



**DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY**

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 31

Meeting Date: 10/11/07

Issue Date: //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 #31**

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

**Attendees:**

<b>EMT</b>	Andy Cotugno	Metro
	Michael Bowers	City of Wilsonville (alternate)
	Fred Eberle	ODOT
	Jeff Graham	FHWA
	Mike McKillip	City of Tualatin
	Lawrence Odell	Washington County
	R. Scott Pemble	Clackamas County
	Mike Stone	City of Wilsonville
<b>PMT</b>	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	Jeanne Lawson Associates (JLA)
	Scott Richman	DEA
	Mark Turpel	Metro
	Tim Wilson	ODOT
<b>Others</b>	Gus Duenas	City of Tigard
	Mike Feves	

**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.

- **Additions and Deletions to Agenda**

- Michael Bowers has concern about some of the modeling, he would like to talk about it after the meeting
- Lawrence asked if there were any comments in regards to 2A after the OTC meeting

- **Evaluation Criteria**

- Lawrence said today we are hoping to take action on the evaluation criteria and be able to make a recommendation to the PSC on the 24th
- He said that this group would look to the PMT memo, and then be able to send an EMT memo to the PSC to address the Metro memo
- Scott said that the memo from the PMT tries to achieve a recommendation on the criteria as well as addressing the issues raised by Councilor Hosticka's memo
- Scott said that what we would anticipate doing in the alternatives analysis is comparing the alternatives to the goals in the existing RTP, while still considering the amendment
- Andy said that the answer on the RTP goals can be a little simpler; he thinks something that says this is the draft, and we understand that when a preferred alternative is selected, we will compare how that alternative measures up to the RTP goals
- Scott said that our sense is that we have that covered in the criteria and we will address that in the analysis
- Scott said the issue about land use and growth (project related induced growth): we are recommending adding a measure to make it clear we will evaluate induced growth qualitatively
- Scott said that we believe we can come up with enough information qualitatively at this level to have a selection process
- Mike M. said that we know this list of goals, but some are in direct conflict with each other; do we really want to know how they comply or do we want to know how they address the goals?
- Lawrence said that he feels that this is a real candid issue; he doesn't see any benefit at this stage to give general words to the issue, he thinks it should be hit head on, why don't we recognize that is where we are in the process
- He suggested that we need that qualitative discussion about induced growth, and how that might be mitigated; are we not better off right now, that this may not be the time to do the detailed modeling, but bring up the qualitative discussion
- Mike M. said he doesn't like the wording about how we are going to comply; he feels they will not all be applicable
- Andy said the position of the project should be that we will have a qualitative discussion about induced growth, but recognize that a more quantitative process may be needed
- Lawrence said that Metro is expecting something in that area, and we are not at a place to do that now
- Andy said that we should acknowledge the issue; communicate that we will have a qualitative discussion about the issue, and should a more quantitative process take place we will welcome the information

## DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 31

Meeting Date: 10/11/07

Issue Date: //07

- Scott said that the other comment was the negative angle on the criteria; he said we are suggesting adding a reference that the traffic analysis completed under 1A, 1B, and 1E
- Andy said 1A-H provides lots of data, but maybe we should have an overall conclusion of how the overall system works
- Randy said that each of these measures will be compared against each alternative
- Lawrence asked where we might be able to make positive statements, such as getting traffic off residential streets
- Randy said the first set of information is getting the facts, the second is getting the findings out of that
- Michael B. offered adding the number of acres protected (different land uses); what is the economic viability of what we are saving?
- Fred said that this project is not "protecting" any land
- Andy said that the project recognizing that an IAMP will need to be done is a good thing
- Mike M. asked if there will be discussion of what will be enhanced (number of acres, etc.)
- Jef said that it will be a qualitative discussion, but there will be no quantitative conclusions
- Jef said all EIS statements are charged with looking at impacts, both positive and negative
- Andy asked if we can put language in the criteria to acknowledge that we will need to do an IAMP
- Scott said that we do not propose assessing only one environmental impact; but rather provide a cost based on performance measures VMT & VHD saved
- Andy said that it should be made clear that environmental impacts will be addressed, just not as a comparison against travel performance
- Michael B. said he would want to know cost per square foot, etc. for each alternative
- Jef said we are going to be more precise that that, we are going to make assumptions based on number of lanes etc. to get a more precise cost
- Scott said that there was also the comment about the size of the connection to I-5, and he said that we are not going to change the criteria, but we will address those types of issues
- Andy said that the sketches that Metro councilors have seen indicate a rather large sized interchange and that is of concern
- Michael B. feels we can make a minimal level assessment of environmental impacts
- Scott said at this point we have the blue band along I-5, we are going to have better traffic numbers for each of these alternatives to show what level of impact is anticipated within that blue band
- Fred said it is a trade off in areas; you can stay tight in the ROW and take out trees, etc., or you can swing out wider to avoid those and take out more land (residential or industrial)
- Jef said we are not going to be showing a range of schematics in the area at this time

- ❑ He said that it will be shown the range of impacts (the trade offs that Fred mentioned)
  - ❑ One of the outcomes of the analysis is we are going to be able to lay those out for the public process and moving into the design phase and how to focus the design
  - ❑ Mike S. asked if ODOT has already done some work; they have asked Wilsonville for additional ROW on Boones Ferry Road between Day Road and the interchange
  - ❑ Fred said that he was unaware of any preliminary work being performed
  - ❑ Michael B. said that he has concern that we are not communicating how we are going to summarize the impacts in the alternatives analysis
  - ❑ Andy said that he felt the EESA option was designed to have a lot of gap fillers, with the transit, bike, and ped facilities; the philosophy of this project is that the solution is going to be a combination of these alternatives, knitting together the pieces for the final solution
  - ❑ He said that those gap fillings will be necessary components to the larger system efficiency; good starting place with gaps
  - ❑ R. Scott said that by the time we get it all straightened out, we will find that there will be some overlap; we need to give ourselves flexibility
  - ❑ Lawrence proposed having the memo revised and sent to the EMT for their review with a cover letter; to be sent on to the PSC
  - ❑ The EMT agreed that is acceptable and we will carry this forward with the changes noted today
- **Alternatives Analysis Approach**
    - ❑ Due to running short on time, we will approach this at the next meeting, November 1st (next weeks meeting has been canceled)
- **Public Involvement Update**
    - ❑ Shareen gave an update about the newsletter moving forward; JLA is coordinating with Sockeye to put out the video and newsletter during a gap of information before the next public open houses
    - ❑ Lawrence said they are hoping to have the video to show to the PSC
- **Other Business**
    - ❑ Lawrence had a couple of comments about the OTC meeting
    - ❑ He said that there was some discussion about a gas tax and tolling; Lawrence felt that any project (especially one of this magnitude) should expect to be a tolling project
    - ❑ He heard that each of the 5 ODOT regions will be looking at tolling
    - ❑ He said that there is a shift from new project dollars to maintenance
    - ❑ Andy said he heard that while there is a need to reduce the mod program, there is a need to balance what the real cuts entail
    - ❑ Andy asked Fred about the OTIA funds, earmarks, and local contributions – did our mod contain the 34%? He is concerned we will also get 70% of the cuts from that.
    - ❑ R. Scott said that it was nice to hear comments about needing to take responsibility how we develop the future systems in the region

**DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY**

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 31

Meeting Date: 10/11/07

Issue Date: //07

- Michael B. said that one question asked to the consultants was doing some spot checks about early on modeling as we progress to the 2035 modeling.
- He handed out some diagrams showing land use assumptions to 2030; there are some areas missing that he feels should be added for consistency (there are no density assumptions in the data base). He said that the answer was that area is outside the UGB, but other areas outside the UGB are shown.
- There seem to be some disconnects between the 2005 baseline and the 2030 and 2035 projections on the employment map

**The Next EMT meeting is scheduled for November 1<sup>st</sup>, from 9:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.**