

Stakeholder Working Group (SWG) Meeting #15

6-8:30 p.m. Thursday, June 14, 2007
Sherwood Police Training Center
20495 Borchers Road, Sherwood

MEETING SUMMARY

I-5/99W SWG members present

Loretta Pickerell, 1000 Friends of Oregon
Elliot Eki, AAA Oreogn
Tom Aufenthie, CPO 5
Mike Feves, Far West CPO
Barbara Shields, Friends of the Refuge
Jack Laverty, Oregon Trucking
Association
Dave Grant (alternate), Sherwood CCI
Jim Haynes (alternate), Sherwood
Chamber of Commerce
Dave Volz, Tualatin CCI
Bob Adams, Tualatin Chamber
Jerry Renfro, Tualatin Valley Fire and
Rescue
Ron Johnson, Oregon Farm Bureau
Jon Reimann, Westside Economic Alliance
Tom Sullivan, Wilsonville CCI

Ray Phelps, Wilsonville Chamber and
Grant Marsh (alternate)

I-5/99W SWG member absent

Nick Storie, Metro CCI

Project staff present

Lawrence Odell, Washington County
Russ Knoebel, Washington County
Scott Richman, DEA
Jef Kaiser, DEA
Alex Dupey, DEA
Randy McCourt, DKS
Leslie Howell, Howell Consulting
Vaughn Brown, JLA
Kristin Hull, JLA
Mark Turpel, Metro
Tim Wilson, ODOT

1. Welcome and introductions - Vaughn Brown, JLA

Vaughn welcomed the committee and led introductions. He told the group that the meeting purpose was to:

- Update the SWG on project progress.
- Report to the SWG on the Transportation Demand Management/Transportation System Management (TDM/TSM) and Expand Existing System Alternative (EESA) progress.
- Discuss draft corridor alternatives with the SWG and collect input.

The group approved SWG #15 notes as written.

2. EMT report - Lawrence Odell, Washington County

Lawrence explained that, at their last meeting, the EMT had reviewed the same information that would be presented to the SWG tonight.

3. Range of alternatives - Scott Richman, DEA Jef Kaiser, DEA and Randy McCourt, DKS

Scott and Randy presented reviewed a presentation describing the draft range of alternatives. Scott told the group that the presentation would be available as a handout and

on the web site (www.i5to99w.org) after the meeting. He explained that he and Randy would review the corridor alternatives and share the EMT's preliminary direction with the SWG.

Jef began by reviewing the process for developing and selecting alternatives. He told the group that the team began by reviewing ideas from the stakeholder process and using GIS-based analysis and professional expertise in developing corridor alternatives. He also told the group that the team, responding to EMT and SWG input, would refine the initial set of corridor alternatives. Finally, he explained that ultimately the EMT and SWG would recommend a set of project alternatives to the Project Steering Committee (PSC).

Jef reminded the group of the initial corridor ideas and explained how each of those initial corridor alternatives had either been screened from further consideration or used in developing corridor alternatives.

Jef reviewed three possible connections at Highway 99W and two possible connections at I-5. He explained that the corridors that would be presented tonight represent the paths of least resistance between those points.

Ray Phelps asked for clarification about where the southern I-5 connection was located. Jef explained that the point was between Stafford Road and Norwood Road. Ray also asked why the Wilsonville Town Center was not included on the list of principal constraints. Mark Turpel explained that the Wilsonville Town Center was outside the solution area.

Tom Aufethie asked why farmland was not on this list on principal constraints. Jef explained that the corridor alternatives would include options inside and outside the UGB which would meet the state's requirements.

Jef reviewed the draft corridor alternatives. He began by explaining that the connection points on I-5 and 99W would require changes to each facility to make the new connections work. He noted that I-5 particularly would require improvements to the entire segment from Wilsonville to Tualatin to accept a new interchange.

The corridor alternatives included:

- 4A: I-205 north to 99W north
- 4B: I-205 to 99W/Tualatin-Sherwood Road
- 4C: Southern route from I-205 to 99W/Tualatin-Sherwood Road
- 4D: I-5 south to 99W north
- 4E: I-5 south to 99W/Tualatin-Sherwood road
- 5A: I-205 to 99W south
- 5B: I-5 south to 99W south (two choices for mid-point interchange)

In response to a question, Jef explained that these corridors would allow room for future decisions about facility type and that these corridors allow for a limited access facility, but do not presume a limited access facility.

Loretta asked if there were any northern corridors that avoided the refuge. Jef explained that at this point, the only corridor option that had a chance of missing all land associated with the refuge was the southern connection option outside of the UGB and that a solution

that missed the refuge altogether had not been identified yet. Loretta suggested that project should consider spending money to avoid resources.

Tom Aufenthie noted that impacting the refuge could be a net benefit for the refuge because mitigation could ultimately allow the refuge to acquire property they want.

Loretta requested that the team identify the best route inside the UGB that avoids the refuge altogether so the SWG is not forced to select an option outside the UGB to avoid the refuge. Jef noted that the team could do that, but it has proven to be difficult given the geometric constraints of designing a highway. Jef noted that opportunities for the refuge existed where the project impacts acquisition lands rather than those that are already owned.

Jef noted that 4E did the best job of avoiding impacts to the land owned by the refuge and staying inside the UGB. Jef told the group that all corridor alternatives except 4A use 124th Street as the mid-point interchange. In response to a question, Jef explained that the scab lands were not considered as a constraint, but would be considered in the evaluation of each alternative.

Mike asked how the list of constraints relates to the list of screening criteria and wanted to know what public deliberations led to the development of these constraints. Jef explained that staff reviewed the environmental constraints and made a determination about which constraints should be avoided and which should be considered in corridor evaluation.

Mike stated that he thought the group had determined that cost would not be a factor considered and that steep slopes, as a principal constraint based on constructability, was clearly focused on growth. Jef explained that this was really just a starting point to develop alternatives that could be evaluated in more detail.

Loretta noted that the Tonquin Geologic area should be considered as a constraint.

Grant asked why the blue line extended east of I-5. Jef explained that extending the list east of I-5 is intentional to allow for collector/distributor facilities or complex ramp configuration like braided ramps.

Tom Aufenthie asked that 124th Avenue be shown more clearly on future maps.

Randy reviewed the results of the preliminary demand modeling that was utilized to compare the relative performance of the alternatives. Randy noted that this level of transportation analysis used a representative alignment for each alternative and some general planning level measures such as daily and PM peak hour demand on the facilities in 2030, changes to travel on Tualatin-Sherwood Road and OR 99W and basic patterns of travel were considered to help refine the options being considered for the range of alternatives. He discussed the factors that were the same and the factors that were different.

- All carry about the same amount of traffic though 4D and 5A carry 20% less traffic than the others since they both run diagonally across the corridor which limits what trips are served. These “angled corridors” do not perform as well because they don’t serve all the regional (through?) travel patterns well.
- All reduce traffic on Tualatin-Sherwood Road. 4E has a more significant reduction of traffic on Tualatin-Sherwood Road than the others.
- Alternative 5B (and 5A) reduce travel on OR 99W through Sherwood whereas all Alternative 4 options increase traffic on OR 99W north of Brookman Road.
- As the corridors move from the south to the north, the north corridors serve different travel markets (for example more travel from Roy Rodgers Road and trips starting and ending in Sherwood and Tualatin). The southern alignment (5B) primarily serves regional (through?) traffic between OR 99W and I-5/I-205 whereas the other alternatives also serve other markets.
- The “5” alternatives offered slightly faster travel times than the “4” alternatives, primarily since they do not utilize OR 99W for travel through Sherwood.

Randy closed by noting that 4E and 5B had specific characteristics that seemed to merit further consideration more than the other corridors and that none of the other alternatives appeared to offer greater benefits.

Randy noted the following related to the arterial system:

- All the options that tie into 99W in the northern part of the study area will need to include major improvements to 99W to make it function.
- All options would require widening of Tualatin Sherwood Road to five lanes through Sherwood.
- All options would require local circulation improvements in the six corners area.
- All options are benefited from a mid-point access and the use of the 124th corridor to better distribute Tualatin, Sherwood and Wilsonville trips to the corridor rather than through the communities.

Randy noted that no option would be allowed to negatively impact I-5 and FHWA requirements for access are very stringent. Significant improvements on I-5 between the connector and I-205 will be required, including such elements as braided ramps, auxiliary lanes, direct connector ramps or collector-distributor roads. Due to the short interchange spacing to the south (north Wilsonville) and north (Nyberg Road), improvements may extend to these area.

Finally, Randy explained that the interchange at 99W may direct traffic to the connector and I-5 as the through route rather than north on existing 99W.

Group discussion

Ray Phelps noted the committee had previously been told that as the connector moves south it is less effective in solving project area congestion problems. Randy explained that this model uses a 2030 base year and looks at more detail. Randy explained that a 124th

extension, which was not included in the original modeling, moves traffic from the north to the south more effectively.

Loretta Pickerell requested additional information about origins and destinations and travel patterns. Randy explained that, when he said that all these corridors do a pretty good job of moving traffic from the southwest portal to I-5 and I-205, he is reflecting those travel patterns.

Mike Feves asked if his intuition that demand is related to people who live and work in the corridor going somewhere else was correct, and if 5B would serve this demand. Randy explained that though these “blue bands” do a good job of serving regional and through trips, there are still lots of local trips in the area and that, by serving through trips on the corridor, can free-up capacity for local trips on local streets.

Mike noted that he is concerned that if you make it easier to get to Newberg, you’ll induce growth in Newberg that will have negative repercussions on the rest of the system.

Loretta asked if the group should establish criteria for evaluating corridors sooner rather than later because staff is controlling the features that are being avoided in developing alternatives.

Grant Marsh asked why we were not looking beyond 99W south of Sherwood and I-5 north of Tualatin. Randy explained that the team would conduct that level of analysis, but this analysis is just a snapshot of this area.

Tom Aufenthie asked about if 4D served traffic from the new Tualatin industrial area especially well. Randy told Tom he’d come back to that point. Tom noted that in the previous study effort an alternative similar to 5B did not perform well. Randy noted that previous work was based on old land use and transportation forecasts.

Tom Sullivan noted that he needed Randy to repeat his presentation more slowly with better graphics so that he could understand the key messages.

Jack Laverty noted that he thought the SWG needed to hear from the transportation industry about the potential corridors and traffic in the study area. He told the group that congestion was costing industry more each year which will have long-term impacts on the region’s economy. The group agreed that they would hear more from the trucking industry at the June 28 meeting.

Ron Johnson noted that he would prefer to advance through the prepared agenda before SWG members asked questions and discussed the information presented.

Dave Volz asked for assurance that the data was relatively accurate and that it would not significantly change as analysis becomes more refined. Randy explained that the regional model has a good track record for accurately predicting traffic growth in the area.

Jef concluded the presentation by sharing the initial staff recommendation for developing a range of corridor alternatives:

- Drop alternative 4D because of relatively low performance in serving regional and through travel.

- Drop alternatives 4A, 4B, 4C and 5A because of relatively high cost and substantial impacts to Tualatin (interchange at I-205). A tunnel scenario to connect to I-205 could minimize impacts but would have significantly higher costs than other options.

Scott told the group, in response to a question, that if the PSC adopts a range of alternatives late this summer, there should be some more detailed transportation and environmental analysis by fall.

The group requested comparative analysis between the TDM/TSM alternative, EESA and corridor alternatives. Randy explained that the comparison between these alternatives would happen in the fall. The TDM/TSM alternative and EESA will be carried forward.

4. Public comment

Clark Eisert

He hopes that everyone keeps in mind the importance of homes, businesses and property in addition to impacts on the refuge.

Larry McCart

Does the corridor take into account the impacts of growth on Highway 99W that will occur as the result on the corridor? Jef explained that ODOT's interchange area management plan process will reduce those types of growth impacts. Randy clarified that the traffic analysis does take into account growth around new highway interchanges.

5. Wilsonville perspective on project - Mayor Lehan, City of Wilsonville

Mayor Lehan reviewed a presentation developed by the City of Wilsonville entitled "Issues regarding the I-5/99W Connector Study." She opened by explaining that as the group can see building any project will be painful and have impacts, making selecting the right project is extremely important.

She focused on travel times in the study area and noted that she thinks the project area is too small to accurately capture travel times for corridor alternatives. She demonstrated that the benefits of the project may not be great enough to outweigh the impacts unless the corridor connects directly to I-205. She told the group that she is especially interested in keeping I-5 functioning.

She noted that the project may need to reach out to people on the east side of I-5 near Norwood Road and Elligsen Road.

Loretta asked if the Mayor's analysis was focused on this project as an east-west rather than a north-south solution. Mayor Lehan explained that the connector is not an effective solution to north-south traffic.

Dave Volz asked if the traffic analysis would address the questions that the Mayor raised. Randy explained that the analysis would address these questions.

Grant asked if there was a ballpark estimate of cost at this point. The Mayor noted that in the past the cost of the project had been estimated at about \$500 million, but that was before additional improvements to I-5 were included.

Jim Haynes asked what time of day she was using for her analysis. Mayor Lehan explained that she did not choose a specific time of day, but instead focused on a consistent travel speed for comparison purposes, but that her point is that the connector forces an additional 3 miles of travel distance which you have to make up with faster travel speeds to make the connector make sense.

Loretta agreed with Mayor Lehan that the project area is too small. Randy reminded the group that the travel model is regional in scope and will consider travel times and impacts beyond the study area.

6. Close

Vaughn reviewed the flip notes taken during the meeting as initial key points for SWG consideration at the next meeting. He asked that SWG members provide other questions and thoughts as they study the range of alternatives materials from the last two meetings. A reminder notice will be sent via email early next week.

The next meeting will be held from 6-8 p.m. on June 28, 2007. The SWG is not currently scheduled to meet in July. The next PSC meeting is scheduled for 1:30-4:30 p.m. at the Sherwood Policy Training Center.

Flip chart transcription

- North Wilsonville Town Center should be a constraint
- Find a blue band that avoids Refuge within UGB
- Tonquin scablands should be considered a constraint
- Identify through, regional and local traffic impacts of alternatives
- Measure the impact of new roadway options on future growth patterns
- Emphasize assurances that modeling data is accurate and not subject to change
- Provide TDM/TSM analysis to compare to connector options now
- 4D goes through industrial land which serves a project need
- Go over Randy's traffic data chart again – on draft agenda