



I-5 Transportation Alternatives and Operational Traffic Model Study



TRC Meeting #5 Summary February 18, 2010

TRC members in attendance:

Forest Sutmiller	WSDOT, Olympic Region		
Mike Villnave	WSDOT, Olympic Region		
Jesse Hamashima	Pierce County Public Works	<u>Project Team</u>	
Larry Mickel	Fort Lewis Public Works	Craig Helmann	WSDOT, UPO
Minh Vo	National Guard (Camp Murray)	Bruce Haldors	Transpo Group
Monica Adams	Pierce Transit	Jon Pascal	Transpo Group
Peter Zahn	City of DuPont	Mike Swenson	Transpo Group
Tamara Nack	Gray & Osborne (City of DuPont)	Richard Warren	WSDOT, UPO
Thera Black	Thurston County Regional Planning Council	Jilma Jimenez	Berger Abam
J. Duncan Cramp	WA Milt. Dept.	<u>City of Lakewood</u>	
		Dan Penrose	
		Desiree Winkler	

Welcome, Introduction, & Status Update

Dan Penrose, Project Manager, welcomed everyone and updated the committee on the current project status. To date, the project continues to be on-schedule. Jon Pascal provided an overview for the TRC regarding the larger OEA Growth Coordination Plan studies and how the I-5 study will be used in the larger transportation planning efforts currently underway.

No comments on the TRC #4 meeting notes or the Tier III screening memo were noted by the TRC members. There was discussion however on whether the costs for the cross-base highway were included in the project costs identified for the concept groupings. There was some concern regarding whether costs were double counted. The project team was directed to further research and compare the cross-base highway costs to those identified in the I-5 study to assure that there is consistency in the two studies.

Review of Improvement Concept Groupings

Mike Swenson provided an overview of the concept groupings. Three concept groupings were developed and presented. The three concept groupings were developed by combining interchange related improvements previously discussed with the TRC with mainline related improvements developed since the TRC meeting #4. The groupings included both interchange and mainline improvements.

TRC members indicated some concern regarding the concept grouping 1 as it appeared that the improvements did not address the long-term needs and could not be used in the phasing of the improvements.

TRC members were concerned with the impacts of terminating the additional GP lane south of the study area and what impacts that has on the I-5 operations. Craig Helman noted that further analysis, likely simulation, would be required as part of the Interchange Justification Report (IJR) to be prepared as part of future phases of the project.

Review of Tier III Screening Methodology/Results

Jon Pascal and multiple members of the project team then provided an overview of the Tier III screening criteria and key results. There were three primary topics discussed as part of the Tier III screening process. They included the following:

- **Tier III Weighting.** Discussion occurred regarding the weighting of the Tier II criteria the general consensus of the TRC members was that the weighting should be directed more to the mobility/operations rather than the other items. The project team indicated that the weighting would be changed to provide 60 percent to the operations criteria and the remaining split evenly between the other categories.
- **Scoring.** In addition to the weighting, the “score” would be changed to be based on a total points possible of 100 rather than the 20 that was used in the original scoring. This would provide a greater separation between the concept groupings and further identify the differences.
- **Benefit/Cost.** The benefit/cost category would be relabeled as the title and individual scoring portrayed a b/c ratio that was actually the scoring, not the calculated b/c ratio. The category will be changed to reflect the construction costs only, as the mobility benefits are highlighted in a separate category. The final report will address the respective b/c ratios as a separate discussion point.

TRC members continued to voice concern regarding the strength of the regional models, as they relate to transit performance. The final report needs to further identify the benefits and impacts to transit based on the travel time analysis, mainline congestion, or other measures as appropriate.

As in the introduction and general discussion regarding the memo, the TRC posed several questions regarding assumptions related to the cross-base highway and how it was accounted for in terms of improvements costs and operational benefits. The project team identified this as an item that would be researched further. Updates would be provided to the TRC members at a later date.

Next Steps

The project team will be working through the revisions to the weighting and Tier II screening over the next several weeks. Updates will be provided to the TRC as soon as they are available. In preparation for the final TRC meeting, the project team will be assembling further sections of the report for review as well as identifying a “prioritized” list of improvements.

The next TRC meeting (#5) will be scheduled for Mid April