

Stakeholder Working Group (SWG) Meeting #16

6-8:00 p.m. Thursday, June 28, 2007
Sherwood Police Training Center
20495 Borchers Road, Sherwood

MEETING SUMMARY

I-5/99W SWG members present

Loretta Pickerell-1000 Friends of Oregon
Elliot Eki-AAA Oregon
Tom Aufenthie-CPO 5
Dan Ruedger (alternate), Far West CPO
Barbara Shields, Friends of the Refuge
Jack Laverty, Oregon Trucking Association
Adrian Emery, Sherwood CCI
Jim Haynes (alternate), Sherwood Chamber
Dave Volz, Tualatin CCI
Bob Adams, Tualatin Chamber
Ron Johnson, Washington County Oregon Farm Bureau
Jon Reimann, Westside Economic Alliance
Tom Sullivan, Wilsonville CCI

I-5/99W SWG member absent

Michael Feves, Far West CPO
Susan Rychlick, Sherwood Chamber
Nick Storie, MCCI
Ray Phelps, Wilsonville Chamber
Jerry Renfro, Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue

Project staff present

Lawrence Odell, Washington County
Russ Knoebel, Washington County
Scott Richman, DEA
Jef Kaiser, DEA
Vaughn Brown-JLA Inc
Shareen Rawlings-JLA Inc
Chris Maciejewski-DKS Associates

1. Welcome and introductions - Vaughn Brown, JLA

Vaughn welcomed the committee and led introductions. He reviewed the agenda, handouts and notes from previous meetings which were distributed to the group prior to tonight's meeting. He updated the group on project progress and reminded the group that the purpose of the meeting was to:

- Discuss the project process and to provide an update
- Discuss a draft range of alternatives and collect SWG feedback
- Address submitted SWG questions regarding the process and the alternatives

The June 14 SWG meeting #15 summary notes were approved without changes.

2. EMT report - Lawrence Odell, Washington County

Lawrence explained that, at their last meeting, the Executive Management Team (EMT) had reviewed a presentation very similar to the one that would be presented to the group tonight. He added that the EMT has not taken any action on the range of alternatives but in July will be developing its recommendation to the Project Steering Committee (PSC) in time for its August 22nd meeting. The next EMT meeting has been scheduled for July 19th and the group will be moving toward their decision at that time.

Lawrence then went on to update the group on the PSC. He explained that at their last meeting the PSC was presented with the range of alternatives for the first time. They appear

to be receptive to the process, and were very encouraged by a discussion of about the ability to develop “hybrid” alternatives that would allow the group to combine the best elements from several alternatives. Lawrence also noted that the notion of Tigard’s involvement in the process was raised in the last meeting. Prompted by statements that were made by a member of Tigard’s 99W Citizen Advisory Committee, Tigard has been invited to participate in EMT meetings from this point on.

The next PSC meeting date has been set for August 22 at 12:30 pm.

3. SWG questions and feedback- Scott Richman, Jef Kaiser & Chris Maciejewski

Project Context and Project Process-Scott Richman

Scott and Jef began by reviewing a handout entitled “Key Questions and Responses” (available on the project website). This handout provides clarification on a variety of questions including: Project context, project process, and details pertaining to the selection of alternatives that would be reviewed in tonight’s presentation. Scott ran through each question on the handout, reminding the group that the list of questions was not all inclusive and that any additional questions would be welcomed. Scott divided the handout into two sections: The first, which focused on project process and clarification regarding project purpose and context, and the second (led by Jef Kaiser) which answered a variety of questions pertaining to both non-connector and connector alternatives.

Scott emphasized how the I-5 to 99W Connector project fit into the bigger picture of transportation planning in the region. He reminded the group of the transportation issues that the project was designed to address, as well as the purpose and goals that serve as the foundation of the alternative selection process. In reference to how the project will interact with I-5’s transportation needs, Scott reminded the group that any solution arrived at by the selection process must be developed in a way that will not deteriorate conditions on I-5 projected by the 2030 baseline condition.

At this point a committee member representing asked why impacts on I-5 were not utilized as one of the screening criteria for the development of staff alternatives. She suggested that the team go back and assess the impacts the alternatives may have, directly or indirectly, on I-5. She urged staff to make this information available as soon as possible.

Scott stated that the alternatives analysis and selection process is set up to provide just that information. In addition to responding to concerns raised by the SWG and others, FHWA access requirements provide very strict guidelines regarding roadway connections onto I-5. He reminded the group that each alternative will be heavily evaluated in terms of its interface with I-5 and reminded the group that ODOT will be conducting a separate corridor study of I-5 south of Portland as a means of helping the region to address some of the existing problems with the highway system.

Scott also reminded the group that the team is very sensitive to I-5 impacts and alternatives have been developed with components intended to mitigate potential traffic volume increases due to this project. Scott urged to group to remember that the process is still in the stage of selecting and filtering out viable alternatives. The group is not at the point where a decision will be made about which alternative will be selected. Jef reminded the group that all of the proposed alternatives will be discussed in detail in the second half of the staff

presentation. He recommended that questions regarding these alternatives be held until that point.

Scott then reviewed the process, and provided clarification in terms of where decision-making in the determination of I-5 to 99W connector solutions. He referred the committee to the handout, and reminded them that at this point the process was focused on developing a Range of Alternatives (ROA) for a corridor-level solution. These alternatives provide a set of reasonable solutions to be carried forward into the next stage of detailed analysis and evaluation. He stressed the fact that the corridor alternatives that would be presented to the group do not provide specific designs, but would instead outline pathways within which designs could fit. The purpose of this stage is to ensure that the group has a range of types of solutions and viable options to move forward, evaluated and compared against one another in the next stage of the process.

Scott explained to the group that the ROAs include solutions in each of the following categories.

- No Build
- Transportation Demand Management/Transportation System Management (TDM/TSM)
- Enhanced Existing System Alternative (EESA)
- At least one connector corridor within the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB)
- And at least one connector corridor partially or entirely outside of the UGB

He provided a brief overview of each category, reminding the committee of the definitions associated with the corresponding topics.

Scott stressed the importance of understanding each alternative as well as the types of evaluation criteria that will be carried forward for this process. He reminded the committee of their role in developing criteria. At this point Scott discussed the topic of “hybrid” alternatives, which was raised at the most recent PSC meeting. He explained to the group that following the alternative analysis stage, the selection process would not require the group to simply choose one solution. In fact, he stated that a hybrid alternative capable of incorporating elements from a variety of projects would end up being the most effective option.

Scott explained that the connector project process was based upon Metro’s 2030 regional travel demand model for future forecasting. This model has been refined to provide additional detail concerning the specific project area, and includes an improved calibration for non-arterial roadways (e.g.: farm-to-market roads). He also explained that the purpose of following this model was to remain consistent with Metro’s Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), which will ultimately be amended by the alternative selection process.

Group discussion

A committee member asked staff to clarify the significance of including or not including the area that connects with I-5. She was interested in how this area will be impacted and what can be done now to address impacts that may fall outside of the project area. She felt that

the projects inability to address these impacts decrease a holistic approach to transportation planning. Scott explained that staff will be using the region's traffic model to assess travel demand in the area, and travel demand associated with all alternatives. He reminded the group of the point that he had mentioned earlier, that federal highway laws require all regional transportation project to mitigate their impact on existing state and federal highway systems.

A committee member asked staff to clarify a statement in Question 8 on the handout. He asked if the text was meant to read "And a larger area will be evaluated" in reference to the defined project area. Staff confirmed that there was a typo in the text, and that the sentence should read:

"The project area definition focuses solutions on the project purpose and a larger area will be evaluated for impacts as alternatives are analyzed during the alternative analysis phase".

Alternatives-Jef Kaiser

Jef's section of the presentation focused on the connectors. He explained that the structure of his presentation would run through all of the proposed routes and alternatives suggested by staff, giving the committee a chance to review this information again and then come back to ask for clarification.

Jef reminded the group about the purpose of the project, and where they were in terms of the corridor development process. As Scott mentioned in a discussion of project process, SWG is right now is in the middle of developing a range of alternatives (ROA). Jef explained that these alternatives followed five categories. He then went on to review the definition of each of these alternatives as well as providing a visual representation of the proposed routes associated with each option.

No Build

Jef explained that the "no build" option correlates with 2030 traffic projections. Those projections assume that the projects in Metro's Regional Transportation Plan and local transportation system's plans which have already secured funding will be assumed to be built. The exception is planned widening of Tualatin-Sherwood Road which will be included as an alternative component.

Transportation Demand Management/Transportation System Management (TDM/TSM)

This alternative identifies a variety of projects that:

- Reduce the number of single-occupancy-vehicle (SOV) trips on existing roadway network toward meeting the Project Purpose and,
- Improve the efficiency of existing transportation facilities toward meeting the Project Purpose

Example elements of this alternative include:

- Managing Parking Supply in Town Centers
- Expanding Transit Pass Subsidies

- Enhancing Transit Service
- New Park and Ride Facilities
- Improving Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities
- Supporting Transportation Management Associations
- Promoting Carpool/Vanpool/Rideshare Programs
- Encouraging Telecommuting/Flex Time
- Signal timing/coordination
- ITS programs
- Access consolidation
- Incident management

Enhanced Existing System Alternative (EESA)

This alternative includes multimodal projects that focus on significantly enhancing the existing transportation system toward achieving the Project Purpose.

Jef revisited the four step process of developing EESA alternatives. The first included reviewing and evaluating proposed RTP and local TSP improvements. The second involved evaluating projects identified by key stakeholders in the process. The third input was staff identification of additional enhancement projects, and the fourth involved developing capacity improvements to Tualatin-Sherwood Road.

Jef indicated that the TDM/TSM alternative was included in this alternative. He referenced a map of the proposed EESA alternative, highlighting the additional transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian projects that represented greater improvements in the project area. He emphasized that this alternative stressed access management on the Tualatin-Sherwood Road, as well as extensions off the road way that could help to create a more effective circulation network. He explained that this element is different from that which was shown in the last meeting. This was due to a desire to include a Tualatin-Sherwood hybrid idea to strengthen this alternative.

A committee member stated that she felt that frontage roads didn't seem to address I-5 travel from Wilsonville to other locations. Chris Maciejewski responded to the question, stating that this new alternative would suggest more of a lane addition as opposed to a new route. He explained that auxiliary lanes can fit in with the existing structure.

A committee member alternate stated that he felt that frontage roads appear to include a little bit of everything (in terms of design elements). Wouldn't they make the most sense in terms of other options? Jef answered this question by highlighting the fact that in all of his experience, the alternative that is most often selected will be an amalgamation of several alternatives. He explained that the process that this committee is currently participating in provides an opportunity to compare and contrast different alternatives. Alternatives that have been provided in tonight's presentation have been intentionally chosen to provide a pure discussion of improvements to an existing system (following the definition of EESA).

Connector(s) inside UGB and outside UGB

Jef reviewed the seven ideas for connector corridors that had been previously presented. He explained that sensitivity modeling for each of these alternatives as well as performance

characteristics helped to determine which of these alternatives would best meet the project purpose and goals. He explained that according to these measures, the two alternatives that performed the worst were alternative 4D and alternative 5A.

A committee member asked if the desired effect of roadway improvements to the area is to draw traffic off 99W and move it to I-5, the criteria that was chosen to measure each alternative may not be the best filter. She highlighted her concern that if the committee begins to eliminate alternatives because of a desire to draw traffic from 99 to I-5, there may be some drastic implications on the project area.

Chris replied to her comment by explaining that staff recommendations followed a variety of measurements, not simply the number of cars that would be moved from 99W to I-5. He stated that while a desire to serve increased demand for regional and through travel in the project area drove the majority of planning decisions, what staff was looking at in their screening process was the impact on Tualatin neighborhoods versus the real benefit in terms of traffic flow and circulation within the region.

A committee member Tom Sullivan stated that he was interested in the traffic flow that will be through Sherwood in relationship to the proposed alternatives. He was interested in how traffic counts were determined “good” or “bad”. A committee member was similarly interested in how this alternative will impact I-5.

Jef responded that the traffic numbers also indicate what effect alternatives have on 99W and I-5 which helps in further defining the alternatives to address those issues. Chris explained that all of the alternatives presented were relatively the same in terms of their impact on I-5. He went on to clarify that staff would be, and has been working with ODOT on I-5 traffic operations concepts like ramps, collectors and other features.

A committee member responded to Chris’s comment by stating that the project will only change the amount of time in term of travel, not necessarily the number of people on I-5. He went on to state that each alternative may not impact the bottom line in terms of vehicles on I-5.

Chris confirmed this statement. He explained that while travel time will be different for each alternative, so will the types of people that will be accessing the connector. The number doesn’t change, in terms of the number of vehicles that will enter I-5, but what type of traffic and which origination-destination trips will use the corridor. Chris went on to emphasize his earlier point that the corridor alternatives impact I-5 relatively identically.

A committee member asked staff if they were going to chart the EESA results on the same chart that presented a performance of alternatives 4 and 5. He stated that he would be interested in putting comparable alternatives together on a chart in order to get a better sense of their performance. Chris replied to his comment by clarifying the differences between the EESA alternatives and the corridor alternatives. He explained that EESA proposes improvements to a dozen different roadways and is more focused upon the numbers on Tualatin-Sherwood Road. Because of this, he stated that it would be difficult to compare the “performance” of this alternative against the measurements that were chosen to evaluate the corridor options. He reminded the group that when the process moved forward to a point where staff would begin to compare alternatives, each alternative will be looked at in great detail.

Lawrence reminded the group of the EESA hybrid option, which would help to squeeze as much efficiency out of these routes as possible. A committee member asked staff to clarify the origin and purpose of the numbers that were used to highlight the impacts and evaluations of the recommended alternatives.

Chris explained that the numbers highlighted in staff's preliminary assessment of performance were based upon the area's 2030 projections. They represented the Average Daily Traffic (ADT) counts associated with the 2030 forecast. He explained that this figured described the number of cars you would see on the connector corridor. This is an absolute number, as opposed to the second set of numbers which shows the difference between having a corridor in place and not having a corridor in place. He explained that these numbers represented a comparative assessment of each alternative.

A committee member questioned the numbers on the chart in terms of the effectiveness of their population projections. He stated a concern that according to a recent study, Sherwood has already passed their previous population projection mark. He went to state that he felt the numbers of the chart seemed to be a bit low in comparison to the rate of growth that the area was witnessing. Staff noted the committee member's concern.

Staff went on to explain that the 2030 model is based upon a metro assessment of regional growth patterns. They explained that in reference to these growth patterns, there is only so much that can fit within the existing boundaries of the UGB. Taking all these things into account, Jef reminded the group that in terms of development these numbers reflect what type of infrastructure is and will be available to accommodate regional growth.

At this point a committee member expressed a desire to see the costs and results of the EESA alternative before moving forward with the selection process. A second committee member suggests that if these numbers cannot be provided, that perhaps the maps from EESA could be filled in to explain how these improvements were decided upon and how they were valued.

Jef reminded the committee that the ROA will include EESA. A committee member stated a concern that he felt the process had not adequately determined the potential impacts of the project on natural resources. He felt that they were moving forward without an understanding of how each alternative would impact these resources. Jef reminded the group that there was a substantial amount of baseline environmental work early in the process, and clarified that all environmental/natural resource constrains were taken into consideration when the connector routes were evaluated in detail.

A committee member told the group that where and how the road would be built will ultimately promote growth in the area. She stated a desire to see which alternative is a better option in terms of land use planning, and an ability to match land use with transportation planning. She urged staff to consider land use now instead of later in the process where planning would be reactionary. Jef explained that that is precisely the reason why the project was going through the alternative development process. He stated that the process provided an opportunity to step back and look at a regional big picture. Jef reminded the group of the scope of the project and explained that regional land-use and transportation planning is directed by Metro's Regional Transportation Plan. Because of this, he stated, that the process was required to look at all of the potential impacts to the

jurisdictions that fall within the project area. He went on to explain that when new transportation facilities are developed there must be agreements that all jurisdictions will agree not to change their land use laws in a way that will compromise the purpose, and intent of the roadways.

At this point Jef went on to describe staff's preliminary recommendations in reference ONLY to the corridor alternatives. They are as follows:

- Drop alternative 4D and 5A because of their relatively low performance in terms of serving regional and through travel.
- Drop 4A, B, C and 5A because all of these options would result in huge property impacts and split the community of Tualatin. Jef explained that tunnels were initially pursued as an option to minimize the Tualatin impacts, but after a preliminary cost assessment it was determined that the construction of a tunnel would be 5 times more expensive than the surface corridor. Therefore, staff recommended that this option be dropped due to the costs associated with this project.

Jef emphasized that staff had been able to directly connect to I-205 with a more southern connection that will not have significant impacts on the Tualatin center.

Group discussion – initial responses and questions regarding connector alternatives

A committee member asked for clarification of the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR). Jef provided a quick summary stating that the rule essentially requires all municipalities and transportation projects to coordinate local land use decisions with transportation decisions in order to secure that fact that one element of planning will not outweigh the other.

The committee member went on to describe some of his concerns with statements that were made in the previous PSC meeting by Metro representative Carl Hosticka at the last PSC meeting. His concerns were essentially that the UGB was being viewed as an arbitrary guideline for this project. Staff clarified the importance of the UGB to this project and reminded the group of the legal guidelines and restrictions that determine the process of altering a jurisdiction's UGB. Chris explained that there are typically UGB expansions planned when you are doing forecasts. However, he reminded the group that while expansions to the UGB may be assumed in terms of an ability to meet increased population demand, these shifts are only proposed shifts. He stated that when you look out to the year 2030 that there may be some assumed expansions south of Sherwood, but these expansions would not accompany the development of a corridor between 99W and I-5.

A committee member asked why staff would consider options outside the UGB if state law and state guidelines require the process to exhaust all alternatives within the boundary first. Staff responded to this question by highlighting the selection process and reminding the group that the alternative development process is only the first stage and has been designed to include a range of alternatives addressing multiple options. At the selection stage of the project process, alternatives will be filtered based upon the criteria that the committee member had mentioned.

The committee member went on to recommend that the group adopt a process shift that looks at EESA first, exhausting this option before looking at alternatives within the UGB. He stated that any corridor development outside of the UGB should not be considered until

everything else has been analyzed. This committee member also expressed his concern with the statements that representative Hosticka made in the PSC meeting the day before.

Jef responded to this question by explaining that the process that staff has been using to create and filter alternatives has been approved in terms of its ability to legally satisfy Senate Bill 100 and statewide planning goals. He explained that staff is working to provide all of the alternatives and gather all of the information so that the group can begin to look through alternatives and screen out the best matches.

At this point Lawrence expressed an interest to respond to the comments made by representative Hosticka in the previous PSC meeting. He stated that what the comments referred to was not the possibility of shifting the entire UGB to accommodate the construction of a corridor connector, but instead addressing small shifts to accommodate areas where roadways may broach the UGB in terms of buffers, etc. Lawrence went on to explain that in these types of situations there may be a legal possibility of extending or creating changes that can help to accommodate things like the footprint on an interchange, a highway buffer, etc. Lawrence also highlighted the need to receive all of the information and conceptual approaches proposed by staff in order to effectively sort through viable solutions.

A committee member expressed his concern with the lack of communication within Metro. He stated that he felt that Metro's planning process is often blinded by constraints, and argued that their mandates creates a lack of coordination in terms of residential planning.

Another expressed a desire to hear how rural reserves and urban reserves (as recently amended by state law) could impact the viability of the proposed alternatives. Another committee member raised a similar concern regarding the recent funding cut to Oregon's Big Look project--specifically in terms of where development will occur and how development will be allowed to occur.

Staff noted these concerns, and offered to gather more information regarding how recent legislative decisions could potentially impact the proposed alternatives.

At this point, a committee member asked if the EESA alternative placed a bridge over the Tualatin. Staff confirmed this by highlighting the proposed new bridge on the Herman Road extension in EESA.

Another committee member asked for clarification regarding Metro's ability to amend UGB's under the existing state statute in order to accommodate transportation projects. Jef reminded the group of the explanations provided in a previous discussion of UGB shifts, and explained that due to the slaloming line of the UGB along I-5 any alternative that is selected will most likely require some sort of minor UGB adjustment.

A committee member recommended that 4D remain on the list of alternatives. His reasoning for this was that it appears that the numbers associated with the assessment of this option may prove to be subjective. He stated that he felt that more options were better at this point, and that the group should retain as many as possible in the first stage of assessment. This committee member asked staff if all people on the east side of I-5 had been identified as in the potential impact area of the project. He stated that he would like to see that all residents within this area are identified and involved in all project notifications.

Vaughn replied to this comment by reviewing the coverage area which included an extensive area east of I-5 for the initial round of project communication. After the initial round, distribution was only to those requesting to be maintained on the mail list. For the ROA round of outreach however, distribution will be expanded to the whole area including the additional identification of areas of impact being identified as the alternatives are sketched out. He noted that it was important to make sure that the alternatives are viable solutions before extending the project outreach program.

A committee member expressed a concern that it would be very difficult for the group to make any decisions without knowing an estimate of the projected costs, performance, and constraints of each alternative. This committee member stated that they were not in favor of dropping any alternatives from this list until the process could move forward to carefully assess each option. Another group member expressed a concern that the only measurement criteria that seemed to have been utilized was traffic flow and traffic count.

Jef reminded the group that staff had looked at performance standards in terms of project purpose and environmental constraints. The alternatives that were recommended to be dropped were rejected based upon a big picture glimpse of their ability to protect environmental resources. Alternatives that created the least impacts, while maintaining reasonable costs were suggested to be moved forward.

A committee member asked if staff would clarify the group process in reference to how the decisions of PSC related to SWG and EMT. Scott explained that all of the groups at this point are at the same stage in terms of what they have been shown and where they are in the alternative development process. If the recommendations that staff has made to the EMT make sense, than these alternatives may be pushed forward in to the analysis stage. He reminded the group that assessment is expensive, and out of respect for tax payer's dollars, there is a desire to boil down the best and most viable alternatives before the process proceeds to the assessment stage. He emphasized that the EMT is very interested in hearing SWG's input before finalizing their recommendation.

A committee member asked Jef if there was anybody that sits on both the EMT and PSC. Jef clarified that each group was comprised of different individuals. EMT members occasionally serve as alternates on the PSC.

There was a question about the southern point on one of the proposed connectors. A committee member wondered if given the current levels of volume on the Stafford (North Wilsonville) interchange, if the distance proposed for this connector will be too short to effectively merge traffic in and out. Staff confirmed his statement, adding that ODOT will be looking at this section in their assessment.

Another committee member expressed their concern in terms of the proposed ramps and their impact on I-5. Staff noted that all ramps will most likely be braided as opposed to following the design of two separate routes.

A committee member recommended that alternative 4D and 5A be dropped in conjunction with staff recommendations. He stated that he was concerned with the potential impacts to residential areas, specifically in terms of areas outside of the UGB boundaries.

A committee member was interested in hearing why there is such a dramatic difference between the traffic counts/measurements of alternatives 4D and 4E. She highlighted that her concern regarding this question focused on the potential impact on the refuge area. Chris replied to her comment by explaining that the numbers associated with the performance measurements of these two alternatives were based upon a preliminary market assessment which determines the flow of traffic. He reminded the group that a detailed discussion of market assessment will take place during the alternative assessment stage.

Another comment was raised by a committee member emphasizing the need to remain within the scope of the project and to remember the purpose and needs associated with the development of alternatives. This committee member stated that he felt that the emphasis up until this point is on assisting through trips between 99W and I-5. He urged the group to remember the priorities and purpose of the project.

4. Public comment

Andy Pel

Comment: He has been listening to the process and stated that he felt encouraged for the first time by the EESA alternative specifically in terms of the creativity that is going into this process. He stated that it looks as though the EESA suggests a viable solution within the UGB. He suggested leaving 4D as an alternative. He does engineering modeling and knows how easy it is to get different numbers by tweaking different variables. Assuming that these numbers are strong is not necessarily true---a plus number may be a good thing in terms of bringing more traffic through a very busy area. He stated that maybe the solution should be in terms of moving more traffic through the corridor. This is important.

He is not in favor of alternative 5B because most of it is outside of the UGB. It seems as though it would not be logical to connect to the interchange there. He ended by recommending that we should look, legally, at the EESA approach in terms of the potential to incorporate small solutions.

Jan Hammond:

He is a proponent of 4D. He suggested we need to expand our vision in terms of where we will hook into Roy Rogers. There are some geographical constraints to the south, and if you take it north you still have access to the north side of the refuge. We need to find out how we can get flow from the Hillsboro location and move it further west.

Committee questions

A committee member asked staff if it would be possible to overlay the EESA option over other options in order to begin to compare and contrast some of the alternatives. This member was also interested in learning about what types of cost projections will be provided in order to help the group make a decision. Staff clarified by explaining that because of the way the process has been designed, a more detailed cost assessment will not be provided until the selection process. Lawrence stated that the EMT is interested in

pursuing a “common sense” approach in terms of which options will be more expensive. He suggested that SWG could follow a similar approach.

5. Close

Vaughn reminded the group that if any of the organizations they represented were interested in receiving a presentation of the alternatives that those could be made available. He encouraged any group members that were interested in receiving greater clarification around specific questions to stay and connect with staff.

The next meeting will be held from 6-8 p.m. on August 9th, 2007. The next PSC meeting is scheduled for 1:30-4:30 pm on July 11th at the Sherwood Policy Training Center.