

Stakeholder Working Group (SWG) Meeting #26

6 to 8:00 p.m. Thursday, October 9th, 2008
Sherwood Police Training Center
24095 Borchers Drive, Sherwood

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

I-5/99W SWG members present

Jim Haynes (Sherwood Chamber)
Jack Laverty
Jerry Renfro (*Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue*)
Dave Volz (*Tualatin CCI*)
Ray Phelps (*Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*)
Dick Winn (*Friends of Tualatin National Wildlife Refuge*)
Tom Sullivan (*Wilsonville CCI*)
Marie Dodds (*AAA Oregon*)
Loretta Pickerell (*1000 Friends of Oregon*)
Ron Johnson (*Washington County Oregon Farm Bureau*)
Cheryl Dorman (*Tualatin Chamber of Commerce*)
Nick Storie (*Metro CCI*)
Mike Feves (*Far West CPO*)

I-5/99W SWG members absent

Adrian Emery (Sherwood CCI)
Tom Aufenthie (CPO 5)
Jon Reimann (*Westside Economic Alliance*)

Project staff present

Russ Knoebel (*Washington County*)
Leslie Howell (*Howell Consulting*)
Jim Evans (*Moyano Leadership Group*)
Chris Maciejewski (*DKS*)
Jef Keiser (*DEA*)
Laura DeGraw (*JLA*)

Welcome & introductions

Scott introduced himself and explained that Vaughn will be present at the next SWG meeting. He gave the SWG an update on scenarios and explained that the project team has not yet presented these concepts to the PSC. He explained that the jurisdiction partners modeling workshop helped refine some of the scenarios and that the next step is to meet with the PSC and EMT. He noted that there is an EMT meeting scheduled for next Thursday 9:30am at Metro.

Approve September 11th Meeting Summary

Russ noted that there was discussion about last month's meeting summary, Laura noted that they will make the changes and send the August meeting notes out for approval. Loretta noted that she will send comments in regarding the meeting summary.

EMT report –Russ Knoebel

Russ noted that it was Jerry Renfro's last SWG meeting; he thanked Jerry for all of his work on the projects he has been involved in. Russ announced that Lawrence Odell has left Washington County, and explained that the County is in the process of looking for a replacement.

Ron asked who will chair the EMT mtgs.

Russ noted that Fred Eberle may chair the EMT meetings.

Russ explained that the EMT has discussed arterial –based solution concepts and that members are starting to agree upon what is needed in the area. He noted that the full EMT has not seen the concept information being presented to the SWG tonight.

Modeling Scenarios-Workshop Results

Scott went over the purpose of the modeling workshop. He explained that the project team is still in the process of vetting information from the modeling workshop.

Scott went over TDM/TSM and noted what was included in Alternative 2. He discussed concepts like parking management, transit pass subsidies, new park and ride facilities and carpool/vanpool/rideshare programs. He pointed out that most of the alternative is focusing on town centers.

Loretta explained that it is helpful to get more detail on the assumptions. She felt that there is still not enough enhancement of the transit service. She stated that the current service is not adequate and she would like greater improvement. Loretta expressed interest in knowing what the subsidy will be for transit passes.

Scott explained that they are assuming 85% for transit pass subsidies and that it will be a combination of government and public. He noted that the model is dollar factored.

Loretta noted that she felt that it doesn't add up to much and she would like to know how many people that will that get out of their car.

Chris explained that they have planned a bus service from Newberg to Wilsonville with the #12 continuing down to Newberg, a connection between Sherwood and Wilsonville, routes going up to Beaverton and Hillsdale, and that all of the bus routes are planned for 15 minute head ways.

Mike asked how you go from 15 minute bus routes to the number of vehicles taken off the road.

Scott explained that it is a mode shift in Metro's model.

Chris explained that it is all about the cost of travel and the cost of using the modes and time. He noted that it estimates how many people would shift.

Loretta noted that she would like to see an express bus and noted that routes will loose people with transfers and delays.

Chris noted that there is a delay in the model for transfers.

Scott explained that the routes are longer which helps address continuity for the loss of riders between connections. Scott reiterated that more headways (15 minutes) are planned for buses.

Loretta expressed that current level of service is not good for suburbs. She is interested in knowing where we have the potential to get people out of their cars during peak hours and noted that seeing that correlation would be helpful.

Scott explained that the model they are using is peak hour based.

Chris went over the Yamhill County study power point.

Jim asked what the commuter rail to Beaverton would look like.

Chris explained that it would tie into Sherwood and into Tualatin. He noted that the Sherwood station ridership estimated about 750/day would use that service.

Loretta noted that it would be helpful to see ridership numbers compared to drive times. She noted that there is a difference in driving and commuting and it would be helpful in order for people to make a decision.

Scott recommended that Loretta talk to someone at Metro regarding her transit concerns and questions.

Chris noted that the connector project is not a commuter rail project so they did not go into line by line detail for each bus and transit route.

Dave asked if the SWG will we have access to this study and if it could be posted on the web.

Chris noted that it may be posted to the Yamhill county website and when the project team receives it they can post it to the project website.

Chris explained that a more detailed report will come out soon, but they wanted to share what they had so with the group. He pointed out that the Yamhill County study is dealing with the same types of capacity that they are trying to provide in the project area.

Scott pointed out that the PMT is recommending TDM/TSM and commuter rail for the project.

Jim asked for clarification on the fact that this is listed as a \$31 million project that would have an impact of 1000 trips a day.

Scott informed the SWG that it is based on the information provided in the power point and it may change in the final report.

Loretta wondered if this was part of a larger project would it cost less?

Chris said the \$31 million is for the leg from Beaverton to Sherwood. He noted that the benefit/cost ratio was going down the farther they go out because there is so much capital investment in the area.

Chris provided an overview of the modeling workshop. He explained that the project team took a small piece of the Metro model and did unofficial forecasting. He noted that they are going to show the group some volume information and he asked the SWG to not get caught up in details because it was an unofficial, broad-level forecast. He noted that the models are showing the growth, not all the traffic.

Loretta mentioned that they should look at increasing capacity and improvements on 99W.

Chris explained that is something they are working on as staff. He noted that they are still going through all those questions.

Loretta expressed concern with the fact that in the past the decisions have been short sighted and they have built without planning. Loretta recommended not assuming a corridor in the future unless they look at what other options there are that could solve the problems

Chris explained that they did that previously with the six alternatives and the alternatives report. He explained that the community and the agencies put in a lot of effort and thought into developing the original six alternatives. He explained that they took what they learned from the public and technical review of the six alternatives to refine those ideas into a hybrid. He noted that the team has considered a lot of different options. He also noted that the comments about planning this better are the whole reason for using this approach and trying to solve the big problems first.

Loretta raised the issue of integrating land use planning with transportation planning.

Chris pointed out that Metro is doing that. Chris then went over the model scenario for 124th, and the southern arterial. He pointed out that Day, Grahams Ferry and Tonquin would have increased traffic.

Scott noted that some of these scenarios may just be informative and may be up to local governments.

Ray asked if the auxiliary lanes were modeled.

Chris noted that the auxiliary lanes for I-5 are included in all of them. He explained that the auxiliary lanes from I-205 to North Wilsonville were included in everything, and noted that in the workshop they looked at what would happen if they took the auxiliary lanes from north Wilsonville to south Wilsonville.

Chris explained that the models he showed were examples of what they worked on during the modeling workshop. He noted that they are still working with jurisdictions to take everything they learned and refine it and come up with a set of packages.

Scott explained that next they will provide the EMT with a tracking worksheet of the workshop outcomes and include all the scenarios – whether or not they are recommending some of the scenarios to be included into the hybrid. He noted that the hybrid concept will probably not change drastically change but will have some refinement in terms of recommended projects and the teams sense of short, medium, long term phasing.

Dave noted that he is concerned with funding for all of this. He asked if this will be a general funding level and asked if it is safe to presume that this will all be funded by RTP.

Scott explained that the phasing of the projects will be a big consideration. He pointed out that they have to evaluate what packages will be the most need and valuable over the next 20 years. He also explained that this will not be one major road but instead they are trying to spread the improvements to smaller roads.

Chris pointed out that 124th is a good example of a package. He noted that it is a big player in freight traffic and one of the things the project team is looking at is if 124th can be a short term project. He noted that one of the biggest problems of Tualatin-Sherwood Road is truck traffic. He noted that they are exploring a lot of options and enhancements in the project area.

Loretta expressed concern regarding the policy issues discussion that has not taken place. She also mentioned that she is not clear on the needs and objectives of the project. She noted that the hybrid that the project team has laid out may not support the policy objectives of what the group wants. She expressed concern regarding the fact that the PSC has not had a policy discussion and asked when that is going to take place. She noted that she is unable to make decisions on the hybrid package and the project needs to move on with the policy discussion.

Scott noted that he has not seen the agenda for the next PSC meeting. He asked Loretta for examples of policies that she is concerned about.

Mike noted that four of the nine PSC members did meet and they did have some policy discussion. He noted that they did not have a quorum so they could not decide on anything but they did start to go through the list of policy issues.

Scott pointed out those decisions are up to the PSC regarding where to go next in the process. He explained that the project has reached a point where we have not had full agreement and we are narrowing the process from a huge range of options to a package of phase-able short term and long term projects. Scott explained that regarding policies they go by state policy and local TSP's. He explained that the PSC is not going to give us policy directions for the RTP.

Russ clarified that the PSC is there to make decisions for the project. He explained that the project team will suggest to the PSC to look at a group of small packages.

Tom S. expressed surprise that staff did not consider it important to report to the SWG that a significant number of members of the PSC objected to the cancellation of their meeting (in violation of their agreed upon meeting policies) and held a meeting anyway to discuss policy issues- something that has been on the agenda for months but never seems to get discussed.

Tom S. further stated that he didn't think it was appropriate to be discussing specific projects -these so called "hybrids"- when the policy questions hadn't been dealt with, and that it seemed that some on the PSC seemed to be avoiding that discussion. Tom S also stated that because neither the SWG nor the PSC ever vote on anything, the "consensus" that staff continually talks about really amounts to whatever the minute taker wants to believe it is. He believes that it is inappropriate to be proceeding as if there is consensus on a direction, when that consensus has not been established.

Russ noted that the partnering agreement is more like a group charter and the whole PSC group is going to have to meet to make decisions but does not mean that they will necessarily meet monthly. He pointed out that nothing binds them to meet monthly.

Tom noted that they were told two times that the policy discussion was canceled. He noted that they had agreed not to cancel a meeting without a weeks notice.

Loretta noted that she would like to be forwarded the PSC's meeting minutes. She noted that having the PSC's meeting minutes would make the SWG's meeting time more worthwhile.

Mike noted that some of the policy decisions that he is concerned about is regarding to the economic situation we are in. He is interested in knowing if they need to modify the purpose and needs of the project because of our economy and wonders if it is worth spending all this time and money pursuing something that has zero chance of ever getting funding. He noted that the reason we went with the hybrid was because we realized we need to scale back and he wondered if the hybrid packages are still going to have difficulty receiving funding.

Scott noted that the PSC can certainly go back. He pointed out that the purpose and need for the project are not set in concrete.

Mike noted that the purpose and need has been a benchmark and that they need to match the purpose and need to reality. They need to get on with those kinds of discussions.

Scott pointed out that a lot of these elements of the hybrid are already in the RTP and that the PSC meeting on the 22nd will likely have planning level costs associated with the concepts.

Russ pointed out that they are trying to update the RTP, not necessarily build the project. He noted that the RTP is a 30 year outlook and acknowledges that there is a package that needs to be built in this area.

Dave expressed concern that the various parts of Metro are working to create a cohesive projects and he would like Metro to get their stuff together. He feels there is a void in this area.

Chris pointed out that Metro is at the cutting edge in traffic modeling and that this project has the benefit of Metro's model.

Loretta pointed out that things are changing and it will effect people's decision on where to work and live. She noted that she does not feel comfortable locking into a 30 year model without all of the numbers and data. She feels that there is a disconnect with the fact that the project is moving ahead.

Russ pointed out that Metro is updating the RTP next year and this process needs to inform them as they update. He noted that they need to have an information packet to them by January, and reiterated that this process is trying to inform the Metro decision.

Scott acknowledged and made note of the fact that some of the SWG members encourage the PSC to have a policy discussion. He noted that he will inform the PSC of the SWG's recommendation.

Mike asked to have the meeting summary for the SWG further in advance. He asked for the summary within a week of the meeting so they can make changes to the summary via email, and have the edited summary back sooner.

Public Comment

There was a public comment regarding Washington County's arterial links. A member of the public pointed out that the county lacks arterial links, and that it is a piece of the puzzle but it is certainly not all of it. There is a lot of traffic to move out there.

Close and adjourn

Next meeting is planned for November 13th from 6:00pm-8:00pm.

DRAFT