

## I-5 to 99W Connector Project Steering Committee

11:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m. Monday, May 8, 2006  
Police Training Room, Tualatin Police Station  
8650 SW Tualatin Road, Tualatin



### MEETING SUMMARY

#### PSC members

Chair Tom Brian, Washington County  
Mayor Lou Ogden, City of Tualatin  
Mayor Charlotte Lehan, City of  
Wilsonville  
Councilor David Luman, City of  
Sherwood (for Mayor Keith Mays)

David Cox, Federal Highway  
Administration  
Jason Tell, Oregon Department of  
Transportation (ODOT)  
Commissioner Bill Kennemer, Clackamas  
County

#### Not in attendance

Councilor Carl Hosticka, Metro

Commissioner Roy Rogers, Washington  
County

#### Staff

Fred Eberle, ODOT  
Michael Ray, ODOT  
Mark Turpel, Metro  
Barry Hennelly, Washington County  
Kathy Busse, Washington County  
Mike Stone, City of Wilsonville  
Rob Dixon, City of Sherwood

Scott Pemble, Clackamas County  
Mike McKillip, City of Tualatin  
Jennifer Danzinger, DEA  
Jef Kaiser, DEA  
Vaughn Brown, JLA  
Kristin Hull, JLA

#### 1. Welcome – Chair Brian

Chair Brian began by asking PSC members, staff and guests to introduce themselves. Chair Brian welcomed Jason Tell, ODOT's new Region 1 Manager, to the committee.

#### 2. Project Update – Barry Hennelly, Washington County

Barry Hennelly told the PSC that staff expected to have the transportation and environmental reconnaissance reports finalized and available for public review by mid-May. He also said that staff was still working to finalize the 2030 population and employment forecasts for use in producing transportation forecasts. He reported that the Executive Management Team (EMT) and Project Management Team (PMT) were working to develop screening criteria that would be shared with the Stakeholder Working Group (SWG) at its next meeting on June 1.

#### 3. Environmental Reconnaissance Summary – Jef Kaiser, DEA

Jef Kaiser reviewed a presentation summarizing the findings of the reconnaissance-level work completed to understand the social and natural environment in the project area (attached). Jef began by explaining that the report was developed by compiling existing data and assembling it to characterize the environmental context of the project area. He identified the project area and reminded the committee that the project area was the area where solutions were expected to be located. He reviewed slides in three categories: land use, community features and the natural environment.

He emphasized that the urban growth boundary (UGB) was an important part of the project's land use context because the project would be required to seek a land use exception for any improvement that was located outside the UGB. Jef referred to the map of the 2040 Growth Concept and noted that the north and south connector alignments shown on the map were developed as part of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) but had significance only as they represent the RTP's finding that some kind of a connector should be investigated. He also noted that the Tualatin River National Wildlife Refuge is a major feature in the corridor.

Jef referred to maps of community features and cultural resources. He noted that only one site in the corridor is currently on the National Register of Historic Places and that four more were eligible. He also noted that there are many Goal 5-listed or Landmark resources in the corridor. He showed a map of sites with hazardous materials and noted that the presence of hazardous materials is not usually a fatal flaw when evaluating corridors.

Jef reviewed the natural features in the corridor and pointed out the presence of riparian areas throughout the corridor and the location of the Tonquin Scablands. He told the PSC that habitat protection methods have changed over time and that, today, habitat is likely to be preserved as wildlife corridors rather than as isolated sites.

Jef closed by reminding the PSC that there are extensive social and natural environmental features to be considered as we develop and evaluate corridors.

Mayor Lehan asked if the study considered geologic resources. Jef responded that it considered geologic resources including topography and soils.

Mayor Lehan asked if the land use analysis anticipated changes that could be precipitated by Measure 37. Staff responded that Measure 37 claims would have a more significant impact on corridors located outside the UGB and that methods for evaluating the impact of Measure 37-related changes are still begin developed.

Mayor Lehan noted that potential Measure 37 impacts should be mentioned in the report. Further, she explained that property owners could make Measure 37 claims against the project if they are not provided with access to the new transportation facility.

David Cox asked if staff had begun coordination with the tribes. Jef responded that yes, the archeological consultant had contacted the tribes with an interest in the study area. David recommended that staff continue communications with the tribes as the project moves forward. *(Post meeting correction to response: Tribal coordination has not yet occurred. ODOT has prime tribal coordination responsibility.)*

#### **4. Transportation Existing Conditions Summary – Jennifer Danzinger, DEA**

Jennifer Danzinger reviewed a presentation summarizing findings from the Transportation Existing Conditions Report (attached). She explained that this report is an assessment of traffic conditions today and will be followed by an assessment of future traffic conditions. She noted that the report considers both operations and safety.

Jennifer explained that the transportation analysis area is larger than the project area to account for the affects of transportation improvements on the larger area. She noted that there are seven travel corridors, 90 intersections and six freeway interchanges that have been studied within the transportation analysis area. She also explained that the 2005 traffic counts provide information about traffic volumes, vehicle classification, speed and queuing.

She reviewed a map showing corridor screenlines and explained that screenlines show how traffic moves through the corridor. She noted that 7 to 30 percent of traffic on Tualatin-Sherwood Road and 8 to 20 percent on other roads is through traffic and that 90 percent of through traffic is moving in the east to west and northeast to southwest directions in the PM peak.

She told the PSC that 19 of the more than 80 signalized intersections studied in the corridor operate at level of service F today and that eight operate at level of service E.

A committee member asked where the volumes on I-5 were measured. Jennifer responded that counts were taken just south of I-205.

Mayor Lehan noted that the PSC had adopted an objective that the project should not cause negative impacts to I-5 and asked what criteria would be used to evaluate impacts to I-5. Barry Hennelly explained that criteria and measures had not yet been developed. Mayor Lehan continued that she was concerned that the objective was not clear. It could mean that the project should not have a “net” negative impact on I-5 which would allow for shifting of problems. David Cox agreed that the objective could be interpreted in different ways.

## **5. Public Comment**

### *Gordon Root, Root Holdings*

Gordon Root told the committee that the study alignment needs to account for the future location of a westside bypass route. He also said that the study area needs to be located as far south as possible since growth will occur in communities south of the metro area on 99W and I-5. He suggested that the study consider the urban service boundary rather than Metro’s current urban growth boundary.

## **6. Development of Corridor Screening Criteria – Jef Kaiser, DEA**

Jef reviewed a board that described the purpose and characteristics of screening criteria. He explained that the goals and objectives, by their nature, compete with one another (i.e. protect habitat and encourage dense development).

He explained that screening criteria, used to narrow a huge number of potential corridors to a few promising corridors for detailed study, should be pass/fail in nature. He noted that corridors would have to pass all screening criteria to be studied in more detail. For this reason, screening criteria need to be carefully developed.

Jef identified desirable characteristics of screening criteria. He explained that screening criteria should invite an easy pass/fail judgment. He explained that screening criteria could use performance criteria (traffic volumes) or require qualitative assessment that would build a case for pass or fail. He reminded the PSC that screening criteria should complement the

goals and objectives, not replace them and that screening criteria should be limited to 6 to 10 items.

He explained that currently the Project Management Team is working to develop draft screening criteria for review by the Stakeholder Working Group and Executive Management Team. *(Summary notes modify the explanation to correct a misrepresentation of the process described during the meeting).* Staff expects to present screening criteria to the PSC for approval at their June meeting.

Chair Brian asked about the process for development and adoption of the screening criteria. Jef explained that the PSC would be asked to review and adopt screening criteria in June after review by the Stakeholder Working Group and Executive Management Team.

Mayor Lehan asked if the Stakeholder Working Group would review and comment on the screening criteria before presentation to the PSC. Jef stated that the PSC would be provided with draft screening criteria and feedback from the Stakeholder Working Group in June.

Jef added that the screening criteria will only be used to identify corridors for further study and will be replaced by evaluation and selection criteria.

Jason Tell asked how many options are likely to emerge from the screening process. Barry Hennelly responded that it would hopefully result in about eight options.

## **7. Upcoming milestones and PSC meetings – Barry Hennelly**

The PSC engaged in a discussion about the type of information and input that the committee should receive and review. Mayor Lehan stressed that information presented to the PSC should focus on policy implications rather than technical detail and noted that she would like to see the PSC engage in more discussion. She also stated that she would like to have an opportunity to preview all information that will be presented at the community forums.

Barry responded that the Project Management Team (PMT) would do a better job of providing briefing materials to the Executive Management Team (EMT) so that they can brief PSC members before their meetings.

Chair Brian suggested that the PSC receive reports on the EMT's activities at each meeting. Jef suggested that the PSC could have a more direct role in shaping products, but it would require a more significant time commitment from PSC members.

David Cox stated that allowing the PSC to provide input on topics before work is complete would be preferable.

The PSC agreed to meet on June 12, a date that had already been set. Beginning in August, the group would meet on the fourth Monday of each month. PSC members will report any known conflicts with fourth Mondays to Barry before June 12.

### **Attachments:**

- Social and Natural Environmental Reconnaissance Summary

- Transportation Existing Conditions Summary
- Development of Corridor Screening Criteria