



DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 33

Meeting Date: 3/20/08

Issue Date: 4/2/08

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 #33

Project: I-5 to 99W Connector
Purpose: Executive Management Team Meeting
Location: ODOT Region 1, Room 228

Attendees:

EMT	Michael Bowers	City of Wilsonville (alternate)
	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
PMT	Tim Wilson	ODOT
	Jennifer Danziger	DEA
	Angie Jones	DEA
	Scott Richman	DEA
	Chris Maciejewski	DKS
	Vaughn Brown	Jeanne Lawson Associates (JLA)
	Leslie Howell	Howell Consulting
Jim Evans	Moyano Leadership Group	
Others	Michael Feves	SWG
	Kristi Halvorson	
	Ashton Root	

Distribution: PMT, EMT, Interested Parties, File

The meeting began at 10:00 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/Introductions**
 - Lawrence welcomed the group and asked if there were any changes to the agenda

- **Alternatives Analysis**

- Scott referred to the PMT meeting held earlier this week, where proposed modifications to the potential impact area along OR 99W for alternatives 4 and 5 were discussed. He presented maps with proposed expanded “blue bands” to cover the proposed modifications. Additional turn lanes would be needed on roads intersecting OR 99W south of the connector interchanges with I-5, and the interchange impact area for Alternative 5 would need to be expanded to accommodate a different interchange layout that would also require grade separation of the Edy/Sherwood intersection with OR 99W in addition to the T-S/Roy Rogers intersection.
- Tim asked if the expanded blue bands would be sufficient to allow for the additional lanes and turn lanes, and Jennifer said that they would be large enough.
- Chris said the modifications would allow OR 99W to operate under a v/c of 1.0, through the project area, but would not achieve the design standard v/c of 0.75.
- R. Scott asked for clarification that the land use impacts for the modifications have not been analyzed, and Scott confirmed that this was the case.
- Lawrence said that that additional analysis would be done once the PSC accepted the modifications to these alternatives.
- Jim said the analysis needs to also determine if it would be feasible from an engineering and cost standpoint to construct these interchanges.
- Jennifer explained that for Alternative 5, the largest travel movement would be between OR 99W to the south of the connector and on the connector itself, so they looked closely at the most reasonable interchange types that would accommodate the heavy flow in that direction. It would most likely still allow at grade intersection access to Meineke Road. She also noted that a portion of the OR 99W interchange under Alternative 4 may need to be three levels high due to directional ramp flyovers.
- R. Scott asked about proposed process to get to a conclusion of which we are going to carry forward for the RTP amendment and into an EIS - do we keep whittling them down now and then we don't have any more than one standing? If the PSC does not like alternative 4 and/or 5 with the modifications, what happens? Do they take it off the table and analysis on it would stop?
- Lawrence said that the PSC has the option of dropping more alternatives, but we are making a good faith effort to modify the alternative to fix the major travel performance flaw.
- Scott said that we are proceeding to present the alternatives analysis information for all alternatives; giving full disclosure about the flaws and our modifications. The proposed modifications to Alternative 5 would cause some land use and environmental concerns because it would impact a major power substation, and it would likely impact small portions of the Refuge. While we are not in a design phase, our discovery process is looking at the constraints from a design point of view. There was a range of impacts determined for the alternatives, and this information will be updated if the modified bands are approved.
- Jef said that it may not be feasible to locate an interchange that fits within the modified blue band because of impacts. The way to express this to the PSC is that our original concepts did not meet minimal threshold standards. If the PSC

does not like what we have come up with to achieve the minimal standards, we could acknowledge it is a flawed alternative and they could drop it, or let the public provide input to inform their subsequent discussions leading to a preferred alternative.

- Members of the project team will meet with Sherwood staff to discuss the proposed modifications prior to the PSC meeting.
 - Lawrence moved that the EMT recommend that the PSC approve the proposed modifications to the blue bands. This motion passed unanimously.
 - Scott agreed to provide the EMT and PSC with an updated information summary to provide information explaining the proposed modifications to Alternatives 4 and 5.
- **Transportation Results and March 26 PSC Preparation**
 - Jennifer handed out an updated draft transportation analysis summary and corresponding figures packet. The information in this packet was not updated to address the modifications to Alternatives 4 and 5.
 - Jennifer said that we are looking more carefully at who is using major roadway segments under each alternative, including which travel markets are attracted to different connector alternatives.
 - She also referred to a new figure that illustrates traffic using the I-5 mainline (and C/D road system with connector alternatives).
 - Scott said the on Alternatives 4 and 5; if the modification was made, it would change the v/c ratio from what is shown on Fig 18.
 - R. Scott said that everyone at the last PSC meeting was asking for more information; he said he would give the information Jennifer handed out today to his PSC representative and ask her if she would like more information or if this answers her questions.
 - Mike M. said we should treat the next PSC meeting as a work session and go through "how we got here".
 - Lawrence said that he would like to give the PSC this packet and make sure that they have everything they need and that they understand the methodology that got us here.
 - Jef said we need to be clear that we are not giving the PSC the perception that we are turning this into a formal decision. There is a spectrum of information needs across the PSC – we should meet individually with them to understand their specific needs as an individual – not all want the same level of information.
 - Fred said that he doesn't feel that his PSC member needs more details, but his issue might be more of agenda management – people deviating from the agenda and delaying progress.
 - Vaughn suggested that we flip the order on the PSC agenda of presenting the data before the modifications (change order on PSC agenda), and Lawrence suggested that he would present them simultaneously.
 - Jim asked if the interchange concepts on 99W were going to be refined for the PSC meeting. Jennifer replied that they were intentionally schematic, they will be distributed to the EMT and PSC along with other materials to be sent out tomorrow.

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 33

Meeting Date: 3/20/08

Issue Date: 4/2/08

- **Other Business**

- The next EMT meeting was scheduled for April 10th 9:30 a.m. -11:30 a.m.