

## Stakeholder Working Group (SWG) Meeting #21

6 to 8:00 p.m. Thursday, May 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2008

Sherwood Police Training Center

24095 Borchers Drive, Sherwood

### MEETING SUMMARY

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

Loretta Pickerell (*1000 Friends of Oregon*)

Mark Brown (*Metro CCI*)

Mike Feves (*Far West CPO*)

Dave Volz (*Tualatin CCI*)

Ray Phelps (*Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*)

Tom Aufenthie (*CPO 5*)

Jon Reimann (*Westside Economic Alliance*)

Ron Johnson (*Washington County Oregon Farm Bureau*)

Tom Sullivan (*Wilsonville CCI*)

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

Marie Dodds (*AAA Oregon*)

Scott Stoddard (*Tualatin Chamber of Commerce*)

Jim Haynes (*Sherwood Chamber of Commerce*)

Adrian Emery (*Sherwood CCI*)

#### **Project staff present**

Lawrence Odell (*Washington County*)

Russ Knoebel (*Washington County*)

Amy Gibbons (*ODOT*)

Scott Richman (*DEA*)

Mara Krinke (*DEA*)

Randy McCourt (*DKS*)

Vaughn Brown (*JLA*)

Shareen Rawlings (*JLA*)

#### **Welcome & introductions**

Vaughn walked through the meeting agenda and revisited the purpose and goals of the meeting.

- Project progress and upcoming decisions reminder
- Establish tonight's timekeeping role as critical to meeting success

He reminded the group of the project process, and explains that the project hopes to have a preferred solution late fall. He briefly discussed the SWG Alternative Analysis Report (AAR) Workshop that was held on May 20<sup>th</sup>. He explained that during this meeting, the SWG would be discussing and reviewing an overview of the AAR.

Loretta asked if Vaughn would describe the next major decision that would signify the transition into the Alternative Refinement Process. Vaughn explained that there was no action on behalf of the PSC of project committees that would mark the transition into the refinement process. He mentioned that the community forum's scheduled for the end of June would begin to mark that transition.

Tom Sullivan asked how the SWG comments would be used. Vaughn and the project team explained that these comments would be forwarded to the PSC and recorded in the AAR internal review comment log.

#### **EMT report – Lawrence Odell (Washington County)**

Lawrence explained that the EMT had a couple of meetings to look through the notable findings of the AAR. He mentioned that at this point, the EMT had reached a unanimous

agreement on the Alternative Analysis and Alternative selection process. He explained that some committee members disagreed with some of the information presented in the AAR. He went on to describe that the EMT sans one committee member agreed to forward the document to the next phase of the process. The EMT agreed on several changes, but overall agreed that the document was sufficient to release to the public for comment. He mentioned that it was the hope of the EMT to get the document out to the public as soon as possible so that the public can have a chance to comment on the findings and that information can move back to the PSC to help inform a decision regarding a preferred solution.

Lawrence also mentioned that it was his personal opinion that the project should look at the proposed alternatives and segment them down into phases and look at the project from a cost perspective in terms of which phases can be funded.

He explained the EMT was concerned about this view and agreed that this project would continue to focus on a corridor level solution. He explained that the EMT would meet on Tuesday, May 27<sup>th</sup> to discuss the AAR and additional committee member comments. He explained that the project teams would wait until after the public comment period to determine phasing options. Lawrence reiterated the fact that committee decisions at this point in the project should be focused on determining if the AAR is ready to be released to the public.

Ron Johnson asked why the alternative recommendation has to wait until later in the project process. Scott Richmond explained that public comment period would be very critical in terms of preferred solution recommendations. Scott went on to describe the public comment period and input process. He explained the project team would come back from the community forums with a better understanding of how the alternatives may be refined and evaluated to move toward a preferred solution.

Loretta mentioned that she felt very strongly that the SWG needed more time to review the AAR. She felt outraged that the SWG has been pushed into such a tight schedule with little time to review the AAR findings.

Vaughn asked that the group move forward with an overview of the AAR and come back at the end of the meeting to see if Loretta's sentiment was shared by the group.

Lawrence reminds the group that much of the information in the AAR has already been presented and/or released to the SWG for review at previous meetings.

Adrian raised a concern regarding segmenting and phasing of the project alternatives. He mentioned that Sherwood was undergoing several planning efforts, and expressed a concern with moving forward with these planning efforts if it was unclear where road improvements and/or improvements may occur. Lawrence said that the project would continue forward with a corridor level solution and regional planning efforts can reflect that.

Michael Feves asked how the AAR and public hearing process relate back to the August deadline for federal funding for additional financial support of this project. Lawrence

explained that the project currently has \$25 million and explained that the project schedule was not pinned to the August federal funding deadline.

### **Alternatives Analysis Review Overview – *Scott Richmond (DEA)***

Scott Richmond explained the project process and walked through a brief description of the project alternatives. He walked through the topics considered as part of the AA including:

- Transportation Performance
- Land Use and Planning
- Socioeconomics
- Biological Resources
- Wetlands
- Geology and Soils
- Parks and Wildlife Areas
- Cultural Resources (Historic and Archaeological)
- Utilities
- Air Quality and Noise
- Hazardous Materials
- Energy
- Visual Resources
- Engineering and Costs

### ***Transportation – Notable Findings***

- Alternatives 4, 5, and 6 provide the most significant improvement for overall regional and through traffic mobility
- All alternatives except Alternative 2 increase PM peak vehicle miles traveled from the base condition due to improvements in mobility
- Only Alternative 6 substantially reduces vehicle miles of travel for the combined town centers in the study area
- Alternatives 4, 5, and 6 reduce travel times for state highway access to the Tualatin and Sherwood Town Centers.
- Alternatives 4, 5, and 6 increase some travel times for state highway access to the Wilsonville Town Center due to additional trips using I-5 (Fig. 7.7-3)
- Alternatives 4, 5, and 6 reduce potential crash rates in the project area
- Alternatives 4, 5, and 6 have the least cumulative hours of delay within the project area
- Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 improve access travel times from Sherwood and Tualatin industrial areas within the project area to the interstate system (pg. 97)
- Alternative 6 provides the fastest route from Sherwood and OR 99W south of Sherwood to I-5 and I-205
- Alternatives 4, 5, and 6 reduce the amount of through traffic on many routes between I-5 and OR 99W in the project area near Sherwood, Tualatin, Wilsonville, and Tigard
- Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 reduce the amount of auto and freight traffic on rural roadways outside the UGB

Tom Aufenthic asks about the difference between a parkway and an expressway? Scott explained that this was a design level conversation. Michael Feves mentioned that there seemed to be a difference in speed between expressways and parkways, and asked if this

difference would determine a preferred solution. Scott Richmond explained that SWG comments would be logged and the project team would respond with an answer regarding what this difference may be. Jennifer Danziger explained that the corridor analysis looked at an area large enough to include both design options. Scott Stoddard mentioned that the thought that the expressway vs. parkway conversation would be a great topic to take out to the public – in terms of getting feedback on which type of facility the public would rather see. Feves asked that a level of sensitivity testing be included in the AAR.

The group discussed methodology used in the traffic study. Loretta asked about travel times, specifically that she felt the report only showed data that looked within and immediately adjacent to the project area and didn't include travel times that reflect delays for the through and regional traffic using I-5, I-205 etc.. She emphasized the fact that she thought the project team had not adequately looked at travel time impacts outside of the project area.

Jennifer responded, directing the group to Figure 7.1 on page 95 of the AAR which described origin and destination trips, including several numbers from locations outside of the project area. Scott Richmond also reminded the group of the project purpose, which as to update the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) – helping to inform the regional plan. Loretta responded, mentioning a concern that rest of the region would suffer because of the connector improvements. She hoped that the group would recommend phasing taking into account regional impacts, for example improving I-5 before adding more congestion there. Scott explained that this project is not designed or charged with solving congestion problems on I-5.

Jack Laverty raised a concern regarding safety and congestion in the project area. He mentioned that he thought solutions are linked to moving traffic away from industrial areas and activity centers – which was a concern. Scott Stoddard added to Jack's comment, asking that the project solutions focus on industrial centers, specifically access roads that would attract freight away from Tualatin-Sherwood Road. Scott Richmond responded, explaining that new connectors draw a substantial amount of freight out of town centers. Jennifer added, mentioning that trucks will take the shortest route and the fastest route to their destination. She said that the hope would be that the connectors will preserve local industrial access. She said it was un-likely that any solution would remove trucks from Tualatin-Sherwood Road. She referred the group to several figures in the AAR – Figure 7-5.2 and 7.4-1.

Michael Feves commented on Figure 7.4-1 – mentioning that it was important to note that Alternatives 4, 5, and 5 all increase traffic on I-5. He also mentioned that the V/C ratio data was very important and figure should be blow up to clearly show that I-5 is being caused to fail. He also mentioned that he would like to see a table that shows vehicle delay outside of the project area included in the AAR.

Tom Aufenthic mentioned that there was no mention of the impacts to I-5 and I-105. Loretta mentioned that she had a problem with the costs represented in the AAR – specifically quantifying the impacts to I-5. She asked that these impacts be factored into the project cost to provide a more realistic assessment of project costs. Tom Sullivan expressed a concern that the consultant team seemed to be pushing an objective and/or a position as

opposed to presenting objective information. Adrian Emery responded to Tom's comment - explaining that the consultant team was bound by a scope and a project purpose.

***Land Use and Socioeconomics – Notable Findings***

- Alternative 6 performs the best in removing region / through vs. local travel conflicts in town centers of Tualatin, and Sherwood. It is followed by Alternative 4
- All connector alternatives result in a slight increase in region / through travel in Wilsonville's town center
- Alternative 5 has a major adverse effect on Sherwood's north commercial area
- Alternative 6 would have the largest impact on designated resource land but is most consistent with RTP goal to "foster vibrant communities and efficient urban form"
- The connectors (4, 5, and 6) result in the largest amounts and similar overall quantity of residential and commercial displacements.
- Alternative 5 has the greatest commercial and industrial displacements, and Alternative 6 the greatest displacement of rural residents.
- The connectors provide the greatest improvement to regional and through freight travel
- Alternative 6 provides the highest potential benefit to state and regional economy by improving mobility for commerce and tourism

Michael Feves asked for a greater more in-depth overview of the Land Use chapter. He explained that he was troubled about the weight of the RTP statement "foster vibrant communities" pinned against rural impacts and mentioned that this RTP statement was a judgment statement.

Amy Gibson with ODOT reminded the group that all of the language used in the AAR and in the SWG presentation has been vetted and worked through by project committees and agency staff. She asked the group to keep this in mind when accusing the project consultant team of inserting bias.

In response to a comment that roads sometimes create hard edges curbing growth, Loretta said that billion dollar investments in new and expanded highways do not create hard edges, but instead provide induced growth and asked that induced growth be analyzed as part of this project. Russ Knoebel with Washington County mentioned that data was available that proves the opposite- that roads do provide a hard edge. He mentioned that Washington County, Metro and ODOT were currently involved in a study that would look at how growth will shift with each of these connector alternatives.

Dave Volz mentioned that in order to enhance the quality of the AAR, it was important to note that Metro drives where growth will occur in the region. He asked that the project team be more specific in the underlying assumptions of how Metro will drive development and provide infrastructure.

Ron Johnson asked a clarifying question – if the EMT indicated that they felt the AAR was ready for public release. Lawrence confirmed that the EMT felt the document was adequate, minus one member. Ron Johnson said that he felt that Lawrence provided a great recommendation – that the SWG continue to comment throughout the public comment period and focus tonight on getting through the large majority of the AAR overview.

Mara and Scott Richmond explained that the AAR that the SWG was handed in this meeting was a working draft. Scott explained that project team would bring this working draft to the PSC along with a comment log outlining the comments received from the SWG and other project committees.

Feves expressed a concern regarding the AAR's discussion of visual impacts. He raised the issue of the trees along I-5 which serve as a gateway to Wilsonville. He mentioned the fact that the connector options may have impacts to those trees and asked that that be mentioned and at least acknowledged in the AAR. Tom Sullivan mentioned that the impact of residential and business relocations would also have a visual impact. Tom Aufenthie asked for additional information regarding cumulative impacts.

### ***Natural Resources – Notable Findings***

- Alternatives 2 and 3 have the lowest overall impacts to wetland, riparian, and upland habitats and wildlife corridors
- Alternative 6 has the highest overall impacts (and would require the most mitigation) to fish and wildlife habitat. It crosses all major drainages in the project area (in their higher value headwater areas)
- Alternative 5 has the highest potential impact to land within the congressionally authorized boundary of the Tualatin National Wildlife Refuge
- Alternatives 3-6 would add substantial and similar amounts of impervious surface to the project area, which increases pollutant loads to ground and surface water systems
- Levels of impacts are similar among Alternatives 3-6 (9-31 historic resources potentially affected)
- 1/2 to 2/3 of project area is considered likely to contain archaeological resources
- Alternative 3 has highest potential impacts to utilities because most utility corridors are within existing roadway rights-of-way
- Alternative 5 presents a difficult design challenge in locating an 99W interchange next to a major power substation and transmission lines
- Generally, all build alternatives would have few impacts to the area's visual quality because facilities are either along existing roadways or new improvements would be visually shielded by topography, vegetation, or existing development
- Alternative 3 would have highest likelihood of encountering contaminated sites
- No project-stopping sites were found for any of the build alternatives
- Alternatives 4-6 have higher potential for increased project cost due to geological conditions such as unstable slopes, shallow bedrock, shallow aquifers, earthquake hazards, etc.
- The western segment of Alternative 6 may interfere with access to shallow water aquifers for some users
- Alternative 3 has highest potential for noise impacts
- Alternative 6 would result in overall decreased noise impacts compared to No-Build Alternative
- All alternatives conform with the region's strategy for achieving and maintaining air quality attainment goals
- Minimal difference between alternatives in regional context
- Alternative 3 would increase fuel consumption in project area by approximately 10 percent

- The Connector Alternatives 4, 5, and 6 provide substantially more congestion relief than non-connector alternatives, but would result in 20 percent more fuel consumption in project area

Scott Stoddard asked for clarification regarding the project impacts of Alternative 6 on shallow aquifers. Scott Richmond explained that technical analysis process and mentioned that impacts would be mitigated by design and/or coordinated with individual property owners.

Jim Haynes asked if there was anyway of knowing how far impacts to the aquifer may spread. Scott Richmond explained that staff would respond to Jim's question. Michael Feves asked if the mitigation costs associated with wetland and riparian areas was factored into the overall project cost. Scott Richmond said yes, that the mitigation costs were included as ranges, and explained that Michael could find mitigation costs in the project development section of the AAR.

The group turned to discuss project costs. Jon Reimann asked about the difference in project costs between alternatives 5 and 6. Scott Richmond explained that due to the topography and water resources in the project area, structures would need to be built to avoid and mitigate impacts to natural resources. He explained that Alternative six was a longer connector, with fewer impacts to properties and utility impacts.

Loretta emphasized her earlier point that the project did not have enough time to review the document and asked that the PSC not move forward until the SWG could thoroughly review the AAR. Vaughn turned the conversation back to the SWG and asked for input regarding the project schedule. Dave Volz asked what the implications would be to the overall project schedule if the SWG moved forward with Loretta's recommendation. Lawrence Odell suggests that the SWG recommend a date to meet prior to the PSC June 12<sup>th</sup> meeting. Vaughn suggested June 5<sup>th</sup> – the SWG agreed. Vaughn also reminded the group that they could continue to send comments to the project team.

Michael Feves asked that the SWG be able to review public materials for the open house prior to the PSC meeting.

### **Public comment**

#### Dan Ruediger

Dan mentioned that Engineering and Cost was not described in the AAR overview, and mentioned that it should be discussed. He also referred back to the Land Use and Socioeconomic findings – emphasizing the fact that pursuing built corridors within the UGB when possible was a state mandate. He went on to request that farm and forest land be addressed in greater detail, and mentioned that impacts to farm and forest land would have a great visual impact on the region. He agreed that the AAR appeared to have a bias and mentioned that the cost of EESA is hard to believe and wants to better understand what figures are behind assumptions relating to that option. He said that he hoped the SWG provided comments, because he felt that the final document was months away from being complete and credible.

Bob Homer

Bob Homer mentioned that he was a resident located in one of the alternatives blue band areas and wanted to know more about the project and specifically the timeline for construction. Scott Richmond responded to his request – explaining that the project team did not have a construction timeline nailed down at this stage in the process. If an RTP amendment was approved, the earliest Right-of-Way acquisitions would occur in the next 5 years or so.

**Close and adjourn**

Loretta mentioned that she thought the deadline for review was unacceptable (just over two weeks for many SWG members with new 6/5 deadline) and does not provide enough time to consult with the group that she represents as a stakeholder.

Michael Feves responded to the project teams' comment regarding the fact that the SWG has had a chance to review some of this data in earlier meetings. He said that the SWG has not looked at impacts and thinks that information regarding land use and other impacts will be what the public is most interested in. He asked that the project team add evaluation measures to the AAR in order to make it clearer to the public.

The next SWG meeting will be held June 5<sup>th</sup>, 2008 from 6 p.m. until 8 p.m. at the Sherwood Police Training Center.