

Stakeholder Working Group (SWG) Meeting #25

6 to 8:00 p.m. Thursday, September 11th, 2008
Sherwood Police Training Center
24095 Borchers Drive, Sherwood

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

I-5/99W SWG members present

Jack Laverty (*Oregon Trucking Association*)
Jerry Renfro (*Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue*)
Dave Volz (*Tualatin CCI*)
Ray Phelps (*Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*)
Steve Moore (*Friends of Tualatin National Wildlife Refuge*)
Tom Sullivan (*Wilsonville CCI*)
Marie Dodds (*AAA Oregon*)
Loretta Pickerell (*1000 Friends of Oregon*)
Ron Johnson (*Washington County Oregon Farm Bureau*)
Cheryl Dorman (*Tualatin Chamber of Commerce*)
Nick Storie (*Metro CCI*)
Jon Reimann (*Westside Economic Alliance*)
Mike Feves (*Far West CPO*)

I-5/99W SWG members absent

Jim Haynes (Sherwood Chamber)
Adrian Emery (Sherwood CCI)
Tom Aufenthie (CPO 5)

Project staff present

Russ Knoebel (*Washington County*)
Lawrence Odell (*Washington County*)
Jim Evans (*Moyano Leadership Group*)
Chris Maciejewski (*DKS*)
Jef Keiser (*DEA*)
Vaughn Brown (*JLA*)
Laura DeGraw (*JLA*)

Welcome & introductions

Vaughn welcomed the group and reminded them of where we were in the project process. He described the purpose of tonight's meeting as reviewing the hybrid concept and the public input summary report. He noted that the hybrid has not been confirmed and that the SWG and EMT will spend more time discussing the package before it is analyzed for comparison with the current alternatives.

Approve August 14th Meeting Summary

Steve and Dave noted changes to the previous meeting summary. Lawrence asked to have more time to review the meeting summary and provide comments. Vaughn asked the SWG to send any comments or corrections to him by Monday via email

Mike indicated concern about how the PSC's decision was reflected in the meeting summary. He disagreed that the word "hybrid" was used in the meeting.

EMT report –Lawrence Odell

Lawrence explained that it was clear from EMT discussion that there never was a specific direction from the PSC as to what projects to go forward with. He stated that the EMT is working to develop project packages that people can agree on that will reduce congestion and improve freight mobility. He noted that there are 3 arterial hybrids that may provide as much capacity as is projected to be needed by the RTP. He explained that the EMT elected to try to get agreement on package elements

before spending a lot of money on modeling. He reiterated to the SWG that he EMT has not decided on the hybrid. The decision on how to solve the area's traffic problem is still in the works.

The EMT will be meeting next Thursday the 18th to try to bring more clarity and that the PSC meeting is scheduled but tentative depending on if the packages can be identified and the data and modeling are ready by then.

Loretta reiterated her concern that she feels we are dealing with historic data. She thought Metro was going to improve their transportation data and asked when the information will be available. She asked if they will have any information regarding future demand.

Mark provided information regarding the metro model. He explained that Metro fundamentally looked at transportation demand in 2030 and used operating costs for auto and transit service projected to that year in the model. He explained that even with the increase in gas prices being a component, the total cost of operating a car have been fairly consistent. That has been the historic trend. He noted reluctance to assume that the market will support the influx in gas prices and indicated that they are being conservative in forecasting.

Loretta was interested in knowing when the model will be available and if it will be available in time to inform the project.

Mark noted that it should be available later this fall. He explained that there are 4 concepts that are being looked at for the RTP and that the information is being developed.

Lawrence indicated that there are HCT discussions going on in Metro right now and pointed out that page 4 of the memo includes the possibility of a commuter rail extension.

Chris Maciejewski explained that Metro is testing new scenarios and not fundamentally changing the model. He explained that they are still using 20 years of history and trends and that new improvement strategies are being tested.

Ray noted that the way commuter rail is portrayed in the memo seems like a secondary thought, and indicated that he would like to see commuter rail have equality with all the projects. He indicated that part of the concern we have when we start counting trips is 95% of the people who work in Wilsonville don't live there. Mass transit would be a significant piece of information for Wilsonville. Wilsonville is very interested in transit because our #1 need is transportation for commuters.

Jef noted that through analysis they have found that they cannot solve the problem entirely with commuter rail or TDM/TSM.

Ray indicated that transit may offer a more substantial solution than we think, especially because of the uniqueness of Wilsonville.

Lawrence noted that there is nothing preventing transit from being included in the hybrid.

Preliminary Hybrid Concept Overview

Jim summarized the EMT memo highlights. He also reviewed the capacity table included in the memo. Some SWG members had questions about the map. Jim explained where each new arterial was on the map and where its description was in the memo.

Loretta suggested the Southern Arterial Corridor should be 2 segments and recommended analyzing the extension of 124th to I-5 separately. She noted that it would be helpful if it was split out in the memo.

Jim explained that that is the kind of feedback they are looking for. He explained that in the memo auxiliary lanes are on both sides of I-5.

Mike expressed concern with the number of cars and how we move them to I-5. He indicated that it looks like we are concentrating them at N. Ellingsen/Stafford Rd.

Jim explained that the hybrid distributes traffic across the project area more than the single major facility alternatives did. He explained that I-5 issues have been heard loud and clear. He pointed out that you don't see a collector distributor system, for instance.

Steve supported Loretta's comment, and indicated that he would like to see the southern portion of the project pulled out and described and analyzed separately. He also noted that he would like to see commuter rail as one of the key projects and analyzed. He noted that the way the memo is written commuter rail is seen as an after thought.

Russ explained that he can bring in an existing study that was done for commuter rail. He noted that they are going to use the existing rail and that it is probably not a huge environmental impact, and that it may be more of an impact to Portland Western and the community. He explained that once we are further along in the process and have the road in place, we can re-analyze the commuter rail and re-evaluate the numbers.

Jon had a question regarding the table describing the number of trips, he pointed out that the new east to west road is projected to carry 2100 vehicles per hour and wondered if we phase it in, will it still meet the RTP amendment.

Chris explained that we are looking basing the model on the year 2030, and that we are planning on getting to that point by 2030.

Mike asked why the numbers don't go up for Tonquin Road.

Jim explained that Tonquin remains a 3 lane road and therefore has no increase in capacity. He noted that it is all based on vehicles per lane per hour.

Ray noted that he would like to see the extension of the commuter rail before they see the southern connector from 99 to Boones Ferry.

Jim summarized the SWG concerns and indicated that he has heard a lot of interest in knowing what the influence is to the road system by including the commuter rail connectivity from Sherwood to the Beaverton/Wilsonville line.

Loretta indicated that it will be very difficult to build a connector outside the UGB. She noted that they should look at what other enhancements can get traffic off, reduce congestion and improve conditions for freight. She indicated that she feels there are other improvements in here besides the 3 corridors. She indicated that she likes rail and would like to look at rapid bus for shorter term. She noted that she has not seen any analysis about transit and continues to feel that there are not enough creative ways to include transit being proposed.

Jim reminded Loretta that the big picture is trying for access and mobility for freight.

Loretta noted that if you get cars out when it is congested, it will free up more space for freight. She asked the team to look at EESA and make it more robust.

Russ commented that the proposed transit system expands and enhances transit service way beyond what Tri-Met has in mind. He noted that it would be good to spend some time reviewing the TDM/TSM elements at the next meeting. Jim noted that they looked at the best they could to relieve congestion and at what systems and existing arterials can you improve to make systems work.

Ray was interested in knowing if the team had obtained information for local jurisdiction transportation plans. He noted that there are a number of improvements around Wilsonville in their TSP.

Jim noted that local system plans feed into the RTP. He pointed out that this is a start. The next step is to go back and talk to the jurisdictions and ask the PSC for their opinions.

Mike stated that he feels that the project is moving in the right direction. He asked the team to look into Sunset. He indicated that it comes straight through, and there is a fair amount of ROW. He asked what if you increased sunset to 4 or 5 lanes and tied in the east end to Tonklin.

Jim noted that they can take a look at it.

Steve indicated that some areas ROW already exist. He was curious knowing if Herman Rd could be expanded to 3 or 5 lanes.

Jim noted that there are a lot of questions as to what happens when certain roads are expanded and how that affects the area. Jim noted that they will take that into consideration.

Lawrence noted that they are not talking about an expressway in any of the corridors in the hybrid – only arterials. Jim clarified that it is also not a Parkway.

Loretta recommended looking at behavior change and providing incentives and subsidized transit packages for those who do not commute. She recommended looking at the cost of road improvements and putting time into looking into incentives and marketing techniques for behavior changes. Loretta reiterated that she is not impressed with the alternatives proposed.

Ron emphasized that he too liked the direction they are seeing tonight. He had a clarifying question regarding the next steps in the process. He made sure that he understood that they are going to try

and get consensus from the PSC regarding the track the team is on. He also asked if there was true consensus from the PMT.

Lawrence responded that the team needs to do modeling to provide information to the PSC that will help them come to agreement. He explained that they looked for reasonable capacity in the RTP and the PMT then put together a package to meet that RTP capacity in this alternative multi-arterial approach. The next step is to ask for approval from the PSC to go forward with the modeling. He noted that the project team is trying to bring consensus on the projects.

Ray asked if it is possible to get a map of the new arterial approach. He indicated that he likes the format of the EESA map.

Lawrence noted that they are not going to produce a map until there has been feedback from the jurisdictions and the PSC.

Vaughn explained that the SWG will get maps and other package details as soon as it is ready for review.

Public Input Summary Report

Vaughn indicated that the SWG will receive a finished product once the report is accepted by the PSC. He went over some of the highlights of the draft report. Vaughn explained that the PSC's decision to move forward with the refinement was strongly influenced by public input. Vaughn went over the alternatives comparison tables and pointed out key likes and dislikes. He pointed out that a big freeway style connector was not favored and that the impacts of an I-5 collector-distributor system on North Wilsonville were unacceptable. He also explained to the group that they heard a lot about alternative 4 and 5 connectors impact on 99W through Sherwood. There was also fairly strong mention of the impacts of EESA on the Tualatin town center but a lot of people wanted to see the congestion on Tualatin-Sherwood Rd dealt with.

Vaughn also made the point that the majority of people who work in the area don't live in the area represented both by the demographic profile data and the dot map people filled out as they entered the Open House Hearings.

Mike indicated that he thinks it is helpful to use the data from the public input to inform the SWG but also the rest of the team. He asked the team to pay attention to the fact that there is overwhelming disagreement with Alternative 6.

Jim noted that he hopes that we can find a consensus solution that meets the congestion need and still reserve the corridor. He explained that if it is needed and we don't reserve the corridor we are going to be in the same situation we are now in another 20 years.

Vaughn pointed out that the PSC did say they want to see short, medium and long term solution ideas.

Mike noted that the purpose of the PSC meeting was to talk about policy issues and the hybrid idea diffused the policy discussion. He expressed concern with deciding on the preferred alternative before setting up policy criteria.

Jim explained that the urban reserve discussion is a major policy driver and that many of the policy questions deal with the urban and rural reserve land use issues.

Vaughn asked the SWG if they wanted to note to the PSC that there are concerns regarding the policy decisions.

Ron pointed out that there are a lot of different points of view within the SWG and that it is important to note when, as a group, they do have consensus.

Vaughn suggested that Mike should put together a statement and email it to the SWG.

Mike noted that he will draft something and send it to Vaughn to send to the SWG.

Loretta asked for clarification on the process. She expressed interested in knowing how the analysis will be done and pointed out that the calendar is not clear.

Chris answered that the analysis will be similar to what was done in the Alternative Analysis Report. He clarified that when the outcome of the urban and rural reserves is done they can come back and revisit the analysis.

Loretta asked if the same criteria will be used that was laid out for the other 6 alternatives.

Chris explained that it the information will be comparable across the entire range of ideas still being considered.

Loretta noted that if we don't use the same criteria she would like to see what we are using to evaluate the criteria.

Jon asked why they would use different criteria.

Jim explained that they had a lot of input regarding some of the criteria they used for the 6 alternatives. He noted that they are not going to reinvent the wheel, but it may be that some of the criteria that people felt was useless will not be used and they will reevaluate the criteria based on the input they have received.

Loretta noted that it would be helpful to see the outline and asked when they can expect to see the information.

Vaughn described that the team is in a limbo position right now not knowing the PSC's perspective on the hybrid concept. He explained that the EMT is meeting September 18th at 9:30am at ODOT and that they will talk about how the PSC feedback then. He explained that if the PSC does approve this and the team will go ahead with the process and begin work on analysis and further refinement. He noted that the earliest the PSC would be looking at any analysis would likely be at their October meeting. He also explained that unless the PSC needs to meet face-to-face to approve the hybrid or clarify their direction to the project team, they will not meet in September. He noted that the SWG is still planning on meeting October 9th. Vaughn indicated that they will keep all meetings and updates on the website.

Public Comment

No public comment.

Close and adjourn

Next meeting is October 9th from 6:00pm-8:00pm.

DRAFT