



DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 28

Meeting Date: 8/16/07

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 #28

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

Attendees:

EMT	Michael Bowers	City of Wilsonville (alternate)
	Danielle Cowan	City of Wilsonville (alternate)
	Andy Cotugno	Metro
	Fred Eberle	ODOT
	Jeff Graham	FHWA
	Mike McKillip	City of Tualatin
	Lawrence Odell	Washington County
	Tom Pessemier	City of Sherwood
	Mike Stone	City of Wilsonville
PMT	Amy Gibbons	ODOT
	Angie Jones	DEA
	Alex Dupey	DEA
	R. Scott Pemble	Clackamas County
	Randy McCourt	DKS
	Russell Knoebel	Washington County
	Tim Wilson	ODOT
	Vaughn Brown	Jeanne Lawson Associates (JLA)
Others	Gus Duenas	City of Tigard

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

- **August 22nd PSC Meeting**

- Russ went over the contents of the PSC briefing packet
 - Draft PSC agenda
 - SWG recommendation
 - Memo from EMT to PSC regarding ROA
 - ROA report
 - Connection concepts (photos and schematic)

- **I-5 and 99W connection concepts**

- Randy explained the different ramps and CDs shown
- Randy said this is just a starting point to give a conceptual idea of the types of connections
- Andy asked about the underpasses in regards to local access
- Randy said Cipole would be a local road that would bend and connect into 124th
- Danielle asked if a direct connection to Roy Rogers was looked at
- Randy said that will be looked at in the evaluation; this is a start, more refinements are possible
- Vaughn gave a brief summary of the SWG meeting and recommendation to move forward 4D, 4E, and 5B
- There was some discussion about the groundwater in Sherwood with option 5B
- There are multiple wells in the area, concern about draining them
- Andy asked if the project cuts off the water, what would we do
- Russ said there was talk about buying the wells, but that would make the property worthless, so the entire property may be bought
- Lawrence said the next phase would bear some fruit on the necessity of this
- Fred said there would need to be some clear cause and effect (are we the party responsible for drying the well? If a neighbor drills deeper, possible he would be taking the water).
- Andy said we would need a description of how we would mitigate this concern
- Lawrence mentioned that the SWG felt the County was pushing Day Road as a connector route, he tried to make a point to be clear that is not the case
- Washington County is not trying to make Day Road a connector route
- Andy said he did not see a clear description of why the direct connections to I-205 have been dropped (he would like to see numbers)
- Randy said that there is nothing to show that a direct connection would perform better than the other options
- Lawrence requested a more detailed discussion for the PSC meeting to describe the impacts in more detail (cost, impact to residences, performance level, etc.)

• **Evaluation Criteria**

- Alex explained how we developed the evaluation criteria based on the Goals and Objectives
- Randy asked for EMT feedback on these – go through each one and ask for comments
- Mike B. asked about land use with the different alternatives
- Randy said that we are not changing the land use for these alternatives
- Russ said it would save time to have the same measurement and multiple goals together
- Lawrence said once you identify the criteria, how do you change the criteria when a specific issue comes up
- Randy said without amending the whole process is to work with this framework
- Tom asked about how is the impact of the facility going to be shown to the public?
- Randy said the travel time indicator will give a pretty good idea of “what does it do for me?”
- Mike B. said we need to measure regional and through traffic performance
- Randy said you will be seeing data for chunks of roadway for each alternative
- Mike S. asked what data this will be based on
- Randy said it will be based on statewide data
- Jeff asked about expanding our area down to Boone Bridge, and should we look at I-205 (between I-5 and Stafford)
- Randy agreed and added the information to study under Objective 1D
- Lawrence asked if there would be any benefit in looking at the local freight throughput (how is it impacted?)
- Randy said that we could take the volumes and do a volume difference against the No Build to see the differences
- Lawrence asked if there is a requirement for local jurisdictions to amend their land use plans for a connector
- Randy said that if it is not in the TSP, there would need to be a land use action taken
- Andy said that is part of this process, is to amend land use plans accordingly for the alternatives
- Objective 1F is looking for where the area does not have coverage
- EMT decided to bring the criteria (with today’s comments incorporated) to the next meeting
- Randy summarized what he heard today, he will incorporate them and re-send the evaluation criteria out for further comment; also will re-open discussion at the September 6th meeting
- Lawrence would like to discuss funding in our next meeting; discuss phasing, etc.
- Mike M. said that the SWG has voiced the concern we are after federal funds, he is sensitive to the issue when we open it
- Lawrence said he feels the discussion needs to occur on a local, regional, and state level also
- ***change maps on the ROA memo 4D and 4E are reversed; change **Carman Drive** from **Carmen*****

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 28

Meeting Date: 8/16/07

Issue Date: 8/23/07

- **Other Business**

- Next EMT meeting, September 6th, 9:30 a.m. -11:30 a.m.