



DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

I-5 to 99W Connector: PSC Mtg. #11

Meeting Date: 7/11/07

Issue Date: 8/16/07

The contents of this summary are assumed correct unless our office is notified in writing within five calendar days of receipt.

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

Project: I-5 to 99W Connector Project
Purpose: Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting #11
Date/Time: Wednesday July 11, 2007 / 1:30 – 3:30 PM
Location: Sherwood Police Training Center
Attendees:

PSC	Tom Brian	Washington County (Chair)
	Roy Rogers	Washington County
	Carl Hosticka	Metro
	Charlotte Lehan	City of Wilsonville
	Keith Mays	City of Sherwood
	Lou Ogden	City of Tualatin
	Lynn Peterson	Clackamas County
	Fred Eberle	ODOT (Alternate)
Executive Management Team (EMT)	Danielle Cowan	City of Wilsonville
	Fred Eberle	ODOT
	Mike McKillip	City of Tualatin
	Lawrence Odell	Washington County
	R. Scott Pemble	Clackamas County
Project Management Team (PMT)	Vaughn Brown	Jeanne Lawson & Associates (JLA)
	Amy Gibbons	ODOT
	Leslie Howell	Howell Consulting
	Angie Jones	DEA
	Russ Knoebel	Washington County
	Randy McCourt	DKS
	Scott Richman	DEA
	Mark Turpel	Metro
	Tim Wilson	ODOT

Stakeholder Working Group (SWG) Tom Aufenthie

Others John Alto, Tracey Erway, Ned and Jan Hammond, Larry and
(including sign-in sheet) Ginger McCart, Dan Ruediger

Distribution: PSC, EMT, PMT, SWG

The meeting began at 1:30 PM. Agendas and other materials were provided prior to the meeting, and copies of these materials were provided at the meeting. The agenda items are represented in "bold" headings.

- **Welcome/Introduction**

- Chair Brian welcomed the group and led introductions

- **Approve June 27, 2007 PSC Meeting Summary**

- The PSC approved the summary of the last PSC meeting held on April 11, 2006.

- **Key Point Discussed**

- The key issues from the last SWG meeting included:
 - Project relationship to land use policies and planning
 - Request for information to compare alternatives
 - Ongoing concern about I-5 and 99W impacts
 - Constraints used in aligning corridors
- Residents on the east side of I-5 were originally notified about the project in earlier outreach. The project will be providing additional outreach and notification to potentially affected properties
- The Alternatives Analysis will provide information needed to distinguish components that might be ideal to carry forward, and which may not be as effective or have greater impacts. The Alternatives Analysis and refinement process should address the following concerns:
 - The selected alternative may be a hybrid of one of the current alternatives and a public hearing is necessary to present this
 - Markets being served (i.e. swing up to the north), can one corridor do everything?
 - For each corridor, there are important connections that need further study such as 124th because it plays a key role for delivering traffic while reducing travel on Tualatin-Sherwood Road and Tualatin-Sherwood Road's width and the need for 5 lanes. 99W improvements needs to be looked at in a more detail for all the alternatives located to the north. At six corners, there are access issues that need to be studied. The connections to I-5 also need to be looked at. Federal restrictions prevent connections to I-5 in certain areas.
- Evaluation criteria will help define who are we serving:
 - Would serve many groups. The range of the types of benefits are similar under each alternative, a few thousand cars, with the exception of 4E, which draws the most traffic off of Tualatin-Sherwood Road
- Politically acceptable alternatives will are not likely going to be able to significantly displace people, businesses, etc.
- Land use actions can be taken to make the TDM option more effective.

- **Additional Information/Graphics needs**

- A more detailed flowchart based on the Corridor Development Steps would be helpful

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

I-5 to 99W Connector: PSC Mtg. #11

Meeting Date: 7/11/07

Issue Date: 8/16/07

- Information about braided ramps, etc., and more definition (visual or descriptors).
- Parkway elements. What does a parkway look like? What should be carried forward?
- **Public Comment**
 - Tom Aufenthie said that he can probably support the 4A, 4B, and 4C being tossed out due to its direct impacts to the community of Tualatin. From a cost basis, he feels 4D could be the lowest cost estimate. He feels EESA should be overlaid with these corridors to get a better feel for what these options will really do.
 - John Alto said he feels alternatives A, B, and C will provide too much congestion. He feels 4D should stay and the public should have the opportunity to look at it. The public is not going to just make a data decision, it is also environmental impacts, etc.
 - Dan Rudiger said he is also in support of 4D, he also wants to recommend dropping 4A, 4B, 4C, and 5A. He feels we are too early in the process to throw away 4D. 4D is too important to take off the list. We can add EESA options, we can mitigate that.
 - Larry McCart added he would like to keep 4D on the table as an option. If 4E creates some environmental problems, then we would go back to 4D. He feels that the ROW is in place, acquisition costs do not go down, material costs are up. The longer the road, the higher the cost.
 - Tracy Erway said she is in agreement about not eliminating them; at this stage, we need more data.
 - Jan Hammond from Sherwood added her support for 4D. She offered some geological perspective on 5B. She mentioned the water resources on Ladd Hill and Parrot Mountain that should also be taken into consideration.
- **Key Decisions Made**
 - Roy said 4A, 4B, 4C, and 5A are so disruptive to the people of Tualatin, and are 5x the cost. He would like to recommend they are dropped.
 - Chair Brian said that we can presume it, and if there is an issue that arises after the next SWG, we can address it at the next PSC meeting in August
 - Motion made and seconded to eliminate 4A, 4B, 4C, and 5A. Motion passed unanimously.

The next PSC meeting is scheduled for August 22nd at 12:30 p.m.