



DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 12

Meeting Date: 08/10/06

Issue Date: 08/16/06

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 #12

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

Attendees:

EMT	Kathy Busse	Washington County
	R. Scott Pemble	Clackamas County
	Andy Cotugno	Metro
	Fred Eberle	ODOT Region 1
	Jeff Graham	FHWA
	Mike McKillip	City of Tualatin
	Danielle Cowan	City of Wilsonville (EMT alternate)
	Rob Dixon	City of Sherwood

PMT	Barry Hennelly	Washington County
	Tim Wilson	ODOT Region 1
	Mark Turpel	Metro
	Kristin Hull	JLA
	Jef Kaiser	DEA
	Scott Richman	DEA

Others	Rian Windsheimer	ODOT Region 1
	Tom Aufenthie	
	Adelle Jenike	
	David Shettles	

Distribution: EMT, PMT, SWG, Interested Parties, Project File

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

- **Welcome**
 - Barry welcomed the group and summarized the agenda. Meeting attendees introduced themselves.

- **Purpose Statement**

- On August 8th, at a Metro Council work session, Andy and Mark provided a project briefing to the Metro Council focused on the project purpose statement at Metro Councilor Carl Hosticka's request. This presentation was one of multiple briefings that the Metro Council has requested when major project decision points are being considered in order to provide Council guidance to individual councilors who are serving as liaisons for major projects in the region. Councilor Hosticka, expects to keep the Metro Council informed on the Connector Project through regular briefings.
- Andy noted that at the August 8 Metro Council work session, individual Metro councilors expressed disparate views and opinions of the I-5 to Highway 99W Connector project, and he summarized key input from Metro Councilors provided at the 8/8 work session as follows:
 - Robert Liberty questions the major projects identified in the RTP, and he has asked that project costs and benefits be weighed against other transportation project costs and benefits, that land use implications be analyzed and that alternative methods of addressing transportation need be compared with the more traditional solutions.
 - Rex Burkholder is also concerned about the affordability of the RTP, but he also acknowledges it as existing policy. He suggested that the Council consider a moratorium on the Connector until Spring of 2007 while the RTP is updated.
 - Rod Park raised the issue of coordination and integration of land use planning related to the New Look and the coordination of planning between Metro and neighboring urban/urbanizing areas including those in Yamhill and other counties. He suggested that the Connector Project would have growth implications beyond the Metro region and emphasized the need to communicate and reach understandings/agreements related to growth management with neighboring jurisdictions.
 - David Bragdon expressed concern that the staff-proposed purpose statement is too much of a solution statement. He believes that the needs the project is trying to serve (e.g. travel between the Portland metro area and other destinations in Yamhill County and the coast) should define the problem.
- The Metro Council is questioning the cost and financial feasibility of major projects in the region, as well as their prioritization relative to each other. Council members also question the status of the Connector project as one of eight projects in Oregon (five in the metro area) that are designated by the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) as "projects of statewide significance." The council asked what the OTC considered for this designation, and Andy responded that they are projects that would serve intrastate travel and/or provide connections with other portions of the statewide highway system and that they are very high cost projects.
- The Metro Council decided that they needed more time to discuss issues and provide clear direction to Councilor Hosticka and project staff about the purpose statement. They agreed to continue their discussion and reach agreement on direction at another work session scheduled for 8/16 at New Columbia Villa in

North Portland. Mark will send out the agenda, plus time and location of this next Council work session to the EMT as soon as it is available to him.

- Danielle noted that she had attended the OTC retreat where the OTC considered the projects of statewide significance. She recalled OTC discussion that they did not fully recall the justification for designating each of the projects, but that they still adopted this designation for them.
- Barry and Danielle also attended the 8/8 Metro Council briefing. They agreed that they heard that the Council does not feel tied to past decisions and that they want to take a fresh look at the RTP. Danielle added that her impression is that the Council views the Connector project as more of a "Portland to coast" than a Metro need. In his recent presentation to JPACT, Congressman Blumenauer emphasized that federal transportation funding is dwindling and this changes past decisions related to planned actions.
- One of the Metro councilors asked why Yamhill County is not represented on the PSC, and they were satisfied with Barry's response that each jurisdiction represented on the PSC may need to take potential actions (e.g. plan amendments) giving each jurisdiction legal standing in the corridor location decision to be incorporated into the amended RTP.
- Kathy questioned whether the Council is somehow missing the travel demand forecast-based project justification established more than ten years ago, and which is only likely to increase based on more aggressive growth occurring and forecast in and around Tualatin, Sherwood and Wilsonville. If the Council is questioning the need for the Connector project, there has been nothing demonstrated that would diminish the project need, and to stop and then have to go back and start over would be a huge waste of time and money. The purpose of the project is to provide a connection; it does not specify a solution, and we will look at a variety of transportation solutions.
- Mike M. added that previous analyses identified the need, mode, type and general location of the project, and that the process we are using provides a mechanism to re-affirm the direction provided in the RTP.
- Fred questioned whether the Metro Council needs a much more thorough briefing of the project background and context for developing the RTP amendment process including the purpose and need, goals and objectives, screening criteria, and alternatives development process. He believes that the questions raised by the Metro Council could be resolved through this process.
- Andy responded that the RTP amendment process needs to re-establish the basic need for the project, and that he believes that the Metro Council understands the project background. He is not sure that the Council understands the intent and work scope for the RTP amendment process, and they may benefit from a briefing on this. He does not think there is a federal problem with this project development. Metro has struggled with agreeing upon the responsibility of this study process, but they agree that it is not to resolve the whole circulation system in the project area. We set out to figure out the larger intrastate and regional travel issues, and we also want to address local access to the statewide system in this area. This is a policy question. We could broaden the scope of the study, but that has not been Metro's position through the RTP and into this

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 12

Meeting Date: 08/10/06

Issue Date: 08/16/06

process. We seem to be arguing over specifics of the RTP amendment phase of the project, and he recommends that this process continue.

- Jeff G. noted that most project development processes are predicated upon previous planning efforts. He is now hearing that some are questioning previous decisions related to the Connector project. We need to know what the Metro Council thinks we should do, especially if it strays from the process we are using.
- Rob and Mike agreed that the vast majority of citizens in the Tualatin and Sherwood areas are fed up with governments' "endless" bureaucratic processes to advance needed projects, and that the lack of agreement amongst the Metro Council on the project purpose and need is exactly what angers most people. Mike asked if the Metro Council is taking similar approaches with other projects in the RTP, and Andy confirmed that the Council is "looking globally" and not just scrutinizing this project.
- R. Scott raised questions of "whose project is this, whose decision is it, and who owns the process?" He asked if there is opportunity for other project stakeholder jurisdictional partners to weigh-in to the Metro Council.
- Fred inquired as to where JPACT weighs-in vs. the Metro Council.
- Considering the federal project development process, Kathy noted that the project need will need to be clearly demonstrated, and that this process does not include a mechanism to prioritize a project. We are too early in the corridor planning process to identify funding sources. We can respond to the questions and concerns raised by the Metro Council with exception of those related to cost-effectiveness and funding. Coordination and consultation with neighboring jurisdictions (e.g. Yamhill County) is appropriate for our process.
- Danielle noted that Rod Park had suggested a "line in the sand" be drawn to reach agreement on sharing project costs with neighboring urban/urbanizing areas. She added that the majority of Wilsonville citizens are raising questions about the Connector project similar to those raised by the Metro Council.
- R. Scott noted that the Council's dialogue related to the New Look is reminiscent of the 2040 Growth Concept approach where three growth concepts were considered: build up, build out, and satellites. He questioned whether there is a role for the other PSC partners to approach the Metro Council, or if we need to let the Council formulate direction to the PSC.
- Andy replied that the Council will provide direction to the PSC through Councilor Hosticka. He also noted that although it was a challenge, Metro and Clark County are discussing how land use planning could be better coordinated.
- Fred commented that the Council's concerns related to funding uncertainty could apply to other projects throughout the state. We do not know costs and potential funding, including the possibility of tolling, and this seems to be a breakdown of the whole regional planning process. We are anticipating that the RTP amendment process for the Connector project will address local land use and transportation planning as it relates to different potential solutions carried forward.
- Andy does not think the staff proposed purpose statement is far off from what the Metro Council would support. It may help if we clarify what the project will address beyond the wording of the purpose statement. Following the 8/8 work session, Andy and Councilor Hosticka discussed identifying all the issues that the

Council raised, and providing responses to each. When Metro convened planning directors from Tualatin, Sherwood and Wilsonville during the process to expand the UGB, they universally supported waiting until the Connector project solution was selected before proceeding with concept planning in areas added into the UGB. However, given the more recent discussions, Andy thinks it would be beneficial to initiate concept planning concurrently with the RTP amendment process and to address future UGB expansion so that these processes can inform one another. Starting in 2007, Metro will be looking at urban reserves and their designations for potential future UGB expansion. Metro and local jurisdictions need to develop an integrated work program for concept planning.

- Danielle noted that Wilsonville is planning a new road to serve planned development in the Coffee Creek area.
 - Kathy, R. Scott, and Mike each raised concerns with integrating the Connector process with local concept planning, and suggested that they need to be separate processes. Local jurisdictions cannot best determine intrastate and regional travel solutions, and potential urban reserves should not have bearing on the Connector decision.
 - The EMT agreed to have another meeting on 8/17, following the 8/16 Metro Council work session. Mark will reserve a room at Metro, and Barry will send the EMT an agenda for this next EMT meeting when it is confirmed.
 - Andy is working with Councilor Hosticka on issues and options for the Metro Council to consider on 8/16.
- **SWG**
 - Kristin summarized the SWG meeting held on 8/3. The majority of the SWG agreed that the current staff-proposed purpose statement is the most acceptable of the different iterations they have reviewed, and they all agreed that they could live with it.
 - The SWG is scheduled to meet again on 10/5 to review plans for the alternatives development workshops, and to discuss travel demand model results if this information is available.
 - **PSC**
 - Barry referred to the draft agenda for the next PSC meeting scheduled for 8/28.
 - The EMT agreed that the PSC needs to move forward with action on the purpose statement, and agreed that the 8/28 PSC meeting should occur. The EMT agreed to keep discussion of the screening criteria on the PSC agenda, but to remove it as an action item.
 - The PMT will provide EMT advance materials for briefings with PSC members by 8/21.
 - Barry noted that Councilor Hosticka has also expressed interest in meeting with representatives of the local jurisdictions to discuss the relationship of the Connector project to their local land use and transportation systems planning efforts.

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 12

Meeting Date: 08/10/06

Issue Date: 08/16/06

- **Travel Forecasting**

- Scott reported that DKS received 2005 base year and 2030 No-Build regional model results from Metro at the end of July. DKS is doing post-processing and sub-area refinements to the model output, and that they appear to be on track to have post-processed results to DEA for more detailed operations analyses by mid-September. DEA expects to have travel demand results to present by early October, with a draft report available by mid-October.

- **Action Items**

Action Items from EMT mtg #12	Responsible Party	Target Date
Reserve room and send agenda for 8/17 EMT mtg #13 to EMT	PMT	8/11
Send out the agenda, plus time and location of this next Council work session to the EMT	Mark	8/14
Provide EMT with advance materials for PSC briefings prior to 8/28 PSC meeting #6	PMT	8/21

Upcoming Events

8/16 – Metro Council work session

8/17 - EMT meeting #13

8/28 – PSC meeting #6