

Stakeholder Working Group (SWG) Meeting #27

6 to 8:00 p.m. Thursday, January 15th, 2009
Sherwood Police Training Center
24095 Borchers Drive, Sherwood

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

I-5/99W SWG members present

Karen Mohling (*Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue*)
Dave Volz (*Tualatin CCI*)
Ray Phelps (*Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*)
Steve Moore (*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*)
Jon Reimann (*Westside Economic Alliance*)
Mike Feves (*Far West CPO*)

I-5/99W SWG members absent

Jim Haynes (*Sherwood Chamber*)
Adrian Emery (*Sherwood CCI*)
Tom Aufenthie (*CPO 5*)
Jack Laverty (*Oregon Trucking Association*)

Project staff present

Russ Knoebel (*Washington County*)
Scott Richmond (*DEA*)
Jim Evans (*Moyano Leadership Group*)
Chris Maciejewski (*DKS*)
Jef Keiser (*DEA*)
Vaughn Brown (*JLA*)
Laura DeGraw (*JLA*)

Welcome & introductions

Vaughn welcomed the group and thanked them for attending the meeting. He had the group introduce themselves. He commented that this is the final SWG meeting in a process that has asked for an extraordinary amount of dedication and commitment from members. He thanked SWG members for their contributions to the project and noted that since the beginning of the process in late 2005 there are still 11 of the original 16 members.

Meeting purpose and agenda

Vaughn explained that one of the main purposes of the meeting is to discuss and describe Alternative 7 elements and analysis summary and to poll members on their level of support for Alternative 7 moving forward to the Regional Transportation Plan. The results of that poll will be forwarded to the PSC at their next meeting. Another primary purpose of the meeting is to thank the SWG for their service.

Approve October 9th Meeting Summary

The SWG accepted the meeting summary.

EMT report –Jim Evans

Jim Evans updated the SWG on the EMT meeting held on the 8th of January. Jim explained that the primary purpose of the meeting was to go over Alternative 7. He explained that the EMT was taken through the same information being presented to the SWG tonight. He noted that Alternative 7 is comprised of short, medium and long term projects. He explained that the City of Tualatin and

Wilsonville asked for some changes to the tables and asked for some more details regarding arterial traffic which the project team is working on. He noted that there are still some concerns about whether Alternative 7 is fulfilling the Purpose and Needs. He also noted that Alternative 7 was presented to the City of Sherwood and Tualatin City Councils and was strongly supported by both.

At the EMT meeting the recommendation memo was discussed and passed unanimously to forward the recommendation to the PSC. Jim explained that the public involvement does not stop at this with the RTP recommendation. It goes forth into the RTP update process as well as through local jurisdictions as individual projects are considered. The next EMT meeting is scheduled for February 12th. He also noted that there will be 2 PSC meetings January 28th and February 25th.

Tom S. asked when it was decided that this would be the last SWG meeting.

Vaughn explained that this SWG meeting was scheduled before the PSC decision meeting. He noted that the PSC decision meeting marks the end of this phase. He explained that a couple months ago the recommendation was gaining ground and heading towards decision. SWG member support for the Alternative will mark the SWG's final formal input into the PSC decision-making process.

Tom S. asked why this information was not presented to Wilsonville.

Vaughn explained that the project team worked with the new Mayor's calendar and have scheduled a meeting on January 26th.

Alternative Recommendation

Scott Richmond thanked the SWG for their commitment and contributions. He noted that their feedback has had a very strong influence on the process and the alternative recommendation they are discussing today. Scott went over a presentation on Alternative 7 and their recommendations to the PSC and the RTP amendment. He went over the components of Alt 7 and explained the alignments arterials included in the alternative. Scott asked for SWG questions on the overview of Alternative 7.

Mike asked about public notification for Alternative 7.

Vaughn explained that they have posted information to the website that invites public comment through website. An extended comment period will also be provided at PSC meeting. An interested parties email will be distributed with a project update. He noted that a press release is being distributed, briefings are offered and conducted for city councils and groups that have shown interest in the past.

Mike noted that Metro and Washington County will have meetings during the RTP update process and asked if the interested parties going to be notified of those.

Vaughn explained that the project is sharing its mailing list with Metro. He noted that Metro is looking to have a meeting in April and they plan on making a decision around October which will match with the reserves process.

Ron asked to go over related project issues on page 3 of the Alternative 7 memo. He asked for more detail, especially in regards to the rural reserves.

Scott explained that without knowing the outcome of the reserves process, they are operating under the assumption that the UGB will not change. He noted that they will go through the goal exception process.

Dave asked about the new rail line from Tualatin-Sherwood and how that fits in. He asked if it will be more like the rail line in the west or like downtown Portland.

Scott explained that it would need to be vetted further. He noted that their study has aligned with the recent Yamhill County study and the findings and analysis are consistent with that. As part of RTP, Metro has been doing a broader range HCT study which may address the rail line.

Chris noted that for analysis and modeling we have assumed it is something like WES and explained that it might turn out to be something different.

Dave noted that Tri-Met is not represented at the table and there are a lot of complaints about the train and the current bus system.

Scott explained that in general this part of the region lacks of a connective network and bus service. He noted that the message from Tri-Met has been, build us an arterial system and we will provide service. He explained that the bus service they have planned in Alternative 7 is substantially more than what we have now in the area.

Loretta asked about the model for extending 65th Avenue to take capacity off I-5.

Scott explained that they looked at a number of componenets in modeling scenarios and that they are looking at this holistically and realistically. He noted that in that area with the potential impacts, it would be too much of a draw back to enhance 65th.

Steve asked if the team is soliciting public comments for Alternative 7.

Vaughn reiterated that an email will be sent out, and if people have comments, they will be collected from the website between now and the February PSC meeting. He noted that there is an extended comment period at the January PSC meeting.

Ray noted that he appreciates the commuter rail extension. He would like to see as a general project element the planning and analysis of the south corridor of I-5, Tigard to Wilsonville, as he feels it is significant. He would like to see that element identified on the table. He indicated the RTP project number is 11062. He noted concern that the study has not been funded and would like to have the study go forward.

Loretta asked when the data will be available that supports these conclusions.

Scott noted that they do have more detailed data in the form of technical memos to the file but at this point it is not very reader friendly. He explained that they are asking the PMT to review those memos and that the SWG and PMT will have that information by the end of next week.

Loretta asked if it will that be shared with the public.

Scott explained that there is a summary chart on the project website.

Mike expressed concern with the fact that the data was not ready for this meeting. He wanted to know if it was going to be in the same format as the AAR.

Scott explained that they trying to put the data into a better format and they will send that information out the SWG next week. The transportation information will be very similar to the AAR format.

Mike was concerned with the fact that they are being asked to provide input when he feels they only have about 10% of the information they need. He noted that the SWG has to make a recommendation to the PSC and they don't have all the information on future congestion.

Vaughn pointed out that they have a lot of information in summary Table 2 distributed last week. He pointed out that there is congestion data and a lot of other information in that summary table.

Mike noted concern about the PSC making a decision with inadequate data. He added that throughout the project data has been given without sufficient time to review before opinions are being requested.

Jon stated that he disagrees with Mike and pointed out that they have been getting the information steadily over the last 2 years and have spent a lot of meeting time reviewing that information.

Tom S. pointed out that generally things are improved but the statement often doesn't include where it improves. He would like to know where things improve.

Loretta asked if they are going to receive the same level of analysis that they did for Alternatives 1-6. She wanted to know when they will get that data and if they will have time to look over it and comment.

Chris explained that they will get very much the same level of analysis as the detailed tech reports. He explained that they didn't do everything that was covered in the AAR because some things didn't prove to tell us anything useful in comparing alternatives.

Jef explained that they focused on creating another column in the summary matrix and build an analysis to support the entries in the matrix for the technical memos. He explained that the same people and same methodologies were used as in the AAR. He noted that this did not go through agency review like Alternatives 1-6. He explained that right now they are tidying up the data so it is more readable and presentable and they will post all the technical reports to the FTP site sometime next week.

Some of the SWG members asked about how the project was going to be funded and the likelihood of receiving funds.

Jim went over the funding available and explained some of the projects that are currently funded. He noted that there is some funding available for some projects, for example - the auxiliary lanes on the south of I-5 are funded through the TSP, but the northbound lanes are not.

Dave asked for explanation on why projects were selected for short term, mid term and long term and what the costs are associated with them.

Chris explained that cost was part of phasing. He noted that they did a lot of testing and noted that sequencing is tied to managing impacts and the order is fairly important. He noted that all of the information will be in the report.

Mark explained that in addition to the work that this group is doing Metro is also doing a High Capacity Transit plan for corridors around the region. He explained that the work is not complete but they are heading towards adding it to the RTP next fall. He noted that if the SWG is interested they should go to Metro's website to the HCT plan.

Mike asked why not having 5 lanes up to Tualatin-Sherwood.

Chris explained that leaving the 3 lane piece in the middle is like having a ramp meter in place. It protects town centers when you are building in the area. He noted that both Tualatin and Sherwood had major issues with leaving it 5 lanes all the way so that element is in response to their needs. Chris explained that without other arterials there is one major corridor, T-S Road. He noted that you can better manage traffic if you spread it out.

Ron asked if it was a unanimous decision from EMT.

Scott explained that it was in fact. He noted that Wilsonville asked for some changes to the table, but did accept if once the changes are made.

Some SWG members asked for a clarification of what the EMT accepted unanimously. After some clarification discussion, it was explained that the EMT forwarded their unanimous recommendation that the PSC consider forwarding Alternative 7 to Metro for inclusion into the Regional Transportation Plan. It was noted that the recommendation did not necessarily express support for the Alternative – only that it be forwarded.

Vaughn explained that after public comment, the SWG would be polled to see where they fall in terms of support for Alternative 7.

Public Comment

Larry Harvey

Larry stated that he has been told by Washington County that even the projects that were identified as part of a plan somewhere else, despite the fact that they might be portrayed as funded, could be in some jeopardy because of the recent political changes. Is the funding for these projects that we consider to be on the books secure and can the projects proceed?

Jim explained that Tualatin-Sherwood Road widening is solidly funded and a design consultant has been selected. He noted that the I-5 auxiliary lanes south bound are funded in the state TSP and 124th extensions funds are depended on where Tualatin-Sherwood Road falls. He noted that construction for 124th is not funded and nor is the northbound auxiliary lane.

Loretta noted that she did not get a sense at all that staff at Wilsonville were recommending this to the PSC; she questioned unanimity of the EMT.

Scott noted that they could follow up with Wilsonville and ask them to clarify.

Jim explained that the motion was made to present the information to the PSC the only person who had a question was Wilsonville, but they did fully support moving it forward. He clarified that they did not ask if the EMT was in support but rather if they felt comfortable with the PSC making a decision.

SWG Support for Alternative 7

Each SWG member present stated whether they fell into the SUPPORT, ACCEPT, OR CAN'T ACCEPT category. Positions were noted on flip charts. The draft results of that poll will be sent out to SWB members for their review. Vaughn explained that he will talk to those SWG members who could not attend the meeting and get their input on Alternative 7. The PSC will have the poll results as part of their consideration of Alternative 7.

The SWG poll results matrix is attached to these notes.

Ann Madden passed out awards of appreciation to the SWG and adjourned the meeting.