

**I-5 to 99W Connector Project SWG #6  
6-8 p.m. Thursday, Feb. 23, 2006  
Meeting Summary**



Location:  
Sherwood City Hall  
22560 Pine Street, Sherwood

**SWG members in attendance:**

Loretta Pickerell, 1000 Friends of Oregon  
Tom Aufenthie, CPO 5  
Mike Feves, Far West Association of Neighborhoods  
Bill Shake, Friends of the Refuge  
Dave Volz, Tualatin CCI  
Bob Adams, Tualatin Chamber  
Tom Sullivan, Wilsonville CCI  
Ray Phelps, Wilsonville Chamber  
Adrian Emery, Sherwood CCI  
Susan Rychlick, Sherwood Chamber  
Ron Johnson, Washington County Farm Bureau  
Jack Laverty, Oregon Trucking Association  
Jon Reimann, Westside Economic Alliance  
Elliot Eki, AAA Oregon  
Nick Storie, Metro

**SWG members absent:**

Jerry Renfro, Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue

**Staff and consultants:**

Vaughn Brown, JLA  
Kristin Hull, JLA  
Scott Richman, DEA  
Leslie Howell, Leslie Howell Consulting  
Barry Hennelly, Washington County  
Mark Turpel, Metro  
Michael Ray, ODOT  
Rob Dixon, City of Sherwood  
Mike McKillip, City of Tualatin

**1. Welcome and introductions – Vaughn Brown, JLA**

Vaughn welcomed the group. He explained that Leslie Howell, the project manager for the consultant team, was going to sit with the SWG to help with clarification questions. He also noted that the project management team was now seated at a table away from the general audience with name tags to make their role clear to SWG members and the audience when the group has questions for staff.

The group agreed, at the request of a SWG member, to revisit the Purpose and Need Statement if there was time at the end of the meeting. Some SWG members were not clear about the purpose of the poll at the end of the previous meeting.

Vaughn also told the SWG that staff was working on a staff report detailed the SWG's comments on the Purpose and Need. This report will be sent to the SWG for review next week and shared with the PSC at their meeting on March 13. SWG members are invited to attend the PSC meeting and provide comments. About six members said they intended to attend the PSC meeting. Vaughn asked anyone else who planned to attend the meeting to let Kristin know ahead of time to ensure that there is time on the agenda for SWG comment.

The SWG approved the meeting summary. The approved summary should include a revision to comments provided by Kristi Halvorson that she will email to Kristin.

## **2. Goals and Objectives**

Vaughn began by explaining the process for reviewing the goals and objectives. He told the group that they could first ask clarifying question and make additional comments. The SWG would then dot vote for the goals and objectives that they could live with using green dots or needed to discuss further using red dots.

The goals and objectives as amended are attached.

Following is a summary of the SWG's suggestions on the goals and objectives:

### **Goal 1**

#### *Objective 1C:*

A SWG member requested to add tractor-trailer access as a mode.

#### *Objective 1D:*

A committee member asked why improvements to Highway 99W were not included as a possible objective. Another committee member noted that improvements to 99W could be a project recommendation but should not be an objective.

A SWG member asked that the objective be refined to ensure that the project does not shift traffic problems to Wilsonville.

A SWG member suggested new wording which was generally OK with the group: "Provide transportation improvements that will not negatively impact I-5 or 99W."

#### *Objective 1G:*

A committee member asked why emergency vehicle response times needed to be "enhanced" as it is stated in this objective. The committee noted that Jerry Renfro from Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue was not present to respond to this question.

#### *Objective 1H:*

A committee member suggested that this objective should be dropped because it refers to increasing capacity as a project objective. Another committee member noted that he would prefer to address capacity in the Purpose and Need but, if it is not included in the Purpose and Need, it should be included in the objectives. The SWG did not remove this objective from the list.

## **Goal 2**

*Objective 2B, 2C, 2D and 2E:*

The group determined that all of these objectives should be consistent in wording and should all begin by stating “Protect by avoiding, or minimizing and mitigating” and should not include “where practicable.”

*Objective 2C and 2D:*

The group determined that both 2C and 2D should include reference to both planned and existing areas. 2C should include residences and communities rather than residential communities and 2D should include industrial areas.

## **Goal 3**

*Objective 3A:*

The group decided to eliminate the word “existing” before habitat.

*Objective 3B:*

The group decided that the words “where practicable” and “as appropriate” should be removed to make the objective stronger.

*Objective 3C:*

A SWG member noted that it was actually important to recognize the special status of the Tualatin National Wildlife Refuge in the objectives. The group agreed and decided to not act on the suggestion by a SWG member to eliminate that objective.

## **Goal 4**

The group discussed Goal 4 and thought it should be reworded to read more clearly. The revised goal reads: “Provide a timely and cost-effective project solution that performs throughout its expected design life.”

*Objective 4B:*

A committee member suggested adding full cost accounting to this objective. The SWG determined that full cost accounting (social and environmental as well as money costs) should be included as a separate objective.

*Objective 4C:*

Vaughn explained that ODOT policy requires leaving this objective in despite a committee member’s suggestion to take it out. The group suggested rewording it to say “Protect the project solution from unintended land use impacts.”

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

##### **Dan Ruediger**

Dan began by stating that he did not understand what had happened between meetings since there was not consensus at the last meeting and at this meeting staff suggested that the purpose and need was settled.

Dan was concerned about the project being labeled as a regional problem where the problem was actually local. He contended that the existing data does not demonstrate any regional traffic issue exists and objected to the word “regional” in Objective 1A and throughout the goals and objectives. He urged the SWG not to approve any goals and objectives that referred to a regional problem.

##### **Kristi Halvorson**

Kristi noted that she would like to revise how her comments were captured in the last meeting summary. She will email revisions to Kristin.

She thought the goals and objectives and purpose and need should refer to addressing issues on Tualatin-Sherwood Road more specifically since there is so much new and undeveloped industrial land in that area. She suggested that objective 2D be revised to add “future industrial areas.”

##### **SWG member discussion**

The SWG members discussed the public comment and directed some questions to Dan Ruediger. A SWG member asked Dan why he objected to the project having a regional purpose. Dan explained that regional means trips outside Tualatin, Sherwood and Wilsonville. He thought the growth in those areas had created the need for a transportation improvement. He stated that he thinks the “regional” purpose is just a way for the project to get federal funds. Another SWG member asked why developing a regional project that could receive federal funds is a problem. Dan responded that he is concerned that the project is about building a connector with federal and state funds rather than focusing on fixing the actual, local problem.

A SWG member suggested adding future industrial areas to objective 2D. Another SWG member suggested adding “planned” to objective 2C. A SWG member thought that a comment like Dan’s about the type of trip would be better addressed in the purpose statement, but that it was really too early to define the type of trip. The SWG determined that the words “regional and intrastate” in 1A ought to be replaced with “through.”

The SWG agreed to place red dots next to any objectives they objected to. A SWG member objected to the revision to objective 1A and thought it should specify regional and interstate trips. Another committee member suggested that objective 1H should be eliminated. All other aspects of the goals and objectives were approved by consensus.

#### **5. Purpose and need**

The SWG agreed to reopen the discussion on the Purpose and Need Statement. Mike Feves shared the revised Purpose and Need Statement that he had submitted earlier as a

supplement to the SWG report to the PSC. He thought it addressed some of the wording concerns raised at the meeting such as “inadequate transportation facilities”, “growing demand” and “regional and intrastate travel”. Ray Phelps suggested the group consider Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce’s revised purpose and need statement which focuses the purpose directly on improvements to Tualatin-Sherwood Road.

Some SWG members noted that they did not think the poll at the last meeting was clear. There was a brief discussion about another poll.

The group recognized that they were not likely to reach any greater level of agreement than already achieved at their last meeting. The group did agree to forward the purpose and need version resulting from the previous meeting along with the two options presented tonight to the PSC with the feedback that there remains a degree of dissatisfaction with the purpose and need statement and that the SWG needs more explicit guidance from the PSC on this issue.

Leslie Howell and Vaughn reviewed the system for project decision making.

## **6. Close**

Vaughn told the group that there would not be a meeting in March. The next meeting would be on April 6.