



**DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY**

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 45

Meeting Date: 08/14/08

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
Fred Eberle	ODOT
Tim Wilson	ODOT
Jeff Graham	FHWA
Mark Turpel	Metro
Tom Pessimier	City of Sherwood
Mike Stone	City of Wilsonville
Karin Hoffman	City of Tualatin
Vaughn Brown	JLA
Alex Dupey	DEA
Angie Jones	DEA
Scott Richman	DEA
Jef Kaiser	DEA
Leslie Howell	Howell Consulting
Chris Maciejewski	DKS
Randy McCourt	DKS
Jim Evans	Moyano Group

**Others:**

**Distribution:** PMT, File

---

The meeting began at 9:30 AM. Fred led the meeting. The summary generally follows the order of the 8/14/08 EMT agenda.

**Welcome and Introductions**

- Fred welcomed the group

## **Agenda Additions and Deletions**

- Fred spoke about the PSC meeting yesterday. Andy said that we need to have several discussions, first question being what we can agree upon; what EESA looks like, what are some elements of that, what do we put in that package. Second question, what does this mean about the connector? We seem to be heading in different directions – Mayor Lehan wanting to remove it from the table, Tualatin and Sherwood requesting it stay on. Randy said that it was clear that there was a lack of articulation of issues. R. Scott said that this changes the scope of our work talking about arterial streets – it is a shift in focus. Andy disagreed, he said that we are looking for a connector for 99W and I-5, but by doing these improvements we are providing a better connectivity. R. Scott said that he was not seeing us moving into a process of modeling local street planning. Jeff G. agreed that is not our role. Fred said he did see us doing some additional modeling and analysis. If this does evolve into something that is not a state highway, maybe FHWA and ODOT move away from that process; not to say that it wouldn't be eligible for federal or state funds.
- Scott cautioned the group not to muddle what we had defined as EESA with what we are going to be coming up with for a hybrid mix. He did not hear yesterday that any type of connector is dead. We have to give them something that they can take away now with phasing, and if we are looking at a multi-billion dollar project, it will not be feasible. Andy said this process needs to define how far south it goes, and part two is 124<sup>th</sup>, and part three is the 124<sup>th</sup> cul-de-sac at Boones Ferry Road. How much of the east-west parallel network in EESA is feasible? Would a hybrid that downscales T-S road and has a southern arterial and 124<sup>th</sup> be a feasible solution?

## **Alternatives Refinement: EMT Discussion of process and input on key elements**

- Jef said wrote down some key points he heard yesterday:
  - Affordability
  - Project businesses in project area
  - Protect TWR and planned resources preservation
  - Create a network
  - Phasability (short/long)
  - Remove uncertainty
  - Protect ROW for future facilities
  - Arterial scale vs. freeway
  - Protect businesses along Tualatin-Sherwood Road and 99W

- Jef drew a diagram of I-5/99W with an illustration of a connection running north-south from T-S Road to the North Wilsonville interchange, and pointed out that the lack of arterials in the western region and in Sherwood causes a greater strain on 99W and Tualatin-Sherwood Road. He drew an arterial from 99W just south of Sherwood moving north to connect with the north south arterial and through to connect with I-5 and into I-205, creating a more complete network. Scott gave the caveat that this is a concept, and has not been vetted through the PMT. Documentation is important to be consistent with the requirements for an exception that you can't do a connector inside the UGB. Andy said we have to bring them back some choices about a connector – do you want a smaller facility?
- Andy said that it is our obligation to give them some choices on which direction they want to head with the connector, and we need to lay that out for them.
- Jef said that any arterial of the magnitude that Andy drew will need to go through NEPA. Unless you have the NEPA process in place you will not be able to acquire a wide enough ROW. Randy said that if we assume a standard Washington County arterial of 100-foot ROW – what if in the future you need ROW for frontage roads – do you still need the NEPA process if you are only doing it in the first phase? Jef said that NEPA would have you address this by showing your ultimate vision, and you can build now what ever you want to, but keeping that future vision in tact.
- Mike Stone asked if we are concerned with the schedule. He wants to make sure there is enough time for him to review proposals and materials before the PSC meetings. Randy said that if we can agree that these projects are independent, we can break the mids and the shorts out.
- Tom said he is concerned with the schedule Scott has laid out – we need to listen to the concerns of the PSC before we go off and start a bunch of work. Unless we have some open conversations about what it going on, we are not going to have buy-in at the end of the process and we will be where we are now in a shift in process.
- Russ said that the big issue he heard yesterday was cost – how are these types of projects going to be funded in the future and what is the reality? Lawrence said that there are some projects up front in the process that people can agree to. We need to keep these projects on the forefront of the congressional minds.

**Next EMT Meeting**

- EMT #47 – August 21st, Metro