



**I-5 to 99W Connector Project SWG #4
6-8 p.m. Thursday, Jan. 19, 2006
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
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
Jerry Renfro, Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue
Adrian Emery, Sherwood CCI

SWG members absent:

Nick Storie, Metro CCI
Jack Laverty, Oregon Trucking Association
Lynette DeVere, Sherwood Chamber
Ron Johnson, Washington County Farm Bureau
Jon Reimann, Westside Economic Alliance

Guests:

David Shettles
Tom Moes
Others

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
Danielle Cowan, City of Wilsonville
Randy McCourt, DKS

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

Vaughn welcomed the group. Vaughn asked new SWG member, Adrian Emry from the Sherwood CCI to introduce himself. Vaughn also told the committee that he had met with Nick Storie, the Metro CCI representative, and that he would likely attend the next meeting.

Vaughn reviewed the agenda and explained that tonight's SWG meeting was aimed at responding to requests that SWG members had made at previous meetings related to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and how available transportation data supported the project's purpose and need statement. Vaughn reminded the SWG that any guidance and feedback to the PSC on the purpose and need and goals and objectives would need to be completed by their February 23rd meeting. This timeframe cannot be altered beyond that meeting to maintain the project decision-making schedule. This means that the SWG protocol allowing delaying a project decision to the next meeting kicks in at this point. Vaughn urged SWG members to discuss any Purpose and Need (including the Goals & Objectives section) concerns with their relevant constituents as soon as possible to meet the February 23rd deadline.

The SWG adopted meeting summary #3 by consensus.

Vaughn asked members SWG members to help in organizing community group briefings. Members should contact Kristin Hull at (503)235-5881 if they would like to schedule a project discussion with their represented group or any other community group.

2. Scoping outreach summary – Kristin Hull, JLA

Kristin reviewed the scoping outreach summary and key findings handout. The handout and the complete compilation of comments are available on the project web site at www.i5to99w.org. She explained that all of the comments received on nearly 400 comment forms and all comments collected on flip charts and maps were transcribed and categorized. She reviewed a few key findings and noted that there were many areas where community members disagreed. She noted that that tonight's SWG meeting was designed to address many of the questions that were raised by community members and by the SWG at previous meetings.

The committee had a brief discussion about the scoping outreach and noted that the open house attendance seemed skewed toward community members who lived near potential corridor locations and did not have good representation from business or freight interests. SWG members suggested more targeted outreach to business and freight interests for the next public meeting.

3. Regional Transportation Plan presentation – Mark Turpel, Metro

Mark Turpel gave a power point presentation about the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Mark explained that the RTP, adopted by the region through JPACT and the Metro Council and developed through a regional public involvement process, lays the groundwork for the I-5 to 99W Connector project. The RTP looks at the regional picture, assesses region-wide needs and identifies areas that need improvements and recommends

more detailed, local studies to consider how those improvements ought to be implemented. He described how the RTP considers and accounts for the impacts of all transportation modes in determining which specific projects to include and prioritize in developing the RTP. The presentation is available on the project web site at www.i5to99w.org.

4. Transportation needs – Randy McCourt, DKS

Randy McCourt, a traffic engineering consultant on the project team, presented current data supporting the identified traffic and transportation needs in the corridor. He reviewed the need section of the project's draft purpose and need statement and provided facts that supported each of the statements. He reminded the SWG that updated traffic forecasts will not be available until the summer because Metro is currently updating the regional travel model to a forecast year of 2030. This new model will be used to update the current information as part of this project's transportation analysis. He used existing data including on the ground traffic counts and other available forecasts completed for local Transportation System Plans to explain the project's need statements. The presentation is available on the project web site at www.i5to99w.org.

5. Committee Q&A about the presentations -- SWG

Vaughn asked the committee if they had any questions for Randy or Mark about the information that had been presented.

Q: What is the forecast year for this project?

A: 2030

Q: Will the transportation analysis include other roads in the area like I-5? The presentation didn't talk about I-5 at all.

A: There is lots of data available about I-5. The travel forecasting model looks at the affects of changes on the entire system, including I-5, and then the information is disaggregated to understand the affects in the local area. The project's transportation analysis will consider the entire system as well as arterials and even some local streets.

Q: Is there any political pressure or bias in the transportation modeling? Who pays for it?

A: The transportation modeling relies on population and housing forecasts that are developed by Metro and reviewed by committees comprised of elected officials from throughout the region. Once those forecasts are approved, they are passed along in the form of numbers to transportation modelers. The models are not biased or subject to political pressure. The I-5 to 99W study is being paid for by ODOT, Washington County and Metro.

Q: Who is championing the project? How did it become a priority now?

A: The corridor was identified through a regional process that compared many corridors based on a range of factors. It emerged out of agreements reached through JPACT. The project has been strongly supported by the Washington County Board of Commissioners and by the cities of Sherwood and Tualatin.

Q: How are local plans related to the federal highway plans? What are FHWA's plans for I-5 and how are they captured in this study?

A: In this region, Metro is the metropolitan planning organization (MPO). The MPO is responsible for planning for regional facilities like I-5. FHWA participates on the regional technical and policy committees for transportation planning and is an ex-officio member of the steering committee for this project.

Q: How accurate have transportation forecasts been over time?

A: They have been very accurate over the long term. In the shorter term, the realization of housing and employment forecasts is dependent on many economic factors and can have ups and downs, but taken over ten or twenty years, they are generally quite accurate.

Q: When will the RTP be updated next?

A: The RTP is due for a major update in 2008 to reflect the outcome of the land use planning effort that is beginning called the New Look.

Q: Can you model how transit would affect transportation needs in the area? What about light rail?

A: The RTP included transit in the form of commuter rail in the corridor and the needs analysis includes those routes. The current RTP did not include east-west transit in the study area because there was not demand to support it. The project's transportation analysis will look at what we call the "kitchen sink" alternative which will include everything except a new roadway (transit, local road improvements, intersection improvements) and see how it performs compared to the no-build alternative and roadway alternatives.

Q: Why isn't Wilsonville shown in more of the data? It is an important industrial center and was only referred to in the presentation as a farm community.

A: It was an oversight.

6. Goals and Objectives – Jef Kaiser, DEA

Jef Kaiser introduced the draft goals and objectives that the committee will be discussing in detail at their next meeting. Jef reminded the SWG that agreement on the purpose and need and goals and objectives is an important project milestone that defines how the project will move forward. He explained that the goals and objectives ought to identify things that should be considered as the project is developed but should not necessarily include every specific concern. He told the committee that the goals and objectives should reflect important themes and issues.

Jef presented the draft goals and objectives. He explained that this draft was compiled from previous SWG input, Open House comments and input received via the web site and reminded the committee that this draft was just a starting point. He asked the SWG to review the goals and objectives and begin discussions with the groups they represent in preparation for the next meeting. The draft goals and objectives are posted on the project web site at ww.i5to99w.org.

The committee requested to have the goals and objectives and the CETAS guidance on purpose and need e-mailed to them.

7. Public comment

Michael Long, Ladd Hill resident

Michael lives near the southern corridor shown in the RTP. He bought his home in the country, like his neighbors, to live in a quiet setting. Now he is concerned that he might have a highway in his backyard. He said that the connector should be located in an industrial area to serve freight traffic not in a rural area. He wanted to know what the status of the southern connector was and if it could be approved since it was not inside the UGB. He also asked if the route was set in stone or if he and his neighbors could still influence the decision-making process.

A committee member responded that no routes had been identified at this time and that he and his neighbors should remain vigilant as the process moves forward.

Tom Moes, Root Holdings

Tom encouraged the committee to look at ways to eliminate parts of the study area where a roadway would not be viable as early as possible so land use planning and development could proceed in those areas.

The project team explained that after the goals and objectives and screening criteria are established, the project will begin to identify all the feasible routes for potential corridors. The potential corridors will be screened according to criteria to a few corridors to be studied in detail. At each of these steps, areas within the study area but outside of the corridors under consideration will “drop out” of the study. The first round of corridor identification should occur by summer.

8. Next steps and close – Vaughn Brown, JLA

Vaughn reminded the group that the SWG will meet twice in February (the 9th and the 23rd). The February 9th meeting will be held at the Sherwood Police Training Facility and the February 23rd meeting and subsequent meetings will be held at Sherwood’s new City Hall.