

## Stakeholder Working Group (SWG) Meeting #23

6 to 8:00 p.m. Thursday, July 17, 2008  
Sherwood Police Training Center  
24095 Borchers Drive, Sherwood

### DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

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

Loretta Pickerell (*1000 Friends of Oregon*)  
Nick Storie (*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*)  
Marie Dodds (*AAA Oregon*)  
Adrian Emery (*Sherwood CCI*)  
Cheryl Dorman (*Alternate - Tualatin Chamber of Commerce*)

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

Jim Haynes (*Sherwood Chamber of Commerce*)  
Steve Moore (*Friends of Tualatin National Wildlife Refuge*)  
Jack Lavery (*Oregon Trucking Association*)  
Jerry Renfro (*Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue*)

#### **Project staff present**

Russ Knoebel (*Washington County*)  
Amy Gibbons (*ODOT*)  
Jef Keiser (*DEA*)  
Vaughn Brown (*JLA*)  
Laura DeGraw (*JLA*)

#### **Welcome & introductions**

Vaughn discussed the project schedule, and went over the meeting materials for the SWG. Vaughn explained the project is currently in the alternatives refinement phase and that during the meeting he will go over the public comment and the open houses that were held in the past month. Vaughn went on to explain that the SWG will begin to look at what recommended solutions were discussed during the open houses and public comment period and give their input and ideas on the recommended solutions. Vaughn noted that the project will be using the term recommended solutions instead of preferred solutions.

Loretta expressed concerned about the process. She noted that she would like to know what the process is, and who is involved in decisions that are being made. She also explained that she would like to know what decisions are still open. She explained that she feels that decisions have been made without knowledge of the group and she is concerned that she cannot move on until she has a better sense of the issues raised. Loretta noted that she feels that the process is not clear and is flawed. Loretta went on to explain that she feels that key information has been missing and that the missing information should be there in order for the public to make informed comments on the alternatives.

Vaughn responded that the PSC is the decision-making body for the project and the SWG's role is to provide their input and guidance to them. SWG input has been considered and has been influential in PSC decisions throughout the process. He asked Loretta to clarify what information is missing.

Loretta explained that there is key information needed evaluate each alternative and also expressed concern that she thought that alternatives were eliminated too early. She noted that if she had known about the costs associated with the I-5 fixes, she would have never agreed to eliminate Avery.

Loretta explained that she feels we should stop and fix the process before it moves on any further. She also noted that the Project Management Team should explain to the SWG what decisions have been made and that she feels the modeling is incorrect.

Jef Keiser went over the process and explained that no decision has been made on the recommended solution. Decisions have been made by the PSC leading us to this point in the process. He explained that the past several months the project has been involved in AAR and comment period. Jef explained that after the public comment period the project looks at the the comments that were received and begins to craft a solution. That solution does not have to be one of the range of alternative options but can be anything. Jef explained that we have been going through a methodical process in order to the group to where they are now. He reiterated that fact that no recommended solution decisions have been made.

Loretta explained that problems are heard in other venues, and people are saying that decisions are being done now so that they do not have to be re-done in the NEPA process. Loretta expressed that she believes decisions have clearly been made.

Jef asked Loretta to explain what decisions have been made already.

Loretta expressed concern that Avery was removed with insufficient data. She expressed concern that the process is rushing through, and that she feels that decisions are continuing to be made without critical information. Loretta noted that she would like to see Avery back on the table to look at costs. She explained that she feels it is the most direct route to I-5 and would not disrupt livability. She also noted that she has not seen comment about others' view on the process, and feels that moving ahead would be premature. She explained that she feels the process and the group needs more time.

Jef explained that Avery was included in the AAR and was removed for specific reasons. He explained that if the open house hearings come back and they find that the public wants Avery, it can be brought back as a recommended solution. Jef explained that there is nothing preventing the project from bringing Avery back to the table.

Loretta explained that she feels that Avery was eliminated because it had too many obstacles and was too costly.

Jef agreed that those were some of the reasons why Avery was eliminated.

Loretta explained that the group never got a chance to compare Avery after to knowing about the cost of the I-5 fixes.

Vaughn noted Loretta's suggestion about forwarding the idea to the PSC that Avery be back on the table on a flip chart and asked to postpone deciding how many other SWG members supported that idea until after tonight's discussion of SWG preferences on a preferred solution. Jef noted that unless there is complete consensus in the room, the only thing he can say is that everything is on the

table, there are no decisions that have been made and that all of the screening that has been done is laid out in the AAR.

Vaughn expressed that he heard Loretta's view and explained that other group members may have other views. He pointed out the key points that Jef made and asked the group to move onto the next agenda item.

Jef explained that we can consider a solution that has not been brought up, or a hybrid of solutions, but there will be a need to do additional analysis to test whatever solutions we come up with. He explained that the analysis is not over and that we can see what else comes up that may fit the need.

Vaughn also mentioned that moving through and screening out options along the way is not uncommon.

Russ Knoebel explained that they received over 300 comments and asked Loretta to clarify on the comments that she sent, and what information she is missing.

Loretta explained that she has not seen anything since the June meeting. She noted that the project team should have a list of all the data that is missing, and that the PSC has not received some of the information as well.

Russ explained that there is a comment log of all the comments that they received and the answers.

Vaughn noted that they will send out the latest version of the comment log to the SWG.

Loretta expressed concern with moving onto the next phase of the recommended solutions without sufficient data.

Vaughn noted that it seemed as if there is a high level of comfort to move on to the next phase, from the PMT, EMT and PSC and from what he can tell with the SWG as well, and that not everyone is on the same wave length. He explained that the EMT has discussed some evaluation measures and that some of that information was determined to not be useful in discriminating among alternatives and was not included in the AAR.

Jef explained that early during the evaluation criteria they explained that they wanted to assemble a list and as they work with the analysts they would consider what is useful in doing the analysis and consider what was more useful. Jef explained that it was what occurred during the evaluation measures.

Amy explained that the PMT and EMT are putting together a list of things that were not incorporated into the AAR.

Vaughn asked that the meeting move on with its agenda and went over the outline for the SWG meeting and explained that the project is now in a new refinement phase - working toward coming up with a recommended solution. Vaughn explained that the recommended solution does not have to be one of the six that are on the table and noted that the AAR did not show a clear winner among the alternatives. Vaughn explained that the Project Team would also like to hear the SWG's preference in order to help guide the PSC.

Vaughn explained that the Project Team would like the SWG's ideas related to their values and preferences. Coming up with a preferred solution will likely require trade-offs among some of the project objectives and that the Project Team needs to get a feel for the group's priorities on that issue. Vaughn noted that these are tough choices and the SWG needs to provide the PSC input and guidance.

Vaughn noted that the comment period was still open and noted that comment forms were available at the sign-in table if anyone wished to complete one and mail it in.

Vaughn went over a small summary of the open house hearing attendance and the different options for input and comments that was available to the public. Vaughn discussed the open house summary and went over the general input numbers since the open house.

Ron Johnson asked if the staff present at the open house hearings were the same at every event.

Vaughn explained that there were a few slight staff changes, because some staff members could not make it to all the meetings, but that it stayed pretty much the same.

Ron asked for findings as to which of the six preferred solutions were favored by the public during the open house hearings.

Vaughn explained that the SWG will get a more detailed and comprehensive summary after the comment period ends at the end of the month.

### **Approve June 5<sup>th</sup> Meeting Summary**

The committee did not note any changes to the June 5<sup>th</sup> meeting summary.

### **EMT report –Tom Pessemier**

Vaughn mentioned that Lawrence Odell was unable to attend the meeting so Tom Pessemier of Sherwood would provide the SWG with an EMT report. Tom discussed that the EMT has been primarily focusing on the policy questions that came out of the last PSC meeting. He explained that the EMT has brainstormed a list of all policies questions that will be part of the alternatives analysis, and they are working on sorting through them, and finding when and where those questions should be addressed. He noted that the EMT is not changing any questions, they are only refining them. Tom explained that the EMT is ultimately trying to synthesize the PSC questions.

Dave asked how this ties into the urban and rural reserves and the revised RTP.

Russ explained that they will have a decision in late 2009. He noted that Lawrence would have better idea. Russ explained that they are working on the scope for the urban and rural reserves now. He also mentioned that one of the policy questions that may come out are will the preferred alternative that comes up be compatible with the urban and rural reserves discussions and outcome. Russ noted that the amended RTP would be a question to ask JPAC.

Amy explained that the RTP can be amended every 4 years if the urban and rural reserves decision is not met.

Dave asked if the funding dependent on making the decision by the end of the year. Dave was interested in knowing more on how the funding and timing works.

Russ explained that he is not completely sure, but there are certain time points in which the federal government funds projects. He noted that the region and ODOT can submit for funding numerous times and that we are funded for what the project this doing at this time.

Anne Madden from Washington County explained that there was an urban and rural reserves map at the open house hearings and that staff present to explain the process and answer any questions.

Loretta expressed concern that critical information has not been looked at. She also noted that the project does not have any projection on induced travel, and asked when the group would have the information available to them for review and comment. She noted that it is being studied by Metro and is concerned that the project is using old growth data and costs that do not reflect prices of gas or climate change impacts.

Russ assured Loretta that it is Metro's model and it is the same model used to update the RTP and does factor in the cost inflation in fuel, although they did not factor in an inflation of \$4.20. He noted that it is the same model used in the RTP, and does not think it is flawed or wrong. Russ also explained that Washington County and Metro have entered into an agreement to look at how growth has shifted because of the roads.

Amy Gibbons noted that the decision to do the induced growth study was directly related to the comment received on the project.

Vaughn explained that the PSC is looking at policy questions that relate to growth and noted that it is a major part of the policy discussion that they have already identified.

Vaughn noted that there was a lot of frustration about discussion of previously made decisions among the SWG members delaying the meeting and asked the SWG to move onto the next agenda item.

### **Project Needs, Goals and Objectives Prioritization – Vaughn Brown (JLA)**

Vaughn discussed the importance of the SWG making distinctions among objectives to provide input to the PSC. He explained that it all the needs and objectives are important or they wouldn't have made it to the list but the PSC needs to have a feel for public preferences in order to think through potential trade-offs during the refinement process.

Vaughn passed out a needs prioritization rating exercise handout. He asked the SWG choose the two most important needs that the project should meet. He explained that it is a personal and constituent group values question.

Loretta noted that she would like to see what the public said before she moved ahead and gives the team input to narrow. She expressed interest in what the public had to say before she gave her input, and noted that she was not ready to select what is most important. She also noted that she does not feel that these needs are complete and correctly reflect the needs of the project.

Vaughn explained that no one is forced to participate and that SWG members can add needs to their handout if they feel that it is not complete or does not reflect their viewpoint but that it would take action by the PSC to revise the needs as previously adopted.

Upon completion of the needs ranking, the group proceeded to an objectives rating dot exercise. Vaughn asked the SWG to make clear distinctions between what they feel is more important or less important.

The results of those activities are posted below.

**Purpose and Needs Ranking**

There is no efficient access or portal into or out of the Portland metropolitan area for state and regional travel along OR 99W.	0
There is inadequate multimodal connectivity in the state highway network for the outer southwest quadrant of the Portland metropolitan area.	1
Freight mobility in the outer southwest quadrant of the Portland metropolitan area is constrained and inefficient due to the lack of effective access to the state highway system and significant congestion conflicts on existing arterials.	4
Conflict between through travel needs and local destination and access needs threaten the continued economic viability of town centers of Sherwood, Tualatin, Wilsonville and Tigard.	5
Due to high levels of congestion on routes intended to serve urban, freight, and regional travel rural land uses and roads in the project area are being infiltrated and adversely impacted by freight and regional traffic.	4
Existing and new industrial lands in the project area do not have effective access to routes to the state highway system.	5

## Objectives Ranking

<b>Goal 1: Transportation</b>			
<b>DRAFT 7.30.08</b>	<b>Very Important</b>	<b>Less Important</b>	<b>Not Important</b>
1a: Reduce congestion from through traffic in town centers (13 total)	7	2	4
1b: Improve the “gateway” access (I-5 and OR 99w) to Portland region (11 total)	0	2	9
1c: Provide improvements to safely serve all modes (11 total)	3	8	0
1d: Maintain operations on I-5 and 99W (17 total)	12	3	2
1e: Provide for freight access and truck travel needs (13 total)	8	5	0
1f: Provide multimodal transportation improvements (11 total)	8	2	1
1g: Enhance emergency response time and access needs (9 total)	4	5	0
1h: Expand transportation facilities capacity in the project area (9 total)	1	5	3
<b>Goal 2: Land Use and Socioeconomics</b>			
2a: Fully investigate options that avoid going outside of the Urban Growth Boundary (17 total)	11	2	4
2b: Protect the character and integrity of town centers (9 total)	6	3	0
2c: Protect established residences and Communities (10 total)	6	4	0
2d: Protect economic viability of established commercial areas (12 total)	10	1	1
2e: Protect farms, forest lands and parks (15 total)	11	4	0
2f: Avoid disproportionate impacts to minority and low-income communities (9 total)	1	8	0

<b>Goal 3: Natural and Cultural Resources</b>			
<b>DRAFT 7.30.08</b>	<b>Very Important</b>	<b>Less Important</b>	<b>Not Important</b>
3a: Protect wildlife and habitat systems (12 total)	8	4	0
3b: Protect cultural sites (historic, archeological (10 total)	2	4	4
3c: Avoid impacts to functional wildlife values of the TNWR (9 total)	5	4	0
3d: Minimize and mitigate adverse impacts to surface and groundwater resources (11 total)	7	4	0
SWG member added: Minimize greenhouse gas impacts (6 total)	6	0	0
<b>Goal 4: Project Development</b>			
4a: All or part of the project can be completed in 10 years (12 total)	5	7	0
4b: Project is cost-effective, consider affordability, sources of funding, role of tolling (13 total)	11	1	1
4c: Develop measures to protect new roadways from the effects of development (11 total)	8	3	0

Loretta noted that she feels that the group does not have a clear understanding of the needs that we are addressing. She asked if the needs that she added would be sent around, and noted that she feels there is a more narrow need for freight. Loretta also brought up that she is bothered by the process and the unclarity and mentioned hearing an ODOT representative say at a public meeting that they are pushing for Alternative 6 to create direct access to the beach.

Vaughn explained that there is not a favored ODOT alternative and again reiterated that no one has made an official decision. Vaughn went on to explained that there is a lot of blaming and finger-pointing occurring and asked the SWG to focus on moving forward with problem solving around finding a recommended solution.

Tom S. expressed concern that the natural and cultural resources did not have enough information prior to eliminating some of the alternatives early in the process.

Jef explained that we had the baseline environmental and transportation study available during the initial screening. Jef noted that during that process we looked at the cultural resources, natural resources and socioeconomics, and looked at those factors to see if there was anything that stood out as a significant reason not to carry a concept forward. Jef explained that nothing was deleted based on natural resources.

Tom S. noted that he was very concerned that we made a decision before we had significant information.

Amy further explained that nothing was removed because of natural resource impacts. She stated that screening was driven by socioeconomic and traffic impacts.

Vaughn polled the SWG regarding asking the PSC to re-evaluate the options that were removed from the table earlier. Five out of twelve SWG members agreed that some things should be rethought.

Loretta noted that Alternative 6 seems to have a lot of environmental and natural resources impacts. Loretta noted that she understood that Alternative 6 was not removed because it was believed that we could mitigate impacts, she also noted that the same assumption should have been made about Avery and that the project could find creative solutions.

Vaughn reminded the group about their concern and strong feelings with the wording of the natural resources goals and objectives, and that all of their concerns were noted and reflected in the goals and objectives.

Tom A. noted that the environmental agencies would be the ones to identify the impacts to wildlife and natural resources.

Amy explained that she met with the Wildlife Refuge, Department of Fish and Wildlife, Partners of State lands, Natural Marine Fisheries and the Corp of Engineers and noted that there are competing interests even among those agencies. She explained that there is not a solution that will not affect something. She explained that they are looking at how to minimize impacts before they mitigate. She went on to explain that from an environmental standpoint we cannot avoid everything. She stated that if a piece of land is not built on currently there may be an environmental reason.

Vaughn explained that they will take the information provided by the SWG to the PSC and explain that it was a quick poll, but the information on the needs, goals and objectives and some of the committees concerns will be helpful for the PSC. He noted that the team will specifically inform the PSC that the SWG would like to rethink some of the earlier ideas.

Mike noted that he would like to specifically look into the Avery tunnel.

### **Public Comment**

Mark Brown asked that the project consider an extended 124<sup>th</sup>.

Vaughn explained that the idea of the 124<sup>th</sup> extension with or without a connector has been presented and is on the table.

### **Close and adjourn**

The next SWG Meeting (Meeting #24) will be held August 14<sup>th</sup>, 2008 at the Sherwood Police Training Center.