



**DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY**

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 37

Meeting Date: 5/27/08

Issue Date: 7/14/08

*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 #37**

**Project: I-5 to 99W Connector**  
**Purpose: Executive Management Team Meeting**  
**Location: ODOT Region 1, Room 344**

**Attendees:**

<b>EMT</b>	Michael Bowers	City of Wilsonville (alternate)
	Andy Cotugno	Metro
	Fred Eberle	ODOT
	Mike McKillip	City of Tualatin
	Lawrence Odell	Washington County
	Tom Pessemier	City of Sherwood
	Mike Stone	City of Wilsonville
<b>PMT</b>	Alex Dupey	DEA
	Jim Evans	Moyano Leadership Group
	Jef Kaiser	DEA
	Russ Knoebel	Washington County
	Shareen Rawlings	Jeanne Lawson and Associates
	Scott Richman	DEA
	Tim Wilson	ODOT

**Distribution:** PMT, EMT, Interested Parties, File

The meeting began at 9:00 AM. The agenda and other materials were provided to EMT members in electronic format prior to the meeting and copies were distributed at the meeting. The primary discussion items are represented in "bold" and underlined headings.

**Schedule and Process**

- o Lawrence asked about the PSC meeting schedule and asked the PSC members to submit availability forms for the summer months.
  - Scott will send out an email to the PSC assistants to confirm that they or their substitutes will be available for the scheduled meetings or proposed alternate dates.
- o Scott went through the Alternatives Analysis. All comments are being logged and will be either addressed in the AA or included in the record of comments with a response.
- o The SWG has added a meeting on June 5th. This is the final day for internal comments.

- Scott said that everyone in the EMT except Wilsonville feels it's ready to go.

### **Presentation**

- Scott Richman went through the presentation, which had been updated based on previous EMT comments. Additional comments and questions about the different slides follow.
- Lawrence said the EMT agreed that there would be a summary about what each alternative would be.
  - Mike M said we should identify some of the impacts (closed accesses, new roads).
  - Jim said add bullet list describing impacts for each alternative.

### **Transportation Slide 1:**

- Michael Bowers asked about Table 7.5-1. Is VMT traveled increased a good thing or a bad thing? There's no discussion about this.
  - Russ said that one of the goals is to protect the vitality of town centers
  - Fred and Lawrence said that determining whether that's a good/bad thing should be up to the public and the PSC. We're only stating what the facts are.
  - Fred said that discussing the evaluation factors are where the value judgments will come into play. EMT/PSC will decide what is important. Lawrence asked if we should remove the VMT bullet and put it on a separate slide and put the numbers on a separate slide to report the VMT numbers for town centers.
- Fred said that the presentation should have a slide just stating that these are the facts.
- Tom P. said that we should look at this from an "overall" perspective, not just for each jurisdiction.
- Lawrence reiterated Scott R. introduction saying there are polarized views. If we pull everything out there will be nothing left to report. Suggested changing the bullet to say that the alternatives have varying impacts to town centers.
  - Jef said that we could add "...regional and through" to better define the VMT.
  - Mike B. said that the criteria say that it needs to improve congestion in all town centers.
  - Andy C. said we need to tell the story about what the AA says. Last bullet need to be better defined. Need to say be more specific about each town center.
  - Michael Bowers said we need to show what the actual percent changes are.

### **Transportation Slide 2:**

- Lawrence asked where Tigard is on this slide?
  - Scott said there is really no difference for Tigard.
- There were some questions about the crash rate estimates. Russ said that crash rates were from the project area and Lawrence asked the project team to get the methodology.

- Russ pointed to page 99 that crash information was from ODOT historic crash tables.
- Mike B. asked about crash rates outside the project area. There has to be an increase with the additional congestion
- Lawrence said that that's an RTP discussion. At some point this discussion will happen, but not with this project only.
- Mike Stone said he has some hand written notes about crashes.
- Jef said that conflicting movements are removed by the connectors that reduce the crash rate.
- Mike B. said he wants to clarify that he doesn't want to include everything, but he does want to include Roy Rogers Road.
  - Russ pointed to page 75 that shows data points outside of the study area.
  - Fred asked about first two bullets. They appear to contradict each other for Tualatin.
- Lawrence requested that the project team add information to clarify.
- Fred asked if we should have some type of tieback to the AA.
- Mike M. said the balance is to try and get through this efficiently without making it too long.
- Jef asked we can change the first bullet to say that Alts 4, 5, and 6 generally if reduce travel times in town centers.
- Fred pointed out that Wilsonville is also generally improved.

**Transportation Slide 3:**

- Mike Stone said that just saying "through traffic" is misleading.
- Lawrence said maybe highlight through
- Fred said that T/S Road overall traffic reductions generally occur
- Mike B. said that it reduces some routes but it also increases some. Should include those as well.

**Land Use/Socioeconomics Slide #1**

- Mike doesn't agree with bullet 1, because there is only a one percent difference.
  - Scott asked if this is only a wording issue?
  - Jef asked if we should just take out conflicts in the first bullet.
- Alternative 6 does the most in reducing regional and through traffic in town centers.
  - Will change to break out town centers separately

**Land Use Slide #2**

- Andy C. said the third bullet should just say Alternative 6 provides the opportunity to provide a hard edge.

**Land Use Slide #3**

- Should add footnote saying rural is outside UGB

**Land Use Slide #4**

- First bullet: replace connectors with "Alternatives 4, 5 and 6."
- Mike B. disagrees about beneficial impact on state/regional economic benefits.

- Lawrence said that this is an RTP discussion.
- Mike B. said we need to be consistent. Either we look outside of the project area or we don't.
- Resolution: change last bullet to remove and tourism and commerce and take out state/regional economy and replace with project area.

### **Biology and Wetlands Slide #1**

- Mike asked if hitting the Refuge is a deal killer.
- Lawrence said there's no legal limit but there is a political one.

### **Water Quality**

- Mike M. asked that if you treat water why do you have mitigation.
  - Jef responded that only about 60% is treated so you need mitigation.

### **Cultural Resources**

- An EMT member asked if any of the issues highlighted potential deal killers? The project team does not think so.

### **Utilities**

- Mike B. asked if Alternative 6 has the highest reimbursement risk?
  - Jim said Alternative 5 is the highest.
- Mike B. asked about rail crossings.
  - Rail crossings are included in the utilities section.

### **Visual**

- Scott said there was some feedback from the SWG about adding something for grade crossings, interchanges etc.
- There was discussion among the EMT to add a bullet about the potential loss of trees along I-5 (driven by potential concern from Charlotte).

### **Hazardous Materials**

- No Comments

### **Geology**

- Mike B. asked when we'll talk about topography. How buildable are these? What kind of discussion do we have on this?
  - We used the Quantm model for the cost and feasibility analysis.  
Alternative 6 has higher costs (\$50 million more) for additional bridges.
- Mike Stone asked about aquifer impacts.

### **Noise**

- Mike Stone asked about noise. Does the cost estimates include noise walls?
  - Noise wall costs are in the engineering contingency

### **Air Quality**

- No Comments

## **Energy**

- There were a few questions and comments about the energy slide:
  - Mike B. asked about the last bullet, how do you measure congestion relief?
  - Tom P. noted that this analysis is just based on the PM peak.
  - Mike B. asked how much congestion do you take off of existing roads? He also commented that he doesn't think it's going to be a 20 percent reduction.

## **Cost Slide (to be added)**

- Fred asked about what the cost chart will look like? Is it phased?
  - The cost charts will show ROW cost, I-5 cost, connector etc. Any of the alternatives could be phased.
- Lawrence said we may use the phasing as part of Washington County internal discussion.

## **Mixing and Matching of Project Alternatives**

- Scott said we're going to be asking the public which pieces they need.
- Mike M. said it's always been his understanding is that the AA shows what impacts are, but that part of the refined alternative could address some of this.
- Mike M. said that none of the alternatives have a clear winner.
- Jef commented that this is similar to the Western Bypass where there was lots of mixing and matching during a refinement process.

## **Project Schedule**

- Scott reviewed the project schedule.
- Mike M asked about the two-month window to get to a RTP recommendation.
- Lawrence said that it's up to the PSC.

## **Publishing the Alternatives Analysis**

- Lawrence asked Mike Stone if they are still uncomfortable with publishing the document. Should we report out to the PSC that the EMT is together with the exception of Wilsonville's concerns. With that caveat, can we recommend this to the PSC to publish for public comment?
- Mike Stone said we haven't spoken about this internally whether or not to move this forward. Would have liked to have the revised material first. His opinion is that it would have to be a qualified approval with a list attached that says what Wilsonville needs to see in the AA. (Mike agreed to provide a list.)
  - Mike B. noted that they've already done that and there are things missing. Criteria are not addressed. He said he is not trying to expand criteria, but the criteria do discuss regional benefits. I don't have a good view of how the options perform without having all of the information.
- Lawrence said Washington County is ready to see color-coded phased options.
- Lawrence asked Fred if ODOT needs to see anything else. Could support this going out. Maybe need some caveat that we're still working on some of this stuff.
- Mike M. said the SWG doesn't feel they've had enough time to review.
- Fred said that the EMT is going to want to vet everything

**Public Involvement Plan**

- Shareen went over the PI plan for the public hearings. A notice card will be mailed to the public by June 13 (this is instead of newsletter proposed earlier).
- Talked about potentially having an online survey.

**Open House Planning**

- Fred asked Jef if we can only focus on the AA during the open houses or can we ask about mixing and matching.
- Jef said yes you can, you just have to be careful how you ask so it doesn't look like you've already made a decision.
- Costs and phasing will stand out separately, possibly discussing phasing.

**PSC Agenda**

- Lawrence requested #5 to just say "Alternatives Analysis overview and discussion"
- Scott requested that June 5th be the drop dead deadline for comments.
- Lawrence said that there shouldn't be any more surprises.

**Other Business**

- The next EMT meeting is scheduled for Thursday, June 5<sup>th</sup> 9:00 a.m.-12:00 p.m., again in Room 344 at ODOT Region 1.