



**DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY**

I-5 to 99W Connector: PSC Mtg. #3

Meeting Date: 03/13/06

Issue Date: 03/16/06

*The contents of this summary are assumed correct unless our office is notified in writing within five calendar days of receipt.*

---

**DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY**

**Project:** I-5 to 99W Connector Project  
**Purpose:** Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting #3  
**Date/Time:** Monday March 13, 2006 / 11:40 AM – 2:40 PM  
**Location:** Tualatin Police Station  
**Attendees:**

<b>PSC</b>	Tom Brian David Cox Bill Kennemer Charlotte Lehan Keith Mays Cathy Nelson Lou Ogden	Washington County (PSC Chair) FHWA Clackamas County City of Wilsonville City of Sherwood ODOT Region 1 (Interim Director) City of Tualatin (via telephone)
<b>Executive Management Team (EMT)</b>	Rob Dixon Fred Eberle Mike McKillip R. Scott Pemble Michael Stone	City of Sherwood ODOT City of Tualatin Clackamas County City of Wilsonville
<b>Project Management Team (PMT)</b>	Vaughn Brown Barry Hennelly Leslie Howell Kristin Hull Michael Ray Scott Richman Mark Turpel	Jeanne Lawson Associates Washington County Howell Consulting Jeanne Lawson Associates ODOT David Evans and Associates, Inc. Metro
<b>Stakeholder Working Group (SWG)</b>	Bob Adams Mike Feves Ray Phelps Dave Volz Tom Sullivan	Tualatin Chamber of Commerce Far West Ass'n of Neighborhoods Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce Tualatin CCI Sherwood CCI
<b>Others</b>	See sign-in sheet (attached)	

**Distribution:** Attendees, Kathy Busse, Andy Cotugno, Jeff Graham, Carl Hosticka, File

---

The meeting began at 11:40 AM. Agendas and other materials were provided prior to the meeting and copies of these materials were also provided at the meeting. The agenda items are represented in "bold" headings.

- **Welcome/Introduction**

- Handouts:
  - Agenda;
  - Draft Purpose and Need Statement and Goals and Objectives (February 2006);
  - Memo from JLA to PSC summarizing community input on Purpose and Need and Goals and Objectives;
  - Tables summarizing SWG guidance, PMT comments, and EMT guidance to PSC on the Draft Purpose and Need and Goals and Objectives; and
  - Letter from Carl Hosticka (Metro PSC member absent from PSC meeting) with suggested input to the Purpose and Need and Goals and Objectives.
- Chair Brian welcomed the group and led the overall PSC meeting. The PSC members and others in attendance introduced themselves.
- The primary focus of this meeting was for the PSC to discuss and approve a corridor-level Purpose and Need Statement, including Goals and Objectives; to hear testimony from SWG members and others in attendance; to receive a project update from staff; and to identify a date for the next PSC meeting.
- Vaughn requested that people wishing to speak fill-out and turn in a blue "Meeting comment card" provided at the sign-in table at the room entrance.

- **Purpose & Need and Goals & Objectives Discussion**

- Referring to the summary Purpose and Need and Goals and Objectives tables, Vaughn described the general development of the Draft Purpose and Need and Goals and Objectives. The Purpose and Need Statement includes Goals and Objectives, but these were developed in multiple steps, and will be discussed in two parts (Purpose and Need and Goals and Objectives).
- Vaughn noted that the SWG is comprised of people who represent a diverse range of interests in the community. In discussing the Purpose and Need, there was general agreement amongst the SWG members on transportation problems, but there was divergence amongst the members on the nature and causes of the problems. The SWG more easily came to agreement on the Goals and Objectives.
- The Purpose and Need shown on the left side of the Purpose and Need summary table is considered the "original" or "baseline" Purpose and Need that was modified to incorporate initial input from the SWG received since the Community Open Houses held in late November 2005. The next column shows guidance on the Purpose and each Need statement provided by the majority of the SWG, as well as alternative input provided by three of the SWG representatives. The next columns indicate comments on each statement provided by the PMT, and guidance on each statement provided by the EMT.
- Vaughn noted a correction to the EMT guidance for Objective 2E, where the EMT had intended to provide similar guidance as they provided under Objective 3B.

Mayor Lehan questioned the difference in the wording for these objectives, and these were discussed (as noted) later in the meeting.

- **SWG Comments**

As summarized below, four members of the SWG (Ray Phelps, Dave Volz, Mike Feves, and Tom Sullivan) provided testimony that, in some cases, was followed by response(s) by one or more PSC members.

- Ray Phelps, Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce
  - The Chamber proposed a different Purpose and Need statement that identifies more specifically what they think the project needs to achieve
  - The current Purpose Statement is too vague even though everyone knows what it means
  - Needs, goals and objectives would flow more reasonably with a better, specific purpose
  - The Chamber is okay with the Goals and Objectives
  - The rest of the SWG recognized and accommodated the need to consider Wilsonville equally in the project because Wilsonville could get "ripple" of project impacts, even though the project area precludes looking at solutions south into Wilsonville
- Commissioner Kennemer: What is the purpose of the project as you see it?
  - Mr. Phelps: The purpose of the project should focus on fixing Tualatin-Sherwood Road.
  - David Cox: FHWA has been criticized in the past for using the project purpose statement to point to a solution. The purpose needs to be general to allow for different types of potential solutions
  - Chair Brian: Recognizing the problems on Tualatin-Sherwood Road, other problems/needs in the area also need to be considered
  - Mr. Phelps: The original Purpose and Need is not a deal breaker for the Chamber. However, the Chamber is concerned about access to industrial land and about Wilsonville being negatively affected
- Dave Volz, Tualatin CCI
  - He is frustrated with the amount of "wordsmithing" that we have done on the Purpose and Need Statement. It is clear that there is a problem that needs to be solved and that it will get worse if we don't solve it now. He mentioned recent regional congestion presentations by Metro President David Bragdon, and Metro Councilor Carl Hosticka.
  - Take an objective look at data and move on.
- Mike Feves, Far West Association of Neighborhoods
  - The SWG is a volunteer effort, while others involved in this project are being paid. The SWG represents diverse interests in communities and has a passion about liveability.
  - The PSC should give the SWG input the weight it deserves since it incorporates lots of viewpoints. SWG has consensus that there is a

## DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

I-5 to 99W Connector: PSC Mtg. #3

Meeting Date: 03/13/06

Issue Date: 03/16/06

transportation problem, but we just don't agree on what the specific problem is.

- The Purpose statement defines the problem as regional. It is clear that it needs to be a regional problem to get federal dollars. The data does not support that there is a regional problem when less than 20% of trips are through trips. Problem is local. SWG had a conflict because of this.
- He sees the PSC having two choices: 1) show a purpose that defines a local problem, or 2) defer a decision on the Purpose and Need until Metro 2030 modeling is complete.
- David Cox: Federal aid is available to address local problems and needs as well as regional problems.
- Mr. Feves: Why is this a Project of Statewide Significance when 217 is not?
- Tom Sullivan, Wilsonville CCI
  - Typical drivers want a direct route and don't like congestion. Drivers typically think of adding capacity as a good idea and engineers can find a way to add it. The real question is how much are we willing to pay – not just money, but in terms of disruption, environmental impacts and community impacts? Americans drive too much, and reducing congestion is not worth the impacts associated with building more capacity for vehicles.
  - Other costs don't get identified as clearly and don't get valued as much. Cumulative impacts are worse than problem we are trying to solve.
  - Do not shift problems from one community to other. Consider all the impacts.
  - Add to goals and objectives – give equal weight to other concerns.
- Lehan: where are you on purpose statement?
- Mr. Sullivan: Ok, but, again, we need to consider larger issues.
- D. Cox: Some of the objectives would seem to address your concerns about considering all the impacts.
- Mr. Sullivan: Bigger community issues need to be given equal weight to reducing congestion.

### • Public Comment Period

As summarized below, 18 other people in attendance provided testimony.

- Dennis Lively(7-year Tualatin resident and former City Councilor)
  - He has commuted to work in different areas. No one wants to adequately fund solutions to growth. He is interested in bike/pedestrian solutions, but we can't solve this problem with bikes alone. We need to provide appropriate through routes, and routes for industrial traffic. Underestimating growth and changes only increases the challenge in addressing them.
- Chair Brian: The Washington County population is forecast to grow from approximately 500K to 900K in 25 years.
- Gordon Root (West Linn)
  - Suggests addition to Councilor Hosticka's objective: "Thereby enabling property owners and jurisdiction to move forward with long-term plans"

## DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

I-5 to 99W Connector: PSC Mtg. #3

Meeting Date: 03/13/06

Issue Date: 03/16/06

- Move connector as far south as possible
- If we don't move forward, we are going to implode.
  
- D. Cox: NEPA requires us to look at a reasonable range of alternatives
- John Bendit (Tualatin, owner of Upscale Automotive)
  - He used to have people come from all over to reach his shop. Now people don't come from other parts of the region because of traffic. Staff has to stagger lunches to run personal errands and avoid congestion. Something needs to be done. Business has suffered. Move forward as quickly as possible.
- Kristi Halvorson (Sherwood)
  - I-5 and 99W are at capacity, and we should not look at a project that could add traffic to them.
  - Study needs to look at how traffic will use connector to reach coast, possibly pay toll
  - Need to look at industrial land that is being developed
  - Freight travel is increasing
  - Enhancing Tualatin-Sherwood Road is paramount
- Stan Russell (Tualatin, Pastor at Grace Community Church)
  - The church and school at Boones Ferry and Norwood are growing. They serve 3,000 people. The school will expand from 500 to 1,200 students. The connector will be compatible with the church and school expansion plans.
  - The area that includes Tualatin/Sherwood/Wilsonville is a region. He would like to see the project resolved.
- Dave Carney (Tualatin, business and property owner)
  - The problem is bigger than Tualatin-Sherwood Road.
  - Tualatin/Sherwood/Wilsonville issues have been studied to death, and it is past time to do something.
- Tom Moes (Tualatin, business and property owner)
  - In favor of identifying new or existing route since growth will continue
  - He encourages the PSC to work collaboratively with SWG and community at large to identify solution and build consensus.
  - Keep on schedule for overall timeline/process
- Allyson Anderson (Legacy Meridian Park Hospital)
  - She supports a solution that provides improved access to emergency services. It is the only hospital south of Portland that provides care for heart attack and stroke patients.
  - Reduce traffic and allow access for advanced lifesaving care.
- Herb Koss (West Linn, owns properties in Tualatin)
  - This is a regional concern. He is involved with the Stafford Triangle, and most of the traffic will end up on I-5. A bypass will affect urban growth boundary expansion in the Stafford area.
  - He is encouraged there has been progress, and he supports future toll roads.
- Chris Feves (Sherwood)

## DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

I-5 to 99W Connector: PSC Mtg. #3

Meeting Date: 03/13/06

Issue Date: 03/16/06

- She submitted a petition signed by 2,300 residents who oppose a connector on prime farmland, per Oregon State law (note: this petition had been submitted previously).
- A connector will exacerbate congestion on I-5 and 99W. To put more traffic on these routes is a waste.
- Mark Cottle (Sherwood, former Sherwood mayor)
  - Tualatin-Sherwood Road defies physics – the fastest, most direct route is not a straight line.
  - Tualatin-Sherwood Road fails. Planning needs to move forward. The lengthy planning process is wearing citizens out. Make a decision and move forward – do something.
- Jon Pries
  - Supports connector. He is dismayed to see process starting from scratch. He supports Councilor Hosticka's comments.
- Neta George (Tualatin, business owner)
  - When she moved to Tualatin, she was told by her realtor that the Westside bypass would be built 15 years ago. She thinks the connector must remain as a top priority.
- Dan Ruediger (Sherwood)
  - Concerned about Purpose Statement – regional and interstate travel access. Only 16% of traffic is regional. PSC should not approve something that has not been proven. Concerned about 217, 99W, I-5, Tualatin-Sherwood Road. He thinks enhancing 217 is a potential and we need to look at enhancing I-5.
- Curtis Thressen, MD (Kaiser Permanente, Tualatin)
  - Agrees with Allyson that Tualatin-Sherwood traffic is affecting medical access. Connector important.
- David Shettles (Beaverton)
  - Lived in area since 1978. Attended all meetings for past and current process. Though there are different perspectives on the SWG, there is a need for this project. Do the right thing for the region. Take the long view.
- Stephanie Garrison(Sherwood)
  - She appreciates the process for this project so far.
  - Sherwood residents care about solution, and we want the right solution. She agrees with Dan Ruediger and Chris Feves. Include I-5 and 217 in the plan.
  - Connector should at least connect with the Newberg-Dundee bypass so that it could justify potential damage to farmland, which will be substantial.
  - Providence is building a hospital in Newberg so access to Meridian Park will be less of an issue when this is done.
  - Some PSC meetings should be held in the evening so that working people can attend them.
  - Time lights on Tualatin-Sherwood Road and 99W, and widen Tualatin-Sherwood Road to four lanes first.
  - Delay urban growth boundary changes until traffic problems are fixed.

## DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

I-5 to 99W Connector: PSC Mtg. #3

Meeting Date: 03/13/06

Issue Date: 03/16/06

- Bob Remski (Sherwood, farmer)
  - He bought property to get away from the city. The problem not fully defined. What is it really – regional or local? Congestion can be resolved many ways. What would happen if Tualatin-Sherwood Road were a toll road? The problem needs to be better defined.
- **Purpose & Need: PSC Discussion and Actions**
  - Chair Brian noted that we will accept written comments throughout the process. He summarized some of the themes of the comments heard, and requested that project staff work to provide clarification on regional/through travel vs. local travel.
  - Mayor Mays: Part of the issue seems to be different views of what is the definition of “regional”
  - David Cox: We don’t need to know if traffic is local vs. regional yet. Suggested deleting “for regional and intrastate” from the Purpose Statement. He thought we should keep logical project termini in the statement.
  - Mayor Lehan: If the purpose statement is broad, it seems that the needs statements ought to be more specific.
  - Mayor Ogden: The RTP is clear and entire scope of project is clear that the project focus is an I-5 to 99W Connector.
  - Kristin edited the Purpose Statement based on PSC discussion. The PSC approved a revised Purpose Statement (included in the attached PSC-approved Purpose and Need Statement)
  - Mayor Lehan: Her fear is we will identify a bunch of problems that will not necessarily be addressed by this project. She is not clear on the explanatory text after the first needs statement (sentence shown in bold text )
  - The PSC discussed need statements and agreed that the first (bold) sentence of each need statement is the focus, and that the text following each bold sentence is supportive. The PSC directed project staff to modify the supporting text.
  - PSC agreed to add “state” and “through” travel to first need statement
  - D. Cox: Questioned whether “multi-modal connectivity” is relevant. The PSC directed staff to provide a more clear explanation of this.
  - The PSC agreed needs, as amended, addressed Hosticka’s proposed revision
  - Mayor Lehan questioned whether there is data to support need statement #4. Barry responded that we are working on this now.
  
  - The PSC agreed to SWG/EMT modification to Need #4
  - The PSC agreed to incorporate the EMT suggestion for Need #5
  - Mayor Ogden: The reference to “rural” could just as easily include “urban” in #5. However, he did not suggest modifying this statement, and the PSC agreed that the other Needs Statements (1-4) address urban areas.
  - Mayor Lehan suggested the needs sounded like problem statements. She will support them but has yet to be convinced that they clearly demonstrate that the Connector is needed and she is still waiting to see that justification.
  
  - Chair Brian read the summarized ODOT Purpose and Need Guidance.
  - The PSC unanimously adopted the Purpose and Need Statement as amended.

**DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY**

I-5 to 99W Connector: PSC Mtg. #3

Meeting Date: 03/13/06

Issue Date: 03/16/06

• **Goals & Objectives: PSC Discussion and Actions**

- The PSC discussed and agreed to new wording to address the issue of avoiding, minimizing, and mitigating impacts that applies to objectives 2B – 2E.
- The PSC agreed to keep Objective 4C at its original text.
- PSC agreed to reject SWG suggested Objective 4D.
- The PSC discussed Councilor Hosticka’s proposed new Objective 4D. The PSC agreed that while it is relevant, it is specific to the process and not necessarily aligned with the context of other objectives.
- The PSC revised Hosticka’s suggested Objective 4D to include interchanges and agreed to add it as a new objective
- Mayor Ogden expressed concern about Goal 4. We need to make sure it does not set an unrealistic expectation.
- Kristin edited Objectives based on the PSC discussion
- PSC voted unanimously to adopt the Goals and Objectives as amended.

• **Project Update**

- Since the meeting ran late, the PSC agreed to receive a staff update on the project as a briefing in the near future.

• **Other Business and Next PSC Meeting**

- Several PSC members noted that they had Monday April 10, 2006 on their calendars. The PSC agreed to hold this date for the time being, as well as look for a date in May.
- Update on tech activities to be provided off line
- Charlotte – what is next decision point/next PSC meeting?
- Barry H. – Present Land Use/Environmental, Transportation findings.
- D. Cox – Invited PSC members to attend an April seminar series about understanding federal process

<b>Action Items</b>	<b>Responsible Party</b>	<b>Target Date</b>
Confirm next PSC date	PMT/EMT	Week of 3/27/06
Brief PSC representatives with project update	EMT members	Weeks of 3/27 and 4/3/06

**Upcoming Events**

**March 23-** EMT meeting 9:30-11:30 am at Metro, Room 601

**April 6-** SWG meeting 6:00-8:00 pm at Sherwood City Hall

April 10 (tentative) – PSC meeting 11:30 am – 1:30 pm at Tualatin Police Training Center

**April 20-** CETAS meeting 1:00-2:00 pm at ODOT Region 1