



DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 18

Meeting Date: 3/9/07

Issue Date: 3/29/07

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

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY-EMT #18

Project: I-5 to 99W Connector
Purpose: Executive Management Team Meeting
Location: Metro, Room 370A

Attendees:

EMT	Andy Cotugno	Metro
	Danielle Cowan	City of Wilsonville (alternate)
	Rob Dixon	City of Sherwood
	Fred Eberle	ODOT
	Jeff Graham	FHWA
	Mike McKillip	City of Tualatin
	Lawrence Odell	Washington County
	R. Scott Pemble	Clackamas County
	Mike Stone	City of Wilsonville
	Mark Turpel	Metro (alternate)
PMT	Amy Gibbons	ODOT
	Russell Knoebel	Washington County
	Mark Turpel	Metro
	Tim Wilson	ODOT
	Vaughn Brown	Jeanne Lawson Associates (JLA)
	Leslie Howell	Howell Consulting
	Angie Jones	DEA
	Jef Kaiser	DEA
	Scott Richman	DEA
Others	Tom Aufenthie	Stakeholder Working Group (SWG)
	Michael Bowers	City of Wilsonville
	Mike Feves	SWG

Distribution: PMT, EMT, Interested Parties, File

The meeting began at 9:30 AM. The agenda and other materials were provided to EMT members in electronic format prior to the meeting and copies were distributed at the meeting. The agenda items are represented in "bold" headings.

- **Welcome and Introductions**

- Russ welcomed the group and led self-introductions of meeting attendees

- **PMT Report**

- Russ updated the EMT on activities over the past month. As Lawrence has transitioned into his new position as Assistant Director of the Washington County Land Use and Transportation Department, he has been involved in meetings with other agency partners and stakeholders to get up to speed on this and other efforts where he is representing the County.
- Lawrence said he had to do some homework before he got fully engaged in this process, and that his transition to the project was the primary reason that the February EMT and PSC meetings were postponed.
- Referring to a draft memo from the PMT to the EMT regarding recommendations on screening of project elements, Russ provided an overview of how the consultants took the broad range of concepts received from stakeholders (including most recently participants at the community forums), condensed them down to 25 different conceptual solution elements, and then worked with the PMT and some EMT representatives through an initial screening process using a matrix tool that has been shared with the SWG and EMT.
- The matrix summarizes elements recommended for further consideration as connectors, recommended for elimination from further study, and recommended for consideration in possible combination with other elements to formulate into initial alternatives.

- **Selection of EMT Chair**

- Russ raised the suggestion that had been made in recent meetings between the partner agencies that the PMT and EMT have a designated chairperson, similar to the PSC. Russ serves as the PMT Chair, and he will provide the EMT with updates on PMT activities. He asked the EMT members if they had thoughts or concerns about selecting a chair.
- Mike M. inquired about the purpose of an EMT chair, and Russ replied that the EMT Chair would serve as the primary EMT point of contact, lead EMT meetings, and bring EMT business before the PSC.
- Fred agreed that it would be beneficial to have an EMT lead and primary point person. He suggested that as Washington County's EMT representative, Lawrence would be an appropriate EMT chair.
- Andy agreed with Fred and asked R. Scott Pemble if he (as the other county EMT representative) was OK with this suggestion. R. Scott said he was comfortable with it.
- Andy moved to select Lawrence as the EMT Chair; Mike M. seconded the motion, and the EMT unanimously agreed to select Lawrence as the EMT Chair.
- Lawrence accepted the role as the EMT Chair.
- Lawrence noted a couple of recent changes to the project committees, including Russ (PMT), Clackamas County Commissioner Lynn Peterson (PSC) and himself to the EMT. He requested an updated list of project committee members, and Scott R. agreed to provide this to the EMT at their next meeting.

- **Range of Alternatives (ROA) Development – Concept Element Screening**

- Jef K. spoke about the next process being to select and initial ROA to carry forward, and presented the five types of alternatives that are proposed to be carried forward:
 1. No Build Alternative
 2. Transportation System Management/Transportation Demand Management (TSM/TDM) Alternative
 3. Enhance Existing System Alternative (EESA - formerly referred to as the "kitchen sink")
 4. Connector entirely inside of the UGB
 5. Connector alternatives located partially or wholly outside the UGB.
- Jef reviewed the eight-step process to develop the ROA, culminating in PSC approval of the ROA, and noted that we are at step three (report initial screening results to EMT, SWG, and PSC).
- He explained the process of the initial screening and referred to the combined element screening matrix to illustrate how the PMT assessed each and came to their recommendations for each concept element.
- Jef reminded the group that the PSC will be asked to agree to the conceptual solution elements to be eliminated from further study, and that the PMT is asking the EMT to make a recommendation to the PSC.
- Danielle inquired if the "partial solutions" indicated by yellow color-coding are really elements to be further studied in the ROA development process. Jef replied that the PMT recommended that each of the yellow-coded concepts could not meet the project purpose and need alone, but could be combined with other concepts to form a potential alternative. Each of the yellow-coded concepts is likely to be carried forward as a supporting element of one or more potential alternatives. Jef reiterated that regardless of the PMT-assigned color-code, none of the individual conceptual solution elements are likely to comprise an alternative unto itself.
- Jef noted that once the screening step is completed, the PMT and consultants will utilize the adopted project goals and objectives to formulate an initial set of alternatives to present to the EMT, SWG, and PSC for review and feedback.
- Lawrence suggested that the EMT members not feel compelled to reach agreement on a recommendation today. If needed, a follow-up EMT meeting to reach consensus on a recommendation to the PSC could be held next week. This would give the EMT time to process the information discussed today.
- Andy suggested that, time permitting, the EMT discuss the elements in some detail and make a recommendation today. If the EMT runs out of time today, they can reconvene next week.
- R. Scott P. understood that some SWG members had expressed concerns with elements numbered 9 (Southern Connector to Boeckman Rd/I-5) and 19 (Improve Tualatin-Sherwood (T-S) Rd as a Connector).
- Danielle questioned the screening process resulting in some options (particularly element 19) recommended to be eliminated from further study and others (such as element 9) with relatively similar impacts, but to different communities, were recommended to be studied further. Element 19 appeared to be eliminated since

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 18

Meeting Date: 3/9/07

Issue Date: 3/29/07

it would be excessively disruptive to the Tualatin Town Center, but Wilsonville representatives believe that element 19 would be destructive to their Town Center. Danielle also does not see how screening criterion 1.3 could be met with freight traffic loading onto a new I-5 interchange at Boeckman. Danielle suggested eliminating element 9 from further study, and advancing element 18 (arterial improvements on T-S Rd.).

- Mike M. also questioned why we would continue to consider element 9. He recalled from the travel demand information that a connector extending as far south as Boeckman Rd. would not have great potential for serving a sufficient amount of regional and through travel demand. He agreed that we do not yet have the complete data to eliminate a potential T-S Rd. option, and he suggested that element 19 remain on the table as a yellow-coded element.
- The EMT discussed element 9, including whether or not it would affect the Wilsonville Town Center. Element 9 is aligned through designated industrial lands directly north of the 2040 designated Town Center for Wilsonville, but City of Wilsonville representatives said that their town center will be expanding to the north and land uses will include non-industrial uses as planned community development occurs.
- Rob noted that the screening criteria should be applied consistently, and that the definitions we use need to be clear. The EMT did not reach agreement on a recommendation for element 9.
- Andy suggested that the EMT should reach agreement on the ROA to study, and then go through a more detailed evaluation process to compare impacts, etc. He believes some form of T-S Rd. improvements - perhaps less intensive than a fully limited access expressway (i.e. element 19) - should remain in the ROA mix to more fully define the negatives and positives of "pushing the envelope" of reasonable solutions for the T-S Rd. corridor. Andy agreed with Danielle to advance element 18, but to further study element 9. He suggested that the PSC be exposed to the EMT's debate and discussion about this. The PSC should discuss reasonable design parameters for the future T-S Rd. and consideration of whether or not a connection to I-5 at Boeckman Rd. should be studied further.
- R. Scott P. questioned whether the screening criteria are sufficient to reach "thumbs up or thumbs down" on elements 9, 18, 19, etc.
- Lawrence agreed with Andy to keep element 9 as a yellow-coded element for the time being, but also to consider the issues raised by the Wilsonville representatives. He proposed eliminating those concepts that obviously could not meet the project purpose.
- Regarding element 3 (Connector south of project solution area), Andy asked if a similar concept had been considered as part of the Newberg-Dundee Bypass study. Fred responded that the Newberg-Dundee study initially considered then eliminated a concept in the general area as element 3. The EMT agreed with the PMT recommendation to eliminate element 3.
- Regarding element 5 (I-5 capacity improvements through solution area) Mike S. asked if traffic on I-5 does not move now, what is the need for a new Connector to feed into it? Jef reminded the group that operational and safety impacts to I-5 resulting from the project would need to be mitigated, but the PMT recommendation to eliminate elements 5 and 6 (99W capacity improvements

through solution area and north to I-5) was that they would not meet the project purpose and multiple screening criterion.

- Russ noted that the Oregon and Washington DOTs just nominated I-5 from I-205 north of Vancouver, WA to the south edge of the Metro UGB south of Wilsonville as a USDOT-designated "Corridor of the Future".
- Jeff G. suggested that element 6 could be carried forward to be considered in support of other alternatives. Russ referred to element 17 (99W capacity improvement through Sherwood) as an element identified by the stakeholders that would remain under consideration to support the ROA.
- Jef K. reminded the group that operational and safety impacts to I-5, I-205 and 99W resulting from whatever solutions advanced would need to be mitigated, and the PMT recommendation to eliminate elements 5 and 6 (99W capacity improvements through solution area and north to I-5) was that they would not meet the project purpose and some screening criterion.
- Andy said 99W has been studied a number of times, and one of the findings (similar to previous studies of T-S Rd.) has been that the high travel demand results in it filling with traffic regardless of the amount of additional capacity. It would not meet the purpose and would cause other problems including impacts to the Tigard Town Center. Mark T. noted that Metro, ODOT and Tigard are studying 99W through Tigard. Fred added that it would not address east-west travel demand that contributes to problems on T-S Rd.
- The EMT agreed with the PMT recommendation to eliminate elements 5 and 6 from further study.
- Regarding element 8 (Tualatin Rd connector), the EMT agreed with the PMT recommendation to eliminate it, and to add a new element 26 (Tualatin Road upgrade as arterial enhancements), as a yellow-coded element to be carried forward in support of other alternatives.
- The EMT agreed with the PMT recommendation to eliminate element 10 (Stafford Rd corridor connection to Newberg-Dundee Bypass).
- Andy suggested that element 13 (new Willamette River bridge west of I-5) could be considered in future I-5 corridor studies. The EMT agreed, and agreed with the PMT recommendation to eliminate element 10 from further study through this project process.
- Given the earlier discussion regarding element 19, Fred said it would be difficult for him to agree to eliminate it.
- Lawrence asked if there would be merit in combining elements 18 and 19 to be further studied, and Andy suggested adding a new element 27 – to be defined in the ROA development – that would be a substantial upgrade to T-S that might include some fully limited access combined with partially limited (at-grade) access to be carried forward.
- The EMT agreed to keep element 18 as a "yellow", eliminate element 19 as per the PMT recommendation, and add element 27 as suggested by Andy.
- Mike M. noted that it seems to him that the travel demand and patterns could be similar between element 25 (north Sherwood connector to Boeckman Rd.) and elements 2 (north Sherwood to south of Norwood Rd. connector within UGB) and 4 (power line corridor) that the PMT recommended to advance. Fred replied that element 25 would result in approximately 2-miles additional out-of-direction

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 18

Meeting Date: 3/9/07

Issue Date: 3/29/07

travel for predominant travel between I-5 and 99W compared to elements 2 and 4. The EMT agreed with the PMT recommendation to eliminate element 25 from further study.

- Lawrence requested that the PMT summarize the EMT recommendations for each element, and summarized what he heard from the EMT:
 - Discuss element 9 further
 - Add new elements numbered 26 and 27
 - Eliminate elements 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 13, 19, and 25
 - Lawrence asked for any objections from the group on the summary of decision he presented – none were given.
 - Fred requested that the EMT meet again next week to formalize a recommendation, and asked the PMT to identify which yellow-coded elements are also identified in existing transportation system plans.
 - Andy requested that connector alternative types four and five not be limited to fully-limited access expressway type facilities. He suggested that connectors should also include partially limited high capacity arterial type facilities. Subsequent modeling during the alternatives analysis phase could guide the determination of appropriate facility type (capacity, access, etc.) for the RTP amendment.
 - The EMT requested that the screening matrix be distributed to them in an electronic file format.
- **Other business**
 - The next EMT meeting is scheduled to be held on Wednesday March 14th from 1:30 – 3:30 PM at Metro.
 - Mike M. suggested that the EMT may need to meet more than once a month through the ROA development phase.
 - Russ asked the EMT to check their calendars for upcoming meetings.
 - Lawrence suggested that he will work with the PMT to develop a more simple and clear presentation for the PSC, to include providing clear reasons for eliminating or advancing concept elements.