



**DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY**

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 38

Meeting Date: 6/5/08

Issue Date: 7/16/08

*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 #38**

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

**Attendees:**

<b>EMT</b>	Michael Bowers	City of Wilsonville (alternate)
	Andy Cotugno	Metro
	Fred Eberle	ODOT
	Jeff Graham	FHWA
	Mike McKillip	City of Tualatin
	Lawrence Odell	Washington County
	Jason Waters for	City of Sherwood
	Tom Pessemier	
	R. Scott Pemble	Clackamas County
	Mike Stone	City of Wilsonville
<b>PMT</b>	Vaughn Brown	Jeanne Lawson Associates (JLA)
	Alex Dupey	DEA
	Jim Evans	Moyano Leadership Group
	Amy Gibbons	ODOT
	Leslie Howell	Howell Consulting
	Jef Kaiser	DEA
	Russ Knoebel	Washington County
	Randy McCourt	DKS
	Scott Richman	DEA
	Mark Turpel	Metro
	Tim Wilson	ODOT
<b>Others</b>	Michael Feves	SWG, Far West Association of Neighborhoods

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

The meeting began at 9:30 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 main discussion items are represented in "bold" headings.

Lawrence asked for deletions/additions to the agenda. Mike B added the discussion about error/deletions/omissions to the AA.

**PSC Debrief**

- Lawrence provided a summary of the PSC meeting. He said that there was some disagreement about how much information is needed at this level. PSC gave conditional agreement regarding release of the Alternatives Analysis provided comments can be addressed. Tom Brian said there is no requirement for PSC approval to release the AA
- Lawrence talked about the PSC discussion on describing Alternative 6 as a potential hard edge for the UGB.
- Question: When is the PSC going to start talking about policy issues? The EMT is going to put together a policy issue list for the PSC to discuss during their next meeting on July 23<sup>rd</sup>.

**Discussion about Release of Alternatives Analysis**

- Andy asked about how much updating will occur to the published version. Scott responded that all comments are being logged and many of the comments will be included in the revised final version to be published on June 12th. Some comments are outside of the scope of this Phase of the project and will be addressed in Phase 2 of the project. Scott said the complete comment log will be provided to the EMT.
- Andy said that it is not practical to have a consistently evolving document. The document should reflect a point in time.
- The EMT will receive hard copies of the revised report. There will also be copies available at public locations and on the project website.
- EMT and SWG members have been reminded that comments will continue to be addressed throughout the public comment period. Comments will be recorded in the public comment log.

**Error/deletions/omissions to the AA**

- Michael B. asked about the adopted criteria and how we are addressing the criteria that aren't being addressed. Scott R. said that the PSC understood that not all criteria would be used in the AA because they did not reveal relevant information. Michael B. said he felt that the EMT/PSC were not aware that some of the criteria might not be used and said it may be a breach of the public process. Fred suggested that the refinement phase may be a time to take a new look at goals and objectives. Additionally, Lawrence said that the PSC may take some of these questions at the policy level.
- Mike B. said Wilsonville has been requesting information for over a year and have not received it. How are we dealing with omitted information prior to the public hearing? When will the EMT discuss the errors/reconciliations contained in the AA?
- Lawrence asked what else you need? You will have a revised document with responses to comments.
- Mike B. said the frustration is that we aren't portraying the conflicts/errors/omissions. Fred suggested that this may be a policy question. Which numbers are important? That's a deliberation about which one is most important?
- Mike B. said that he is opposed to not having EMT review of what goes to the public hearing. Lawrence responded the EMT has agreed to move the AA forward.

**Open House Format**

- Vaughn went over the public open house locations and format. There will be an opportunity for the public to provide comments in writing and orally (with a court reporter).
- Mike S. suggested that the PSC should be given the opportunity to review the video and the PowerPoint. Lawrence said we can show the video next week and have a draft PowerPoint. The video is a background presentation that will build off of the last open house. The EMT can be given an opportunity for review on June 12<sup>th</sup>.
- Scott Pemble commented the AA report on line is difficult to read. Thus, the most education will come at the open house. They need something to take. Maybe offer in the notice that CDs are available. Lawrence said he is concerned will the public get the information. Should have some hardcopies available and CDs available. It's important that people can review and get accurate information.
- Lawrence said the mailer assumes that people know about the project. Need to include something about the project and what it is we're discussing.
- A "take home" document was discussed by the EMT. Some suggestions were diagrams of the different alternatives, a handout showing possible segmented solution elements, hardcopies of the AA, CDs of the AA, etc. Fred proposed having a few copies available and provide a sign up sheet for the AA.
- The EMT discussed costs and the presentation of cost estimates to the public. After the discussion, the EMT agreed to have a separate cost station at the open house. Andy C. said the cost station needs to reflect all of the alternatives and show the full cost of the projects with a footnote that some of these elements can be produced separately.
- Jeff G. was concerned that we have logical termini at the facility. We should just be talking about alternatives and not jump too far ahead. Scott said we're trying to get people to start thinking about elements. Jeff G. would prefer to not see the alternatives broken out and then have a table showing the project component costs.
- Scott P. said the PSC can give comments on the open house materials and then we can make changes. Vaughn will also send out .pdf out for EMT review.

**Policy Issues**

- Policy Issues introduced by the group included:
  - I-5 land limitation issues. Total maximum 6-lanes (Objective 1D). Andy C. said that the RTP views the freeway in the context of the full system-improving parallel routes as well.
  - Redirecting development outside of UGB (induced growth), particularly with midpoint interchange (Objective 2E)?
  - Funding priorities. What should we really be spending our resources on (Objective 4A, 4B, and 4D)?
  - Who is really being served? How much impact should we endure to meet that purpose (Objective 1A)?
  - I-205 impacts-How are we measuring impacts to I-205 (Objective 1D)
  - How does the PSC consider the immediate impacts outside of the project area (I-205, I-5, OR99W)?
  - How do we tie the c/d system back into I-5?
  - Phasing the project.

## DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 38

Meeting Date: 6/5/08

Issue Date: 7/16/08

- What alternative will be the most compatible with urban rural reserves (see induced growth bullet)?
- If we're trying to preserve rural areas, what will that do to redirect land development?
- What are the average speeds?
- In addition to segment, what is the notion for the hybrid that will constitute the preferred alternative?
- Should we consider lower design standards (parkway/expressway)?
- Does selection of any alternative preclude any type of funding?
- How does tolling factor into this project and design characteristics?
- Is the PSC ready to pay for a giant interchange? Can we proceed if that is the only option?
- Scott P. said these are really process issues and may direct the policy discussion. Fred said we should focus these around the objectives and keep it short

### **Other Business**

- Mike Feves asked that the SWG also get the public hearing format.
- The next EMT meeting is scheduled for Thursday, June 12<sup>th</sup> 9:00 a.m.-12:00 p.m., again in Room 344 at ODOT Region 1.