

## Stakeholder Working Group (SWG) Meeting #19

6-8:00 p.m. Thursday, February 21, 2008  
Sherwood Police Training Center  
20495 Borchers Road, Sherwood

### MEETING SUMMARY

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

Scott Stoddard (*Tualatin Chamber of Commerce*)  
Mike Feves (*Far West CPO*)  
Dave Volz (*Tualatin CCI*)  
Ray Phelps (*Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*)  
Jack Laverty (*Oregon Trucking Association*)  
Tom Aufenthie (*CPO 5*)  
Loretta Pickerell (*1000 Friends of Oregon*)  
Jerry Renfro (*Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue*)  
Tom Sullivan (*Wilsonville CCI*)  
Jon Reimann (*Westside Economic Alliance*)  
Adrian Emery (*Sherwood CCI*)  
Jim Haynes (*Sherwood Chamber of Commerce*)  
Barbara Shields (*Friends of the Refuge*)

#### **SWG Alternates**

Chuck Smith – Alternate (*Washington County Oregon Farm Bureau*)

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

Marie Dodds (*AAA Oregon*)  
Ron Johnson (*Washington County Farm Bureau*)  
Nick Storie (*Metro CCI*)

#### **Project staff present**

Lawrence Odell (*Washington County*)  
Scott Richman (*DEA*)  
Alex Dupey (*DEA*)  
Chris Maciejewski (*DKS*)  
Vaughn Brown (*JLA*)  
Shareen Rawlings (*JLA*)  
Russ Knobel (*Washington County*)

#### **Welcome and introductions – Vaughn Brown (JLA)**

Vaughn led the group through a brief round of introductions and asked group members to describe their interest and role in the I-5 to 99W Connector Project. There are several new group members, although not all in attendance, since the last SWG meeting held in September. New members include: Jim Haynes – formerly an alternate (Sherwood Chamber of Commerce), Marie Dodds (AAA Oregon) and Scott Stoddard (Tualatin Chamber of Commerce).

#### **Meeting purpose and agenda– Vaughn Brown (JLA)**

Vaughn referred members to the meeting agenda; reminding the group that the purpose of the meeting would be to:

- Review the meeting schedule and process for alternative selection
- Present and discuss preliminary transportation analysis results progress

Vaughn reminded the group that the project process is entering a new phase which he described as workshop based. He explained that in this new phase SWG members would be working together to review alternatives and walk through detailed analysis. He emphasized that from here on out the project is focused on solutions – which may require the re-working of specific elements of project solution alternatives.

### **Approve Sept. 13<sup>th</sup> Meeting Summary - Group**

Vaughn asked for revisions or additions to the Summary Meeting notes for SWG meeting #18. Loretta stated that she would like to review notes further and verify her specific comments. Vaughn asked for feedback by next Monday (Feb. 25<sup>th</sup>)

### **EMT Report – Lawrence Odell (EMT Chair)**

Lawrence provided a brief EMT report, explaining that the EMT had only met once since the last SWG meeting. The meeting provided an opportunity for the EMT to review the transportation analysis that was being presented to the SWG in this meeting.

### **Project Progress and schedule update – Scott Richmond, DEA**

Lawrence turned the meeting over to Scott Richmond to discuss project progress and updates to the project meeting schedule. Scott reiterated Vaughn's previous statement regarding project process shifts and briefly revisited the major project decisions up until this point – emphasizing the significance of the PSC's adoption of alternative evaluation criteria in October of 2007.

Scott explained that this stage of alternative analysis would support the project committees in the next round of decision making to determine which solution alternative, or solution elements, to move forward into a final recommendation. Community forums will be scheduled during the alternatives refinement process to present alternative analysis findings and results. Input from this round of community meetings will then be fed back through project committees, helping to guide decision makers in the development and selection of a preferred solution.

A public hearing will be held following the PSC's agreement on a preferred solution to enlist additional public input and feedback before the PSC finalizes its solution recommendation. The final recommended corridor-level solution will then be passed on for adoption by the affected jurisdictions individually.

Scott mentioned that the project team anticipates at this point that there will be several elements of the alternatives that may require additional refinement and analysis before a final recommendation is made.

Following this discussion, Scott walked through a brief re-introduction of the six solution alternatives. He explained that the project team has re-numbered the project solutions for simplicity:

- No Build: **Alternative 1**
- TDM/TSM: **Alternative 2**
- EESA: **Alternative 3**
- Connector Concept 4D: **Alternative 4**
- Connector Concept 4E: **Alternative 5**
- Connector Concept 5B: **Alternative 6**

Scott then went on to discuss the short term track/schedule for committee meetings. He explained that by March the SWG should see a complete summary report of transportation

analysis and findings. Following this information, the SWG would meet to workshop alternatives based upon specific findings.

Vaughn mentioned the project website and urged community members and committee members to visit the site for regular meeting updates and project postings.

### **Preliminary Transportation Analysis Results – *Chris Maciewjewski, DKS***

Scott turned the meeting to Chris Maciewjewski – traffic engineer with DKS. Chris explained that the information that the SWG would receive this evening represented the preliminary transportation information to come out of the traffic analysis process. He explained that the data starts with a system wide, level measurement that outlines major themes. Higher level, more detailed information would be available to the SWG in their March meeting – when the traffic report was complete.

### ***Analysis results and alternatives comparison summary***

Chris then turned the group to the PowerPoint presentation. He explained the structure of the presentation and preliminary transportation findings – noting that each project goal and objective statement was used to develop a series of transportation/traffic related questions. Preliminary findings have been organized around these questions, as a means of condensing technical data into a more digestible format.

The presentation tonight outlines data collected Chris went on to explain that many of the questions outlined in this presentation have been used as placeholders – highlight the data to come. Chris walked through Goal 1, highlighting the major preliminary findings relating to each Alternative under objective statements 1A-1H. These preliminary findings and major clarifying questions are outlined below according to objective numbers and themes.

### **Objective 1A: *Town Centers of Tualatin, Sherwood, Wilsonville and Tigard***

#### ***Key Findings:***

#### Tualatin

- Alternatives 4, 5, and 6 would all reduce overall traffic and through/regional traffic on Tualatin-Sherwood Road in Tualatin by 25%-30%.

#### Sherwood

- Alternative 6 would reduce overall traffic and through/regional traffic on Tualatin-Sherwood Road and Hwy 99W in Sherwood.
- Alternatives 4 and 5 would increase overall traffic and through/regional traffic on Hwy 99w through Sherwood

#### Wilsonville

- Data available in March

#### Tigard

- Data available in March

#### ***Group Discussion:***

- Loretta Pickerell asked how each of these alternatives reduces traffic on Hwy 99W. Chris explained that this is caused by increasing traffic flow onto I-5.

- Loretta asked if analysis factors take into considerations impacts to I-5. Chris explains that I-5 analysis will be addressed in later stages of the analysis process.
- Adrian Emery asked a clarifying question – if alternatives more effectively put traffic onto I-5, impacts are not necessarily negative (i.e.: increased congestion).
- Chris explained that traffic counts in this analysis include peak hour and shoulder time traffic.
- Loretta asked Chris to address the potential for increased volumes on roadways due to the construction of a new connector. Chris explained that new roadways do not necessarily result in increased traffic and promoted development.
- Mike Feves asked for clarification regarding the geographic boundaries of the Sherwood Town Center. Chris explained that the technical uses the six corners area as defined by Metro as the boundaries for the Sherwood Town Center
- Tom Aufenthie noted that new developments in the area have caused the Sherwood town center to shift.

**Objective 1B:** *“Gateway” Access for regional and intrastate trips on 99w and I-5*

**Objective 1D:** *Provide transportation improvements that will not negatively impact I-5*

***Key Findings:***

- Alternative 6 would provide travel time savings of between 7 to 15 minutes between 99w and I-5 or I-205
- Alternatives 4 and 5 would provide some travel time savings (1-10 minutes) along the connector routes
- Alternatives 4, 5, and 6 would provide reductions in total study area PM Peak congestion by up to 42%. Chris explained that in order to obtain this information the technical team not only looked at key points within the study area, but also all roads and roadways in the project area. Detailed information about study area impacts will be available in March.

***Group Discussion:***

- Scott Stoddard asked if the average travel time in this study was based on travel time during peak traffic time. He noted that these numbers seemed very low for I-5.
- Loretta expressed a concern that the analysis is only looking at travel times as opposed to times between destination points. Chris reminded the group that the traffic time data presented tonight was only the first measure. Additional information would be available in March that highlights destinations outside of the study area. This information will outline the average travel time of these trips, and will be able to break the study area into smaller parcels outlining trip times between internal study area origins and destinations.
- Tom asked Chris to clarify and confirm that there are in fact two connections to 99W in Alternative 6. Chris confirms, and explains that the connection from 124<sup>th</sup> to 99W will be a major piece of Alternative 6. Tom stressed the fact that this fact will impact travel times.
- Tom Sullivan expressed a concern about traffic impacts to Wilsonville – as most of he wants to see is related to how each alternative will reduce traffic outlined by region and by municipality.

**Objective 1C:** *Provide transportation improvements that are safe and effectively serve all travel modes included bicycles, pedestrians, transit, and motor-vehicles (including trucks)*

***Key Findings:***

- Alternative 3 (EESA) would provide a significant increase in transit ridership and would serve the most total person trips
- Alternatives 2 and 3 would both provide substantial improvements to the bicycle and pedestrian system by increasing connectivity and filling in gaps in the study area grid system
- Each of the Connector alternatives would incorporate safe pedestrian and bicycle facilities along the Connector corridors.
- Alternative 6 would have the lowest estimated crash rate due to the greatest traffic shift from surface streets to higher classification roadways
- Alternatives 4 and 5 would also have reduced crash rates compared to a no build option (alternative 1)
- Alternative 3 may potentially increase study area crash rates due to increased traffic and congestion on some of the signalized local surface roads (It is important to note that urban arterials have lower crash rates than rural roads)

***Group Discussion:***

- Adrian asked if the EESA alternative were adopted, would it be mandated that transit would be provided to the area. His concern stemmed from a long history of talking about providing transit options in the region, but no action or policy work towards making this a reality. Chris explained that funding sources are very different for each alternative option. In the case of EESA, improvements would be done project by project and would require close coordination with TriMet and individual municipalities. Scott Richmond explained that the alternative selection process would prioritize transit options if EESA was selected (i.e.: Committed Funding).
- Jon Reiman asked if the traffic modeling that was project out to 2030 assumed that some of the EESA improvements (i.e.: transit) would already be in place. Chris explained that the EESA layer of data is not incorporated into the Connector analysis process except in Alternative 6 – where specific arterial enhancements would be assumed on Tualatin-Sherwood Road. Chris stressed that each alternative evaluation was occurring independently of one another.
- Loretta made mention that whatever option selected would require competition for funding. She expressed a concern that improvements associated with each option will not be guaranteed. Chris explained that different types of improvements would have different sources of funding.
- Chris also noted that Alternatives 2 and 3 basically turned Tualatin Sherwood Road into a high capacity roadway. Because of this, the project team would look into bike and pedestrian crossing enhancements in order to maintain and promote safety. He also mentioned that each of the connector alternatives would not promote the same “filling in” of the grid system that alternatives 2 and 3 would. In order to promote connectivity and access with the connector options, the project team would most likely suggest the addition of trail systems and other bike/pedestrian features. Arterial improvements

could include the construction of additional bike lanes and roadway pedestrian improvements.

- Jerry Renfro asked in the crash rates outlined in the data findings combined fatal crashes and other fender benders. Chris explained that all crashes are treated the same way, and create an average crash rate for the roadway and for the study area.
- Lawrence Odell, the EMT Chair, asked how crashes impact travel times in the study. Chris explained that incidents are not factored into the travel time modeling.

**Objective 1E:** *Provide for the access and regional and intrastate travel needs of trucks hauling freight into and out of the Tualatin, Sherwood and Wilsonville areas.*

**Key Findings:**

- Alternatives 4 and 5 would provide the greatest travel time reduction for the Sherwood and Tualatin industrial areas, particularly for access to I-5 South and I-205. (On average, the modeling showed a decrease range of 2-11 minutes)
- Alternative 6 provides the greatest overall travel time benefits for the Tualatin and Wilsonville industrial areas.
- Alternatives 4, 5, and 6 would provide similar reductions in study area congestion (34%-42%) with a significant reduction in roadways over capacity (40%-50%)

**Group Discussion:**

- Tom expressed a concern about the growth of major industrial centers in the area. Interested if these new growth centers have been included in the transportation analysis.

**Objective 1F:** *Provide multimodal transportation improvements that complement and support local transportation systems planning*

**Key Findings:**

- Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 would provide similarly substantial overall traffic reduction as well as overall freight and regional traffic reduction on rural roads outside the UGB (a decrease of 17% to 24% of total vehicle miles traveled).

**Group Discussion:**

- Dave Volz expressed an interest in seeing how the percentages associated with the transportation data relate to current standards or existing conditions. Chris explained that it was possible to model traffic data using existing conditions as a baseline. He explained that this level of comparison and detail would be available in the final analysis report.
- Chris explained that traffic analysis for options 4 and 5 show a lot of increased traffic pressure placed on 99W through Sherwood. He explained that the project team would need to address and mitigate these impacts to 99w in order for options 4 and 5 to remain viable transportation solutions. He explained that ODOT is currently working on additional transportation improvements to these options – these improvements should be addressed in the next SWG meeting. Improvements may include: improved intersections, spot improvements, and bike/pedestrian crossings.

- Tom asked if an overpass would be considered as an option for addressing these concerns on 99w. He also asked if costs data would be available in the analysis report. Chris and Scott Richmond both answered yes. They explained that complete datasets should be available included cost considerations. Scott stressed the importance of ensuring that options 4 and 5 are presented in a way that can be compared and analyzed against the other alternatives and the project's goals and objectives. He explained that the project team is finding that they need to study additional intersection improvements with these options, and ODOT would need to work to determine performance standards.
- Tom asked if there was a reasonable alternative option inside of the UGB.
- Loretta asked if the group was going to look at impacts to Wilsonville and impacts to I-5. She also asked if the group would rely on ODOT to determine standards, or if the project groups would determine what the communities can "live with". Chris responded to her questions – explaining that data regarding impacts to both I-5 and to Wilsonville would be available as part of the analysis report. In regards to her second question, Chris reminded the group that ODOT ultimately establishes the standards for their facilities.
- Tom expressed a concern about the existing bottlenecks outside of the project area at Newberg and Dundee. He noted that statewide plans need to take these traffic concerns into consideration. Scott responded, explaining that the data suggests that there is not different between the No Build option and build options on 99w South in terms of traffic impacts south of Brookman Road.
- Mike asked for a copy of the technical findings. Scott explained that the project team has been exploring different formats for communicating this information and anticipates that the team would have some summarized and synthesized information that would then go to the EMT for feedback and approval. He explained that the intent of this information is to compare how alternatives compare against each other. Scott explained that it is important to note that the information presented to the SWG tonight was only part of the complete data set. Mike said he understood, but was interested in seeing details, data and numbers from the original data set. Scott put out the option to distribute technical data to the group. The group agreed.
- Loretta expressed that she does not find consumer reports helpful, because it does not show the factors that she thinks are important. She asked if the group could talk about biases and assumptions in the data. Chris explained the process behind the technical findings summary, explaining that the project team would be taking a pile of data obtained during the analysis process – consolidating this information into a report and then into a graphic consumer report style.
- Vaughn explained that there is not a weighing process attached to the technical findings – Mike disagreed, explaining that he feels like there is a weighting process communicated through engineering judgment calls. Vaughn explained that the criteria selected for use in the analysis process were identified and discussed with all project committees including the SWG before getting PSC approval. He explained that technical information would aid in the recommendation process, but is NOT a decision. A decision will ultimately come from the PSC.
- Tom said that he wanted to be able to compare the alternatives to each other.

- Lawrence suggested that there should be an opportunity to email questions to the project team. The SWG agreed. Loretta said that she would like to see questions from the EMT and the PSC as well.
- Tom asked about constraints on funding. Lawrence explained that the project team would look at financial impacts and get back to the committees with cost data. Tom asked for clarification regarding the role funding will play in the analysis process. Chris explained that funding is a part of the process. He explained that the PSC will make a judgment about financial limits and about the project that they think will be realistic to pursue (funding wise).
- Jack Laverty asked to see meeting information at least a week before meetings.

## **Public Comment**

### Mark Brown

Comment: Explained that he is a truck driver, and owner of Tonkin Trucking Group. He expressed a concern that one of the project connectors goes straight through a new industrial growth area. He explained that he and others in the area had spent a lot of time putting this industrial area plan together, and farmers spent a lot of time working their land. In regards to Tonkin Road, he expressed a stakeholder view for the preservation of industrial ground for the community and the economy. He noted that this project was not easy and appreciates the time that the committee and the project team have put towards making a decision.

### Carla Thayler

Comment: Question regarding transit ridership communicated in the transportation findings. She asked if the transit ridership expressed in the findings could be put into real terms – how many people, etc. Chris Maciejewski explained that this information would be available – he also explained that these percentages showed a project shift in ridership based up existing conditions as a baseline. In response to a question posed by committee member Scott Stoddard Chris also explained that the findings would not break down WHO those riders will be.

### Bob Remski

Comment: Explained that he and his wife are property owners in the study area. He asked project staff if the traffic study, specifically relating to Alternative 6, assumed that a distributor system would be built into the model. Chris Maciejewski explained that a distributor system would be built into the model, which would look at regional systems of roads. Bob urged the group to come to a conclusion soon in terms of what impacts the project may have on area residents. His property is his savings- and hopes to pass it on to his son. He urged the group to make a decision as soon as they can so that homeowners have a better understanding of the impacts and their reality.

## **Close and Adjourn**

Vaughn reminded members to forward any data questions they have to Shareen for use in the next SWG meeting. He announced the next meeting to be on March 13th from 6-8 pm at the Sherwood Police Training Center.