

**I-5 to 99W Connector Project SWG #7**  
**6-8 p.m. Thursday, April 6, 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  
Bill Shake, Friends of the Refuge  
Dave Volz, Tualatin CCI  
Tom Sullivan, Wilsonville 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

**SWG members absent:**

Jerry Renfro, Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue  
Mike Feves, Far West Association of Neighborhoods  
Bob Adams, Tualatin Chamber  
Ray Phelps, Wilsonville Chamber  
Adrian Emery, Sherwood CCI  
Nick Storie, Metro

**Staff and consultants:**

Vaughn Brown, JLA  
Kristin Hull, JLA  
Scott Richman, DEA  
Alice Rouyer, DEA  
Barry Hennelly, Washington County  
Mark Turpel, Metro  
Rob Dixon, City of Sherwood  
Mike McKillip, City of Tualatin

**1. Welcome, meeting purpose and agenda**

Vaughn welcomed the group and reviewed the agenda. He noted that this meeting would be mostly presentations to the SWG by staff members. The SWG adopted meeting summary #6 as written.

**2. PSC meeting report**

Vaughn briefly summarized the Project Steering Committee meeting held on March 13, 2006. Vaughn noted that four SWG members had attended to provide comment and more

than 20 other community members provided comment. He explained that the PSC carefully reviewed the comments of the SWG and generally adopted the recommended changes from the SWG. He reminded the group that it did not reach consensus on many issues related to the Purpose and Need Statement and that it had forwarded four versions of the Purpose and Need Statement to the PSC. He noted that the adopted version of the Purpose and Need Statement and Goals and Objectives are included in the meeting packets. Vaughn reminded the group that the adoption of the Purpose and Need Statement was a major milestone.

Loretta stated that she and many other SWG members were still uncomfortable with the justification included in the need statements. She feels uncomfortable that the need statements are being used to justify spending lots of money without supporting data. Vaughn reminded the group that this is a normal part of the process and that the Purpose and Need Statement can be reviewed and changed as data is available.

One member noted that he had requested in writing that the need statements be supported with data. Another member also asked why the available current year data that was not used to justify the need statements. Scott Richman explained that using the 2030 forecast data was more consistent with other projects in the region and that the team did not want to contribute to public confusion by using old forecasts in the need statements before releasing updated data this summer. The SWG member suggested that a footnote be added to the need statements noting that the data would be added when it is available.

A member noted that the Councilor Hosticka's suggestion about eliminating routes as soon as possible to allow people to move on with their lives was a good suggestion.

A member noted that many of the committee's suggestions in the Goals and Objectives were not adopted by the PSC. Vaughn noted that the PSC did not change all objectives precisely as recommended by the SWG, but did consider all the comments and made changes to reflect the spirit the SWG changes.

Mark Turpel noted that a table was prepared with the EMT recommended changes, the PSC recommended changes and the base language. He told the group that the PSC was provided with lots of information and carefully deliberated the changes. A member reiterated that the PSC did not adopt all the changes and particularly did not adopt the objective related to full cost accounting. Kristin Hull agreed to email the redlined version of the Purpose and Need and Goals and Objectives and to the SWG.

### **3. Land use and environmental reconnaissance**

Alice Rouyer and Scott Richman presented the Project Area Social and Natural Environment Reconnaissance Summary. Alice told the group that the full report would be available on the project web site in mid-May. The presentation is available on the project web site at [www.i5to99w.org](http://www.i5to99w.org).

Alice noted that, though not shown on the 2040 Growth Concept map, there are areas within the study area that are undergoing or will be required to complete concept planning efforts. The group noted that concept planning for some areas within Tualatin are on-hold until the corridor location is selected.

A member asked if the analysis includes the areas that are in the Metro greenspaces bond proposal that will be voted on in November and requested that the boundaries of the green spaces proposal be added to the data set.

A member asked about how future urban growth is captured in the land use analysis. Mark Turpel noted that the maps show areas that have been adopted by the Metro Council. It is likely that other areas will be added to the UGB over time. The land use assumptions for the travel forecast has assumed land use changes to 2030, but has not assumed that exception areas near Sherwood were added for the purposes of travel forecasting for the project. This decision was made to ensure that the project is not justified in terms of future UGB expansions.

Scott explained that the 2040 Growth Concept map showed a south and a north option for the I-5 to 99W connector. He told the group that the locations shown represent past planning efforts and should not be interpreted as a location for a corridor. A SWG member asked if the commuter rail shown on the map would be included in the travel forecasting. Mark Turpel responded that it would not be included in the forecasting since it is not included in the financially constrained Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

Scott discussed the Tualatin River National Wildlife Refuge and noted that the areas shown in shaded green are currently owned by the refuge. These areas receive special protections and would require additional analysis and justification if they are to be impacted by a potential corridor. The other areas outlined in orange are areas that the refuge would like to acquire but does not currently own.

A member asked that if the refuge lands had to be avoided when alternatives were developed and if they were affected what thresholds must be met.

Scott explained that there was a very high threshold that would have to be met if a corridor that affected refuge owned land was selected. The threshold is high enough that it is in the best interest of the project to avoid directly impacting areas that are currently owned by the refuge.

Scott showed the agriculture and forest resource land maps and explained that locating a corridor outside the UGB would require proving that there was not a feasible location inside the UGB. A member noted that the process was starting with a clean slate and that the northern alignment could still be considered feasible.

A member noted that full cost accounting is very important given the land uses in the corridor. A connector on farmland could be viewed as cheaper than one that affects existing businesses if only construction costs are considered even though it is very expensive to put a connector on farmland from a full cost accounting perspective.

Scott showed the cultural, historical and archeological resources. He noted that there is cluster of historic buildings in downtown Sherwood's historic district. A SWG member asked what kinds of things are captured as historic resources. Scott explained that the

historic features database really includes anything from buildings to utility lines that is over 50 years old.

He showed the Hazardous Site map. He explained that the hazardous materials sites are a consideration because they can add cost to projects. Scott clarified that the NW Natural Gas pipeline would be considered a hazardous materials site. Vaughn noted that all sites identified do not imply contamination.

Scott then talked about natural features. He began with wetlands, waterways and habitat areas. He showed a map of Metro Goal 5 Classification including riparian habitat and upland habitat areas. He explained that any corridor will likely affect some riparian and upland habitat areas. Barry Hennelly noted that some ESA-protected species are present in the study area and that habitat for those species receives special protection.

A member asked why the Tonquin Scablands are shown on the natural resources maps. Barry said that they receive special land use status because they are a mining resource.

In conclusion, Alice explained that this data will be used in developing evaluation criteria and in comparing alternatives according to those evaluation criteria.

A committee member noted that that the topography in the area will limit the location of corridors. Scott noted that the geotechnical consultant prepared information about that topic though it was not shown here.

A member asked about the north and south alignments that are shown on the 2040 Growth Concept map. Mark Turpel explained that the alignments were from previous planning efforts and are an acknowledgement that a route is needed. Mark explained that the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) did not completely approve the southern route outside the UGB. LCDC did find that the need and mode were justified, but did not find significant justification to locate it outside the UGB.

A member noted that there is a gap in the refuge boundary for a connector.

A member noted that some maps showed resources outside the immediate study area. He said it is important to understand the physical constraints around the study area to ensure that the connector could be expanded in the future, if needed.

A member asked if there were constraints related to distances between interchanges. Scott explained that there are state and federal guidelines about interchange spacing. The accepted standard for interchange spacing in an urban area is one mile. If interchanges are located less than one mile apart, other fixes such as braided ramps or split diamond interchanges are considered.

A member asked if there was room between existing interchanges for a new interchange to be located on I-5 within the study area. Barry noted that there was not space for a new interchange with standard spacing.

A member said that, from the big picture, Tualatin-Sherwood Road seems to be the only alternative that works so the study should focus on widening Tualatin-Sherwood Road. Barry explained that we'll look at Tualatin-Sherwood Road and any improvements that we can make to it.

A member asked for copies of the presentation to be distributed by email. Kristin agreed to post the presentation to the web site.

A member noted that this information made him think that there no place for a corridor to be located without negatively affect land use and the environment.

A member asked if David Cox (the FHWA representative on the Project Steering Committee) could attend a SWG meeting to provide information on NEPA and FHWA to the group.

A member asked if there is a map that shows who is for and who is against different alignments. Vaughn responded that the project won't be developing that type of listing but will be asking for SWG assistance in preparing criteria that the alternatives can be evaluated against. That will provide the project basis for selecting a preferred alternative.

#### **4. Project schedule update**

Scott reviewed the project schedule and next steps. He noted that, though the PSC adopted the Purpose and Need Statement and Goals and Objectives, those documents also need to be agreed to by CETAS before being considered complete.

He explained that the next major project work product will be the development of screening criteria that will be used as a filter for developing a range of alternatives. He told the group that the next SWG meeting will be focused on reviewing draft evaluation criteria.

Scott explained that the project expects to have 2030 travel forecasts for the no-build condition to be available late this summer. The SWG will likely meet in August to review this information.

#### **5. Public comment**

##### **David Shettles**

David proposed two questions:

- Does Metro have a position supporting or opposing this process?
- What would Metro do if the selected corridor impacts areas identified for purchase with bond funds?

Mark Turpel responded that the properties that would be purchased if the bond passes have not yet been specifically identified. Metro's proposal is to buy properties from willing sellers within areas identified as high value habitat. Metro is coordinating internally. Mark also noted that Metro is a participant in the process.

##### **Tom Moes, Root Holdings**

Tom first noted that there is more than one mile between some interchanges on I-5 in the study area.

Tom said that he had requested at a previous meeting the public be notified of any areas that are eliminated from further consideration. He suggested that the SWG determine how they will publicly announce the elimination of some corridors from consideration when decisions are made.

He noted that the community features map does not show the new Horizon High School. It should be identified.

### **Lance Powlison**

Lance requested that a schedule of future meetings and topics be posted on the web site.

Lance said that he can see that this is going to be a long process and he can understand why. He would like to request that areas that are not feasible for corridors are eliminated as soon as possible. He is currently waiting for the City of Tualatin to complete concept planning for an area. The city will not proceed with concept planning until the Connector Study identifies corridors.

A committee member asked how long it will be before areas can be eliminated from study.

Vaughn Brown explained that all possible alternatives will be compared to the screening criteria and those that do not meet the screening criteria will be eliminated from further consideration. Scott Richman noted that it could be as long as a year before that is complete.

A committee member noted that the concern is that local jurisdictions are not allowing development to move forward and asked if there is anything we can do to give these people some certainty sooner.

Mark Turpel noted that many of the issues are not absolute, but will represent trade-offs between alternatives. Those alternatives are not easy to eliminate since they are all going to have some impacts, but they will be different impacts. There are no easy options where the answer is obvious.

## **6. Next steps and close**

Bill Shake, Friends of the Refuge, noted that the grand opening of the refuge is June 3 and 4. The public is invited to attend. Bill will provide details to the SWG.

A member suggested that the SWG should have a field trip to the refuge and the scablands. Bill offered to arrange it when staff thought it was appropriate.

Next meeting: June 1