

Stakeholder Working Group (SWG) Meeting #24

6 to 8:00 p.m. Thursday, August 14th, 2008
Sherwood Police Training Center
24095 Borchers Drive, Sherwood

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

I-5/99W SWG members present

Jim Haynes (*Sherwood Chamber of Commerce*)
Jack Laverty (*Oregon Trucking Association*)
Jerry Renfro (*Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue*)
Dave Volz (*Tualatin CCI*)
Ray Phelps (*Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*)
Tom Aufenthie (*CPO 5*)
Steve Moore (*Friends of Tualatin National Wildlife Refuge*)
Tom Sullivan (*Wilsonville CCI*)
Marie Dodds (*AAA Oregon*)
Adrian Emery (*Sherwood CCI*)
Dan Ruediger (*Far West Neighborhood Association*)

I-5/99W SWG members absent

Loretta Pickerell (*1000 Friends of Oregon*)

Nick Storie (*Metro CCI*)
Jack Laverty (*Oregon Trucking Association*)
Jerry Renfro (*Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue*)
Mike Feves (*Far West CPO*)
Jon Reimann (*Westside Economic Alliance*)
Ron Johnson (*Washington County Oregon Farm Bureau*)
Cheryl Dorman (*Alternate - Tualatin Chamber of Commerce*)

Project staff present

Amy Gibbons (*ODOT*)
Jef Keiser (*DEA*)
Scott Richmond (*DEA*)
Vaughn Brown (*JLA*)
Laura DeGraw (*JLA*)

Welcome & introductions

Vaughn asked SWG members to go around and introduce themselves. He then went over the agenda for the SWG meeting. He noted that the PSC meeting was very productive and that part of the timeline had shifted.

Approve June 5th Meeting Summary

Vaughn asked the SWG to send comments on the summary by the end of the week, in order to post the approved summary on the website. No immediate changes to the summary were noted.

EMT report –Tom Pessemier

Lawrence summarized the EMT and PSC's actions for the previous meetings. Lawrence clarified that the PSC agreed by consensus to move into the refinement process and look at doing a hybrid package of projects. He explained that the hybrid package should address the purpose and needs of the project and many of the potential projects might come from EESA but could also include some projects that are not in EESA. He also noted that the PSC did not specifically choose EESA. He explained that the PSC looked to identify what, if any projects could be supported by the full PSC to move them forward as short term priority projects. Lawrence noted that the focus of the new hybrid package is east-to-west connectivity and freight routes. He noted that the cost of the project package might be lower and more practical. He explained that the hybrid package will have tiered phasing and will work on a priority level of projects.

Lawrence reiterated that the PSC did not remove alternatives 4, 5 and 6 for consideration or endorse the complete EESA alternative.

Vaughn noted that a PSC meeting summary will be posted online once the PSC reviews them.

Tom Aufenthic said he thought the PSC had moved completely away from the 6 alternatives. He expressed concern that there are projects not in the AAR that could be considered. He asked if an environmental impact statement is needed to look at a new hybrid.

Lawrence reiterated that from the beginning the PSC has discussed that there may be some refinement of the alternatives and that they are not moving EESA forward automatically. Rather EESA continues to be a good source for projects. He cited the 124th extension, the rail extension to Tualatin and the changes to Tualatin-Sherwood Road as ideas that could be included in the hybrid.

Scott mentioned that the PSC all agreed upon the fact that there is a lot of frustration with the fact that this is a big project. The PSC wants to work on short term actions that aren't constrained by the need for federal process so we can move on with the RTP process. Scott noted that the hybrid package allows the team to work on the highest priority needs like 124th and the widening of Tualatin Sherwood Road. He explained that whether we call this a new alternative, it is important to be clear that the new hybrid may have some elements of one of more alternatives that we already studied and also new elements. Scott explained that the cost has been a huge issue, and that they are now looking for a realistic project.

Lawrence explained that he thinks it was a good discussion and there was major consensus on the part of everyone. He noted that it is important to fair out some of the details, and that new projects are more palatable to fund and support, instead of a billion dollar project. He explained that they are now looking to be sure that the projects we identify can pass FHWA funding. He noted that there are other discussions that will be taken place with the urban and rural reserves process that is occurring. He explained that the success will depend on how successful we are at putting together the package for this.

Vaughn noted that this does put this in a new process, and informed the SWG that if they have any questions they can talk to Scott.

Open House Hearings - Public Input Highlights

Vaughn went over the public input highlights from the open hearings comments that came in. The SWG will be able to look at the full report once it is reviewed and complete. Vaughn explained the format of the comment forms provided at the open house hearings. He noted that as the project moved through thinking of the hybrid package the project team can go back to the public comments to look for some public opinions and possible consensus. Vaughn referred the group to the SWG's goal and objectives handout that they worked on during their last meeting. Vaughn noted that he did go through and compare the SWG's exercise and the public's input, and asked the SWG to do the same. Vaughn noted that the outcome of the handout is a bit different than the goals and objectives in the meeting summary because he asked for input from the SWG members who were not present at the past meeting. Vaughn went over the alternatives ranking, and noted some of the key comments that were received. Vaughn noted that there was a lot of support for Alt 3: EESA, and that the connector projects showed weak support. He asked the SWG to think about this input when talking about the hybrid solution.

Steve asked that the charts all use the same scale, he pointed out that it can be misleading.

Vaughn noted that he will make that change.

Tom A. asked if there will there be a public review process for the hybrid packages.

Vaughn explained that it is part of the decision process and that he is not making any promises but would think that we would bring this to the public.

Lawrence noted that it would be very important to get the public's opinion since it is such a huge project. He explained that this should be a very open and transparent process.

Dan R. was interested in knowing what the chart and protocol is for amending the RTP and who makes the recommendations to the RTP:

Scott explained that it depends on how much we can progress with the PSC, and noted that there will be an analysis phase.

The SWG had many questions about how the hybrid package will look and what aspects of the 6 alternatives will be included. Lawrence explained that the PSC and PMT needs to figure out the details, and that the decision to move forward with the package was made yesterday, he noted that they will keep the SWG up to date on the process.

Jim Haynes asked if each of the packages will generate the same kind of analysis that the previous alternatives went through.

Scott noted that they are not going to get rid of the analysis that they previously did. He explained that there is enough information that we gathered already to use toward the packages. He explained that they may be asked to add new components that may be longer term which he anticipates the RTP amendment could include a the actions that the PSC discussed with a timeline. Scott noted that it ultimately could be one recommendation with a prioritization of several projects involved.

Lawrence reiterated to the SWG that the project is not starting over, that they are taking the information we have now and creating a hybrid package of projects.

Scott apologized to the SWG for not being completely clear and explained that this will make more sense once the project team has met.

Lawrence explained that all the information that has been gathered over the past year and a half has been valuable to this point. He explained that the comments received by the SWG allowed the PSC to come to consensus and the decision that they did. Lawrence noted that the SWG is a very good source of information as to the problems that the area is facing. He asked the SWG to provide feedback and ideas as to what projects the team should look at and how they may be packaged. He noted that the EMT will be going through the same exercise.

Tom explained that the hybrid package is not one of the 6 alternatives and that it seems like something new.

Lawrence explained that the hybrid package is not something new; it uses pieces of the projects that the team has been talking about and analyzing. He noted that the concept of a connector is being “parked” for now. Lawrence noted that the term hybrid package is something that the PSC has been using and it is not a new alternative.

Tom noted that maybe it should be called the EESA refinement or the refinement alternative.

Lawrence explained that he does not want the perception that EESA is the chosen alternative, he noted that the PSC is trying to be sensitive and objective, and this hybrid packages is talking about all the other pieces.

Vaughn explained that the PSC wanted to evaluate and refine the project after they had heard from the committees and public. He noted that after the analysis and public input it is clear that there is no complete winner; there is not one alternative that avoids all impacts and solves all the problems faced in the area. Vaughn explained that because of that the PSC has decided to go to the refinement phase.

Key Features Discussion

Vaughn asked the SWG for input on what projects and features they would like to pursue. Scott noted that this is not their last opportunity to provide input, and after the meeting the SWG can send additional input to Vaughn. Vaughn also noted that the SWG will have another meeting before the PSC meets in September. (A complete list of refinement suggestions can be found on page 7 of the meeting summary.)

Dan noted that he is interested in the enhancement of the Elligsen interchange and wanted to know how that can be added to the list of projects.

Vaughn explained that they are asking the SWG for project and package ideas, areas of interest or solutions to some of the problems in the area. Vaughn explained that he will create a list, which they will report back to the PSC. He explained that the SWG does not have to come up with design details, but that they are interested in getting feedback as to what projects to pursue as part of the hybrid.

Steve noted that he would like to look at commuter rail with an extension to Newberg and McMinnville as well.

Scott explained that he doesn't want to restrict the SWG's ideas, for the purpose of the I5-99W, they are just looking at extending to Sherwood.

Dave noted that he would like to make sure that there is infrastructure for the designated industrial areas, including the areas that are not currently developed, so that they can be serviced by the system of improvements.

Ray noted that it would be more productive to look at commuter rail for the project area. He explained that the system should extend or connect Sherwood to Beaverton, in order for people to go from Beaverton, to Tualatin and Sherwood. He noted that this area has a big commuter

population, and also noted that if Newberg and McMinnville are going to be taken into consideration, he would like to add Tigard as well.

Dan noted that Sherwood is ideal for commuter rail, being that there is a large population of people traveling from Sherwood to Beaverton. He noted that it is important to understand how people are traveling and what the flow is.

Scott reminded the SWG that they came up with purpose and needs for the project and there were reasons for coming up with the range of alternatives that they did.

Vaughn noted that the Newberg-Dundee rail may not fall under the project.

The SWG noted that 124th to Tonkin extension, including Elligsen and Coffee Creek was preferred.

Ray noted the he would like to add 12-15 from the EESA table 4.3-1.

Scott explained 12-15 EESA table is a package of improvements that go from 124th down to Elligsen.

Tom A. noted that the improvement to the Elligsen interchange is not on the list and needs to be added.

The SWG agreed with the improvements added to the list.

Tom A. noted that there are 3 iterations of the Tualatin Sherwood Rd. widening. He explained that he would like to promote the 99W to Teton as a package, and explained that Tualatin Sherwood Rd to I-5 would be included in the Teton package. He noted that it seems that the 3 iterations of the Tualatin-Sherwood Rd seem to become duplicates and would like an explanation at some point to clarify some of his confusion.

Dan pointed out that we need to find a way to deal with the enhancing Tualatin-Sherwood while being sensitive to the driveways, the residents, the City of Tualatin, and the Tualatin Town Center. He noted that we need to be sensitive to the fact that there is a lot of opposition in Tualatin, and find a way to deal with Tualatin-Sherwood Rd while respecting those in Tualatin.

Ray noted that he does not feel that the movement within the city has to be destroyed in order to enhance Tualatin-Sherwood Rd.

Dave noted that there are a lot of big barriers to the city in regards to ESSA. He explained that it restricts a lot of the access to driveways, and it ends up putting the connector right through the city of Tualatin. Dave noted that they need to find a way to get truck traffic out of downtown Tualatin, and serve the current facility. He explained that he is not against improving Tualatin-Sherwood Rd and would like to look at ways to improve signaling and other traffic issues.

Dan noted that there is not any truck traffic on the weekends, and a lot of people traffic on the weekends. He explained that we need to have improvements that are sensitive to the needs without cutting the city off.

Scott noted that major changes to Tualatin-Sherwood are included in EESA, finding ways to make it serve as a throughway and an extension of parallel roads to improve local access. Scott noted that he wants to hear from everyone regarding the parallel roads, and finding out if they feel it is feasible from a connectivity stand point. He explained that if everyone agrees that it would be detrimental to the businesses and town centers in Tualatin to have something like what is pointed out in EESA for Tualatin-Sherwood Rd, he would like to know if the group would still like to look at the feasibility of the parallel roads.

Dave noted that he does not want to harm Wilsonville or Sherwood, and he has a firm belief that there is a wide area between Sherwood and Wilsonville. He noted that the longer we wait to figure it out, the more difficult and expensive the project will become and the more potential for more business and residents to be displaced.

Dan noted that there should be sensitivity to all the cities needs and that improvements to Tualatin-Sherwood Rd. is not the complete answer, the project and package needs more.

Scott noted that he wants the SWG input, he asked the SWG to look at a hybrid as well as other corridors that can help us find a solution. He asked the SWG what their opinion was regarding parallel roads.

Vaughn asked Jack for a trucking standpoint on Tualatin-Sherwood Rd

Jack noted that access and support to the industrial area is important. He explained that he is getting a group together in September to get some formal recommendations together.

Vaughn noted that it has been helpful to get input from the SWG and that the team will be talking to the different jurisdictions. He explained that the meetings are not scheduled because the team just got guidance yesterday, but the PSC did note that the project team should get as much input and guidance as possible.

Jerry noted that Boones Ferry Rd., Grahams Ferry Rd., 124th, Tonklin and Brooks Rd run north and south seem to be a better alternative, and they do not run through residential areas. He noted that as a package that area including Avery should be looked at. He explained that it would be separate from Tualatin-Sherwood Rd., but would relieve some of the trucking and heavy use.

Dan asked that number 2 be added to the 12-15 package of EESA.

Ray asked that auxiliary lanes along I-5 be included as a package of 124th. He explained that north to south to Elligsen would surely benefit the freight flow and that the team should look at auxiliary lanes between I205 and Elligsen. He also noted that the businesses that we have spoken to do not seem to have a problem with that. He noted that the auxiliary lanes would help with traffic on Tualatin-Sherwood Rd., and improvements to 124th alone would not be enough.

Dan added to Ray's package the idea to add auxiliary lanes on the north and south side of I5 on to the Tonklin idea. He pointed out that this was you do not have to go on I5 from I205.

Tom A. added improvements to Herman Road, parallel to Tualatin \-Sherwood Rd., and noted that it could handle more traffic as well as the fact that it is in the middle of the industrial area.

Jack noted that he thinks it may be difficult and a worth while conversation, but he has a concern over the railroad and the fact that there isn't an entrance and exit on Herman to the city center.

Tom A noted that 124th would give more access to Herman.

Jerry wanted clarification of an auxiliary road.

Scott clarified an auxiliary lane would be adjacent to the travel lanes, which would provide a direct connection between the interchanges. He explained that someone going from Elligsen and onto I2055 would be able to stay into a lane with free flow without having to merge.

Ray observed that there are a number of items on the EESA list that are TSP, and thought that part of the idea was to make these larger investments through this process and have the city's TSP to take care of the smaller projects.

Scott asked the SWG if there are other things that people want to reaffirm, he noted that he has heard mention of the TDM/TSM.

The SWG noted, with solid support, that they agree the TDM/TSM should be part of the hybrid.

Tom A. brought up an idea for a pedestrian bridge across 99W in Sherwood. He noted that there are schools on both side and that it could be a very attractive feature.

Steve noted that he does not want to include that, and is concerned about Avery/Adams. He noted that it crosses over Rock Creek and could impact habitat. Steve explained that he is still concerned with alternative 5 and the fact that it runs through the wildlife corridor and would involve habitat fragmentation.

Vaughn highlighted some of the ideas brought up by the SWG and thanked the group for their positive participation and ideas. He explained that the team is planning on coming back on Sept 11th with updates on the package development. Vaughn noted that there is a PSC meeting on Sept 24th. He noted that the EMT will go through the same process that they asked the SWG to go through.

Ray asked for notification for the PSC meeting minutes.

Vaughn noted that he can send the SWG the PSC minutes from August 13th, and from now on he will send the PSC meeting minutes to the SWG.

Public Comment

No public comment.

Close and adjourn

The next SWG Meeting (Meeting #24) will be held September 11th, 2008 at the Sherwood Police Training Center.

Suggested Refinement Elements

Commuter rail

- Extend out to Newburg/Dundee
- Tigard extension

Access and support to industrial areas

- 124th extension south of T-S Road
- EESA ideas 2, 12, 13, 14, 15 – take 124th to Elligsen
- Elligsen Interchange improvements

Tualatin-Sherwood Road

- Add capacity from Teton to 99W
- Protect business access
- Don't create barrier that splits the city
- Get trucks off T-S Road
- Creative solution
- Parallel road access may impact emergency response

Boone's Ferry, Graham's Ferry, Tonquin improvements

- Important for emergency services

Auxiliary lanes on I-5

- Benefits freight flow in combination with previously suggested road improvements (124th)
- Connect 205 and Elligsen – both North and South

Herman Road improvements

- Capacity-freight
- Entrance and exit needed to make it work

TDM/TSM is important to include

Pedestrian bridge across 99W in Sherwood and T-S Road in Tualatin

CONCERN/CAUTION

Avery-Adams over Rock Creek

- Concern with wildlife potential habitat fragmentation