

**Glencoe Interchange Project
Stakeholder Working Group meeting #2**

7-9 p.m. Tuesday, April 25th, 2006
Fire District #2 Administrative Offices
31370 NW Commercial Street, North Plains

Meeting Summary

Project Staff:

Amy Gibbons, Lili Gordon, Tim Wilson, Tom Braibish, Steve Harry (ODOT)
Kristin Hull, Kalin Schmoltdt (JLA)
Rick Kuehn, Donna Kilber-Kennedy (CH2M Hill)
DJ Heffernan (Angelo Eaton & Association)
Matt Hughart (Kittelsohn Associates)

SWG Members present:

Tai Kim (Subway)
Mitch Ward (North Plains Planning Commission)
Stewart King (North Plains Chamber of Commerce)
Butch Kindel (Washington County Fire District #2)
Marie Finegan (Washington County Bureau)
Hal Ballard (Washington County Bicycle Transportation Coalition)
Wayne Holm (Oregon Canadian Forest Products)
Clark Berry (NW ACT)
Nick Kelsay (City of Forest Grove)
Bob Jossy (Jossy Farms)
Paul Coussens (Property Owner)
Susie Anthony (CPO 8)
Robin Biden (Hillsboro School District)

SWG Members absent:

Debbie Raber, City of Hillsboro
Joe Darby, Stewart Stiles Truck Line

Other Attendees:

Rick Dobbs
Remi Coussens

Welcome and introductions

Kristin welcomed all to the meeting and briefly discussed the agenda. The key purpose of this meeting is to resolve outstanding issues from the last meeting, learn about the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), and identify issues, questions and concerns for the project.

Before adopting meeting #1 summary, a member suggested changing the third paragraph of the second page to reflect that Washington County has identified “and funded” the need for a three lane roadway from the interchange to the intersection of West Union and Glencoe Street. The group agreed.

The first open house is scheduled for Thursday, April 27. Lili distributed a handout regarding the open house and encouraged all SWG members to attend as ambassadors for the project, and listen to comments and report back to the group. She noted that the public may feel more comfortable talking to SWG members than to ODOT. Lili noted that there will be three open houses.

A member inquired about how people were informed about the open houses. Lili said that residents of North Plains had been notified via a newsletter, and residents in surrounding areas had been contacted via city and CPO newsletters.

About three quarters of the SWG indicated that they planned to attend the open house. Kristin noted that there will be some information about the IAMP at the open house which will be presented at the May 11 SWG. She noted that normally the SWG will be the first to be review information, but in this case, it will come as a sneak preview of content.

Adopt protocols and ground rules

Kristin began by recapping the SWG discussion about when to hear public comment at meetings. She proposed a method whereby she would poll those wishing to make comments at the beginning of the meeting and then modify the time devoted to public comment accordingly. The time allotted for public comment would not exceed 15 minutes without approval of the SWG. The group could decide to hear comments at the beginning or the end of the meeting. The SWG accepted this suggestion.

Kristin then addressed the question about what would constitute a group recommendation. She stressed the importance of reaching consensus and told the group that consensus-based recommendations would hold more weight with decision makers than recommendations with dissenting opinions. In instances where consensus cannot be reached, she asked whether approval by two-thirds of the SWG members present was a reasonable threshold for passing along a group recommendation. There were no objections. There was subsequent discussion and it was further determined that 50 percent of the SWG members should be present to take action.

There was some discussion of the process for adding items to the agenda. Anyone wishing to suggest an agenda item should contact Lili at least one week before the meeting. Kristin noted that small items are easier to fit in with less notice, while discussion of larger items might need to be scheduled into later meetings. Members were also encouraged to let Lili know in advance if they were planning to miss any meetings. Kristin noted that SWG member alternates will be included in email notices.

Kristin asked the SWG to review and adopt the changes to the protocols as developed at the last meeting. The changes were accepted.

NEPA 101

Donna Kilber-Kennedy introduced herself as the environmental team lead for the project who will be managing the CH2M Hill staff performing the environmental analysis. She

introduced Amy Gibbons with ODOT who will actually write the Environmental Assessment (EA). She then gave a brief presentation on the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and how it relates to the project (presentation is attached).

There was a question about “Class 2” project designations, which Donna stated were “categorical exclusions” and unlikely to apply to this project.

During her explanation, Donna noted that, while there is an expectation that this project will yield a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI), it is not certain. FONSI are issued by the Federal Highways Administration (FHWA).

While discussing cumulative impacts, Rick Kuehn noted that the Tualatin River is another example of resource which could be affected by the accumulation of impervious surfaces.

There was some discussion about what “scoping” involves. Donna noted that there is formal scoping with regulatory agencies. A group of regulatory agencies that meets and reviews ODOT projects, Collaborative Environmental and Transportation Agreement on Streamlining (CETAS), decided the project was not of significant interest to them. Kristin noted that scoping is also an opportunity for community members to identify concerns and questions about the project.

A member asked about the Record of Decision (ROD). Amy answered that they were not anticipating a ROD because a ROD is only issued for a project where an Environmental Impact Statement is prepared.

Tom Braibish then commented briefly on how the timeline for the Environmental Assessment parallels the timeline for the Access Management Plan.

Land use context

DJ Heffernan distributed a handout which outlines three types of documents which pertain to land use regulations affecting planning and permitting. The first group consists of state plans and regulations such as Statewide Planning goals and the Oregon Highway Plan. The second group includes local regulations and plans such as the Washington County Comprehensive Plan and the City of North Plains Comprehensive Plan. The third group documents plans and regulations that are currently under development.

He noted that this process will probably result in the identification of long-range plans which will be incorporated into the Oregon Highway Plan, the Washington County TSP, and the City of North Plains TSP. He also noted that nothing decided today is final. When it comes time to build, there may be additional rules to consider.

There was then some discussion of amending the Washington County Transportation Plan. Tom Braibish noted that there is the potential for amendments if there are changes which affect North Plains. DJ added that there while Glencoe Road will be affected, the land uses around the edge may not need to be amended in the Washington County TSP.

A member asked how the project will coordinate with the updates to the Transportation System Plans and the Transportation Planning Rule. Tim Wilson pointed out that the TSP

plans are too broad to affect the project as it currently stands, and noted that the rules that pertain to the project are not currently being updated. DJ added that changes to the TPR are unlikely to affect this project once it has been accepted into the local transportation plans, and are more likely to affect projects which occur after this project is put in place.

A member noted that North Plains is planning to create an Urban Renewal District which includes a gateway feature, and inquired how this project might affect their plans. DJ indicated that there will probably be little effect, though it might be worth letting the design team know about the intent and desire to add a gateway feature.

A member asked if there were any differences between and IAMP for a new interchange versus an IAMP for an existing interchange. Staff responded that the same process will be necessary, and Tim Wilson pointed out that the interchange itself will be completely rebuilt.

Tom Braibish asked about the land use issues that emerged during the Jackson School Road project. Tim Wilson said the project was unique as it was a rural interchange, but designed to handle urban traffic. Steve Harry noted that the primary issues were with access, traffic, presence on farmland, and whether it would be a cloverleaf or diamond interchange.

Tom Braibish asked about the role the SWG will play in the land use process. Staff noted that the process requires public involvement. The SWG will help determine where access and local circulation are needed, as well as evaluate land uses which will lead to the long-term preservation of the facility.

DJ Heffernan added that they also want to look at what land use patterns tell us about development in North Plains. Rick Kuehn noted that separate a Local Access Group, consisting of those directly impacted by the interchange, will be formed in August. Kristin noted that DJ will be available for questions through staff, but will probably not attend SWG meetings until the Local Access Groups are formed.

Tim Wilson noted that this project will not redesign local plans. He stated that revisions to local plans will only be necessary if zoning is found to be inconsistent with the IAMP. Rick added that the group wants to take plenty of time with these issues.

A member asked about the order of events for this process. Rick Kuehn responded that they had “inventoried” the natural and social environment which, as the SWG brainstorms alternatives, will be used to evaluate how transportation and the environment are affected.

Identify issues, questions and concerns

Kristin described this process as a way to gather goal statements and concerns. She outlined the various headings for the topics written on the walls: Transportation and Access, Land Use, Social and Economics, Aesthetics, Natural and Cultural Resources, and Project Development.

A member asked how this interchange compares to others in terms of size. Tim Wilson described it as similar to others on Hwy 26. He said it probably won't be as big as the 185th Ave. interchange, as even with the 20 year growth model. Matt added that the uniqueness of

this project is the presence of North Plains, with its UGB to the north and with farming and other uses to the south.

A member asked how the process would be affected if the people in North Plains prefer no growth or slow growth. Tim Wilson responded that it is the state's job to provide access to the city based upon projected need. DJ added that North Plains has tacitly endorsed a certain level of access by designating areas within its UGB for urban development. Staff noted that this process isn't designed to make those direct considerations. A member commented that expansion and growth were a matter for voter approval.

A member asked about the footprint of impact for the project. Kristin then described the relationship between the county and local processes and the scope of the project. A member asked about projects on the south side of the interchange. Tom Braibish responded that there is a possibility, as the preferred alternative might include improvements which extend to the south side. This was followed by some discussion of the impact on the south side of the interchange. Rick Kuehn noted that traffic coming from the south will affect design, as well as location of access to the interchange.

Kristin then segued into posting sticky notes on the butcher paper. When SWG members had finished writing their comments and posting them under the appropriate headings, Kristin read them aloud. The results of the activity are attached.

There was some discussion of the Gateway Project and which heading it should fit under. Amy noted that no structures qualified for the National Register of Historic Places between Hwy 26 and West Union. A SWG member brought up the issue of the Dersham Overpass which she described as under-used.

Kristin noted that they would be making a similar list at the open house on Thursday. Rick Kuehn added that at the next meeting there will be discussion of screening and evaluation criteria and noted that the list of questions and concerns is important for that process. Kristin also reiterated that this is not the last chance to contribute, and the list will continue to grow.

Public comment

The two members of the public present had no comments.

Next steps and close

- Open house: 5-8 p.m. Thursday, April 27 at North Plains Elementary School
- Next meeting: 7-9 p.m. **Thursday**, May 11 at Jessie Mays Community Hall

Action items

- Update SWG #1 meeting notes as adopted
- Update SWG protocols and ground rules

SWG Scoping Activity 4/25/06

Project Development

- Involve Cornelius?
- Use of Gordon overpass
- Why 10 years?
- Funding the project
- Don't construct the interchange in a way that discourages/endangers bicycle use on the shoulders
- Public Involvement
- Direct traffic to the Dersham overpass

Transportation and Access

- Congestion
- Bike and Pedestrian safety
- Freight movement
- Local transportation system impacts
- North and south access from Beach Road and residence on east side of Glencoe
- Access points to local business
- Project affecting business along Glencoe during construction
- A Banks style interchange at Gordon Rd would seem to be much cheaper and less invasive than any Glencoe option. Has this been seriously considered? Can it be? Related to this, what are really trying to accomplish? If it is to relieve congestion would Gordon provide major relief? Have surveys been done to determine who is going where?
- Emergency services
- Alternate route wont handle the volume of traffic Jackson/old Scotch Church
- Access during construction
- Also accommodate Yamhill and Vernonia traffic
- Glencoe south of highway 26:
 - Business access
 - For traffic from Hillsboro and Forest Grove and hazards to bicycle commuters
- Don't construct the interchange in a way that discourages or endangers bicycle use on the shoulders

Land Use

- Impact to commercial sign ordinances
- Impact on future development
- Look at 20 year growth potential on south side
- Minimize impact to accesses
- Project affecting zoning and comprehensive plan on south side by county

Social and Economics

- Local business impacts

- Farming impacts
- Width for large farm equipment for access to farming industry on both sides (north and south) of North Plains
- Keep Glencoe open during construction
- Support gateway concept
- Noise impacts
- Property values

Aesthetics

- Blend into wetland environment?
- Visual impacts
- North Plains Gateway project
- Lighting

Natural and Cultural Resources

- Runoff into wetlands during winter-spring heavy rains, will this create a new low area for standing water?
- Maintain and improve drainage
- Wetlands protection