

Stakeholder Working Group (SWG) Meeting #18

6-8:00 p.m. Thursday, September 13th, 2007
Sherwood Police Training Center
20495 Borchers Road, Sherwood

MEETING SUMMARY

I-5/99W SWG members present

Barbara Shields (Friends of the Refuge)
Carla Thaler (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)
Ron Johnson (Washington County Oregon Farm Bureau)
Jerry Renfro (Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue)
Tom Sullivan (Wilsonville CCI)

Jon Reimann (Westside Economic Alliance)
Adrian Emery, Sherwood CCI

I-5/99W SWG members absent

Elliott Eki (AAA Oregon)

Project staff present

Lawrence Odell (Washington County)
Jef Kaiser (DEA)
Scott Richman (DEA)
Randy McCourt (DKS)
Vaughn Brown (JLA)
Shareen Rawlings (JLA)
Leslie Howell (Howell Consulting)

1. Welcome and Introductions-Vaughn Brown

Vaughn welcomed the group, and reviewed the meetings purpose. He explained that the primary purposed of the meeting is to review evaluation criteria and to offer suggestions and feedback regarding

2. Approve August 9th SWG Meeting Summary Notes- Group

Ray Phelps asked if the SWG could postpone approval of the meeting summary notes for the August 9th meeting due to email complications, and therefore a delay in receiving the August 9th meeting notes. The group moved to postpone approval until later in the week.

A group member suggested a motion to include Working Group member names in future meeting note summaries. The SWG moved to approve to attribute comments to specific members of the group.

3. EMT Report- EMT Chair Lawrence Odell

Lawrence Odell explained that the EMT had focused primarily upon two topics in their last meeting on September 6th. The first topic addressed parkway options and definitions. He explained that the EMT had decided to step away from the task of creating definitions, but the group did agree to study three concepts for each connector alternative including a

parkway option. These options include: (1) A three lane express way , (2) A 4 lane parkway and (3) a 4-6 lane parkway. He explained that all project alternatives will be studied according to the footprint of each of these options. He said that he hoped that the EMT would keep this conversation general as the project moved forward. The second topic that the EMT discussed was the draft evaluation criteria. Lawrence explained that the EMT was currently waiting for the technical team to revise elements of the evaluation criteria. He said that the EMT planned to address concerns and suggestions regarding the document in their next meeting on September 20th.

Loretta Pickerell asked for clarification regarding the three concept options for each connector alternative. Lawrence responded, providing additional detail regarding the terminology that he had used to describe these concept options.

4. Alternative Analysis Process- Jef Keizer, Alex Dupey, Vaughn Brown, Randy McCourt

Vaughn provided a brief introduction to Jeff's presentation. He referred the group to the Evaluation Criteria hand out and emphasized that the purpose of tonight's meeting was to gather feedback and suggestions from the SWG regarding the middle column of the document--which focused on criteria that would serve as the basis of analysis for each project objective.

Jeff's presentation emphasized how evaluation criteria and adoption of the evaluation criteria fit into the overall alternative analysis process. He reminded the group that the current stage of the process (evaluation criteria) would move into alternative analysis. He explained that this alternative analysis would closely follow an EIS report (environmental impact statement), where each alternative was carefully evaluated against a set of detailed criteria and then moved into a comparative analysis of results. Jef explained that following this next stage of alternative analysis, findings and a discussion of those findings would be made their way to the public for feedback and input through a public hearing process.

Jim Haynes asked for clarification regarding WHO the public hearing process would include. Jeff explained that a public hearing would include any and all members of the general public. He explained that the public hearing process would extend beyond one meeting. He said that there would be an opportunity for multiple community forums, electronic comments, written comments, etc. Following these public hearings, staff will work with the information and technical information to recommend a preferred alternative with a basis for selection. He said that at this stage, the PSC would move to adopt a preferred solution, which would then be forwarded to the Regional Transportation Committee.

Jef went on to describe and review the members of the technical team who would be involved with the alternative analysis process. He also provided a brief overview of the subjects that would be studied in a comparative analysis between alternatives, such as: noise, engineering and costs, energy, parks and wildlife.

Jim Haynes asked for clarification regarding the role of a cultural specialist. Jef explained that this position would be filled by a certified state historical officer, and would address topics such as historic and archeological impacts.

Jef went on to describe the methods that technical staff would use in the alternative analysis stage. Tools include: modeling, field work, GIS and other analytical tools. Documentation of these findings will be provided in an Alternative Analysis Report, and an Evaluation Matrix showing comparative analysis. He reminded the group that this methodology would still be focused on the footprint, not into the details surrounding specific design. Jef explained that a more detailed analysis will follow recommendation from the PSC.

Jef emphasized the role of evaluation criteria in this process. He explained that there are different ways to define categories of data in order to ensure that technical staff will gather usable data that will allow staff to gather information that will help to provide a comparative analysis between alternatives. He referred the group to a handout detailing the project goals, objectives, evaluation criteria and evaluation criteria measurements. He highlighted the middle column outlining evaluation criteria. Jef explained that these statements would help to guide the technical team, essentially serving as a checklist of data they need to collect in order to evaluate the objective. He also explained that these statements also help to provide reasons/justifications that will eventually inform staff's final recommendations.

Dave Volz expressed the concern that certain alternatives would be weighed against each other by placing a greater value upon certain criteria. He provided an example of wetland protection.

Jef responded to his comment, and explained that the evaluation criteria would serve as a guide that will help to provide data and a greater understanding of potential impacts. He explained that the intent of evaluation criteria was to not weight criteria, and therefore weight the alternatives. Evaluation criteria is simply a guide for gathering information so that decision making bodies involved in the process can use this information to provide an informed recommendation.

5. Evaluation Criteria overview and input

Vaughn introduced the next section of the presentation. He explained that the format of the discussion would walk through each goal, introducing evaluation criteria and welcoming feedback and input from the group. He stressed the need to move through all of the evaluation criteria, in order to gather feedback from the SWG.

Alex Dupey led a discussion of evaluation criteria. He described the process behind developing evaluation criteria for each of the project objectives. He then referred the group to the handout, and explained how the sheet had been set up. He reiterated Jeff Keizer's discussion of evaluation criteria, and explained that there are four basic themes of criteria following project goals. These themes are:

- Transportation (Goals 1, Objectives 1A-1F)
- Local and Regional Land Use (Goal 2, Objectives 2A-2F)
- Natural and Cultural Resource Impacts (Goal 3, Objectives 3A-3D)

- Project Costs and Feasibility (Goal 4, Objectives 4A-4D)

Alex then walked through each goal and objective, providing a brief overview of evaluation criteria within each goal/objective. The sections that follow outline SWG member concerns and questions pertaining to each goal/objective statement.

Goal 1:

Loretta Pickerell asked if staff could provide more detail, or paraphrase what the evaluation measures are attempting to define. Randy McCourt explained that the first objective is largely characterized by capacity on roadways.

Loretta also expressed a desire to see overall travel time addressed in evaluation criteria addressing objective 1A. Staff explained that this was addressed in 1B. Alex describes that many of these criteria will overlap with each other. Loretta explained that she thinks this criterion would be important to the topic of capacity and should be included. Carla Thaler, a new representative for the Tualatin Chamber of Commerce emphasized that she thought that objective 1A really seemed to focus on capacity issues more than travel time.

Mike Feves reiterated Loretta's point. He said that he felt capacity was not important in this section, and staff should focus more on how long it takes to get from point A to point B. He emphasizes that travel times should not be measured only by v/c ration or traffic counts. Staff explained that this criterion is addressed, specifically under objective 1B.

Mike Feves recommended that staff measure travel time at different time periods.

Randy reminded the group that tonight's conversation is largely focused on discussion elements and key questions/criteria. He described the conversation as "discovery mode" and urged the group to remember that criteria would serve as a guide for gathering data.

Ray Phelps asked how staff planned to reflect impacts outside of the study area if evaluation criteria only focused on the project area. Randy explained that the study focuses on the whole region while the objective at the end of the study will be to provide a comparative summary of alternative analysis for the project alternatives. Ray expressed another concern that the measures didn't show intersections, or roads outside of the project area. Randy explained that staff had considered that, and decided that the volume measurement of the study area adequately showed how things changed in the region as a whole. He explained that this data should give a fairly accurate picture of regional impacts.

Dave Volz requested that all data be compiled consistently, so that all alternatives could be measured and compared across the table. Alex assured Dave that this was the case, and that the part of the alternative analysis required this consistency. He went on to explain that evaluation criteria would serve as a benchmark to ensure that staff would be looking at all of the information consistently.

Ron Johnson expressed a concern that the group was getting off base with their comments. He was interested in going back to a "broad brush stroke" discussion that would look at

what is important to address for each of the project objectives. He asked for clarification surrounding the fact that the purpose was to provide guidelines for technical staff. An SWG member said that it seemed to her like some of the comments about the relevance of evaluation criteria would be better served later in the process. She explained that it seems more important to assign importance over one goal or another.

Alex Dupey responded, explaining that those types of considerations would be better served later in the process. He said that at this stage in the process, what the group is attempting to do is to ensure that there are enough guidelines in place for staff to gather the information that they will need for the alternative analysis. Loretta said that she felt that this was repetitive, and expressed a concern that this process would provide an over analysis in some areas and under analysis in others. Alex explained that there are similarities between criteria, simply because you are looking at how they relate to each other while attempting to create consistently across all alternatives.

Mike Feves asked if alternative 1E included a distinction between through trips and regional trips. He also asked if staff could clarify the number of trucks that would be through trucks or regional trucks. Randy responded to his comment, explaining that trucks will be broken into three classifications: local, regional, and through.

Loretta asked a general question about how the project process was going to work. She expressed that it seemed like an iterative process. She asked what would happen if staff and decision making bodies moved forward and then discovered that the project objectives don't address what staff had hoped. She wondered if there was a place in the decision making process to go back and draft new alternatives, or strengthen alternatives based upon the holes that may be found in the alternative analysis. Alex responded, explaining that this place Loretta mentioned would fall more into a alternative refinement stage. He explained that what is on the table are described as "starting alternatives", and reminded the group that this alternative selection was not necessarily the final draft of each alternative.

Goal 2

A group member stated that it seemed that the evaluation criteria beneath objective 2A implied that there is a threshold of pass or fail for goal 2. This group member asked for clarification regarding who determined those thresholds and at what point in the process would those be established. Alex explained that in terms of the highway, ODOT would great standards and thresholds. Residential impacts are allowed to be determined individually according to the project. He explained that the key for the majority of criteria addressed in 2A would be individual to the project. SWG, EMT, and PSC will make decisions regarding those thresholds following alternative analysis.

Dave Voltz expressed the concern that land use evaluation criteria only looks at current patterns of growth. He expressed an interested in understanding where the urban growth boundary will expand, and including that type of information/data/impacts in the project. He felt that this aspect of analysis was not very well addressed. Alex Dupey responded, stating that it is easier to determine how alternatives will impact the current UGB as opposed to determining impacts for a future boundary that is not yet determined. Working from a

static UGB provides project analysis without forecasting UGB expansion. Dave followed Alex's comment, asking for clarification, in possible, in terms of what other land use rules should be applied to this process. He stated that he was uncomfortable making a decision on alternatives without information about future land use impacts.

Mike Feves expressed a concern with the language of 2A, which used words such as "significantly" and "reasonable" and other areas of the evaluation criteria which used words like "avoid". He explained that these types of discrepancies created a feasibility threshold concern. Mike went on to note that the language promoted the fact that any alternative could be selected or rejected by shifting the feasibility thresholds. He suggested that these thresholds should be established prior to analysis.

Ron Johnson also suggested that urban reserves and rural reserves should be included in a discussion of land use. Following his suggestion, Tom Sullivan asked if impacts to communities played out in the current draft of the evaluation criteria. He expressed an interest in seeing how certain alternatives impacted specific communities, i.e: which alternatives provided what benefits to what communities, which alternatives provided to be detrimental to the others and why.

Alex Dupey explained that evaluation criteria should show these impacts, and that these types of impacts would come out of data collection. Tom expressed an interest in seeing this stated in the evaluation criteria. He used the example of business impacts to Wilsonville businesses. Alex said that staff would work to provide as much information as possible concerning impacts to communities, including more detail than simply relocations impacts.

A group member asked for a clarification regarding criteria statements beneath objective 2E, specifically what was a cultural specialist and how a specialist would help to define functional value. Alex explained that functional value pertains to how an alternative would impact the function of the land. A land use specialist would be the person that would determine those impacts, and this specialist would be employed by one of the consulting team firms.

Loretta stated a desire to see something stated about the functional value of industrial land. Alex responded, explaining that staff would be looking at the zoning of vacant land in the region.

Going back to the evaluation criteria under objective 2A, Mike Feves expressed a concern that the language insinuated that alternatives inside the UGB will create greater impacts to residents. He suggested that the wording needed to be shifted so that it was a little more neutral. His concern is that the language of 2A is not consistent with the language of the other evaluation criteria, and emphasized a need to set thresholds before evaluation criteria and data gathering.

Alex responded, explaining that thresholds would be set by decision making groups in the process. He also explained that the evaluation criteria beneath 2A was largely because 2A stood on its own in terms of the fact that it relates to the Oregon State land use plan exceptions. Jef also responded to the comment, explaining that the development of thresholds at this stage in the process would only limit data gathering. This topic generated a discussion among the SWG about thresholds.

Vaughn explained that the Mike's point was made, and that it would go back to staff for a conversation.

Goal 3: Natural and Cultural Resource Impacts

Loretta expressed the desire to see more in-depth data gathered concerning the functionality impacts to the habitat areas and land uses addressed in the evaluation of Goal 3. Jef explained that staff would be breaking data out according to functional classifications, so the level of detail that Loretta requested would be available after data collection.

Goal 4: Project Costs and Feasibility

Loretta said that she felt that the group was not getting to the important questions. She was interested in seeing how the study will promote or delay movements towards transit. She also expressed a desire to see things like green house gas emissions and energy consumption measured in this study. Jim Haynes reiterated an interest in look at some of the impacts Loretta mentioned, especially getting people into transit. Carla Thaler expressed a frustration that the SWG discussion of evaluation criteria seemed to be related to details that were not outlined in the meeting or the project purpose. She also noted that it was important to be realistic about transit and emphasized that it was important to look at what the best way to address transportation issues and concerns in the region.

Tom Sullivan asked if evaluation criteria would be looking at driver behavior due to future impacts such as fuel impacts and road capacity issues. Jef explained that the project needed to follow certain guidelines. He said that at the project level it is inappropriate to assume new urban forms and new forecasted demands that would be outside of the project purpose. He went on to explain that future visions for a region are questions to take to Metro Regional Planning Council. He explained that the RTP process would decide if the project was on mark or not with the connector process. He said that it was important to remember the boundaries and charges of this specific project and the responsibility to stay within that task.

Vaughn reminds the group that the TDM measurements really get to some of Tom's concerns. Ron Johnson asked how long revision on evaluation criteria would take, and how long a discussion of this criterion would continue. Alex explained that the SWG comments and suggestions would to the EMT at their next meeting on September 20th. Ron Johnson asked if the SWG would have a chance to see the evaluation criteria before it goes to the PSC for a final decision. Vaughn explained that the PSC had indicated that they may need one more session to finalize their comments regarding the evaluation criteria.

As a wrap up statement, Lawrence Odell reminded the SWG that transit subsidies, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, park and ride, and parking supply and management were all addressed in the TDM and TSM options.

6. Public Comment

Andy Pihl

Andy Pihl provided comments regarding the evaluation criteria beneath objective 1D and objective 2A. In terms of objective 1D, he noted that there was not measure to show the negative effect of transportation improvements. Specifically, he was interested in seeing a measurement that showed impacts to I-5. His second comment, regarding the evaluation criteria beneath 2A provided a suggestion to include a bullet beneath this evaluation criteria that said “farm and forest land” similarly to the other bullet that mentions “residential and commercial”. He explained that without this text, it seems as though this alternative would have a lot more impacts on farm and forest land than other alternatives. Including that bullet would support the objectives that are there for goal #2.

7. Other Business

Mike Feves seconded Andy Pihl’s comment to include an additional bullet under objective 2A.

The next SWG meeting will be held October 11th.

8. Close and adjourn