have put  
21 in a sound barrier wall, because they did widen -- But see,  
22 that's in Lents, and Lents doesn't get much stuff.

23 MR. UNSWORTH: Well, I think the  
24 proposal here is, obviously, to look at these noise walls.  
25 I will tell you that you will hear the train as it goes by.

1 It's got a distinctive sound as opposed to the freeway.  
2 You will hear it as it goes by. There are impacts that  
3 remain there, even after we put up this wall. And I think  
4 TriMet is going to be having further meetings with people  
5 that are considered impacted under the federal criteria and  
6 working with those individually as we move forward. So I'm  
7 not saying that -- I'm saying that there are noise walls  
8 going up. Will it solve all the problems? It will not.  
9 Will you be able to hear the train when it comes by? Yes,  
10 you will. I think we've got some further work to do as we  
11 meet with other individual property owners.

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The -- And I --

13 MS. LAWSON: You know what? I'm going  
14 to -- I'm sorry. It's -- One of my roles is to enforce  
15 the protocols for this.

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

17 MS. LAWSON: We will -- I promise we'll  
18 come back after the committee has had a chance.

19 MR. UNSWORTH: I would stay here after.

20 MS. LAWSON: Yeah, he'll be here.

21 MR. UNSWORTH: I'll be here after.

22 I've got a lot to get through, too.

23 So, wetlands. What we found is, we  
24 found one -- two wetlands. One we're completely avoiding.  
25 We've now got concrete-lined ditches we have to worry about,

1 from a federal standpoint. We are impacting one wetland.  
2 It's about 437 square feet. We are looking at riparian  
3 there. We had to put together what's called a "biological  
4 assessment" to look at the impact on the stream crossing at  
5 Johnson Creek. The mitigation for that is looking at  
6 planting trees; shade trees, certainly, on the South bank  
7 and North bank of Johnson Creek between I-205 and 92nd. So  
8 it helps habitat and it helps the fish. So we're moving  
9 through that.

10 Water quality. We've got a couple  
11 things that we're worried about. We have some floodplain  
12 fill, about 411 cubic yards. We're mitigating that by  
13 finding a hole where we can match our fill with a cut in a  
14 hundred-year floodplain. And that also matches very nicely  
15 where we're taking one of those concrete-lined ditches and  
16 we're making a water quality swale out of it. The quality  
17 and quantity of the water -- We're creating about 16 new  
18 acres of impervious area. All that water is going to be  
19 treated both for quantity of water so it doesn't hit the  
20 streams, and also, the quality. So it's going to -- Most  
21 of it is going to end up going back into a swale and then  
22 injected back into the water.

23 Hazardous materials. We've looked at a  
24 series of -- There are files that either DEQ has or EPA  
25 has. And there's about 80 or so different files open on



1 year 2025 as it is in the year 2040, so it's not --  
2 It's not in auto traffic, so it's going to be better and  
3 it's going to be more reliable for the long run.

4 MR. WHEELER: How about verses driving?

5 MR. UNSWORTH: I've got those. I  
6 didn't write them down but I've got them here, and I'll  
7 gladly provide them to you after. We know that with the  
8 scenario of light rail over where we are today, there'd be  
9 172 percent increase in transit ridership. And that's  
10 something that's not too small, too, when you think about  
11 the overall picture of how people get in and around this  
12 region. Let's see. On light rail, from here in this  
13 section (indicated) basically, from Gateway down to Clackamas  
14 Town Center we find there would be 38,000 people on an  
15 average day on that light rail line, and you add another  
16 8,000 that would be using light rail line from Gateway into  
17 downtown Portland, so a total of about 45,000, 46,000 riders  
18 per average day. So it's a pretty good number.

19 So, parking -- We -- On I-205, we  
20 remove about 30 off -- on-street parking spaces. They're at  
21 Holgate across the bridge and also some around Fuller.  
22 There's about 280 spaces at Clackamas Town Center that's  
23 going to be removed, but that balances out because there's  
24 some new parking being created there. So these are the  
25 places that we've found that there is reason to do traffic

1 mitigation. So we compared it in the future year compared  
2 to a no- build and our scenario and found that there are a  
3 series of locations that we're going to have to do something  
4 to fix a traffic problem that pretty much exists today and  
5 will exist in the future. And so they are identified as  
6 nice -- You've got the numbers here. The first one is at  
7 Main and 96th. And you'll see some of them are clustered  
8 around our park-and-rides. So in some cases, it's simply  
9 providing a left-turn pocket to get into the park- and-ride  
10 and maybe a new traffic signal here, coming off Division.  
11 It's a left -- allowing a left-turn pocket there. At No.  
12 8, near Holgate and the entrance to the park-and-ride, it  
13 has more to do, actually, with the pedestrian and bicycle  
14 crossing of the trail than it does anything else. Here at  
15 No. 7, Holgate and 92nd, there's some improvements that need  
16 to be done to that intersection. So they're pretty  
17 detailed. They talk about what the project's committing to,  
18 from its traffic mitigation issues. And considering the  
19 number of intersections that we have through here, there's  
20 actually very few required mitigation components in the  
21 Environmental Impact Statement, so we're pleased at that.

22 I will talk -- I can talk about  
23 bicycle, but basically those bicycle improvements are some  
24 of the bridges that we are now providing, where people have  
25 to cross that grade. So, for instance, at Woodstock --

1 Foster and Woodstock -- a new bridge providing an easy  
2 access across those streets for the I-205 multitask. Yes?

3 MR. CHASSE: Now, on the -- On the  
4 traffic mitigation --

5 MR. UNSWORTH: Which one are you --

6 MR. CHASSE: It's like 5, 6, 7, and 8.

7 MR. UNSWORTH: Okay.

8 MR. CHASSE: The Powell Boulevard, 92nd  
9 --

10 MR. UNSWORTH: Yeah. I'll tell you --  
11 Do you want me to go through them?

12 MR. CHASSE: All I want to know is, in  
13 the Impact Statement, does it -- Do you actually put what  
14 you're going to do to mitigate --

15 MR. UNSWORTH: Yes.

16 MR. CHASSE: -- the traffic?

17 MR. UNSWORTH: Yes.

18 MR. CHASSE: Okay.

19 MR. UNSWORTH: This -- At 5th, this is  
20 near the bowling alley, and so there isn't enough distance.  
21 And so we're actually bringing a right- turn lane,  
22 essentially, into the bowling alley and making more capacity  
23 to go northbound through that intersection and to go left  
24 and right. The 6th is simply a traffic signal, I believe,  
25 to get in and out of the Powell park-and-ride. So it gets

1 very -- pretty specific about what's expected of the  
2 project.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Who will be  
4 dealing with the traffic --

5 MS. LAWSON: I'm sorry. I have to make  
6 sure that -- This portion is just for the committee. I  
7 promise you, you'll have a chance.

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh. I thought  
9 this was --

10 MS. LAWSON: Yeah. No, this is the  
11 committee portion.

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. Well, I  
13 didn't know. Oh, okay. That's okay.

14 MS. LAWSON: That's why we have that  
15 public comment period up front, so that --

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I thought that  
17 meant everybody.

18 MR. UNSWORTH: I'm going to kind of go  
19 through freight. Freight is -- The fact is that we are  
20 putting less cars on the road, there's less vehicle miles,  
21 so it's going to be better for freight. We have no impact  
22 in railroads. Construction really is its own topic, as --  
23 During construction, what happens under all these topics is  
24 addressed. So, for instance, hazardous waste -- hazardous  
25 material; how are you going to deal with the dust; air

1 qualities? All of those issues are discussed in each  
2 section. I need to keep moving here.

3                   Historic properties. We have one along  
4 the alignments; the Orrin Battin House, which is the old  
5 pastor's house at the Baptist church south of Johnson Creek  
6 Boulevard. We're taking about 132 square feet of that  
7 property. Parkland property. Our impact there is the  
8 Springwater corridor. It's the bicycle trail that goes  
9 underneath. Part of the mitigation for that is simply  
10 putting a light rail structure over and above that trail and  
11 making connections to it.

12                   Capital costs. The project cost is  
13 described in a number of different manners. Remember, as  
14 Jeff said, the total cost of both projects -- and this is  
15 one project; both I-205 and downtown -- is about \$495  
16 million. That's in year-of-expenditure dollars. So we're  
17 expecting a midyear of expenditure to be about 2007. 60  
18 percent of that -- if we're lucky and we get a full funding  
19 grant agreement and everything -- all the bucks -- you know,  
20 the angels -- the clouds part and the angel sings -- is  
21 going to be 60 percent federal funding. That means,  
22 locally, we're going to have to come up with some bucks.  
23 And I'll tell you how we're expected to do that. Through  
24 this area, Clackamas County's urban renewal district is  
25 expected to come up with about \$35 million. The City of

1 Portland is going to -- through different funds -- urban  
2 renewal -- come up with \$21 million. PEC, \$20 million,  
3 TriMet \$25 million. Part of that was some bond measure  
4 that was passed earlier in, I think, 1991. Metro's coming  
5 up with \$48 million. Those are through dollars that are  
6 flexible that come in from the federal government. And  
7 ODOT, through the same manner, is coming up with \$23  
8 million. So we have basically looked under every rock we  
9 can to make sure that we aren't going to the taxpayers and  
10 saying, "We need more money." We're trying to do this with  
11 the funds that we have; flexible funds that come into the  
12 region, monies that are -- You know, the Clackamas --  
13 Clackamas Town Center urban renewal dollars -- We're  
14 bringing a big investment to them. It's going to help the  
15 Town Center. Therefore, they're seeing some benefit, and  
16 therefore, they're paying for part of it. Same with  
17 downtown. Local -- The local improvement district is part  
18 of that \$20 million. You know, those people that have  
19 property on the Mall and a couple blocks out are saying,  
20 "We're seeing a \$160 million investment coming to downtown.  
21 We think it's important. We're going to help pay for it."  
22 And so that's been part of the argument.

23 Operating costs. TriMet is required --  
24 in revenues -- We basically have to match these two and  
25 make sure that the revenues that TriMet has is going to be



1 some people telling us, "We didn't like it." Some people  
2 saying, "We liked it." Some people said, "Change this."  
3 Some people said, "Have you really considered this?"  
4 Similarly, we had a separate Environmental Impact Statement  
5 for downtown Portland when we looked at putting light rail  
6 on the Mall, called, you know, the "Amended Supplemental  
7 Draft" in that Environmental Impact Statement. And, again,  
8 we had hundreds of comments. The Final Environmental Impact  
9 Statement, as we like to call it, the "FEIS" -- We have to  
10 go through and respond to all those comments. So in the  
11 back of the document, you'll see the person's name and where  
12 those comments were responded to in the document itself. So  
13 we're trying to be responsive.

14 So that's the quick 20 on -- on the  
15 Environmental Impact Statement. It should be at -- I think  
16 we'll probably have it in the mail December 10th or  
17 something in that time frame. So I'll stop.

18 MS. LAWSON: So, any questions for him  
19 you guys?

20 MR. WHEELER: I have a question on the  
21 alternatives. And maybe you don't know the answer. Did  
22 they actually compare, say, adding a lane of traffic versus  
23 light rail?

24 MR. UNSWORTH: Not in this scenario  
25 here. In the other alternatives that we've looked at, we've

1 looked at toll lanes -- When we started this project out,  
2 we looked at toll lanes, we looked at HOD lanes, and we  
3 narrowed it down. So there are steps where you go through  
4 and you narrow down, saying, "What are we trying to do?  
5 What's the purpose and need of the project?" So, I-205 --  
6 What I can tell you is that one of the reasons that the  
7 Federal Highway Administration has been very attentive to  
8 this document is they want to make sure that we haven't  
9 precluded them from expanding the freeway at some other  
10 time. So, again, the dollars that we're using for light  
11 rail are discretionary, so we're competing on those.  
12 Dollars that come for highway are coming in formula. And  
13 there's not the dollars right now that we can pull together  
14 to put another lane on here, although, it's being done  
15 piecemeal. As I showed you before, there was a short  
16 segment of auxiliary lanes. And, essentially, what we're  
17 doing with the highway system -- and we are still investing  
18 in the highway system -- is to remove some of those  
19 bottlenecks. So instead of a widespread -- okay, we're  
20 going to add another lane or another two lanes -- it's the  
21 bottlenecks that we've got to fix. And so, auxiliary lane  
22 and smart ways of adding short pieces of traffic lane is  
23 the way that ODOT is going and the way the region is going,  
24 is fix those bottlenecks first and then come back and look  
25 at highway expansion.

1 MR. WHEELER: Does this preclude --

2 MR. UNSWORTH: No, it doesn't.

3 MR. WHEELER: -- adding another lane?

4 MR. UNSWORTH: And if it did, the  
5 Federal Highway Administration would not sign off on this  
6 document.

7 MS. LAWSON: Okay.

8 MR. UNSWORTH: Thanks.

9 MS. LAWSON: Thank you. So, no more  
10 comments. So we are now to the point of the agenda where  
11 we wanted to come back and talk -- It's basically some  
12 committee business; when we want to have our next meeting or  
13 when it's appropriate to have that for future schedule, the  
14 CAC membership and the outreach associated with the Final  
15 Environmental Impact Statement. And, Elizabeth, I don't  
16 know how you want to move through these items. You want to  
17 start with the next meeting?

18 MS. DAVIDSON: Yeah, and that's kind of  
19 a segway into the rest of the --

20 MS. LAWSON: Okay.

21 MS. DAVIDSON: -- the bullet points under  
22 this committee's business. As Jeff mentioned in his  
23 presentation, and Dave touched on it as well, TriMet is, for  
24 all practical purposes at a little bit of a holding point,  
25 as we are waiting for permission from the federal government

1 to enter the next significant phase of the project called  
2 final design. We are hopeful that will come sometime in  
3 the spring to summer months. But as most of you can now  
4 attest to, federal timelines are -- fluctuate quite a bit.  
5 So that could come anywhere in kind of mid-'05.

6                                 For purposes of this committee, it makes  
7 sense to me that the CAC, for the time being until we get  
8 that permission to enter final design, would take a little  
9 bit of a hiatus, just as it's formed to convene on a  
10 regular basis. Now, with that said, that does not mean  
11 that I'm not going to be working with probably individuals  
12 on the committee -- on the committee, the neighborhood  
13 associations, as Dave mentioned, the impacted individuals who  
14 we're going to be working with along the alignment on some  
15 of the issues that we've studied and that Dave just talked  
16 about, in the meantime. But again, for purposes of this  
17 committee, I don't see a whole lot of reason until we get  
18 that permission, to continue to meet.

19                                 So with that, I wanted to also mention  
20 that a few committee members have expressed either an  
21 interest to drop off the committee or take a hiatus. And I  
22 wanted to let you know that in this interim time in the  
23 next couple months, I'll be kind of contacting each of you,  
24 individually, to see if you have interest in continuing on  
25 this -- on this committee, given kind of our respective time

1 line and next steps. So --

2 MR. WHEELER: Well, assuming final  
3 design, what's required of us after that?

4 MS. DAVIDSON: Well, that's -- That's a  
5 really good question. I mean, I think that part of that is  
6 going to depend on where you live on the alignment, if  
7 you're affiliated with a particular neighborhood or a  
8 business, for example. So I think --

9 MS. LAWSON: Go ahead. Finish. "You  
10 think" --

11 MS. DAVIDSON: Oh. Yeah. I was just  
12 going to say, I think that what I would hope -- and I can  
13 talk to each of you about this in person as well as -- I  
14 think Jeanne also wanted to mention some CAC membership  
15 changes that are occurring. But I would probably give you  
16 a new -- this group -- a new charge, if you will. And I  
17 think that's to be determined, so -- especially with our  
18 design-build contractor onboard.

19 MS. LAWSON: And I did run out and  
20 catch Ken as he was leaving and told him we were going to  
21 be talking about the role of the committee. And one thing  
22 he wanted to share, in return, was that he was hopeful that  
23 the committee would continue its work, especially in light  
24 of the issue that the two of you were talking about in  
25 terms of -- I don't like the term "watch dog." It has a

1 real negative connotation, but sort of trying to make sure  
2 that certain issues are addressed as it moves forward, like  
3 the issue of encouraging TriMet to use local contractors and  
4 how that happens and being a liaison to the community as  
5 issues surface and are addressed. So that was his point --  
6 his words that he wanted to share.

7 So, anything else?

8 MR. CHASSE: Well -- And to kind of  
9 expand on that, Ann said that there was -- TriMet had  
10 something in place for local contractors that --

11 MS. BECKLUND: We have a model we used  
12 on Interstate. We'll have a different contractor, a  
13 different kind of contracting method --

14 MR. CHASSE: But something --

15 MS. BECKLUND: -- but we will do that --

16 MR. CHASSE: -- that will specifically  
17 address that -- that --

18 MS. BECKLUND: Yes.

19 MR. CHASSE: -- particular issue?

20 Okay. And we'll be proactive in --

21 MS. BECKLUND: What I'd like to say is  
22 that, it offers you, as a committee, the opportunity to  
23 advise us and to watch us shape these and make sure that,  
24 you know, these promises are met and -- and also to help --  
25 You know, it helps keep us in touch with your community.

1 So I would certainly encourage all of you who have -- who  
2 have -- "enjoy" is not the right word -- but, who have  
3 certainly participated and really represented your particular  
4 area. It's very valuable for us to have you along. It  
5 builds a better project. It's -- You know, what we do is  
6 not only about working in construction. It's about building  
7 a community, and that is essential to have a committee's  
8 participation like yours to make sure that we true-up the  
9 construction project all the way through to where we reach  
10 -- You know, now we're at 30 percent design. Well, we've  
11 still got 70 percent to get to a hundred, and we do need  
12 your help to do that.

13 MS. LAWSON: Wilda?

14 MS. PARKS: So would the expectation be  
15 that if folks drop off the committee we just continue on  
16 without filling those posts? I would think it would be  
17 difficult to bring a person on who hasn't been part of  
18 everything else that's been going on so far. I -- I'm just  
19 curious as to how that would work. And I think it's  
20 valuable to continue. So, yeah.

21 MS. DAVIDSON: Yeah. You bring up a  
22 very good point and stole my closing remarks. But you're  
23 right. Your work -- And she's totally right on. Your work  
24 and your liaison work, not only at this committee level but  
25 through your constituents, has been amazingly helpful to me

1 and has just made this project go as smoothly as it has.  
2 And kudos to all of you who have put in, you know, amazing  
3 effort and time on this committee.

4                   That's a very good question that I'm  
5 struggling with, myself. And it's kind of -- It's actually  
6 a natural kind of segway -- I don't have an answer for you,  
7 Wilda. Ruth Bade sent me a letter a couple months back,  
8 stepping down from the committee. And one thing I'm  
9 struggling with is trying to find someone to replace her.  
10 And --

11                   MS. LAWSON: Yeah. And, you know --  
12 And Elizabeth asked me to speak to Ruth's issues. Because  
13 I think, you know, in the position she is, the nature of  
14 the comments, you know, that kind of - - in -- But, you  
15 know it's -- I think it's no surprise to you. Ruth came  
16 into this process feeling pretty frustrated already and had  
17 some specific issues that this committee wasn't able to  
18 address and recommendations that this committee didn't, in  
19 terms of the Holgate, specifically -- Certainly, there were  
20 others that were, but I think that one being such an  
21 important one to her, it -- it, I think, reinforced the  
22 frustration she already had. The nature of her concerns --  
23 but I did -- You know, I don't -- I don't want to, by any  
24 means, let anybody walk out of the room without  
25 understanding that she was seriously frustrated, you know,



1 MS. LAWSON: Right. So, yeah. And  
2 that may be determined that that's sufficient. I know that  
3 that's a critical area and is certainly one --

4 MR. WHEELER: Have you approached it  
5 with him -- with Ken at all?

6 MS. DAVIDSON: One of the things that  
7 the neighborhood has made pretty clear is that -- Well, the  
8 URAC has very specific interests in the neighborhood and  
9 they want, I think, more of a neighborhood or at-large  
10 person representing the actual neighborhood as opposed to  
11 just the URAC --

12 MS. LAWSON: The urban renewal --

13 MS. DAVIDSON: -- as Ken currently --  
14 currently represents.

15 MS. LAWSON: Mm-hm. Yeah.

16 MR. LAWHING: I think a lot of Ruth's  
17 frustration was the fact that, since she lived in Lents, she  
18 felt as though Lent's is, like, kind of considered the  
19 armpit of Portland. And we don't -- You know, Lents -- the  
20 neighborhood -- they don't get much consideration for  
21 anything. And it's said, well, the thing is, like, that's  
22 (inaudible) they talked about.

23 MS. LAWSON: Yeah.

24 MR. LAWHING: I mean, the 1970s, I've  
25 been -- I've been trying to be proactive about talking to

1 --

2 MS. LAWSON: ODOT.

3 MR. LAWHING: -- ODOT. It's like  
4 talking to a wall, you know. And they, you know --

5 MR. WHEELER: Not just about a wall.

6 (Multiple speakers. Inaudible.)

7 MR. LAWHING: I'm sure that -- I'm sure  
8 that that's part of this frustration is the fact that she's  
9 a Lents resident and she's seen and heard how things have  
10 not been done for Lents, where in other parts of Portland,  
11 they are done. And so, you know, I can -- I can see, you  
12 know, and appreciate part of her frustration. But, you know  
13 --

14 MR. WHEELER: I've seen concessions made  
15 because of her, also. And maybe you -- It's a cliché, but  
16 maybe you just can't win them all.

17 MS. LAWSON: Yeah.

18 MR. WHEELER: She expected everything to  
19 go the way she wanted it. And there were concessions made  
20 because of her presence, so she was -- It wasn't fruitless,  
21 her being here, certainly.

22 MS. LAWSON: Well, I'm glad you say  
23 that, Rob. You know, it is -- It is hard when you're in a  
24 position like hers and you're working hard for a specific  
25 issue, sometimes it's hard to see the impact it makes. And

1 I'm glad you -- you guys can see that there was an impact.

2 It's kind of, you know --

3 MS. PARKS: I -- I've felt -- and I  
4 haven't had much of a voice in this committee because I've  
5 just sort of been listening to everybody else, I mean,  
6 throughout the entire process. And when I do, it's more  
7 organizational kinds of things. And I don't represent a  
8 particular area or, you know, have an affinity to a  
9 geographical area, but I have been impressed overall with  
10 the fact that the committee and all of the, you know,  
11 partners that we've been working with at TriMet and, you  
12 know -- and everything, have always listened to everyone and  
13 tried to reach some kind of agreement as to how that might  
14 work the best. And I think we all knew from the outset,  
15 for instance, that the issue of not having even a stop in  
16 any one particular area was not going to occur because there  
17 were just too many other reasons why that couldn't happen.  
18 And that may be, you know, one of her frustrations. I  
19 don't know that because I don't know what the frustrations  
20 were. But I agree with Rob. I think there was a lot of  
21 agreement that was reached because a lot of various issues,  
22 not just from Ruth, but from many other people -- were  
23 placed on the table. People like -- You know, like, I  
24 listen to Harry and I listen to Ken and I listen to other  
25 people who had specific issues about things that everybody

1 was willing to talk about and listen to them and -- And  
2 there were a lot of different kinds of agreements reached.  
3 It wasn't just -- (inaudible) -- that's not important,  
4 forget that. So I agree. I don't think you can win them  
5 all.

6 MS. LAWSON: Jim?

7 MR. CHASSE: She was -- She was trying  
8 to win them all.

9 MS. PARKS: Life is just not that way,  
10 you know.

11 MR. CHASSE: So did we have other  
12 committee member fatalities? Or --

13 MS. PARKS: Good point, Jim.

14 MR. CHASSE: It is kind of a sparse  
15 grouping.

16 MS. LAWSON: Tonight, yeah.

17 MR. CHASSE: Paul's not here.

18 MS. PARKS: It looked like there were a  
19 couple other people who thought they were going to be here  
20 who ended up not being here. I know why -- I'm pretty sure  
21 I know why Paul DiMarco isn't here.

22 MS. DAVIDSON: Yeah. Paul called. And  
23 yeah, he's --

24 MS. PARKS: He's probably over in --  
25 What's the name of that place?

1 MR. WHEELER: Pioneer --

2 MS. DAVIDSON: Pioneer Square.

3 MS. PARKS: Pioneer Place. Because now  
4 his company owns both of them.

5 MS. DAVIDSON: Right. Right.

6 MS. PARKS: Yeah, he's just been real  
7 --

8 MS. LAWSON: Oh, I didn't know that.

9 (Multiple speakers. Inaudible.)

10 MS. DAVIDSON: Jim, the only other  
11 casualties or fatalities on the CAC has been Sharon Owen,  
12 who has represented the Hazelwood neighborhood association.  
13 She actually moved out of the neighborhood. So, I believe  
14 --

15 MR. WHEELER: Wow, this thing could  
16 probably go quite smooth --

17 (Multiple speakers. Inaudible.)

18 MS. DAVIDSON: -- Arlene -- which is her  
19 alternate, is going to sit in her place, I believe.

20 MS. PARKS: So is that Arlene --

21 MS. LAWSON: I have not gotten  
22 confirmation.

23 (Multiple speakers. Inaudible.)

24 MS. DAVIDSON: That's Arlene, yeah.  
25 She - -

1 MS. PARKS: Okay. All right.

2 MS. DAVIDSON: Use your imagination.

3 (Multiple speakers. Inaudible.)

4 MS. LAWSON: And Arlene has been at the  
5 committee member meeting.

6 MS. PARKS: Right. So she's at least  
7 been at the table. See, I -- I would be real concerned if  
8 we brought somebody else on in any of the areas who doesn't  
9 have -- either somebody doesn't spend a lot of time filling  
10 them in or doesn't have all the basis of information and  
11 hasn't been part of the dynamics of all those, you know,  
12 different group discussions and everything. I mean, at the  
13 point we are, where we've got through all the really,  
14 really, really hard stuff already, you know --

15 MS. DAVIDSON: However, each project  
16 phase has its own nuances.

17 MS. PARKS: Okay. So that's fair.

18 MS. DAVIDSON: And it's all -- yeah. I  
19 think, you know, final design -- While you're right, some of  
20 the big decisions will be made, they'll be more at a  
21 parochial level and around, you know, station areas --

22 MS. PARKS: So in other words --

23 (Multiple speakers. Inaudible.)

24 MS. PARKS: -- it's almost like new  
25 issues and so it's a whole new --

1 MS. DAVIDSON: Right.

2 MS. PARKS: -- conversation anyhow?

3 MS. DAVIDSON: Right. So that's the  
4 other way of looking at it. But you bring up a very valid  
5 point, that -- You're right. Having some of that history  
6 and institutional knowledge is helpful.

7 MS. LAWSON: I think what I just saw,  
8 with a lot of heads nodding -- and I'm sensitive to the  
9 fact that we've had a lot of members of the public come in  
10 and we've promised to do this station area work. So, what  
11 -- Let me just say, I saw a lot of heads nod, that how  
12 ever it's done, we need to assure that whoever comes on is  
13 fully briefed on the history.

14 MS. PARKS: Yeah. That would be really  
15 important.

16 MS. LAWSON: So -- with concerns about  
17 that. Harry?

18 MR. LAWHING: Our next meeting. Where  
19 do we stand on that? What? Are you just going to contact  
20 us?

21 MS. DAVIDSON: So, if you're okay with  
22 that, I think we'll just leave it up in the air, given that  
23 we're not sure when we'll -- when that exact time frame,  
24 for permission.

25 MS. PARKS: But am I correct that,

1 meanwhile, you're going to get in touch with everybody  
2 that's still on the CAC?

3 MS. DAVIDSON: Yeah.

4 MS. PARKS: And, you know, kind of  
5 reiterate and reconfirm that they --

6 MS. DAVIDSON: Exactly. Talk about  
7 some of the --

8 MS. PARKS: Sure.

9 MS. DAVIDSON: -- study issues and the  
10 impacts and those types of things.

11 MR. WHEELER: What about Foster Road  
12 station? Where is that? I know that that's kind of a  
13 limbo thing.

14 MS. DAVIDSON: Oh, you mean --

15 MR. WHEELER: Has there been a final  
16 decision on --

17 MS. DAVIDSON: You mean the  
18 park-and-ride?

19 MR. WHEELER: Whether there will be a  
20 park-and-ride, yeah. Not station -- excuse me --  
21 park-and-ride.

22 MS. DAVIDSON: I think, because we had  
23 heard from the neighborhood that they did not actually want  
24 to see a service park-and-ride, that really, their efforts  
25 really want to be focused on some sort of mixed-use

1 structured parking, that for the time being, we would not  
2 start the service park- and-ride, but keep those discussions  
3 with our other jurisdictional partners -- the neighborhood  
4 -- going. So, you know, if, at a time along between now  
5 and, you know, opening day, that that becomes actually a  
6 feasible alternative with other partner cooperation, that  
7 maybe that would happen. But for the time being, no.

8 MS. LAWSON: And -- And I think we --  
9 There were some time markers in there in terms of when the  
10 Lents area comes up with that plan. That has been a really  
11 difficult thing because of all the reasons that have been  
12 discussed. And I -- There has been no final plan  
13 developed; is that right?

14 MS. DAVIDSON: That's correct.

15 MS. LAWSON: Okay.

16 MS. DAVIDSON: That's correct.

17 MS. LAWSON: So, with that --

18 MR. CHASSE: For -- For -- For a  
19 park-and- ride?

20 MS. LAWSON: Pardon?

21 MR. WHEELER: For a park-and-ride.

22 MS. PARKS: For a station.

23 (Multiple speakers. Inaudible.)

24 MS. LAWSON: No. The station is there,  
25 but I mean the broader urban renewal plan has not been

1 confirmed. And it was --

2 MS. PARKS: Oh, yeah. The mixed use --

3 MS. LAWSON: -- somewhat hinged on  
4 that.

5 So with that, we're going to transition  
6 -- Did I miss anything? Okay. We're going to transition  
7 into the public meeting and Sean is here -- Where -- Oh,  
8 Sean is here. I knew I'd seen him and then I'm staring  
9 right at him.

10 THE COURT REPORTER: Are we off the  
11 record?

12 MS. LAWSON: We are now off the record  
13 and into the public meeting format.

14 (Whereupon, the I-205 Citizens Advisory  
15 Committee Meeting concluded at 5:45 P.M.)

16 .

17 .

18 .

19 .

20 .

21 .

22 .

23 .

24 .

