



**DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY**

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 29

Meeting Date: 9/06/07

Issue Date: 9/10/07

*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 #29**

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

**Attendees:**

<b>EMT</b>	Andy Cotugno Michael Bowers Danielle Cowan Fred Eberle Mike McKillip Lawrence Odell Tom Pessemier R. Scott Pemble Mike Stone	Metro City of Wilsonville (alternate) City of Wilsonville (alternate) ODOT City of Tualatin Washington County City of Sherwood Clackamas County City of Wilsonville
<b>PMT</b>	Vaughn Brown Alex Dupey Amy Gibbons Angie Jones Jef Kaiser Russell Knoebel Randy McCourt Scott Richman Mark Turpel	Jeanne Lawson Associates (JLA) DEA ODOT DEA DEA Washington County DKS DEA Metro
<b>Others</b>	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. There were no changes to the agenda

- **PSC**

- Lawrence gave a brief summary of the last PSC meeting held August 22nd, and their unanimous decision to approve three alternatives: 4D, 4E, and 5B

- **Parkway Alternatives**

- Lawrence asked at this stage in the process if we need to determine a definition of "parkway" and suggested that we analyze two types of parkways to address PSC member's concerns as we proceed
- Mike M. said that politically we should address it now as appropriate to inform a corridor level decision
- Scott R. said that the EMT needs to agree to an approach for analyzing parkways to propose to the PSC. His understanding is that Commissioner Peterson has concerns that this process will screen out what she envisions for a parkway and only consider a higher speed expressway for a connector corridor.
- Randy noted there are environmental issues we will have to address, and a lower design-speed parkway could help mitigate some of those impacts. However, the footprint or the profile may not change much based on facility type (expressway vs. parkway) with landscaping, etc. Randy referred to the DKS memo provided to the EMT that describes parkway concepts to analyze. DKS has tested the general travel demand implications, but not environmental impacts of different parkway concepts (4 lanes with one grade-separated interchange vs. 4-6 lanes with 3-4 at-grade intersections).
- Mike S. said he doesn't feel we can eliminate a parkway concept at this stage, and recommended having sketches or photos to illustrate the different concepts
- Fred remarked that we are not prepared or scoped to do design level of detail to determine the type of facility at this corridor planning and selection phase. That will come in the EIS. We could move into the EIS with an expressway and one or more parkway concepts if a connector is selected through the RTP amendment process. The RTP decision should be something more generic to cover the potential for a facility other than an expressway. He suggested we evaluate three alternatives (one expressway and two parkways) for each of the three connector corridors. The EMT should also agree to the analysis sections for expressway and parkways to guide the analysts.
- Jef said that considering parkways across the country, some parkways have an even larger footprint than an expressway. We could evaluate a comparable segment showing a parkway and an expressway to show the basic areas of impact. He suggested that we propose a "typical" section for a parkway and an expressway
- Andy said one of the concepts studied should be a narrower roadway, lower speed, to show the difference in environmental impacts
- Amy suggested if we study one or more parkway options, we be consistent for all three connector corridors (4D, 4E and 5B). The results of this corridor level analysis would have to be re-evaluated when we enter a design-level EIS. If the process goes through and determines a parkway, that may not stand in the EIS

Amy said ODOT project development should be involved in this process to ensure concept feasibility for design/construction

- Lawrence said he is comfortable moving all three through, with the caveat that they will be further analyzed during the EIS process
  - Randy said that there will be three analyzed, an expressway, a “hybrid” – modified parkway, and the parkway 1 (described in memo) type already defined
  - Danielle said she recalled at the last PSC they wanted to talk about “facility” and drop the names parkway and expressway, but rather define it by characteristics
  - R. Scott said as we do the modeling, there will be subtle differences when we look at the capacity and operations. One concern Lynn has is also related to UGB and land use implications.
  - The EMT unanimously agreed to study all three concepts for each connector corridor: 4-lane expressway (55 mph) with one grade separated interchange, 4-lane parkway (45 mph) with one grade separated interchange, and 4-6 lane parkway (45 mph) with 3-4 at grade intersections.
- **Evaluation Criteria**
    - Scott led the discussion of the evaluation criteria
    - Michael B. asked about a bottom line (general/overview) – does it meet a specific criteria to deal with volume/congestion, and what is overall demand volume traveling through the town centers? He is concerned that using the PM peak hour would not provide a complete picture of transportation performance
    - Tom said that 6 Corners is the City of Sherwood’s town center. He is concerned that the analysis will not sufficiently measure impacts to businesses including physical impacts and operational impacts related to access. He also questioned the level at which we could identify potential mitigation.
    - Jef clarified that qualitative assessment is used for some evaluation measures because we will not have enough design of what we are looking at yet to be parcel specific. We only need enough information to distinguish between different corridor alternatives. Mitigation would be discussed in general terms including identification of potential appropriate actions. An example could be addition of frontage roads to offset potential access impacts.
    - Danielle and Michael B. noted that Wilsonville has similar concern with impacts to businesses in north Wilsonville including around the Elligson/Stafford Interchange
    - Mike M. said that he understands when people start asking about impacts that we want to be able to provide as much information as possible, but it can be very dangerous to map speculative design level information before we have done corridor level analysis and we have many uncertainties
    - Mike S. said it is important to keep people informed about what the possible impacts could be
    - Lawrence proposed coming back at the next EMT meeting to finish the evaluation criteria discussion.
    - Scott proposed that the consultants and PMT meet with appropriate planning and engineering staff at the cities over the next two weeks to discuss the alternatives and criteria.

**DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY**

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 29

Meeting Date: 9/06/07

Issue Date: 9/10/07

- **Public Involvement**

- Vaughn handed out the SWG agenda for next week
- He also handed out the latest draft project update newsletter
- Vaughn requested feedback on these items from the EMT prior to the SWG meeting to be held on September 13<sup>th</sup>.

**The Next EMT meeting is scheduled for September 20<sup>th</sup>, from 9:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.**