



**DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY**

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 20

Meeting Date: 5/17/07

Issue Date: 7/12/07

*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 #22**

**Project: I-5 to 99W Connector**  
**Purpose: Executive Management Team Meeting**  
**Location: Metro Council Chambers**

**Attendees:**

<b>EMT</b>	Danielle Cowan Gene Thomas Fred Eberle Jeff Graham Mike McKillip Lawrence Odell R. Scott Pemble Mike Stone	City of Wilsonville (alternate) City of Sherwood (alternate) ODOT FHWA City of Tualatin Washington County (EMT Chair) Clackamas County City of Wilsonville
<b>PMT</b>	Alex Dupey Kristin Hull Amy Gibbons Leslie Howell Angie Jones Jef Kaiser Russell Knoebel Scott Richman Mark Turpel Tim Wilson	DEA Jeanne Lawson Associates (JLA) ODOT Howell Consulting DEA DEA Washington County (PMT Chair) DEA Metro ODOT
<b>Others</b>	Tom Aufenthie Mark Greenfield Kristi Halvorson Steve Kelley Charlotte Lehan Randy McCourt	SWG   Washington County PSC DKS

**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**

- Lawrence welcomed the group and led the group in introductions.

- **Additions or Deletions to the Agenda**

- Charlotte presented a powerpoint regarding the connector.
- Reduced congestion vs time savings
- Plans for impacts to I-5 and I-205
- What problem are we trying to solve?
- Presented maps with travel distances, times
- Charlotte claims her travel speed assumptions same as DEA's
- Randy agreed that there is an access issue that will have to be fixed, the analysis will look at that
- Charlotte asked if there is an assumption of a direct connection to I-205
- Randy said that there are two connector type corridors in addition to the TDM/TSM/EESA
- Fred said when we get to evaluation factors, we will evaluate time savings; different pros and cons to different alternatives
- Randy said it does not make a large travel time difference if it comes straight across I-205 or connects in another location
- Lawrence asked about an ODOT project on I-5 that is already being looked at
- Fred said it is the entire I-5 corridor from Portland to Wilsonville
- Randy said we are going to look at impact on adjacent facilities as part of the analysis
- Charlotte asked if that means additional lanes on I-5
- Randy said they will run models to determine capacity constraints on I-5 and I-205
- Randy said that improvements to I-5 will need to be looked at
- Danielle asked about congestion trying to get on the freeway
- Randy said that FHWA will not let you degrade the operation of I-5
- Randy said a "gold standard" could be achieved through different connection locations
- He said that the project is not intended to create more impacts, but to make things better
- Mark said Andy had some comments about the powerpoint, the first being we want to hear the concerns, the second being that we want to know those can be addressed in the project process, we want to make sure we are getting the data in an informed way
- Charlotte said 99W is involved in this, and she doesn't think we have looked at areas beyond the study area enough (the portion of 99W up to I-5)
- She does not think we could go farther south than Norwood, the critical area of I-5 is north of and including Elligson.
- Randy said the modeling is regional and works its way down
- He said we are looking at a different level of detail with the TDM/TSM/EESA
- Randy said if there are concerns, it would be helpful to know up front so the study and modeling can be done appropriately
- Charlotte said it is strange that Tigard is not at the table on this

- Lawrence mentioned we met with Tigard and King City last week, and Scott will provide a summary later in the meeting
- Fred said we will have travel times for areas beyond the project area to evaluate in connection with this area
- **ROA Development**
  - Scott brought the group up to speed on the range of alternatives development
  - He spoke about the meeting with Tigard and King City (Durham was unable to attend, but Russ met with them separately)
  - They found a couple of areas of capacity improvements (99W and Durham Road) and did an analysis
  - Part of the message from Tigard was that a widening of 99W was already in their study, but their vision is to have it be a more multi model
  - Tigard will not support the widening of Durham based on impacts to the residential area, schools, etc.
  - Scott mentioned the SWG meeting last week, and Randy said the comment he heard often was the question of improvements to T-S road
  - Scott said the Tigard representative said they are fine with the level of communication they are currently receiving given the project focus at this time
  - Randy said just because we are not including Durham Road as an alternative does not mean we are not going to be watching it and looking at it
  - Tom asked about the concept elements and which ones have been included in the analysis done by DKS
  - Tom is wanting to have an updated status of the elements that have been dropped off from further study
  - Jef spoke about where we are on the process and how we are starting to look at connectors (both inside and outside the UGB)
  - He said it does not seem appropriate to have a new connection to I-5 north of I-205 based on the existing 5 interchanges and lack of capacity or space
  - He illustrated the potential 5 connection points on I-5 and 99W (2 on I-5, 3 on 99W)
  - He said we would like to take an initial shot of placing bands (1,000 foot corridor) on the map, and then bring them before the EMT
  - We will be able to refine the band quite a bit – we will be able to narrow it down further in the process
  - R. Scott asked about Quantm and if it is able to place a corridor that size
  - Jef said no
  - He drew a sketch to show how the alternatives might appear (shown with a wide band for the corridor, and then a footprint on I-5 and 99W for an interchange)
  - Danielle asked about travel to I-205
  - Jef said it will be modeled to have traffic re-directed to I-205 via alternate routes (i.e. collector distributor roads, etc.)
  - He said that we would like to come up with a “package” for each alternative (what it will impact, etc.)
  - Mark Greenfield spoke about goal exceptions
  - First requirement is you identify the transportation need

## DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 20

Meeting Date: 5/17/07

Issue Date: 7/12/07

- ❑ Next step is to consider the range of alternatives, including those that do not require goal exceptions
  - ❑ It needs to be operationally feasible
  - ❑ The fact that an alternative might be better is not enough to allow for a goal exception if there is an alternative that will meet the need without a goal exception
  - ❑ If you have existing roadways outside the UGB, sometimes improvements can be made to those without a goal exception
  - ❑ You have to treat the interchange as a separate improvement if it falls outside the UGB as part of a connector also outside the UGB
  - ❑ Mark said the rule just changed – you no longer are required to have a goal exception to make an extension to the UGB slightly to accommodate a facility that is primarily inside the UGB
  - ❑ The remainder of the facility must be adequate for your needs
  - ❑ An interchange in the middle of a new connector would be a separate goal exception
  - ❑ Randy asked if it is partially in and outside; Mark said you would need an exception if any part of it is outside
  - ❑ If it is an improvement to an existing road outside the UGB, be it a widening or other improvement, it is not required to have a goal exception
  - ❑ Mike asked if we keep the connector stays completely within the UGB but has three times the impact as a connector outside the UGB, can we get a goal exception
  - ❑ Mark said yes
  - ❑ If an alternative costs double, it is enough to get a goal exception
  - ❑ Mike asked if we could get some notes from Mark – he will put together a memo to send out
    - ❑ See attached memo from Mark (dated May 21, 2007)
- **Public Involvement**
    - ❑ Washington County is still looking at hiring a PR firm, although none have been selected yet
    - ❑ Scott said we are trying to get action on the ROA by the PSC by August 22nd
    - ❑ He said we will need to have briefings this summer with various other councils and committees (planning commissions, etc.) that will need to occur before the August PSC
    - ❑ Mid July to late August to have the information ready
    - ❑ Non governmental might be able to be briefed sooner than that
  - **Other Business**
    - ❑ Next EMT is June 7th