



DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 30

Meeting Date: 9/06/07

Issue Date: 9/10/07

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 #30

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

Attendees:

EMT	Andy Cotugno	Metro
	Danielle Cowan	City of Wilsonville (alternate)
	Fred Eberle	ODOT
	Jeff Graham	FHWA
	Mike McKillip	City of Tualatin
	Lawrence Odell	Washington County
	Tom Pessemier	City of Sherwood
	R. Scott Pemble	Clackamas County
	Mike Stone	City of Wilsonville

PMT	Alex Dupey	DEA
	Amy Gibbons	ODOT
	Leslie Howell	Howell Consulting
	Angie Jones	DEA
	Jef Kaiser	DEA
	Russell Knoebel	Washington County
	Randy McCourt	DKS
	Shareen Rawlings	JLA
	Scott Richman	DEA
	Mark Turpel	Metro
	Tim Wilson	ODOT

Others Gus Duenas City of Tigard

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 agenda items are represented in "bold" headings.

- **Welcome/Introductions**

- Lawrence welcomed the group. There were no changes to the agenda

- **Draft Evaluation Criteria**

- The SWG has gotten through the evaluation criteria, and their comments have been incorporated in the latest version (handout today)
- Alex said the evaluation criteria are what will guide the technical team in the next phase
- Alex said that we have met with Tualatin and Sherwood to discuss questions and issues, will meet with Wilsonville on Monday
- Tom said that he appreciated the concerns being addressed and listened to
- Tom said that Sherwood has done an economic needs analysis, and employment was a big concern, he wants to make sure that there is not a fatal flaw; not taking out land use pertaining to employment
- Andy said that he thinks that by improving accessibility, there might be improvements to employment
- R. Scott said that a lot of the measures look at how we can advance our urban areas; he said that at the last PSC meeting it was brought up about developing urban lands where they were not intended – converting rural lands to urban use
- Scott pointed out the last bullet under 2C, 2D, 2E – “loss of area or functional value of farm and forest lands, wildlife refuges, parks, and other protected rural land uses.”
- Andy said that so far we have looked at it in two areas, Measure 37 claims and expansion of the UGB
- Andy asked if you put a facility in the south, does that push for moving the UGB to incorporate Parrott Mountain
- Lawrence asked if rather than trying to fit this issue into this criteria, perhaps it is better to create a different criteria to focus on this issue
- R. Scott said there will be some pressure to develop an area between the connector and the edge of the UGB should it extend outside of it
- He said that we should have a measure of magnitude between the alternatives
- Andy said that if we are creating impacts, we need to look at also mitigating
- Randy said that you either imply a policy that is not going to induce growth or not – it would have to be a “yes/no” policy
- Danielle said it would be tough to convince property owners that this is a good idea for their property
- She does not feel it will be simple to just state that this is a rural reserve
- R. Scott said he agrees that we should add a criteria to address urban growth to start the discussion
- Fred said he doesn't feel we should add an objective; we have already adopted them. He feels we should have a discussion and see what some of the steering committee members are thinking
- Lawrence suggested adding a bullet about “urban growth influence”, he feels that discussion will take an entire PSC meeting down the road
- Danielle said that this was a discussion that Metro had about the Columbia Villa
- Tom said he feels Sherwood's perspective is the best thing we can do is make a decision where this facility is going to go first

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 30

Meeting Date: 9/06/07

Issue Date: 9/10/07

- Jef said that these objectives and the criteria are not the complete list of what the technical teams will use – there are other things to be considered
- Jef suggested adding a number 8 to make certain it is noted that it will be addressed by the technical team
- Danielle said that she doesn't feel it should be listed last
- R. Scott said that we are taking all the alternatives and comparing them against one set of facts; he agrees with Jef's suggestion about having a numbered item to address it
- Mike S. asked about utilities being allowed to install along this corridor
- Lawrence said that is far down the road
- Jef said no matter which corridor you select, there are design techniques that can be used to determine future growth; we can defer to the design phase
- EMT decided to add a bullet and the number 8 that Jef suggested
- Lawrence asked if historical sites are only those registered; Jef said no, we also look at those with potential
- Andy said that he has concern about the wetland corridor from the Willamette river that connects to the Wildlife Refuge – it is important to recognize that as a corridor
- Jef said that we are aware of that; we have a natural resources specialist on staff that looks at watershed level and wildlife habitat, etc.
- Lawrence agreed with Andy about the importance of addressing the wetland corridor specifically
- EMT agreed to expand the definition under 3C of wildlife corridor to "wildlife corridor and its association extending to the Willamette River"
- Danielle asked about the amendment to the RTP financially constrained projects
- Andy said that ODOT is saying \$100 m for the project to begin with
- Jef said that money could be used for the EESA alternative if that is the alternative we decide
- Danielle said Wilsonville gets nervous when connections to I-5 are suggested, assumption of Ellingsen connection
- Lawrence asked if we want to make a recommendation to the PSC next week, or if it would wait until the October PSC meeting
- Danielle said she is not comfortable making a recommendation on something that is not complete
- EMT decided that they would wait to make a recommendation until the October PSC meeting
- Lawrence asked if there is a reason for the PSC to meet next week
- Scott said he requested we don't make changes to the evaluation criteria from Wilsonville on Monday, but rather if we are able to make them today to get this out to the PSC for review
- Lawrence suggested rather than put Wilsonville on the spot now, we can put the criteria out this week with the side note that there may be some further comments prior to the draft for the PSC review at their meeting

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 30

Meeting Date: 9/06/07

Issue Date: 9/10/07

- **September 26th PSC Meeting**

- Scott asked that anyone at the SWG meeting last week look over their comment summary and provide any suggested comments or edits
- We will provide this to the PSC in their briefing packets
- Fred asked if we have a response to their comments
- Mike M. suggested that we point out how the comments have been addressed (responses)

- **Public Involvement Update**

- Shareen gave a summary of recent community forums – only one recently – Ladd Hill CPO, which was held last night
- Scott mentioned that there were some good questions, some about Measure 37, coordination with Newberg-Dundee, and concern about when this will be built
- Shareen said that JLA is revising the fall schedule of public outreach meetings
- JLA is working with Sockeye Creative to update the website
- The newsletter is due to come out a few weeks in advance of the next public open houses

The Next EMT meeting is scheduled for October 4th, from 9:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.