



DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 26

Meeting Date: 8/02/07

Issue Date: 8/23/07

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 #26

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

Attendees:

| | | |
|---------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|
| EMT | Andy Cotugno | Metro |
| | Michael Bowers | City of Wilsonville (alternate) |
| | Danielle Cowan | City of Wilsonville (alternate) |
| | Fred Eberle | ODOT |
| | Jeff Graham | FHWA |
| | Mike McKillip | City of Tualatin |
| | Lawrence Odell | Washington County |
| | Tom Pessemier | City of Sherwood |
| | R. Scott Pemble | Clackamas County |
| | | |
| PMT | Alex Dupey | DEA |
| | Amy Gibbons | ODOT |
| | Angie Jones | DEA |
| | Leslie Howell | Howell Consulting |
| | Jef Kaiser | DEA |
| | Russell Knoebel | Washington County |
| | Chris Maciejewski | DKS |
| | Scott Richman | DEA |
| | Tim Collins | Metro |
| | Tim Wilson | ODOT |
| | Vaughn Brown | Jeanne Lawson Associates (JLA) |
| | | |
| Others | Tom Aufenthie | |

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

- **Additions and Deletions to Agenda**

- Lawrence said it would be good to update the group on the presentations
- He said he and Scott met with the Wilsonville Government Affairs Committee
- Vaughn gave an updated schedule of upcoming presentations

- **ROA Development**

- Jef distributed an outline of the ROA report
- Danielle asked about why the reference of the project area changed from "study area" to "solution area"
- She feels since it has not been determined that there is a solution yet, there might be concern about that term
- Jef agreed we have not identified a solution, however the possible solutions we have discussed reside in that area
- Jef spoke about the ROA comparison table; it gives a brief description of each alternative, the pros, the cons, and the recommendation
- Lawrence asked about keeping all the options on the table, since the PSC has already rejected some of these alternatives
- Jef said we have tried to not create a report that just gathers everything together, but rather to tell the story of how we got to the point of recommending a range of alternatives
- Lawrence said if there are two or three alternatives that move in to the next phase, it would be good to clarify how the type of facility will affect the range of alternatives
- Mike asked if capacity improvements refer to driveway consolidations, etc.
- Jef said that it does include access management
- Jef said that in order for us to effectively model (parkway for example), we need to set up our assumptions for that type of facility
- He said the technical team was proposing a 4 to 6 lane parkway facility with at grade intersections
- The expressway alternative is most likely the largest impact of footprint due to the size of the interchanges
- Tim said that roundabouts might be a good function, although he is unsure how that would affect freight travel
- Jef said roundabouts would be something that we would be looking at in the next phase
- Chris said it would be difficult to model at this point, but we can fit something within our existing blue patterns
- Scott said that we are trying to define what parkway is
- Jef gave a summary of what Lynn said at yesterday's meeting
- She is against converting rural lands to urban lands
- She is more comfortable with a parkway facility that might have the same kind of access as an expressway, but force travel to slow down (45 mph) with appropriate queuing

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 26

Meeting Date: 8/02/07

Issue Date: 8/23/07

- The key characteristics would be to keep interchanges throughout, have a smaller midpoint interchange while still keeping travel from pushing down on rural lands, design it in a way with curves to keep operators traveling at a lower speed
- Jef said the alternatives we have on the table are only meant to be hypothetical scenarios to narrow down to the alternatives analysis phase
- Tom asked about showing travel times from your home or business to the facility
- Fred said it would be good to model times between certain points (i.e. Sherwood to Portland, etc.)
- Wilsonville said it might be good to pick a center point of the Tualatin industrial area and analyze traffic pulled from that area (the "mix" of freight and through travel)
- Chris said he can check to see if he can model times between key origins and destinations
- Tim said looking at the industrial traffic, you can look at zones by type
- Jef said we are adding more network to the solution area to give more options of travel; he does not feel we are creating a freight route
- Jef said we have two key areas of direction for defining type of facility: what assumptions do we model, also Metro has mentioned tolling
- Lawrence said we are trying to address regional and through, and the regional traffic would be reliant on access points versus a fully limited facility
- Jef listed parkway assumptions we need to define: number of lanes, speed, number of accesses, and type of mid accesses
- Danielle asked about connection to 99W, Chris and Jef said it could be a flyover type of ramp
- Lawrence asked if we should model anything different that 4 lane and 6 lane facilities
- Lynn said 4 lanes; they both assume 45 mph; Andy said at grade, Lynn said separated grade
- He said Lynn feels it can get down to a narrower footprint and ROW than with an expressway
- Jef proposed that we model and look at a 4 lane facility for the parkway
- Lawrence asked if it would not be beneficial to also look at the 6 lane facility, don't worry about the term "parkway", but do the modeling
- Jeff G. said we need to be able to compare the operational differences to know if the facility will be a freeway or a parkway
- R. Scott said there are three models to run; 4 lane expressway and two models of a parkway (4 lane one access point, separated grade; and a 6 lane, 3 or 4 access points, at grade)
- Fred asked if we really want to make every alternative comparable to the freeway
- Jef wrote the following options for EMT vote:
 - 4 lane, 45 mph, 3 at grade intersections - parkway
 - 4 lane, 45 mph, 1 at grade interchange – parkway
 - 6 lane, 45 mph, 3 at grade interchange - parkway
 - 4 lane, 55 mph, 1 interchange - expressway
- Fred said when we go to the EIS this will become more specific

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 26

Meeting Date: 8/02/07

Issue Date: 8/23/07

- Chris said they can model 5B and 4E for each type stated above
- **Other Business**
 - Proposed meeting again next week (August 9th) to continue conversations and get some traffic data