

## Stakeholder Working Group (SWG) Meeting #20

6 to 8:00 p.m. Thursday, March 20, 2008  
Sherwood Police Training Center  
24095 Borchers Drive, Sherwood

### MEETING SUMMARY

#### **I-5/99W SWG members present**

Scott Stoddard (*Tualatin Chamber of Commerce*)  
Marie Dodds (*AAA Oregon*)  
Mike Feves (*Far West CPO*)  
Dave Volz (*Tualatin CCI*)  
Ray Phelps (*Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*)  
Tom Aufenthie (*CPO 5*)  
Jon Reimann (*Westside Economic Alliance*)  
Adrian Emery (*Sherwood CCI*)  
Barbara Shields (*Friends of the Refuge*)  
Ron Johnson (*Washington County Oregon Farm Bureau*)

Tom Sullivan (*Wilsonville CCI*)

#### **I-5/99W SWG members absent**

Nick Storie (*Metro CCI*)  
Jim Haynes (*Sherwood Chamber of Commerce*)  
Loretta Pickerell (*1000 Friends of Oregon*)

#### **Project staff present**

Lawrence Odell (*Washington County*)  
Scott Richman (*DEA*)  
Jennifer Danziger (*DEA*)  
Vaughn Brown (*JLA*)  
Shareen Rawlings (*JLA*)

#### **Welcome & introductions**

Vaughn walked through the meeting agenda and revisited the purpose and goals of the meeting. He explained that during this meeting, the project team would:

- Present preliminary 99W and I-5 alternatives analysis info
- Discuss alternatives 4 and 5 99W operations issues and implications
- Review I-5 operations & connections
- Collect SWG input on transportation analysis information

Vaughn mentioned a concern that several SWG members communicated through email to the project team. This concern was that the PSC would be making a decision to drop Alternatives 4 and 5 in their next meeting. Vaughn explained that this was not true – he emphasized the process and the role of analysis, reminding the group that the PSC would make a final recommendation based upon input from the SWG and project team.

Vaughn walked back through the project purpose. He explained that the project team was hoping and looking forward to next fall, late 2008, to come to a conclusion or consensus surrounding the a selected alternative. He explained that due to the amount of technical information, the SWG and other committee groups would be focusing on the alternatives analysis report and technical findings during their next couple of meetings.

Vaughn asked the group to turn to the agenda – and made mention of several changes. He explained the I-5 discussion today would be a brief discussion regarding connections to I-5 proposed in the modified project alternatives. Other changes including a staffing switch – Jennifer Danziger with David Evans would be talking about modifications to alternatives 4 and 5 in the Alternatives analysis – transportation volume and capacity data and findings section of the meeting.

Vaughn then led the group through a brief round of introductions. He then asked for corrections or additions to the summary. Tom Sullivan noted that his closing comment in the previous SWG meeting was not recorded.

**EMT report – Lawrence Odell (Washington County)**

Lawrence explained that essentially the EMT met today and received a similar stack of information that the SWG has in front of them. Looked at the vehicle capacity ratios with the Alternatives 4 and 5 – preliminary findings indicated that there may be a need to expand the footprint and expand access points for 99w in order to ensure that these alternatives achieve the project goal. The EMT recommended unanimously that the PSC retain these alternatives and look into surface area improvements that may expand the footprint of these alternatives.

A SWG member asked Lawrence if there was discussion at the EMT about the pros and cons of this decision. Lawrence noted that the SWG material today would focus on the same discussion points.

Vaughn turned the discussion over the Jennifer and Scott to discuss the alternative analysis findings. He explained that the tonight would focus on volume and capacity. He mentioned that the next couple of meetings would focus on other areas of analysis including environmental, and land use.

**Alternatives analysis – transportation volume and capacity data and findings – Scott Richmond and Jennifer Danziger (DEA)**

Scott provided a brief introduction into the transportation analysis – revisited the purpose of tonight, and walked through a revised project committee schedule.

Jennifer explained that in the last meeting Chris Maciejewski explained the broad level of analysis. As the analysis process moved forward – smaller levels of detail indicated some complications in terms of capacity and demand on 99w in alternative options 4 and 5. She explained that these capacity issues raised a red flag for the project team, specifically in terms of ODOT policy that mandates that all corridors must be a mile away from fly over interchanges. Jennifer explained that these two factors required that the team go back through and look at some additional surface area improvements that could help to address some of the volume and capacity issues along 99w for options 4 and 5.

She directed the group to a power point that looks at several modified interchange connection concepts. Modified north connection concept includes a signalized interchange between the connector and 99w to the North. She explained that this modification would realignment Cipole Rd and undercrossing to Pacific Dr.

Proposed Alternative 4 modifications include:

- Making improvements along the roads that intersect with 99w. Most likely, these roads would need to go the 5 or 6 lanes. Proposed to extend small sections of connecting roads into the blue band indicating surface area improvements.

Adrian Emery asked if Jennifer would discuss what these improvements would look like in greater detail. Jennifer explained that she does not have those specific improvements yet – explained that this level of detail would come out of an additional level of analysis later in the process.

Adrian asked what the process would look like if these intersections are already at/over capacity during certain times of the day. Jennifer explained that this fact is noted – and that the team is proposing to add improvements that would decrease congestion. Tom asked why the project team was constrained to these intersections – why not address capacity in the region as a whole.

Mike Feves asked about the connection between Roy Rogers Road and Tualatin Sherwood Road. Jennifer explained that this connection is covered in these modifications and that the map in the handouts has an error and does not cover that improvement.

Mike Feves mentioned that if the project was going to the PSC to determine impact zones, it would make sense to make these impact zones larger rather than larger. Jennifer agreed – she mentioned that the group is interested in revisiting these improvements in an additional level of analysis.

Scott Richmond reminded the group that the blue band originally conceived in the project covered an additional lane on Tualatin Sherwood Road. Jennifer explained that modifications assumed that 99w road would be a 7 lane through.

Jennifer moved on to discuss the alternative 5, central connection. She mentioned a flyover interchange where the corridor interchange would come into 99w. She raised several issues, one that there is no at-grade access permitted within one mile of connector ramps and two an intersection failure on OR 99w. She explained that there are a lot of different improvement options with this connection concept, but there is not a lot of room to move with this concept. Would have to restrict access and create a viaduct type overpass to address the two issues raised.

Jennifer explained that the largest volume attracted to alternative 5 is through traffic, from the connector to 99w. She explained that if the design reoriented the interchange and pulled it away from 99w, the connector would have to maintain high speed connections. One of the concepts that the project team was looking at included an interchange system as opposed to a flyover connection. She explained that the morning traffic (northbound of 99w) was heavy – so many need to pursue a fly over connection. She highlighted the issues – explaining to the group that when you go down from the ramp down a mile you cannot get a connection before Meinecke. On the other hand, Jennifer mentioned several bonuses – noting that these modifications could help increase connectivity to the connector off of Tualatin Sherwood Road. She explained that with modifications to alternative 5 could meet ODOT standards. With these modifications, this alternative could be improved, but was still not perfect. Jennifer then described the proposed modifications to alternative 5 mentioned in the PowerPoint presentation:

- Expand the blue area, trying to move as far away from downtown Sherwood as much as possible. Trying to avoid as much of the wildlife refuge as possible.

- Looking for a connection option – wanting to ensure that the concept is viable before moving forward with an additional impact analysis.
- Would need improvements extending out on roads that would be an under-crossing of 99w.

Tom Aufenthie mentioned that there are improvements that are already planned in conjunction with the expansion of the UGB on Sunset. He wanted to know how much of a constraint the wildlife refuge would be in this conversation. He mentioned that he thinks there are opportunities that may be possible in terms of increased publicity and visibility relating to the refuge– and noted that he felt the SWG and project team should look at additional options. Scott Richmond explained that it would be difficult with this alternative to retain all of the refuge. Jennifer also mentioned the sub-station and major transmission and power lines in this area – emphasizing the fact that impacts to these areas would be hugely disruptive and expensive.

Tom Aufenthie turned to Barbara Shields with Friends of the Refuge and raised the point that if this option is pushed through alternative 5 this could create opportunities for the refuge – in terms of increasing access to the refuge center. Barbara mentioned that the refuge would need to find a balance between mitigation and impacts to the refuge.

Dave Volz raised the point of incremental costs associated with each of the alternatives. Scott and Jennifer confirmed that this information would be available as part of the alternative analysis report. Scott explained that expanding the footprints associated with the modified alternatives will have additional impacts that the team needs to study – further analysis will look at comparing costs including right of way acquisition. Dave Volz mentioned that he felt a fair basis of comparison was absolutely necessary. He asked for an incremental cost analysis as opposed to a flat cost between alternatives. Vaughn asked for clarification – wanted to know if Dave is asking to see a difference between connection options within each alternative. Dave confirms that information is what he is hoping to see.

Mike Feves asked if Jennifer could sketch out the intersection improvements to show why you would need to expand the blue line to the North. Jennifer explained that as the team reroutes 99w, the expansion allows room for additional intersection improvements.

Scott explained that shifting the predominate movement to the south as well as ODOT standards outlining interchange spacing may require the expansion of the connector footprint. He explained that the goal would be to pull back the ramp away from Sherwood. The project team’s initial thought was to create a concept that would force smaller demand roads to feed into greater demand roadways.

Tom Aufenthie asked where alternative 5 would come through onto 99w. Jennifer explained that initially, this connection avoided the substation, but modifications to the alternative expanded the blue band which may impact this area. She explained that these modifications would look at additional opportunities to mitigate impacts where possible.

Jennifer went on to describe that there were not proposed modifications to Alternative concept six. Dave Volz asked if the comparison between traffic volumes in the area shown

on the meeting handouts included these modifications. Jennifer explained that no, modifications were not included in the preliminary transportation findings.

Lawrence explains that early on the project process there was a commitment to the refuge from the PSC. He went on to describe that modifications made to Alternatives 4 and 5 could create the possibility that the band may impact a boarder of the refuge. The group discussed possible impacts, perceptions and concerns regarding impacts to the refuge. The group also discussed the term “significant” impacts, asking for greater clarification.

Vaughn asked if the SWG had any objections to the EMT’s decision to retain all project alternatives (including the modified alternatives 4 and 5). The group did not have any objections.

Mike Feves asked Jennifer and Scott for clarification in terms of project fatal flaws. He wanted to know if a v/c ration greater than 1 on a state highway was fatal flaw in terms of project/highway standards. Jennifer explained that highway standards note that a v/c ration greater than 1 is not acceptable. She explained that what the project team was really trying to do with the proposed modifications to alternatives 4 and 5 is to level the playing field to create viable options that can be compared to each other. Mike Feves mentioned that given that all connector options will increase flow and traffic on highway 99w, if 99w goes above v/c ration 1, would the team consider that a fatal flaw. Jennifer explained that this would indicate a red flag for the project team, and would require further analysis to make sure that alternatives could meet the project purpose and need. She explained that the project team had tested the recommended modifications and understands the extent of the v/c ratio/impacts. She explained that the team knows that they can not get to an acceptable or reasonable v/c standard on all of the local roadways.

Jon Reimann asked for clarification regarding the blue band expansion due to ODOT 1 mile standards previous highlighted. He wanted to make sure that the team looks at the pros and cons of that shift, specifically in terms of impacts to commercial areas, substations and the refuge.

Jennifer responded, explaining that the project team would be looking for minimal impacts whenever possible. She explained that certain shifts could be made, but that the team would need to ensure that these modifications can pass the policy level.

Tom Aufenthie mentioned that intersections are placed very close together at Clackamas Center and I-205 through an exception. He noted than an exception could be pursued here to get around the ODOT 1 mile standards. Scott responded, noting that ODOT’s standards have become more stringent and does not typically approve modifications/exceptions on highway spacing for safety reasons.

Adrian mentioned that modifications to alternative 4 and alternative 5 make these alternatives less acceptable. Lawrence Odell mentioned that these modifications and impacts would be quantified as the project team moved forward in the process.

Vaughn shifted the group into a conversation about the data findings, noting that the project team would carry the SWG’s recommendations forward to the EMT and PSC.

### **Hwy 99 capacity solutions – Alts 4 & 5 - Jennifer Danziger**

Jenifer explained that there are a lot of place holders still in the findings presented to the SWG. She explained that these placeholders would be filled in as the analysis process.

She referred the group to a handout outlining different data sets and findings from the preliminary transportation evaluation summary. She explained that the information presented in this handout is organized in a manner that follows the logical progress of information contained in the Alternative Analysis report that would be finalized in May. She also explained that the information presented in this preliminary summary did not assume any modifications to Alternatives 4 and 5 from the originally adopted Range of Alternatives. She mentioned that following the decisions made by the PSC regarding these proposed modifications, the information pertaining to these alternatives (4 and 5) may change.

Jennifer briefly described the key findings highlighted in each of the summary figures. The first figure showed a comparison of 2030 weekday PM peak hour total traffic and truck volumes. Key findings include:

- Alternative 4 shows the highest volumes of any alternative north of Tualatin-Sherwood Road with smaller increases south of Tualatin-Sherwood Road
- Alternative 5 shows decreases in volumes north of Tualatin-Sherwood Road and the largest increases south of Tualatin-Sherwood Road with greatest increases in the Sherwood Town Center
- Alternative 6 shows decreases in volumes both north and south of Tualatin-Sherwood Road.

Mike Feves asked for clarification regarding these findings, specifically why the traffic decreases found for Alternative 6 are not represented in the findings from Alternative 5. He mentioned that it seems as though the findings assume that traffic will be moving from the south to the north. Jennifer responded, explaining that this question is still out there, that findings have not gotten to the level of detail that will be able to better understand who is taking these trips and using these roadways. She explained that distance traveled may play a role in traffic behavior presented in these findings.

Mike then mentioned that the findings show that there is relief on Tualatin-Sherwood Road with Alternatives 4 and 5 – he noted that one would think that this traffic would increase demand on Tualatin-Sherwood Road. Mike also requested that existing conditions be added to this table to provide a greater understanding of what these numbers mean. Tom Aufenthie asked why I-5 below Elligson Road does not have a red “fail” dot. Jennifer explained that the dots show on the map are on I-5 are located both north and south of where the connector would connect into I-5.

Tom mentioned that there was a UGB expansion connection between points 5 and 6 to 99w. He mentioned some of the spacing issues and concerns that this may raise. Jennifer and Scott reiterated that ODOT’s spacing requirements pertained to ramps and not intersections. Dave Volz asked how the traffic model compared to existing standards. Jennifer explained that the model is based on a direct model, which means that the data has not been compared to the existing conditions.

Jennifer went on to describe several key findings pertaining to Tualatin-Sherwood Road, Interstate 5 and other key roadways: Key findings include:

- Tualatin-Sherwood Road: Traffic volumes are highest with Alternative 3 because capacity on TS Road has the greatest capacity with this alternative
- Traffic volumes on other Tualatin roads are generally the same or higher with Alternative 3 and generally lower with Alternative 4, 5 and 6
- Traffic volumes are generally lower on roads outside the UGB with Alternatives 3 through 6 except on Roy Rogers Road which increases; Alternative 5 shows the greatest increase on Roy Rogers Road.
- Alternative 4 shows increases on volumes west of 124<sup>th</sup> avenue and decreases in volumes east of 124<sup>th</sup> avenue.
- Traffic volumes are generally lower on the other roads in Sherwood with Alternative 3 through 6 except on Roy Rogers Road which increases; Alternative 3 shows the greatest increase on Roy Rogers Road.
- Traffic volumes on I-5 are generally similar for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3
- Traffic volumes on I-5 are generally similar for Alternatives 4, 5, 6 and all are higher than No-Build because of the added through-put capacity from the collector/distributor system.
- North of the connector interchange, Alternative 6 shows the greatest increase while Alternative 4 shows the smallest increase over No-Build. South of the connector interchange, Alternative 4 shows the greatest increase while Alternative 6 shows the smallest increase over No-Build.

Jennifer briefly described key findings relating to truck volumes. She explained that the truck volumes presented in this handout were estimates of medium and heavy vehicles in the regional forecasting model and measures and existing truck volumes.

- Alternative 2 shows no measureable change over Alternative 1
- Alternative 3 shows minimal changes in truck volumes with some roadway having small increases and others have small decreases
- Alternatives 4 through 6 show decreases in truck volumes on Tualatin-Sherwood Road as well as some of the other roads in Tualatin.

Tom Aufenthie asked about the increased capacity on I-5 – he mentioned that it seemed that even today where I-5 and I-205 merge traffic seems to be completely stopped. He asked Jennifer to explain why these figures show this demand to decrease. Jennifer noted that analysis has highlighted some areas of concern, this being one of those areas. Mike Feves said that it looks like the project team is taking traffic from 99w to I-5, and he was concerned about the impact on areas to the north (Carmen Dr. etc.). Jennifer explained that there are a lot of factors to consider, and that the project team must weigh impacts one the analysis is complete. Mike mentioned that impacts to I-5 needed to be considered as a fatal flaw in this project. Jennifer agreed that impacts to Carmen and I-5 needed to be looked at in additional research.

### **Public comment**

#### David Shettles

David emphasized the need to coordinate between counties, Metro, and ODOT specifically regarding the Metro Green Spaces program. He mentioned a concern, or a fear that

property could be bought up to potentially block corridor developments if coordination between these agencies was not pursued. Scott Richmond responded to his comments and questions, mentioning that the conceptual maps for the trail system were included in the EESA system plans.

Ken Kolb

Asked what the ball-park figure for the project was and who will be paying for it. Scott explained that the project team did not have all of the answers to that question, but further cost analysis and detail would be available later in the process once a preferred solution is selected. Lawrence Odell with Washington County said that the current estimate was between 600 and 700 million dollars, but noted that the project team was still far away from knowing what the preferred option will be. He explained that there are a number of impacts and considerations that will determine what the final estimated cost of the project may be. He also mentioned that funding will be researched after potential impacts have been identified, and that the project team would recommend a phased approach that would pursue multiple sources of funding.

Mike Feves asked how much has been spent on the project so far in the process. Lawrence said that about 400 million had been spent since the start of the project.

Ken followed up with an additional question for the project team – asking if the casino expands in the county as they are proposing, how will this impact traffic forecasts. Jennifer explained that the project analysis may not have something specific to show regarding that particular development.