

**I-5 to 99W Connector Project SWG #2  
6-8 p.m. Thursday, Nov. 3, 2005  
Meeting Summary**



**Location:**

Sherwood Police Training Room  
20495 SW Borchers Drive, Sherwood

**SWG members in attendance:**

Loretta Pickerell, 1000 Friends of Oregon  
Elliott Eki, AAA Oregon  
Tom Aufenthie, CPO 5 (unincorporated Washington County)  
Mike Feves, Far West Association of Neighborhoods  
Bill Shake, Friends of the Refuge  
Jack Laverty, Oregon Trucking Association  
Susan Rychlick, Sherwood Chamber  
Dave Volz, Tualatin CCI  
Bob Adams, Tualatin Chamber  
Jerry Renfro, Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue  
Ron Johnson, Washington County Farm Bureau  
Jon Reimann, Westside Economic Alliance  
Ray Phelps, Wilsonville Chamber  
Debra Iguchi, Wilsonville CCI (alternate)

**SWG members absent:**

Adrian Emery, Sherwood CCI

**Organizations without a member identified:**

Metro Committee on Citizen Involvement

**Guests:**

David Shetteles  
Dean Sorensen  
Tom Moes

**Staff and consultants:**

Vaughn Brown, Jeanne Lawson Associates  
Kristin Hull, Jeanne Lawson Associates  
Leslie Howell, Howell Consulting  
Jef Kaiser, DEA  
Mark Turpel, Metro  
Barry Hennelly, Washington County  
Michael Ray, ODOT  
Rob Dixon, City of Sherwood  
Mike McKillip, City of Tualatin

Steve Kelly, Washington County

**1. Welcome, meeting purpose and introductions- Vaughn Brown, JLA**

Vaughn welcomed the group and thanked the SWG for their participation. SWG members agreed to share their contact info among the membership. Vaughn reviewed the revised agenda. Audience members and SWG members not at the first meeting introduced themselves.

Loretta Pickerell, 1,000 Friends of Oregon, clarified a point made at the last meeting. She said that Commissioner Rogers had identified the connector project as part of the LUTRAQ recommendation. She noted that she had checked with 1,000 Friends of Oregon and that group thought that the LUTRAQ recommendation had not specifically called for the connector project but had called for modest improvements to existing roadways and locating jobs and housing within the current UGB.

The committee adopted meeting #1 summary as written.

**2. Adopt protocols/committee charter**

Vaughn reviewed the revised committee charter/protocols document. The SWG discussed if the section titled “SWG goals” should be included in the chartering document. The SWG determined that the SWG goals should be removed from the chartering document but should be the starting place for developing project goals and objectives later in the process.

The SWG discussed the role and purpose of the SWG. They discussed whether the SWG was formed to select a transportation corridor given the presumption that a corridor is the solution to the transportation problem or if the SWG was formed to find a transportation solution to a problem that will be identified whether it is a corridor or something else. The group agreed that the steering committee needs to provide a clear expectation of the SWG’s role. Another member said that the SWG will learn about the study area and find out which corridor, if any, is the best solution. The SWG agreed to table this discussion until the purpose and need agenda item. Vaughn clarified that the SWG was not going to make decisions, but the SWG would provide guidance and feedback on project decisions.

A member suggested adding a bullet in the responsibilities section stating that the SWG will be cognizant of other regional and local planning activities.

**Question:** Are other project committees operating by consensus?

**Response:** *All project committees are operating by consensus. The project is structured so that all affected jurisdictions have to buy-in to an eventual solution.*

A committee member requested that the web site be kept up-to-date so that SWG members can direct interested people to the web site for information.

The committee charter/protocols were adopted as amended.

### **3. Introduce scoping and purpose and need- Jef Kaiser, DEA**

Jef began by explaining that the SWG is important to the scoping process. Jef reviewed the process flow chart (attached). Jef explained that the project is predicated on the inclusion of the connector in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The RTP calls for a connector to serve regional and intrastate travel in the area. He told the group that the inclusion of the connector in the RTP doesn't mean that the SWG can't conclude that the connector is a bad idea or that it should be done differently.

Jef explained that the project is broken into two phases to make the work more manageable. The first phase will focus on selecting a corridor for the connector that can be adopted into the RTP and local plans. The second phase will focus on designing a transportation facility within the selected corridor and meeting the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

Jef told the group that the consultant team is already collecting information about the study area. He said that early work to create a draft purpose and need has already occurred. The SWG will be invited to comment on the purpose and need.

Jef reviewed a board describing what a purpose and need statement is. He told the group that the purpose does not describe the solution and that the need provides evidence that there is a problem that needs to be solved. He explained that the goals and objectives provide further refinement of what needs to be done and shaping of the character of potential solutions.

Jef then reviewed the project's draft purpose and need (attached). He explained that the study area has an obvious transportation deficiency when viewed from a regional perspective. There are no direct routes between I-5 and 99W.

**Question:** How was the purpose and need developed?

**Response:** *The purpose and need was developed by the PMT and EMT. The PSC will ultimately adopt the purpose and need after public review and input.*

**Question:** Why is Tigard not included in the PSC?

**Response:** *The PSC includes jurisdictions with land in the study area. Tigard is involved through council and staff briefings.*

**Question:** Can you provide examples of areas with facilities that serve a similar purpose to the connector we're discussing?

**Response:** *In other areas of the region, highways are connected by arterials or other highways such as the Banfield connecting I-5 and I-205.*

**Question:** I-5 and I-205 have traffic problems. Why are they not included in the purpose and need?

**Response:** *I-5 and I-205 south are separate priorities for study and improvement. The transportation planning process looks at discrete projects so that we can move forward, but the modeling looks at the affects on the whole region.*

**Question:** How often is the RTP amended?

**Response:** *The RTP has been amended at least every three years as dictated by federal law. The federal law just changed to require amendment every four years.*

A committee member noted that the draft purpose and need seems intuitive and that the committee should be able to quantify benefits and costs to make informed decisions. Another committee member noted that the corridor study approach does not allow planners to look at the big picture. Looking at the big picture is necessary to make sure that the solution identified in this area doesn't create a bigger problem elsewhere. A PMT member clarified that the transportation modeling will look at how proposed I5 to 99W connector solutions affect the whole system.

**Question:** Is improving local connectivity by removing local traffic from existing arterials to make capacity on those arterials available to regional and intrastate traffic a possibility?

**Response:** *Even if you removed all local trips from the existing arterials and improved them to accommodate regional and intrastate traffic, you would still not have good direct routes between I-5 and 99W.*

**Question:** Is the purpose and need statement broad enough to allow for other types of solutions that would serve local needs.

**Response:** *Yes, the purpose statement is broad enough to allow for all kinds of solutions.*

**Question:** What is the timeframe implied in the purpose?

**Response:** *The study will consider population growth and traffic projections to 2030.*

#### **4. Project context and issue identification- Leslie Howell, Howell Consulting**

Leslie reviewed scoping topics. She explained that the team would provide information about the following topics during scoping:

- Air quality
- Natural resources (wildlife, fisheries and aquatic, botanical, endangered species)
- Cultural resources (archaeological and historic)
- Geology and soils (flood plains and prime farmlands)
- Hazardous materials
- Land use (existing and planned land uses; and approved local, regional, and state plans)
- Parks, recreation lands, wildlife refuge
- Noise
- Socioeconomics (residences, businesses, minority and disadvantaged populations, emergency and community services)
- Transportation (vehicular traffic, non-motorized traffic, transit)
- Water quality and hydrology
- Wetland and other waters of the U.S. and State
- Utilities
- Visual

The committee requested a copy of the board Leslie reviewed.

Vaughn led the group in a modified brainstorming exercise. SWG members were asked to write down on stick notes the answers to these questions:

- What questions do you what answered?
- What information do you need?

The responses were then posted and the group categorized them. The transcription of the sticky-notes and categories is attached. The group placed most of the sticky notes in the following categories:

- Natural resources
- Commercial traffic
- Industrial areas
- Land use
- Transportation and congestion
- Multimodal transportation
- Community
- Farmland

#### **5. Open house plan- Kristin Hull, JLA**

Kristin reviewed the open house and public notice plan. She explained that the structure would be a self-guided open house where a participant would arrive and be directed to an introductory presentation. After the introduction, participants would be free to review displays and complete a feedback form. Kristin also explained that the major means of notice would be a newsletter mailed to all addresses in the study area. The group suggested making it very clear in the newsletter that the next one would not be mailed to everyone and that the newsletter be mailed to the entire Sherwood zip code not just the study area. It was also suggested that the newsletter describe why it is important for interested parties who have been involved in earlier planning efforts to continue to participate in this effort.

#### **6. Public comment**

Tom Moes

Tom began by stating that the public involvement would be very important to this process. He also told the SWG that they should keep impacts on schools in mind as they consider solutions. He said that Metro would consider making future UGB expansions in this area and that UGB expansions would be accompanied by concept plans. The planning processes should not be waiting to see what route is selected for an I-5 to 99W corridor. The SWG should keep in mind the affect of the location of the connector on other planning. He said the SWG should use its clout to be sort of a watchdog on other I-5/99W committees (i.e., they should review/comment on their meetings) as well as on city planning officials for starting concept plans, meaning there has to be strong communication with city planners especially in Tualatin during this study process.

## **7. Next steps and close**

An SWG member asked if the SWG could provide comment on the purpose and need. Jef said that they could provide comments. The SWG member then stated that the purpose was good – it was a narrow statement and it should stay that way.

An SWG member asked when traffic projections would be available. A PMT member responded that the population and employment forecasts would be available in mid-December and traffic projections would be available in mid-February or early March.

The next SWG meeting is scheduled for December 1 from 6-8 p.m. at the Sherwood Police Training Room.

## **Brainstorming Results** – sorted by goal/objective (*G/O*) or information needed (?)

### **Community**

- Promotes livability: (*G/O*)
  1. Transportation choices
  2. Connected communities
  3. Healthy communities
  4. Green infrastructure
- Support business without sacrificing local livability (*G/O*)
- Avoid existing residential neighborhoods (*G/O*)
- Reduction of busy residential streets (*G/O*)
- Impact on livability in rural areas (?)
- Impacts on residential and other development along any route (?)
- How will the placement of a traffic corridor impact the quality of life of existing residential areas (?)
- How will traffic noise levels be projected and evaluated (?)

### **Natural Resources**

- Protects natural areas, corridors, habitat, wetlands (*G/O*)
- Avoiding or mitigation impacts to fish and wildlife habitat (*G/O*)
- Impacts of project within refuge approved boundary (?)
- Impacts of water run off- quality and quantity (?)
- Geological impacts (?)
- Effect on wetlands on and off the refuge (?)
  1. Rock Creek
  2. Coffee Creek

### **Land Use**

- Avoid adding pressure to expand urban growth boundary (*G/O*)
- Support local comp plans and region 2040 plan (*G/O*)
- Impacts on UGB expansion or vice versa (?)
- Impact on accelerating development (?)
- Need answers to basic land use and transportation questions: (?)
  1. Who is using roads and why?
  2. Where are they going? Why?
  3. How is it zoned?
  4. Who owns what?
- How does UGB affect alternatives – Clearly define this upfront (?)

### **Industrial Use**

- Impacts on industrial area development (?)
- Industrial areas (?)

1. Scattered?
  2. Centrally located?
- How will the transportation “solution” lead to industrial land development in the study area (?)

### **Farm Land**

- Protect farmland (*G/O*)
- Impact on farmland and prime farmland (?)

### **Commercial Traffic**

- Emergency response within connection corridor (*G/O*)
- Access points to and from connector to industrial and residential (*G/O*)
- Freight mobility (*G/O*)
- Fluent commercial traffic (*G/O*)
- Connector considerations: (*G/O*)
  1. Access to Portland
  2. Access to South Valley
  3. 24 hour truck access
  4. Ability to scale traffic volume in 20 years

### **Transportation**

- Avoid adverse impacts to existing traffic interchange on I-5 (*G/O*)
- Avoid creating one more 99W, Tualatin-Sherwood Road (*G/O*)
- Be more efficient (*G/O*)
- Connector not to serve as a by-pass (*G/O*)
- Coordination with other planning efforts such as Tualatin industrial area concept plan and downtown visioning process (*G/O*)
- Impacts beyond termini of the study area – I-5, I-205 and 99W (?)
- Concerned that there seems to be an idea of funneling traffic from 99 to I-5, which is already overwhelmed and declining (?)
- Clearly quantify amount of regional and interstate traffic volume, and where they come and go outside the study area (?)
- Now, will road reduce congestion or just keep it from getting worse (?)
- What are we trying to do (?)
  1. Reduce travel time
  2. Redirect existing traffic flow

### **Multi-modal**

- Mass transit expansion (*G/O*)
- Consider multi-modal solutions (*G/O*)
- Promote transit choice (*G/O*)

### **Miscellaneous**

- Economic Development (*G/O*)
- No investments without necessary local land use restrictions are in place (*G/O*)

- Use full cost accounting to extent possible (*G/O*)
- Solution is cost effective (*G/O*)
- Compatible with school locations (*G/O*)
- Where are pipelines located (?)
- How do other large cities and communities deal with this issue (i.e.: Vancouver BC has no freeway through the city) (?)
- How likely is it that the study area will be expanded or moved or limited (?)