



DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 42

Meeting Date: 07/17/08

Issue Date: 7/22/08

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 #42

Project: I-5 to 99W Connector
Purpose: Project Management Team Meeting
Location: David Evans and Associates, Inc.

Attendees:

Russell Knoebel	Washington County
Lawrence Odell	Washington County
R. Scott Pemble	Clackamas County
Fred Eberle	ODOT
Amy Gibbons	ODOT
Mike McKillip	City of Tualatin
Tom Pessemier	City of Sherwood
Gus Duenas	City of Tigard
Michael Bowers	City of Wilsonville
Vaughn Brown	JLA
Angie Jones	DEA
Jef Kaiser	DEA
Jim Evans	Moyano Group

Distribution: PMT, File

The meeting began at 9:00 AM. Lawrence led the meeting. The summary generally follows the order of the 7/17/08 EMT agenda.

Public Involvement

- Lawrence said that a letter has been sent to the Wilsonville Spokesman to correct some mis-information that was printed in an editorial article. The correction letter has not yet been printed, but should be in next week's paper
- Vaughn distributed the SWG agenda; Vaughn said we should target our community briefings to correct mis-information. He has spoken with Mark Ottenad to pull together some of the same business owners to visit with them and clarify information for them. JLA has received letters from Argyle Square and Costco that sound as though they are going to be taken away, which is not the case.

- Mike M. asked when we would be able to see the letters and comments received during the comment period. Vaughn said that JLA can make and distribute copies to the EMT via email. Fred asked if the EMT wanted the letters as they come in or get them in a packet – Lawrence said it would be best to get them as they come in so that they can keep their council members informed. Michael B. asked if the letters from businesses have any more weight than comment forms or emails, Fred said that it depends on the contents of the letters – if there is a great deal of mis-information, the letters should be responded to, there is no greater weight in terms of a decision.
- EMT agreed that they would like electronic copies of all the comments (comment cards, letters, court transcripts, comments made via the website, etc.) Lawrence asked the EMT if we should ask the PSC to approve ODOT to be the holder of the originals and all the copies for the official file.
- Vaughn said the SWG meeting is to get them ready for the next phase – priority objectives to be addressed, project needs, etc. Vaughn said that they are going to get opinions from the SWG members and chart the results. Lawrence suggested providing an attendance list of SWG members present along with the data collected to the PSC.
- EMT discussed having the policy questions available for the SWG, but they are not for their input, just information
- Lawrence said that every document for this project should have a date in the lower corner, and if it has not been vetted through the PSC, it should have a “draft” marked on it.

Steps for Selecting Preferred Alternative

- Jef briefly went through the information flow chart for alternatives selection that illustrates what will be feeding in to the alternative selection criteria to select a preferred alternative to be added to the RTP amendment.
- Jef said that we do not want to wander from the project purpose and goals and objectives when making the alternative selection criteria. Vaughn asked about the refinement process; we are not expecting to be selecting from the six alternatives, but rather a hybrid of two or more alternatives. Jef said that if we can come quickly to the selection criteria, we can rate them and begin that process. Lawrence said that up until this point, we have not allowed the PSC to look at the alternatives as a combination of solutions. Is there any way we can have them decide that none of these alone satisfy the project purpose and need? Then starting from the least impacted rated, have them decide which elements of those they like. Jef agreed that could be a good way to do it, but there needs to be ground rules, which is what

the selection criteria serve as. Michael B. asked how each of the alternatives meet the purpose and need from a performance standpoint. Lawrence said that the rational first step would be to determine that one of these alternatives alone will not serve to be a solution, and then go from there to decide how to put together elements to serve as a solution. Fred said that he would make a matrix that would show all the alternatives and the elements of each, and then be able to talk about the benefits and impacts of each.

- EMT discussed the PSC meeting next week; the attendance is not strong from the PSC members, should there be a meeting, or should we postpone until August 11th? Fred said we are also waiting for confirmation of the facilitator from Tom Brian; it might be good to wait until she is under contract as well.

Context for Addressing Policy Questions

- Amy said the policy issues that were raised at the last PSC were focused to address the process we are going through now. A spreadsheet was distributed that contained the original policy question, comments in regard to the question, a summary of the question, what phase the comment would be addressed, and a suggested action/recommendation. Tom asked if we could highlight Phase I in some way to show that more prominently. Jim said that he sees no value in having the STIP/Funding column; Amy said it was added per the request of her PSC member. R. Scott asked if we could have something referring to venue instead of level of government. R. Scott suggested having the needs listed. R. Scott said he has concern about going through this with the PSC without having the facilitator on board. He said that if we go through this without one, it should be made clear if these need to be prioritized.
- R. Scott said that we need to clarify and provide data around the edge of the project area to show the impacts and effects to highways running through the project area and how those highways are listed for improvements in the corridor studies. R. Scott said we need to be prepared to address the questions that come up, and give simple answers as to avoid a debate that might arise with these issues. Michael B. asked how the regional area and project area inter-relate is not made clear. He suggested putting the mark under alternatives analysis and selection criteria rather than deferring it to the JPACT/State level. He asked if the RTP went through an AA process – Russ said it is not required to. Michael said that the officials have not gone through a thorough RTP review and he would like to know how that is incorporated into the I-5/99W alternatives analysis report data. Fred said we need to explain enough about the RTP and communicate

about it to make the PSC comfortable with the impacts to highways the run through the project area. Vaughn said we have not made it clear what we are doing in project development vs. transportation system planning, and we need to better communicate that and identify it with detail. Gus asked if the details of this project change assumptions in the RTP. Amy said that right now the RTP analysis has already included impacts that are foreseen with this project. Lawrence asked if we do that, does every project on the books need to also go through this process? If we are ready to put those rules out there is a big step. He also said that projects that we are doing are going to make improvements despite the service level of red for 2 hours a day. Michael B. said information needed is projects that are unanticipated at this point, but could occur as a result of impact from this connector project. The elected officials need this information.

- EMT discussed holding the PSC meeting next week – there are only about 3 confirmed PSC representatives attending. EMT agreed to ask their representatives today if they would like to meet next week or postpone the meeting and have two meetings in August.
- Discussion about design type – Michael B. said that he thinks it should be pushed until the next phase of the project. Lawrence said that Councilor Peterson would like to have it discussed; we should keep it on for discussion. Fred said that we can build any of these within the corridor; the footprint will vary slightly, but not affect a corridor level decision. Amy agreed to classify it as a “factor” not a criterion.
- Lawrence asked the have the questions numbered.
- Lawrence asked why the projected cost per hour of delay was based on 30 years; it should be 20 years. Amy will make the change of calculation. Michael B. would like to see decreased hours of congestion on existing arterials. R. Scott said that it was calculated this way because if you try to do a benefit cost discussion it can be objective of what benefits are.

Next EMT Meeting

- EMT #43 – July 24th, 2-4pm

Action Items

Action Items from EMT mtg. 42	Responsible Party	Target Date

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 42

Meeting Date: 07/17/08

Issue Date: 7/22/08