



## Stakeholder Working Group (SWG) Meeting #11

6 to 9 p.m. Thursday, November 2, 2006  
Sherwood Police Training Center  
24095 Borchers Drive, Sherwood

### DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

#### Attendance:

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  
Mike Feves, Far West Association of Neighborhoods  
Bob Adams, Tualatin Chamber of Commerce  
Loretta Pickerell, 1000 Friends of Oregon  
Rick Ross, Friends of the Refuge  
Tom Aufenthie, CPO 5

#### Members absent:

Adrian Emery, Sherwood CCI  
Elliot Eki, AAA Oregon  
Nick Storie, Metro CCI  
Jack Laverty, Oregon Trucking Association  
Jon Reimann, Westside Economic Alliance

#### Staff present:

Barry Hennelly, Washington County  
Amy Gibbons, ODOT  
Mark Turpel, Metro  
Scott Richman, DEA  
Jennifer Danziger, DEA  
Jef Kaiser, DEA  
Kristin Hull, JLA  
Vaughn Brown, JLA

#### Meeting purpose

- Answer additional questions on baseline traffic information
- Conduct SWG modeling workshop

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

Vaughn welcomed all participants and reviewed the agenda. He told the group that tonight's meeting would be focused on sketching ideas on maps and capturing ideas about concepts that the SWG would like to see considered in the screening process. He reminded the group that their ideas would be consolidated and shared at the open houses.

Vaughn reminded the SWG that open houses are scheduled for November and December and that details are available on the project web site.

The SWG adopted meeting summaries #9 and #10.

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

Vaughn told the SWG that the next PSC meeting would be from 12:30-1:30 p.m. on Wednesday, Nov. 22 at the Sherwood Police Training Center.

## **3. Travel demand results review – Jennifer Danziger, DEA**

Vaughn recapped Jennifer's presentation for those who missed the last meeting and asked SWG members what key ideas they'd like to share with those who missed the meeting. The following comments were made by SWG members:

- The presentation was excellent. Everyone should understand the depth of the data that goes into developing the traffic forecasts and the validity of the model.
- Most SWG members were satisfied with how the traffic data was developed after the presentation was complete.

### *Committee questions and discussion*

The SWG spent time discussing the finding that east-west traffic in the area doubles by 2030. Jennifer clarified that this finding refers to east-west traffic doubling in the study area. A SWG member was skeptical about how this number was developed and whether or not it was correct. He noted that the percentage increases in traffic in the southern portion of the project area were large but the actual numbers were very small. Jennifer agreed to provide additional information on the screenline to the SWG.

A SWG member noted that the increases in traffic in the southern part of the project area were due to Villebois. Another SWG member disagreed and said that it was due to additional employment in Wilsonville. Project staff explained that the growth is probably due to both housing and employment changes but that Wilsonville will continue to have more jobs than housing. The model recognizes that cut-through traffic on local roads will become a bigger issue as major routes become more saturated.

A SWG member noted that the model is not detailed enough to differentiate which trips are local and which are cut-through. Project staff explained that the model looks at all east-west traffic and is able to show us the changes in traffic over time based on land use inputs.

A SWG member said that he'd like to know what the model's margin of error is. Jennifer said that she was not sure but that the team would look into it.

A SWG member stated that he would like to know where traffic is coming from and where it is going to make sure the connector is located in the right place. Jennifer explained that the modeling can reveal origin and destination pairs and that the comparison of different alternatives will help everyone to understand what connector location will best serve demand.

The SWG continued to discuss the impetus for trips in the southern part of the project area. One SWG member thought that most of those trips were commute trips while another SWG member expressed concern that the trips are generated by Villebois development but will lead to people thinking that the corridor should be located further south.

A SWG member asked if level of service data would be added to need statements now that it was available. Barry explained that the project team could demonstrate the needs with the data but that the actual need statements would not be revised.

A SWG member asked if the baseline includes projects that are already funded. Jennifer explained that the baseline includes all locally funded projects and those included in the RTP's financially constrained alternative. The baseline does not include improvements to Tualatin-Sherwood Road.

#### **4. Alternatives development workshop – Jef Kaiser, DEA**

Jef introduced the alternatives development workshop. He explained that alternatives would be developed to a very low-level of detail at this point. A corridor alternative would identify the area of influence of a connection at I-5 and 99W and would include a broad corridor (500 to 1000 feet). The connector ideas could also include intermediate accesses. The width of the corridor would allow room for a roadway to be designed in the area that minimizes impacts.

Jef explained that the project will be required to consider:

- options with the fewest impacts to some resources
- improvements to the existing system include Transportation System Management (TSM) and Transportation Demand Management (TDM)
- solutions inside the UGB

A SWG member asked why TDM improvements are not included in the baseline. Jef explained that TDM improvements that are included in the financially constrained alternative are included in the baseline; other TDM improvements should be tested along with other improvements.

Jef then reviewed the results of the EMT workshop at the SWG's request.

Finally, the SWG broke into groups to develop ideas. The results of the SWG workshop were collected, summarized and will be included in the compilation of all ideas generated at the EMT workshop, SWG workshop and public open houses.

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

No comment at this meeting.