



**DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY**

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 24

Meeting Date: 6/21/07

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 #24**

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

**Attendees:**

**EMT**

Rob Dixon	City of Sherwood
Fred Eberle	ODOT
Jeff Graham	FHWA
Mike McKillip	City of Tualatin
Lawrence Odell	Washington County
Mike Stone	City of Wilsonville
Mark Turpel	Metro

**PMT**

Amy Gibbons	ODOT
Andy Cotugno	Metro
Angie Jones	DEA
Chris Majeweski	DKS
Jef Kaiser	DEA
Leslie Howell	Howell Consulting
R. Scott Pemble	Clackamas County
Russell Knoebel	Washington County
Scott Richman	DEA
Tim Wilson	ODOT
Vaughn Brown	Jeanne Lawson Associates (JLA)

**Others**

Tom Aufenthie  
Mike Feves

**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/Introductions**

- Lawrence welcomed the group and asked if there were any changes to the agenda

- **Review upcoming work and ROA timeline**

- Scott updated the EMT on where we are in the process, what our next step after the ROA is approved
- He encouraged communication between EMT members and their PSC representatives

- **Public Involvement update: June 14th SWG summary and community briefings update**

- Vaughn gave an update of the briefings that have recently taken place
- Tigard City Council was rescheduled to next week
- Vaughn said the public outreach materials are being updated and the FAQs page
- Scott said once we have the ROA defined, we will be going out for another round of community forums (possibly later this year)
- Vaughn said the SWG has received the information on the ROA, we are having another meeting with them next week to clarify their questions and concerns regarding the information
- Lawrence said he felt they expect a greater level of detail, and they continue to raise the issue of what they believe they are expected to do now is select a corridor
- Vaughn said some visual aids might be helpful
- Jeff G. asked if there were any questions about Quantm
- Jef K. said we are not talking about Quantm specifically
- Jef said when we get into the refinement process, Quantm will play a strong role

- **ROA Development: Presentation and Discussion of T-S Road Hybrid Concept, and Refinements to Connector Corridors**

- Jef went through the presentation and the flow chart of what the process will be
- Jeff G. asked about the purpose of the public hearing
- Jef K. said it is very important that the public is aware of how their comments are heard, a public forum is a good place for them to voice themselves
- Jef said the public do not even have to show up at the formal event to give feedback
- Andy said that he feels it is very important that the communication to the PSC is about the process as well as the project progress
- Fred suggested having a public comment period
- Lawrence asked if we should have a court reporter take down comments during the forums
- Andy said he feels it would be a good idea to document what is said and summarize it in a form that is accessible to the various committees
- Jef said the PSC normally takes a record
- Jef said that it is important to go through these processes; when we enter the NEPA process, it will be more closely scrutinized

## DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 24

Meeting Date: 6/21/07

Issue Date: 7/12/07

- Lawrence asked if it might be good to have a public hearing before the PSC makes a decision to be able to bring comments we heard to the PSC to take into consideration with their decision
- Jef said that Jeff G.'s attorneys will need to have a public hearing shown on record, and he feels we should only have one.
- Lawrence said the SWG meeting could serve as the "official" public meeting for the NEPA process
- Jef said we are finished with our work on the no-build alternative
- Jef spoke about the T-S road hybrid (shown on the EESA map)
- We expanded the hybrid to include as a part of EESA, not to have as a connector alternative of its own
- Rob asked if T-S road needs to be punched up even more (6-7 lanes)
- Chris said with Sagert, Avery and other roads included we are in the range of capacity needed
- Jef summarized the characteristics of the hybrid
- Mike Stone mentioned bike lanes
- Jef said that is a design choice to be made and it will not matter for modeling
- Mike S. said it should be shown for the public hearing purposes; also mentioned pedestrian crossings
- Jef said right now we are looking at the big picture and not getting into that level of detail just yet
- Jef showed a slide of the level of detail for the alternatives analysis phase (blue band, no interchanges, etc.)
- We are working on refining this – ODOT is looking at layouts for midpoint interchanges, I-205, 99W, and I-5.
- Chris explained the parkway would have more lanes to meet the same capacity as a higher speed expressway (6 lanes on parkway, 4 lanes on expressway; 45 mph on parkway, 55 mph on expressway)
- Russ asked if it would be a FHWA project if we selected a parkway
- Jeff G. responded yes
- Scott recommended clarification of partially versus fully limited access in regards to parkway and expressway slide
- Andy asked if roundabouts would be possible on the parkway
- Chris said it would be a 3-lane which would be difficult (a rotary versus a round about)
- Lawrence asked if we are going to be able to drop off some of the alternatives at the next EMT meeting, or if anyone requires more information
- Lawrence asked if we should target July 19<sup>th</sup> for a recommendation, R. Scott said he felt we should target that date
- Mark T. said he wonders if we need some more level of detail
- Lawrence said some of the detail will not be available until we are further down the road
- Jef said we want to discourage refinement within the alternatives analysis
- Adjustments on number of lanes and intersection approaches can be looked at
- Fred asked if we are adopting a blue band, and then within that blue band will be more detail (i.e. intersections, etc.) in the next phase

## DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 24

Meeting Date: 6/21/07

Issue Date: 7/12/07

- Jef said if we want to give the parkway the greatest benefit of the doubt, we model it with conventional intersections, and then later it can be modified to look at roundabouts
- Jef said he feels it would be helpful to know if there is support from the EMT to go with the staff recommendations
- General consensus was positive to go with recommendations
- Andy wants to know who is behind the interest in the direct connection to I-205
- Mike Stone said he felt the main objective behind it was to keep I-205 traffic off of I-5
- Andy asked if we have sufficient information to respond to arguments to keep or drop I-205 direct connection
- Lawrence asked if we could have an impacts analysis of a north versus a southern corridor for the record
- Jef said he believes we could; it would be a rough number
- Mike Stone said he has gotten some traffic data numbers from Randy to give to Charlotte about where traffic is traveling to and from I-205
- Mike S. asked about land use impacts of the frontage road connection to I-205 versus a direct connection and new interchange at I-205 and Avery – would it be safe to assume the impact is less on the frontage road connections?
- He said Charlotte is concerned about the fir trees along I-5 (within ODOT's ROW)
- **June 27th PSC Meeting: Review Agenda and discuss EMT/PSC Briefings**
  - Scott offered to make a folder of the last few presentations available on the ftp site for the EMT members to brief their PSC member before the meeting
  - Andy said next week's meeting should be about getting the information, the next meeting would be to comment on the information, and then getting action in the August meeting
  - R. Scott said it would be good to pare down the agenda to have the information presented with a Q&A afterward
  - Mike M. recommended moving the agenda item to schedule the August meeting up in the order
- **Other business**
  - Mike M. said the Wildlife Refuge are on the Tualatin Council agenda on Monday night; he is not sure what the topic is
  - Jef said we are having a project briefing with the Friends of the Refuge board on July 12th
  - Next EMT meeting, July 19th – 9:30am-11:30am