



Stakeholder Working Group (SWG) Meeting #9

6 to 8 p.m. Thursday, August 3, 2006
Sherwood Police Training Center
24095 Borchers Drive, Sherwood

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

Attendance:

Rick Ross, alternate, Friends of the Refuge
Mike Feves, Far West Association of Neighborhoods
Tom Sullivan, Wilsonville CCI
Dave Volz, Tualatin CCI
Elliot Eki, AAA Oregon
Loretta Pickerell, 1000 Friends of Oregon
Ray Phelps, Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce
Jerry Renfro, Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue
Ron Johnson, Washington County Farm Bureau
Nick Storie, Metro CCI
Tom Aufenthie, CPO 5
Jack Laverty, Oregon Trucking Association

Members absent:

Bob Adams, Tualatin Chamber of Commerce
Jon Reimann, Westside Economic Alliance
Susan Rychlick, Sherwood Chamber of Commerce
Adrian Emery, Sherwood CCI

Staff present:

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

Meeting purpose

- Update on Project Steering Committee (PSC) purpose statement deliberation
- PSC guidance - draft screening criteria and measurement
- Input on public alternatives development process

1. Welcome, meeting purpose and agenda

Vaughn welcomed all participants and reviewed the agenda. He announced that the Stakeholder Working Group (SWG) would not meet in September and that the next SWG meeting will be on October 5. The group requested some corrections to the attendance recorded for meeting #8 and asked to add a sentence about developing metrics to the measure the criteria.

A SWG member asked that the EMT meetings be announced on the project web site. Barry responded that staff would post them in the future.

2. PSC items under consideration

Purpose statement update- Vaughn Brown, JLA and Jef Kaiser, DEA

Vaughn introduced the purpose statement agenda item. He reminded the group that the SWG's initial input to the PSC included three different purpose statements and had indicated the highest level of support for the staff-recommended purpose statement. The PSC subsequently adopted that purpose statement with some revisions. Further agency and staff review of the PSC adopted purpose statement identified some wording and policy weaknesses and led project staff to recommend PSC reconsideration of the originally proposed statement. The PSC was not able to reach consensus on a new statement at their June meeting and referred the purpose statement back to staff to incorporate PSC concerns. Staff worked to develop a new purpose statement that better addresses those concerns in an effort to reach PSC consensus.

The refined purpose statement to be presented to the PSC in August is:

The purpose of the project is to address the problem of an inadequate state highway connection between I-5 and 99W in the southwest quadrant of the Portland metropolitan area to serve the growing demand for regional and intrastate travel, while considering the need for local arterial access to the state highway system.

Vaughn asked each SWG member to share their thoughts about the purpose statement with the group.

- Dave Volz asked if the proposed purpose statement meets federal and state requirements. Staff responded that it meets all requirements. Dave then asked if including "local arterial access to the state highway system" is a problem. Staff responded that it was OK because it focuses on the state highway system but explains that there needs to be local arterial access to the state highway system. Dave asked if this includes improving traffic congestion on Highway 99W. Staff explained that the purpose does not preclude looking at how solutions will affect Highway 99W. Dave asked if traffic modeling will look at an area broader than the study area. Staff explained that the project will use a regional traffic model and will look at the study area in more detail. Dave then stated that he is happy with the way the newly proposed purpose statement.
- Ron Johnson reported that he had listened to public comment at the PSC meeting and is comfortable with the new purpose statement.
- Jack Lavery said he was fine with the new purpose statement.
- Rick Ross said that he thought linkages between new development and the future connector are important. He said that the purpose statement seems to allow for that type of thinking about land use and the connector working together.
- Tom Sullivan said he did not have any comments.
- Ray Phelps said the new purpose statement was fine.
- Tom Aufenthie quoted the purpose and need statement guidance, "need should be understandable to general public." He said that the need is understood to be on Tualatin-Sherwood Road and this should be clearer in the purpose statement. He explained that he would like to see "growing demand for local travel" included in the purpose statement. Vaughn explained that the statement accounts for local traffic issues within the context of a regional project.
- Jerry Renfro said that he thinks that this statement is much clearer and that it provides focus.

- Elliot Eki said that he was confused about context for purpose statement. He said it is pretty bland and passive and should use stronger verbs (i.e. “project is going to do this.”)
- Mike Feves said that this purpose statement is far better than any other statement that has been considered. However, the way the statement is written now, if the data shows minimal regional traffic, the project would not move forward. Mike would like to see the last clause deleted and add the word “local” to “regional and interstate traffic.”
- Loretta Pickerell said that it is still not clear if this purpose statement allows for alternatives that improve local connectivity to relieve Tualatin-Sherwood Road instead of building a new highway connection. Staff responded that the purpose statement allows for improvements to existing facilities instead of building a new highway connection.
- Nick Storie said that he did not have an opinion.

The group had a discussion about what local traffic means and how many of the trucks on Tualatin-Sherwood Road are actually local. Jef explained that regional truck trips could have one trip end within the study area.

A SWG member explained that the Wilsonville area has more jobs than people to fill them and that part of the local traffic in the area is commuters coming to work in Tualatin and Wilsonville.

Most of the remaining discussion centered on the issue of local traffic with a variety of perspectives expressed. Several suggested revisions to the purpose statement regarding local traffic were suggested but there was no consensus around any of the suggestions.

Vaughn asked Jef to explain the phrase “local arterial access to the state highway system.” Jef explained that when you look at the state highway system within the southwestern quadrant of the region there is gap between I-5 and 99W. Jef also explained that travel from within the area that moves out or outside travel that ends in the area is all considered regional travel not local travel. Vaughn explained that this process cannot address every local transportation need in the area so the purpose statement needs to be somewhat specific in referring to local traffic.

A SWG member suggested that local road widening could solve the regional problem. Jef responded that it is regional travel but is not necessarily on the regional system. The SWG member said that that the current statement sounds like local arterial access is not regional travel and suggested changing the wording to “including the need for local arterial access to the state highway system.” Another SWG member thought that made more sense but there was no further consensus about the revision.

Draft screening criteria input- Jef Kaiser, DEA

Jef reminded the group that they had provided some input on the screening criteria at the last meeting. He explained that screening criteria were the first step in choosing which options should move forward and which options should be set-aside.

Jef referred to the chart that had PMT, EMT and SWG input and revised screening criteria based on those comments. Jef reviewed how the screening criteria had been

revised to respond to SWG comments. He then explained that the criteria had sense been further refined.

Screening criteria comments

Proposed screening criteria	SWG comments/input
<p>Provides a solution that meets the future demand for regional and through travel to/from and between I-5 and 99W in the Tualatin/Sherwood/Wilsonville area.*</p> <p>* Does not preclude consideration of existing roadway facilities and allows for the designation of a state highway route connecting I-5 with 99W.</p>	
<p>Provides relief from regional and through traffic for Tualatin/Sherwood Road and 99W north of Tualatin/Sherwood Road.*</p> <p>*Does not preclude consideration of existing roadway facilities and allows for the designation of a state highway route connecting I-5 with 99W.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggested need to keep options for local road network improvements on the table, both new and existing. • Confusing to include the footnote at all; screening criteria should be simple. • Assume that traffic modeling staff can interpret the results to measure these criteria including differentiating between local and regional traffic. • Should allow solutions that allow for regional traffic on T-S rather than “relief from regional..” by providing other routes for local traffic. (Group split on whether or not this criterion allows this consideration.). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o One suggestion: “Provides relief from congestion for Tualatin/Sherwood Road and 99W north of Tualatin/Sherwood Road.”
<p>Mitigates operational and safety impacts on I-5 and 99W resulting from this project.</p>	
<p>Improves freight access to/from I-5 and 99W.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Freight is narrow and limiting given the other “commerce” related trips that need to be served (i.e. commute). • What exactly does improve mean? How much better does it have to be to be improved? Suggestion to include the forecast year in the criteria or the metric.
<p>Provides a transportation solution that addresses the goals and policies of the Oregon Highway Plan, including mobility standards, access management, and rail and highway compatibility.</p>	
<p>Provides a transportation solution that addresses regional</p>	

land use planning and the intent, policies, and standards of the Regional Transportation Plan.	
Provides a transportation solution that is compatible with local comprehensive planning.	Substitute city and county for “local
Provides a transportation solution that maintains the functional values of protected natural resource areas.	
Provides a transportation solution that avoids protected or designated cultural resources that are dependent on remaining in place for their value.	

A SWG member suggested adding a cost-effectiveness criterion. Jef responded that at this initial screening phase cost would be difficult to calculate and that options might be prematurely eliminated.

Jef then explained the development of metrics for the transportation criteria. He explained that a sub-committee of transportation experts would be developing measures for the criteria under goal 1.

Loretta asked about if there are creative, new ways to address these problems rather than just using the same old assumptions and techniques that have not worked that well so far. Staff explained that the opportunity for creativity is in the development of alternatives. The Metro transportation model is recognized as a good model – the looking at things differently comes in the development of alternatives.

A SWG member asked what would happen if all alternatives fail the screening criteria. Jef explained that if no solutions work, we’ll need to reexamine how we’re doing this.

A SWG member asked what would happen if you discover that just building the connector does not solve the problem because it also requires new lanes on I-5 and Highway 217. Jef explained that demand modeling will help us to understand the rest of the region better, but that this project will not attempt to solve all those problems.

3. Public process

This agenda item was tabled to the next meeting.

4. Public comment

Dan Rudiger

Question: can someone define the terms local, regional and intrastate traffic? 80% of traffic in the study area is local.

A staff member explained the following:

- Local traffic has both an origin and destination within the boundary
- Through traffic has no origin or destination within the boundary
- Regional traffic has one end of the trip within the boundary and one end outside the boundary

Dan suggested that the group add local to everything in the screening criteria because there is a local component.

John Alton

Other cities might have solutions that are worth looking at. Look at best practices and consider innovative solutions that may have worked other places, also look at things that fail in other places for solutions.

Loretta: It seems like the measures for screening is the first place that we will preclude creative thinking. Assuming that a lane can carry a certain number of people is limiting. If everyone “in the know” knows that improvements to Tualatin-Sherwood Road are not going to work, the committee needs to know that. Vaughn explained that the alternatives development process will allow for the suggestion of any creative solution.