



## Stakeholder Working Group (SWG) Meeting #10

6 to 8 p.m. Thursday, October 19, 2006  
Sherwood Police Training Center  
24095 Borchers Drive, Sherwood

### MEETING SUMMARY

#### Attendance:

Jon Reimann, Westside Economic Alliance  
Susan Rychlick, Sherwood Chamber of Commerce  
Tom Sullivan, Wilsonville CCI  
Dave Volz, Tualatin CCI  
Ray Phelps, Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce  
Jerry Renfro, Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue  
Ron Johnson, Washington County Farm Bureau

#### Members absent:

Bob Adams, Tualatin Chamber of Commerce  
Adrian Emery, Sherwood CCI

Mike Feves, Far West Association of Neighborhoods  
Elliot Eki, AAA Oregon  
Loretta Pickerell, 1000 Friends of Oregon  
Tom Aufenthie, CPO 5  
Nick Storie, Metro CCI  
Jack Laverty, Oregon Trucking Association  
Bill Shake, Friends of the Refuge

#### Staff present:

Barry Hennelly, Washington County  
Tim Wilson, ODOT  
Mark Turpel, Metro  
Scott Richman, DEA  
Jennifer Danziger, DEA  
Kristin Hull, JLA  
Vaughn Brown, JLA

#### Meeting purpose

- Review and understand modeling process and baseline travel demand results
- Prepare for SWG alternatives development workshop

#### 1. Welcome, meeting purpose and agenda – Vaughn Brown, JLA

Vaughn welcomed all participants and reviewed the agenda. He announced that the next Stakeholder Working Group (SWG) meeting would be three hours long to accommodate the alternatives development workshop.

Vaughn reviewed the project's benchmarks and reminded the group that they had made a lot of progress and had moved through the development of the purpose and need, goals and objectives, screening criteria and was now at the step of developing a range of alternatives.

#### 2. Project Steering Committee update – Vaughn Brown, JLA

Vaughn explained that the PSC had adopted a Purpose and Need Statement and Screening Criteria at their last meeting. He told the SWG that the several documents were provided for their information:

- staff memo on screening criteria
- two memos from Councilor Hosticka
- adopted purpose and need, goals and objectives and screening criteria

Vaughn told the group that one screening criterion, noted with an asterisk, was under review by the Attorney General at the request of the PSC. One SWG member noted that the PSC had concerns about making sure that the screening criteria considered issues related to community connectivity. Another SWG member asked why compatibility with current plans required review by the Attorney General since it was something all committees agreed was important. Barry Hennelly noted that the question was in how narrowly the criterion was currently stated. The re-wording would allow for a broader body of plans to be reviewed.

A SWG member asked if the cultural resources map had been updated to include the natural gas pipeline. Scott responded that the natural gas pipeline including the general location is described in the Environmental Reconnaissance Report, and that Northwest Natural Gas would not release the data needed to show the pipeline location on a map. Another SWG member noted that it was important to have constraint maps with the most up-to-date information available.

### **3. Modeling and travel demand – Jennifer Danziger, DEA**

Jennifer reviewed a “Draft Baseline Travel Demand Results” presentation (attached). Her presentation reviewed how the transportation model works and preliminary demographic and transportation trends. Jennifer also responded to questions raised by the SWG at previous meetings.

Jennifer began by defining trip types and explaining that understanding how local, regional and through trips were defined for this study was important. She then reviewed the aggregated travel volumes for the study area and noted that the ratio between local, regional and through trips is similar in 2030 but that volumes increased a great deal.

Jennifer then looked at the development of the travel model and how land uses, route choice and origins and destinations are determined. She noted that the land use assumptions for this model do include some expansions to the urban growth boundary to accommodate population and employment growth. For the purposes of this model run, no additional urban growth boundary expansion in the Sherwood area is assumed.

Jennifer then explained some key trends from the preliminary modeling results. She reviewed the baseline 2030 assumptions and noted that the baseline model included all projects in the financially constrained regional transportation plan and funded local projects in the study area with two exceptions: a new east-west arterial link south of Tualatin, and expansion of Tualatin-Sherwood Road. She noted that the baseline model does not include an expansion of Tualatin-Sherwood Road because we anticipate that different kinds of improvements to Tualatin-Sherwood Road will likely be tested under project alternatives. Jennifer discussed forecast travel trends and how they support the need statements.

*Committee questions and discussion*

Q: How does the model know which trips are regional, through and local?

A: The calculation of these trips is defined by the user not the model. We have developed a set of specific definitions for through, regional, and local trips. The model is then used to run the calculations based on these definitions.

Where a trip begins and ends is based on land use data that is aggregated into analysis zones. Trip generation is estimated and a matrix of trip origin and destination pairs is developed. The model determines origin and destination pairs based on zone size, travel time, and other factors developed from surveys and travel diaries that detail actual people's travel patterns. This data was developed using a very elaborate travel behavior survey completed in 1994 and which is calibrated with 2005 actual road volumes to ensure that the model remains accurate.

Q: Are there biases built into the model that would support a connector?

A: The 2005 model run results were compared to actual measurements of traffic to ensure the output valid. The same model is used throughout the region with some detail added in the project area. The model that is used currently does a better job of approximating local conditions than models used in the past. The model is accepted by the Federal Highway Administration, Environmental Protection Agency and the Federal Transit Administration.

Q: Has anyone checked old model forecasts to see how close they were to reality?

A: It has been done, but I am not sure of the details. Some of the past models have under-forecasted population and traffic growth.

A committee member asked if the forecasts become a self-fulfilling prophecy because the system is built to address forecasted demand. Rob Dixon, City of Sherwood, noted that he has worked in this field for twenty years and has seen communities under-build the transportation system.

Q: Does the model consider public transportation and biking as options?

A: The model assigns trips to a mode (biking/walking, transit, car, truck) based on the system available for that trip. The model includes bike/pedestrian and transit improvements included in the financially constrained regional transportation plan.

A committee member clarified how to read several of the graphs depicting trends. Jennifer agreed to verify that a point on the highway trend map was shown in the correct location. A committee member noted that Wilsonville attracts a large number of regional commute trips into the city each day.

Q: What does baseline transportation improvements mean? Why are so many projects shown in Wilsonville? Are they actually funded?

A: Those are the improvements that are included in the financially constrained regional transportation plan and funded local projects. Wilsonville has several local projects that are funded related to development.

Q: How can traffic volumes on I-5 continue to grow when it is already congested?

A: Some trips divert from I-5 because of congestion, but many trips remain on I-5 because there is no where else to go despite the congested condition of I-5. When travel options off I-5 become too congested, then people make the choice to travel on a busy interstate because it is less congested than other roadways.

Q: Is there migration from arterials to local roads when arterials fill up?

A: The team is hearing anecdotal evidence that local roads are already experiencing increased traffic volumes. That trend will continue.

Q: The data seems to suggest that most trips in the area are regional, not local. That is not consistent with the expectation of people in the area. Is there a way to validate or buttress this argument to make it more believable?

A: Only 14% of trips are local (both origin and destination are within the project area) but all regional trips have a local component since one end of the trip lies within the project area. Some regional trips may not be that long; they may begin/end just outside the project area.

The analysis focuses on the PM peak period which is the time when congestion is typically the worst during the day. The PM peak may be skewed to more regional trips because it is the commute time. It is possible that a higher percentage of trips during the mid-day are local trips.

The committee discussed that there needs to be a very deliberate effort to explain how the model is developed and validated at community open houses if the findings are to be believed. Jennifer reminded the committee that the model can be best used as a tool for comparison and it will be used to compare different alternatives.

A committee member requested that the team provide information about conditions in the mid-day, not just at the peak period.

A committee member noted that Wilsonville is right – the connector is going to have an impact on I-5 south. Jennifer noted that we will be able to compare how different options change the operation of I-5.

The committee was asked if any of the key findings outlined in slide 29 were a surprise. None of the SWG members present indicated that they found anything surprising about the key points.

#### **4. Alternatives development process – Kristin Hull, JLA**

Kristin discussed the alternatives development process. She explained that the SWG and EMT would each have an alternatives development workshop where they would have the opportunity to review the environmental constraints and traffic trends in developing ideas about project solutions. The solutions could include improvements to the existing system or new corridors. Kristin reminded the group that this step will be very conceptual with corridors being about a 500 foot wide swath within which a much narrower roadway would be located. The community will have the same opportunity to complete this exercise at the open houses in November and December.

Kristin also told the group about outreach to support the open houses. She noted that JLA was preparing a newsletter to be mailed to about 1700 addresses. Newsletter announcements would also be provided to community and advocacy groups for inclusion in their newsletters. The project team would also use local media to advertise open houses.

#### **4. Public comment**

John Alton

John told the group that he had saved forecasts from when Highway 99W was expanded. He would provide it to the team so that they could see how accurate forecasts were for that project. He thought the 2005 numbers seemed pretty consistent with what was forecasted for 2005 in the early 1990s.

## Responses to questions received after SWG #10 -- November 2, 2006

### PSC Review

When is the PSC going to have an opportunity to review the results of the traffic modeling?

*The PSC has had access to the travel demand presentation handout from the October 19<sup>th</sup> SWG meeting. A brief presentation will also be provided to the PSC at their next meeting on November 22, 2006.*

### Model Inputs

The 2030 baseline improvements do not show any improvement to I-5. Are any planned?

*The 2030 baseline improvements include only those improvements identified in the financially-constrained Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) project list which does not identify any improvements to I-5.*

Are all road projects planned by the cities involved included in 2030 baseline improvements?

*The 2030 baseline improvements includes those city projects that were also identified in the financially-constrained RTP and other city projects which have known funding programmed except Tualatin-Sherwood Road.*

### Travel type definition

Why does the definition of "Local Traffic" differ from that presented to the PSC previously by the consultants in their report of May 2006 entitled, Existing Transportation Conditions Technical Memorandum" ..Page 11 paragraph 3.1 says, "The analysis found that 7 to 30 percent of traffic on key existing corridors is non-local traffic (neither trip end is within Tualatin, Sherwood, Tigard or Wilsonville.)"

The presentation at the SWG meeting has now defined traffic with trip ends in the project area as regional traffic! Therefore switching 58% of the traffic from local to regional?

*The information presented at the October 2006 SWG meeting is consistent with the information contained in the existing conditions tech memo but the terminology used is different. The "other" or "non-local" traffic described in the memo is the same as the through traffic. When aggregated for the study area, this through percentage in the 2005 model is estimated at about 25% versus the 2000 model estimate of 7 to 30% on various roadways in the project area.*

*We have since chosen to examine more closely that traffic which is not through but that either begins and/or ends within the project area, i.e. traffic that has some "local" connection. We have defined regional traffic as that traffic which has only one trip end within the project area (the local component of the trip) while the other trip end lies outside of the project area. The remaining trips, those that remain wholly within the project area are those trips that we are terming local trips.*

*That approximately 60% of the traffic is regional is not surprising for the PM peak period that we are examining. This time period is generally the most active period of the day because it includes high levels of commuting trips as well as other types of travel. Commuting trips are much less sensitive to travel distance than other types of trips. The project area contains many people who live within the boundaries but work elsewhere and many who work within the boundaries but live elsewhere.*

Does ODOT have a standard definition of local traffic?

*The term local traffic can be defined in multiple ways, but is generally associated with travel within a community or other specific area. Because the project area contains several adjacent communities, we have used the project boundary to specify the local area. ODOT staff has reviewed and supports this definition.*

The presentation to the SWG indicates the trip type definition has very specific meaning within the context of this project. Is that the normal approach to defining trips? (i.e. project by project?).

*Any of these terms can have a variety of interpretations and meanings depending on the person and his or her individual viewpoint, and depending on different project context. By clearly defining their meaning in relation to this project and project area, we create a common understanding of their usage for everyone associated with this project.*

*It is important to differentiate between regional, through and local trips because each trip type can be most appropriately served by a different type of road. Local trips should use local roads while regional trips and through trips should use major roads (arterials) and the state highway system.*

### **Concept evaluation**

Tualatin has nearly completed a "Concept Plan" for their portion of the recently added industrial area. Will that plan be incorporated in the analysis? It includes a draft transportation plan that seems at least on the surface to solve some of the problems on T/S road. Will this be looked at?

*The recommendations from this concept plan will be considered as we develop the transportation system improvements alternatives that will be evaluated.*

Will the traffic modeling of alternatives include an analysis of the Direct/Indirect and cumulative impacts on I-5?

*When the range of alternatives is developed, the impacts to the I-5 corridor that result from each alternative will be identified as well as appropriate mitigation measures.*

Have the impacts of the planned Nyberg Shopping center been included in the analysis?

*The land use in the travel demand model accounts for planned retail use in the area that the shopping center is located.*