



**DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY**

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 27

Meeting Date: 7/19/07

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 #27**

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

**Attendees:**

|              |                                |                                 |
|--------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <b>EMT</b>   | Danielle Cowan                 | City of Wilsonville (alternate) |
|              | Jeff Graham                    | FHWA                            |
|              | Mike McKillip                  | City of Tualatin                |
|              | Lawrence Odell                 | Washington County               |
|              | Tom Pessimier                  | City of Sherwood                |
|              | Mark Turpel                    | Metro                           |
| <b>PMT</b>   | Amy Gibbons                    | ODOT                            |
|              | Andy Cotugno                   | Metro                           |
|              | Angie Jones                    | DEA                             |
|              | Alex Dupey                     | DEA                             |
|              | Jef Kaiser                     | DEA                             |
|              | Leslie Howell                  | Howell Consulting               |
|              | R. Scott Pemble                | Clackamas County                |
|              | Randy McCourt                  | DKS                             |
|              | Russell Knoebel                | Washington County               |
|              | Scott Richman                  | DEA                             |
| Tim Wilson   | ODOT                           |                                 |
| Vaughn Brown | Jeanne Lawson Associates (JLA) |                                 |

**Others**

**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

- **ROA Development**

- Scott said DKS did some comparative modeling for the parkway alternatives we discussed last week
- Randy discussed what a parkway is from an aesthetic standpoint and a performance standpoint
- DKS made some comparisons of parkways and expressways (Randy gave out a table)
- Randy said that the 5B alternatives offered more access; more percentage of local trips
- Randy said if you open up the access, local trips increase
- Randy said that it is important to determine the amount of capacity, since it will be used in the 2030 projections
- Randy said when we start moving blocks of hundreds of cars, we need to look at how we are changing the LOS and travel times, they can play heavily in reducing travel times
- 2,000 vehicles per hour, per lane is the figure DKS used to model expressway
- Lawrence asked if the modeling distinguished between freight and cars
- Randy said no, this is an overview of all
- The next step would be to determine those differences in types of transit
- Danielle asked about Yamhill County traffic
- Randy said that was not modeled; we can look at that gateway pattern and get some numbers
- Jeff asked about the volume reductions on 99W; they do not appear to show variance based on type of facility
- Tom said he is concerned about Oregon Street getting over used to access the new facility
- Mike asked if the 4E alternative brings more traffic to Yamhill County; better access for a western bypass. He feels the impact to I-205, I-5 is the same, it just depends on where the traffic is going to be coming from
- Randy said it is important for this group to think about the purpose and need, and we need to observe the travel patterns to know who we are serving and determine what is okay
- Lawrence asked if the model has the ability to build other constraints into it (land use issues, etc.)
- Randy said that from a model standpoint, we have a 2030 land use already determined.
- Lawrence asked about a potential requirement to regulate or force control
- Scott said it would be a state requirement to have an IAMP, management mechanisms would be needed
- Randy said eventually we will need to address the sprawl in Yamhill County, it will get politically sensitive considering they are out of Metro's jurisdiction
- Mike asked about the western bypass argument; if we do a connector north of Sherwood, that will be called into question

## DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 27

Meeting Date: 7/19/07

Issue Date: 8/23/07

- R. Scott said that the problem is the transportation model has its limitations in respects to land use. Lynn's concerns are as much about function as it is about impacts to land use.
- Danielle asked if the model will show if the traffic will be coming from the new industrial area, and if we can distinguish this in the model
- She also asked if we can have discreet segments determined without determining the whole facility at this point
- Randy said this will be done in segments
- Lawrence asked about the recommendation to the PSC, he took a vote of the EMT of their recommendation
- Mike said he would go with the two remaining alternatives – 4E and 5B; and if people think that the PSC has already decided on 4D, lets not re-open that discussion
- Tom said that he feels the PSC is looking for options based on the numbers, and he has not had an opportunity to look at the numbers
- Jeff recommended moving forward the two – 4E and 5B, he has no strong feelings one way or the other on 4D, he is not opposed to it necessarily
- Andy asked if we go into a DEIS on any of these, the key conclusion we will need to have from FHWA would be that any alternative directly connected to I-205 would not work
- Jeff agreed based on what he has seen
- Andy said that 4D is not as black and white, it is not so clearly an unreasonable alternative
- Lawrence asked if the elected officials would spend public funds for an alternative that is 20 percent less effective (4D)
- Jeff said we need to be considering reasonable alternatives, and we need to consider that we have alternatives that perform better
- Danielle said we cannot ignore 4D based on our preliminary numbers of how it will perform. She feels if we take it off, it will suffer the consequences of not being further studied. She is okay with 4E and 5B. She agrees with Lynn's request of asking for more numbers about the cost of the tunnel. She feels we need to study at least the three, Michael Bowers would like all seven
- Andy said that 4E serves less local traffic (10% less overall traffic). He feels that 4D adds another option, it may appear we are stacking the deck if we only present two alternatives when one is clearly of more impact.
- R. Scott Pemble said that the statements were generalized against 4D. He leans more for the three options.
- Tim said that ODOT supports the two alternatives, and would consider 4D with a traffic analysis. Take it to the next level, but possibly not carry it all the way through
- Mike asked if we can get through this process without doing the entire analysis
- Lawrence said we would move them all through analysis
- Jef said we have been working with ODOT to determine what interchanges might look like north of Sherwood; and it is a tight fit. He feels we may want to have another possibility (keep 4D for further analysis)
- EMT voted to move 4D, 4E, and 5B forward to the PSC for recommendation; passed unanimously

- Lawrence recommended having a small packet of our recommendations
- Mike asked about what is next after the alternatives analysis – public hearings? How long before this would take place?
- Scott said that he expects the analysis would take several months, and then we will be holding public briefings– determined to be spring 2008
- **Public Involvement update**
  - Vaughn passed out a new schedule of community briefings
  - We are providing the latest information about the ROA to these groups
  - Scott said it is good to note we are also including city councils on this list of briefings
  - Mike said he and Lou are doing an update on August 13<sup>th</sup>
  - Vaughn showed a map with areas of mailings that have recently gone out (8,000 addresses approx.)
  - Vaughn said we are planning a newsletter to come out in early September pending the PSC decision on August 22<sup>nd</sup> (about 19,000 mailing out)
  - SWG meeting tonight
- **ROA Evaluation Criteria**
  - Scott said that the action by the PSC on the 22nd will be key to kicking off the alternatives analysis
  - Jef passed out the draft evaluation criteria sheet, Scott requested EMT feedback
  - Not enough time to go through this today, Scott proposed it as a future agenda item to discuss
  - Andy asked if this will be on the PSC agenda
  - Scott said we can put it on there as a “next steps” item
  - They meet again in September, we can spend more time discussing it with the PSC in detail then
  - Danielle asked for more clarity of the collector/distributor discussion at the next PSC meeting (have illustrations?) – ROW could be significantly impacted, etc.
  - Scott agreed that we will need to discuss that and braided ramps, etc.
  - Randy will have some additional information about parkways for the PSC meeting, he will email the EMT materials as they are produced
  - R. Scott asked if at some point we will be asking the PSC to define the type of facility
  - Randy said that might occur in September
  - Jef said that speed, number of lanes, and access management would be needed to be determined from the PSC
  - Mike asked about IAMPs for at grade intersections
  - Jef said that would still apply at each end of the parkway, IAMPs only apply to state highways
- **Other Business**
  - Next EMT meeting, August 16<sup>th</sup>, 9:30 a.m. -11:30 a.m.