



**DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY**

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 44

Meeting Date: 08/07/08

Issue Date: /08

*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 #44**

**Project:** I-5 to 99W Connector  
**Purpose:** Project Management Team Meeting  
**Location:** David Evans and Associates, Inc.

**Attendees:**

Lawrence Odell	Washington County
R. Scott Pemble	Clackamas County
Andy Cotugno	Metro
Amy Gibbons	ODOT
Tim Wilson	ODOT
Jeff Graham	FHWA
Mark Turpel	Metro
Jason Waters	City of Sherwood
Michael Bowers	City of Wilsonville
Mike McKillip	City of Tualatin
Gus Duenas	City of Tigard
Vaughn Brown	JLA
Alex Dupey	DEA
Angie Jones	DEA
Scott Richman	DEA
Leslie Howell	Howell Consulting
Randy McCourt	DKS

**Others:** Mike Feves

**Distribution:** PMT, File

---

The meeting began at 9:30 AM. Lawrence led the meeting. The summary generally follows the order of the 8/7/08 EMT agenda.

**Welcome and Introductions**

- Lawrence welcomed the group and led introductions

**Agenda Additions and Deletions**

- Lawrence mentioned that documents that are distributed to the EMT need to be passed on with discretion and the document integrity needs to remain intact, otherwise it should be specified as a document from that individual or group, not to be shown as official project material

**EMT: Moving into Alternatives Refinement**

- Scott directed the EMT to a memo from the PMT to the EMT regarding responses to the City of Wilsonville's Alternatives Analysis comments.
- Scott said that the technical reports are going to be made available. Originally they were not released to the public since they are written in technical terms and then put into the Alternatives Analysis report in a more digestible format for reading.
- Scott said he would like to go through the table of comments from Wilsonville and address the three key points raised by Michael Bowers. Lawrence said that this committee voted 7-1 to release the AA report, and we have spent hundred of hours responding to comments raised, which has been important to do, but we do want to move this process forward at this point. Michael B. said that Mayor Lehan was not in favor of the release of the AA; Lawrence stated she did not object at the PSC meeting.
- Scott said in this first phase we are trying to address at a planning level a location of a possible solution. We will be able to make adjustments in the design level phase. Andy said this project has an obligation to show impacts to areas immediately outside the area because of this project, however, he doesn't feel there is a obligation to also fix those impacts.
- Michael said that he doesn't feel this project is being held to the same standard as other projects, namely Wilsonville Road. Operational standards for example. Randy said that we study the exact same measure of performance standards at different levels of detail. Randy said as you progress through the NEPA process, the level of detail will change over the course of the analysis.
- Lawrence asked Jeff G. how FHWA feels about our process at this stage. Jeff G. said that FHWA is comfortable at this stage the level of detail that we are using. At the end of the RTP amendment process, the tier 2 NEPA process will begin, and then we have an RTP that identifies a corridor. That corridor will not change, so we do need to make consensus on that. Until we can reach that and have Wilsonville agree, we cannot get to that point.
- Michael B. asked if he can just see the impacts around the periphery of the project area and how big those are for comparison purposes.

- Lawrence asked Andy if Metro is comfortable with the process, and Andy said he is, although he wants to be sure before moving on that all the comments have been addressed adequately and he has not had time to look through those.
- Michael said that he has not asked for any additional detail than what is in the adopted evaluation criteria. He is not asking for any additional detail beyond that – he just wants to know that the criteria are all addressed in the AA. R. Scott said that some of it may be how we are organized, the real conversation is that we have consultants doing this technical work, then summarizing this information into the AA.
- Mike M. said that he understands that whatever we do there will be some impacts around the edge. He said that Randy and the staff are aware of those and that we have enough information to know what those are and that we have enough to make a planning level decision, with keeping those impacts in mind. He feels we know enough of what is going on around the perimeters to make a decision. EMT agreed with exception of Michael B. He said that he has concern about the performance of I-5 adjacent to Wilsonville.
- Lawrence asked Randy if they have addressed that issue in their meetings with Wilsonville. Randy said that it is shown that the performance does not vary greatly from the non-connector options vs. the connector options. Michael said that he wants to see these issues addressed in the alternatives analysis.
- Scott asked again what level of detail will be needed. We can use a more specific tool to gather a finer level of detailed information, however he doesn't feel it would show a different level of performance. Michael said he appreciated Andy's comments about providing additional information as needed to make a decision, and all he really needs to know is the impact to I-5 through Wilsonville. Randy said that information has been gathered and will be provided.
- Scott addressed the comment about town center impacts; is the information provided enough information? Andy asked Michael if he could put the question in context of what information he needs. Michael said he would like to have the numbers that would show the variances in congestion levels for each alternative through Wilsonville, namely Wilsonville Road. Andy said the length volumes will tell more than the 24-hour counts. Jeff G. asked if we are providing more information on Tualatin and Sherwood TCs, and is Wilsonville getting short-changed because their town center is outside the project area.
- Regional and through traffic –Michael said that the major purpose of this study seems to be relieving the regional and through traffic, and he cannot tell if we are solving that problem, or how each of the six compare in solving that problem.

- Russ directed to Figure 7.5-2 that shows the percentages for type of trip, and reductions. Russ said it shows 33 data points, do we need to show more? Michael said that only addresses a couple of arterials, and it should address all. Scott said that we could set up a separate meeting around this for Wilsonville and DKS to discuss. Lawrence would like to get an affirmative from Michael of what he is looking for. Michael asked if regional and through traffic will exert the same influence as the no build vs. the other five alternatives. Scott said that we can create the matrix Lawrence asked for. Andy directed the EMT to page 50 of the technical report and the map – he feels that answers a lot of Michael’s questions. Lawrence wants to see Figure 16A in a matrix of data with numbers and not just the percentages. EMT voted unanimously for it. Amy also suggested having a focus on each town center as well.
- Andy said that the substance of our conversation has been useful to get down to the fundamental understanding to what is going on. He charged Michael with going through all of these responses and doing the same thing of what is fundamental to his concerns. He asked if Michael could identify any of these that we can discuss at our next meeting. Lawrence said what he would like to accomplish today is to see that we have addressed the issues, not that they are not going to be discussed further. We will have to do more modeling and look at more impacts as this process moves on. He suggested creating the information requested, and the EMT may comment – and then the EMT can submit this to the PSC. Motion made, and voted unanimously in favor.

**Next EMT Meeting**

- EMT #45 – August 14<sup>th</sup>, Metro