



Meeting Date: 08/17/06
Issue Date: 08/24/06

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 #13

Project: I-5 to 99W Connector
Purpose: Executive Management Team Meeting
Location: Metro, Room 370
Date: 17 August 2006

Attendees:

EMT

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

PMT

Barry Hennelly	Washington County
Tim Wilson	ODOT Region 1
Mark Turpel	Metro
Leslie Howell	Howell Consulting
Jef Kaiser	DEA

Others

Rian Windsheimer	ODOT Region 1
Danielle Cowan	City of Wilsonville (EMT alternate)
Tom Aufenthie	CPO 5 and SWG
David Shettles	

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

The meeting began at 2 PM. The agenda items are represented in the following "bold" headings. Barry Hennelly welcomed the group and led the overall EMT meeting.

- **Project Purpose Statement**

Andy went over what Carl Hosticka took away from the Metro Council work session yesterday:

1. Local needs do need to be addressed but the Council did not distinguish whether that means local circulation or local access to the state system.

2. Land use needs to be addressed either through separate concept planning or merging land use planning with this project effort. Andy thought we should start concept planning as a separate but parallel activity now.
3. Purpose and Need statement should not be that we are missing a Connector but should allow for other outcomes. And, that we need a broader involvement of jurisdictions outside of Metro (e.g., Yamhill Co.) in defining those outcomes (refer to Carl's 8/15/06 memo to the Council).

Fred commented that these outcomes are largely embodied in the adopted Need statements and that Council was not looking beyond the Purpose statement. Fred suggested going back to the statement originally recommended to the PSC rather than the latest, which references the lack of a state highway connection - - viewed as too solution specific by the Council.

Kathy suggested adding "while addressing the need for local arterial access" to this statement. Also alert the Council to the language on local travel contained in the Goals and Objectives.

Danielle asked why we couldn't use the statement already adopted by the PSC.

Jef explained that this statement broadened the project's intent and solution area beyond what was directed in the RTP. Also, for the project process to be an effective entrée into NEPA, its purpose must be founded on a solid planning decision (RTP). The PSC adopted version really suggests going through concept planning rather than a development process for a specific project.

Jeff G. emphasized the importance of refinement planning (this process) and NEPA being based on a sound regional planning decision. FHWA's current, project-level participation is based on this assumption.

Kathy again, proposed going back to the original, staff recommended statement and adding the clause about local access.

Andy felt this was on the right track.

Mike asked whether Andy's suggested parallel concept planning process would include just the newly added areas or all exceptions lands in the area.

Andy responded that there would need to be assumptions made on what lands are likely to be brought into the UGB with the next 20 years.

R. Scott stated that the RTP was based on a specific set of land use assumptions and asked the question: Are we advancing the Connector project to test those assumptions or are we stopping to rethink the assumptions? Scott had a problem with the latter because things are always evolving - - no good starting point. Scott also asked whether our current urban form requires something like the connector regardless of what happens with

future urbanization - - we do not have an efficient regional connecting route in this area to serve existing land uses. That is not going to change.

Danielle responded that it does affect the urban form in that a new expressway type facility would induce the growth of commuting from outlying communities, increasing the congestion on existing local roadways. It is different than the Sunrise project because Damascus is already planned.

Fred stated that under any conclusion, an efficient connector route is needed - - the question is where. We need to restore a state highway system in this quadrant.

Mike agreed with Kathy's proposal and added that the Needs statements can be used to show that the project is focusing on the outcomes of Carl H's memo.

A discussion ensued about how outcome can be accounted for in the Needs statements. There was general agreement that two additional statements may need to be added - - one regarding the "unmistakable path" and the other regarding freight access to the state system.

- **Land Use Planning**

Andy advised there are three questions to be addressed:

1. How does this project process incorporate the land use effects in Yamhill County?
2. How do we coordinate with Yamhill County?
3. Do we do concept planning sequentially or parallel?

Induced impacts are really a systems planning responsibility.

R. Scott questioned whose responsibility it was to address the causality of the connector. This is a broad market question.

Fred stated that if this is systems planning maybe ODOT and Washington County need to step back.

Kathy said that we should not wait for systems planning. Carl H. wants to move forward now.

Danielle said that councilors Liberty and Burkholder would have the Connector process put on hold until the completion of the New Look effort.

Rob noted that these planning processes are all iterative and we don't need to stop.

Barry said that the New Look process will be talking to Yamhill County and that the Connector project will be informed by that discussion.

Meeting Date: 08/17/06

Issue Date: 08/24/06

All EMT members but Danielle think concept planning and communication with Yamhill County should be a part of the New Look and a separate process. Danielle believes that this should be a responsibility of the Connector project.

Andy said that the project needs to factor in the results of concept planning. If this is a growth corridor, then one set of actions; if not, then a different set.

- **Preparation for the PSC Meeting on August 28**

The EMT generally agreed that the Purpose Statement would be presented as a discussion item at the PSC rather than an Action item. Fred will brief the PSC on the evolution of the statement and why the adopted statement will not work for the project's intent. Andy or Carl will follow with a briefing on the two Metro work sessions as they relate to the Connector project. As a possible staff recommendation to the PSC, Jef was directed to prepare a revised version of the purpose statement per Kathy's proposal and craft the two additional Need statements ("unmistakable route" and "freight access").