



## DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 9

Meeting Date: 04/27/06

Issue Date: 05/02/06

*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 #9

**Project:** I-5 to 99W Connector Project  
**Purpose:** Executive Management Team Meeting  
**Location:** Metro, Room 501

#### Attendees:

<b>EMT</b>	Kathy Busse Fred Eberle Jeff Graham Mike McKillip R. Scott Pemble Michael Stone Rob Dixon	Washington County ODOT FHWA City of Tualatin Clackamas County City of Wilsonville
<b>PMT</b>	Barry Hennelly Michael Ray Mark Turpel Vaughn Brown Scott Richman Jef Kaiser	Washington County ODOT Metro JLA DEA DEA

**Distribution:** EMT, PMT, File

---

The meeting began at 9:30 AM. Agendas and other materials were provided prior to the meeting. The agenda items are represented in "bold" headings.

- **Welcome**
  - Barry welcomed the group, reviewed the agenda, and led the overall EMT meeting. CETAS debrief from April 20<sup>th</sup> meeting. PSC – May 8<sup>th</sup> meeting and June 12<sup>th</sup> – want to hold that date.
- **4/20 CETAS meeting follow-up**
  - Generally well received, some feedback
  - Michael re-iterated process, Purpose and Need, Goals and Objectives, and Environmental context.
  - There was a question regarding Purpose and Need: why the project area boundary defined as is.

## DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 9

Meeting Date: 04/27/06

Issue Date: 05/02/06

- Michael is writing a memo to file regarding how boundary was established. His memo leaves open potential for change. (He will send to people as requested).
  - Comment that purpose and need needed to be tightened by establishing defined area milepost to milepost typically.
  - Michelle Grant wanted Purpose and Need tightened.
  - John Marshall thought Purpose and Need was okay.
  - Susan Haupt requested CETAS feedback within thirty days.
  - Fred to have a "fact sheet" regarding background, basis of project area would be beneficial. Interim check-in(s) with CETAS recommended.
  - John Marshall had questioned need for CETAS participation in pre-NEPA process. CETAS needs to be clear that this is the equivalent opportunity as they would have in LEIS.
  - Barry said our message to CETAS is that we would not want to move forward with steps CETAS opposes.
  - Mark said it was suggested by CETAS that the Refuge be invited to future CETAS meetings. If the Refuge is represented, we would invite Ralph Webber.
  - Rob said there is synergy between City of Sherwood and the Refuge. He wants to coordinate.
  - Mike McKillip said the Refuge resolution being considered in Tualatin to support the Refuge.
- **Corridor Screening Criteria**
    - Jef said the Right of Way is the next milestone – a large one. He used a flipchart to reflect the Range of Alternatives (ROA), selection tools: Project Purpose, Goals and Objectives, Selection Criteria. These will be used collectively to narrow and select ROA.
    - Jef described relationship of selection criteria to other tools. Intent to have criteria that "have teeth".
    - We have crafted ten draft screening criteria – it is a work in progress.
    - When we get to design phase, there will be new alternatives
    - Selection criteria – PMT will work with EMT feedback on draft selection criteria, come back to EMT.
    - Try to establish defensible cast for an alternative meeting or not meeting each criterion.
    - Fred asked if there are a couple of rounds of this, Jef said there may be, it depends on the univ. of alternatives.
    - Kathy asked if the alternatives have to meet all of the screening criteria, and Michael Stone asked how we are going to measure Goal 1 Criteria.
    - Transportation team is considering performance measures for Goal 1 screening criteria. Goal 1 criteria are most likely to be subject to quantitative measures.
    - Jef suggested measuring an amount of thru traffic removed from Tualatin-Sherwood Road after five, ten, twenty years.
    - Jef illustrated how third screening criteria may manifest itself as corridor – may require expanded corridor up and down stream from highway connection points.
    - Scott Pemble asked if we have thoughts of how to measure. Barry suggested that we could extend baseline from existing volumes and capacity. It seems the travel times between Point A and Point B should be considered. Jeff Graham

## DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 9

Meeting Date: 04/27/06

Issue Date: 05/02/06

- agreed and said it would be more applicable under the second bullet (criteria) measure of "relief". Level of service could also be screening criteria measure.
- Mike McKillip said it would be helpful to identify under each bullet of how we may want to measure each criterion.
  - Fred asked where it would go. The first screening criteria is more assumption versus measure, number of vehicles per hour equivalent. Second screening criteria, level of service. Third screening criteria addresses affected area by alternative; concept design may be needed to facilitate.
  - Scott Pemble said identifying "regional" seems redundant between first and second screening criteria. Seems first screening criteria could just focus on capacity and not what traffic we are serving. Otherwise measure would need to only measure the capacity for through traffic.
  - Mark Turpel addressed comments from Andy about concerns regarding screening criteria two and three.
  - Screening criteria two should focus on forecast travel demand and [REDACTED]
  - If we are focused only on vehicle travel, we may get resistance.
  - Screening criteria four may need clarification.
  - Jef said we need to be allegiant to Project Purpose. We want to achieve same performance of project intent in RTP.
  - Barry said to measure screening criteria four, we need to address compatability with needs of prevalent industries in the area.
  - Mike Stone said Morse Brothers is only [REDACTED] in area he knows who uses rail, old sidings are no longer used.
  - Rob mentioned new (re-located) siding built in Sherwood. We will likely see increase in freight rail use in area, but has enough to make it a viable alternative.
  - Goal two screening criteria are going to be a judgement call, not measurable.
  - Mark Turpel said AC would disagree and mentioned RTP has different mobility policies, standards. May be suggestions for using RTP policies and criteria.
  - Scott Pemble said Goal two, screening criteria three would be a challenge for compatibility with Clackamas County Planning. CC TSP does not include connector.
  - Fred mentioned the need to consider LCDC rules and goals. All screening criteria references may require amendments. Consider changing "Plans" to "Planning" – other more detailed considerations.
  - Mike McKillip said to anticipate SWG suggesting [REDACTED] impacts to number of residences.
  - Scott suggested showing illustrative example(s) of criteria.
  - Reinterate we are not weighing or prioritizing to be looked at collectively.
  - Jef re-stated that the intent is for a pass/fail versus the Pupose Statement.
  - Scott said people will try to make connection
  - Barry said the PMT will continue to work on screening criteria and will come back to EMT May 25<sup>th</sup>.
- **PSC Meeting #4**
    - Barry summarized logistics, agenda. Information meeting on Transportation and Environmental Reconnaissance Report, Existing Conditions.

## DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 9

Meeting Date: 04/27/06

Issue Date: 05/02/06

- Scott asked what we are asking the PSC to do.
- **Public Involvement Update (SWG)**
  - SWG seems to be becoming more cohesive.
  - \_\_\_\_\_ update: Far West CPO tonight.
  - Scott said it would be good to provide information from briefings to PIOs from affected jurisdictions. He prefers getting PI information from PIOs
  - Mark Turpel said the 2005 baseline has been run. \_\_\_\_\_
  - New software
  - Network
  - Metro provided initial model output that he wants checked versus existing could data.
  - 2030 no build done for Columbia River Crossing.
  - Travel forecasting for northbound estimated to be done, ready for DKS/DEA mid May.
  - Do not think connector is critical to Newberg-Dundee project may not broaden funding gap versus closing \_\_\_\_\_
  - May circle back to include I-205 and Sunrise toll rate for connector would not generate ample revenue to pay for construction.
  - Fred gave OIPP/OTIG update. OTIG has done forecasts. They may issue fees – study tomorrow.
  - One scenario is tolling “everything” including existing 99W at Rex Hill.
  - OTIG still likes connector project if they could sub. May come back as unsolicited proposal or new ODOT request for proposals.
  - Focus groups on projects held two weeks ago.
  - Phone surveys being done now – pretty generic, not project specific.
  - Let ODOT know if we are contacted by OTIG.
  - Need to look at numbers from Newberg-Dundee compare to 2030
  - Same in Yamhill County perceive connector project adds traffic.
- **Next EMT meeting**
  - Barry reminded the EMT that their next meeting will be on 3/23 at Metro.

### • Action items

Action Items from EMT mtg #6	Responsible Party	Target Date
Incorporate EMT edits to P&N/G&O summary tables and send to PMT	Scott	3/3
Send revised P&N/G&O summary tables to EMT	Barry	3/3
Brief PSC representatives on P&N/G&O including SWG and staff (PMT and EMT) comments	EMT	Week of 3/6
Schedule OTIG to attend future EMT meeting	Fred/Lis	March/April

### Upcoming Events

**DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY**

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 9

Meeting Date: 04/27/06

Issue Date: 05/02/06

**March 13** – PSC meeting #3

**March 23** – EMT meeting #8

**April 6** – SWG meeting #7

**April 27** – EMT meeting #9