



*City of Tualatin*

## **Tualatin TSP Transportation Task Force Meeting #2 Summary**

**December 15, 2011, 5:00 p.m.**

Tualatin Police Department  
8650 SW Tualatin Rd  
Tualatin, OR 97062

### **Committee Members Present**

Alan Aplin – *TPAC Representative*  
Allen Goodall – *Large Business Representative*  
Bethany Wurtz – *Tualatin Tomorrow Representative*  
Bill Beers – *TPAC Representative*  
Brian Barker – *TVF&R*  
Bruce Andrus-Hughes – *TPARK Representative*  
Charlie Benson – *Citizen Representative*  
Cheryl Dorman – *Tualatin Chamber of Commerce*  
Deena Platman – *Metro Transportation Planning*  
Jan Guinta – *CIO Alternate for Mike Riley*  
Joelle Davis – *City Councilor*  
Julia Hajduk – *City of Sherwood*  
Karen Buehrig – *Clackamas County*

### **Committee Members Absent**

Amanda Hoffman – *City of Wilsonville*  
Candice Kelly – *Alternate Tualatin Tomorrow Representative*  
Judith Gray – *City of Tigard*  
Kelly Betteridge – *Trimet*  
Mike Riley – *CIO Representative*

### **Public in Attendance**

Joe Lipscomb – *Economic Development Committee, Tualatin Chamber of Commerce*  
Mayor Lou Ogden – *City of Tualatin*

### **Staff and Project Team**

Alice Rouyer – *City of Tualatin*  
Ben Bryant – *City of Tualatin*  
Cindy Hahn – *City of Tualatin*  
Dayna Webb – *City of Tualatin*  
Paul Hennon – *City of Tualatin*

Lidwien Rahman – *ODOT*  
Monique Beikman, *City Councilor*  
Nancy Kraushaar – *Citizen Representative*  
Randall Thom – *Small Business Representative*  
Ryan Boyle – *Citizen Representative*  
Steve L. Kelley – *Washington County*  
Travis Evans – *Citizen Representative*  
Wade Brooksby – *City Councilor*

### **Alternates in Attendance**

Gail Hardinger – *Alternate Business Representative*  
Valerie Pratt – *Alternate TPARK Representative*  
Nic Herriges – *Alternate Citizen Representative*  
Sherry Oeser – *Metro*

### **Advisory Participants**

Hal Ballard – *Washington County BTC*  
Yvonne Addington – *Tualatin Historical Society*  
Zach Pelz – *City of West Linn*

Alan Snook – *DKS*  
Eryn Kehe – *JLA Public Involvement*  
Theresa Carr – *CH2M Hill*  
Sylvia Ciborowski – *JLA Public Involvement*

## **Welcome and Call to Order**

Eryn Kehe from JLA Public Involvement welcomed the group and thanked them for their attendance. Eryn introduced City Councilor Wade Brooksby. Wade thanked members for their participation, and encouraged them to engage fully in the process. He noted that he is very passionate about transportation and traffic management, and hopes that this group will work together to decide how they want Tualatin to look and feel in the future. He welcomed any questions.

Members, staff, and audience members introduced themselves. Eryn reviewed the meeting agenda and goals, and noted that the main objective of the meeting is to discuss transportation values.

Ben Bryant from the City of Tualatin announced that Washington County held an open house on December 14<sup>th</sup> to discuss the Basalt Creek Transportation Planning projects. Staff will gather and summarize all feedback received from that event and share the summary with this group. Ben added that the project website includes copies of maps and information from the open house, if anyone is interested in learning more. On January 9, staff will bring the project before City Council.

## **Communication from the Public**

*No public comment.*

## **General Items**

### ***Approve Meeting #1 Summary***

Members approved the meeting summary with no comments or revisions.

### ***Discussion on the Consensus Process***

Eryn discussed the consensus process and noted that consensus will likely be a challenge for a group this large. Eryn defined consensus and explained that the purpose is to come to a result that represents the best possible decision for the group. All members should be afforded equal input into the process. If anyone feels they have trouble speaking in a large group, they should talk to staff or to Eryn individually to make sure their opinions are taken into account.

One committee member asked if there will need to be consensus from all members of the committee, including agency representatives, or just community representatives. Committee members were concerned that representatives who are not a part of Tualatin should not have an equal voice in the final decision in this process, since it is supposed to rest with the citizens of Tualatin.

Eryn responded that the goal will be to reach consensus among the original Task Force members. This includes representatives of ODOT, the cities, and other jurisdictions and agencies. The agencies and jurisdictions participate on the committee, but they keep in mind that the decision that comes out of this group should be what is best for the City of Tualatin. Agencies and jurisdictions outside of Tualatin will be impacted by the decision of this group. Also, the ultimate decision will need to meet guidelines and rules set by Metro and other agencies, so it will be helpful for those groups to have a voice in the process.

Alice Rouyer from the City of Tualatin explained that she is committed to mediating any differences between the agencies. If there are differences between the points of view of citizens and agencies, she will take that on in between meetings.

Some of the agencies explained how they view their role on this committee. Deena Platman with Metro explained that her role is to explain the Regional Transportation Policy (RTP) and ensure that the ultimate Tualatin TSP is consistent with the RTP. However, the regional policy is flexible, and Metro encourages members to include creative or nuanced elements that would benefit Tualatin, so long as they are consistent with the RTP.

Lidwien Rahman of ODOT explained that she has participated in dozens of TSP processes. When it comes time to fund elements of the TSP and design projects, ODOT and other agencies do end up becoming the champions of the TSP. The role of ODOT on this committee is to make sure the TSP is consistent with ODOT policies, and that its elements are actually fundable. Lidwien added that she personally is a pedestrian and cycling enthusiast, and will bring that perspective to this group as well.

### ***Approve Committee Roles and Responsibilities, Meeting Protocols and Guidelines***

Eryn directed members to the updated copy of the *TTF Roles, Responsibilities and Meeting Guidelines* document in the meeting packet. She noted that this draft includes the changes that were discussed at the last meeting, including the name of the committee and the path of decision-making.

A member asked if Task Force members are obligated to reach out to their neighborhoods or groups about this process. Eryn responded that the *Roles, Responsibilities and Meeting Guidelines* document indicates that members have a responsibility to take information back to their groups. If members want ideas for how to do that, they should talk to staff.

Members approved the *Roles, Responsibilities and Meeting Guidelines* document by consensus.

### **Goals and Objectives Exercise: TSP & Linking Tualatin**

Eryn explained the importance of setting goals and objectives for the TSP and Linking Tualatin projects. The goals and objectives will later be used to create evaluation criteria and measurable objectives in order to select projects.

Eryn explained the process for creating goals and objectives for this committee. Today, members will be guided through a brainstorm session to develop very broad values. These values will inform both the Linking Tualatin and TSP projects. The project team will then use those values to create a draft goals and objectives statement. Members will review the statement at a later meeting. Later, the project team will use the goals and objectives to create measurable evaluation criteria.

Eryn explained what “values” are. Values are not themselves solutions, but rather explain the “why” behind solutions; they are the big idea behind the solution.

Eryn led members through a three-part values exercise that included:

1. Members individually wrote down broad values for Tualatin on half-sheets of paper.
2. Members then got into groups of three, shared their ideas, and removed duplicates.
3. Members then got into larger groups and again shared ideas and removed duplicates.

Audience members and alternates were also invited to participate. Each group then reported all of the values they came up with. Some of the more popular ideas included: mobility, equity, access, safety, transportation options, fiscal responsibility, supporting the local economy, and livability.

Members had a short discussion about the goals and objective exercise. They commented that group members tended to have similar ideas and values, and a general sense of agreement. They noted that it was often difficult to stick with values and not jump straight into solutions.

Staff posted all ideas on a wall, grouping similar ideas into categories. At the end of the meeting, all members then “voted” for their favorite values and/or categories of values using dots. The results of that exercise are available at the end of this summary.

### **Sample Evaluation Criteria: TSP**

Theresa Carr gave a brief presentation that included examples of what evaluation criteria can look like. Examples from the Seaside TSP and other communities were included in the presentation.

### **Overview of Existing Conditions: TSP**

Alex Nook and Theresa Carr gave a presentation on existing conditions in the Tualatin area. The PowerPoint included:

- What existing conditions were studied
- Why do we study existing conditions?
- Land use
- Roadway System and Conditions
- Traffic Operations
- Travel Time in Tualatin
- Safety
- Bicycle Facilities
- Bicycle Needs
- Pedestrian Facilities
- Pedestrian Needs
- Public Transit
- Freight, Rail and Pipeline
- What we have heard from you

Members made a few comments about the map of Tualatin and its road functional classifications. The ODOT representative made a comment regarding class on a roadway. Another member pointed out that 124<sup>th</sup> Ave should extend to SW Tualatin-Sherwood Rd.

During the presentation on existing bicycle conditions, one member asked when the bike data was collected. Another member asked if historic transportation counts are available.

One member asked if this group will receive a written copy of the final existing conditions report. Theresa responded that an existing conditions report does exist, which includes a lot of technical information. The report is currently out for review by other members of the project team. The report will be available on the project website in about a month.

One member asked if the existing conditions report looks at network connectivity. Theresa responded that it does. The project team is looking at connectivity and the different choices that people make to get from one place to another.

Theresa added that an online comment opportunity is available until January 15, which includes an interactive map where people can make geography-specific comments about transportation in Tualatin. The results of this map will supplement the technical data of the existing conditions

report. Eryn asked members to use their social networks to encourage people to participate in the online comments map. The website includes a link to share on Facebook easily. People who take the survey can also view other people's comments and build on them.

Eryn added that she would also like to get more videos of personal stories about transportation in Tualatin. If anyone would like to participate in a video or know someone that would, they should contact Eryn.

### **Closing and Next Meeting**

Eryn thanked members for their attendance at the meeting. Staff did not have time to make the "Land Use Scenarios: TSP" presentation, and will go over this at the next meeting.

At the end of the meeting, members "voted" for the most important values on the wall using dots. The results of that exercise are available at the end of this summary.

#### **Next Meeting:**

Thursday January 19, 2011

5-7pm

Meeting adjourned.

**Tualatin Transportation Task Force Meeting #2  
December 15, 2011**

**Values Exercise**

The chart below includes all of the “values” ideas submitted by Task Force members, alternates, advisors, and the public at the December 15, 2011 TTF meeting, along with the number of votes that each idea or category received.

*Note: The bold headings in the table represent category titles created by staff. Participants could vote for the category title, or for the individual topics within each category. The table summarizes total dots received in each category and for individual ideas (i.e., the number of dots listed next to the category name does not include the number of dots voted for each individual idea listed under that category name).*

<b>Reduce Travel Time</b>	<b>18 Dots</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce Transit Times</li> <li>• Time – Get me from point A to point B by the quickest way</li> <li>• Time</li> <li>• Less time in cars</li> <li>• Velocity – Less time standing still</li> <li>• Travel time reliability for freight and for transit</li> </ul>	1 Dot 1 Dot
<b>Safety</b>	<b>10 Dots</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safety: for all users, all modes, all ages, all abilities</li> <li>• Safe community</li> <li>• Safety</li> <li>• Safety</li> </ul>	6 Dots
<b>Efficiency, flow</b>	<b>13 Dots</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Functional, smooth</li> <li>• Flow</li> <li>• Efficient movement; point A to B</li> <li>• Operational</li> <li>• Connectivity</li> </ul>	
<b>Transportation Options</b>	<b>10 Dots</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transportation options</li> <li>• Complete streets, including pedestrian facilities, bicycle facilities and transit on some streets</li> <li>• Alternatives for all who live here—bus enhancements, bike lanes, etc.</li> <li>• Universal access</li> <li>• Effective for all users</li> <li>• Provide multiple options</li> <li>• Safe options for all users</li> <li>• All population can choose from all modes how to get around (choices)</li> </ul>	1 Dot 1 Dot
<b>Support Local Economy</b>	<b>10 Dots</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Encourage Local Employment</li> <li>• Support Local Businesses</li> </ul>	1 Dot

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prosperous Community</li> </ul>	
<b>Support Economy (in general)</b>	<b>8 Dots</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Economics</li> <li>Regional (and sub-regional) economy is healthy</li> </ul>	
<b>Livability</b>	<b>7 Dots</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Livable neighborhoods</li> <li>Family friendly</li> <li>Livable community</li> <li>Quality of life</li> </ul>	1 Dot
<b>Improve Health</b>	<b>7 Dots</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduce childhood obesity</li> <li>Healthy public and children (all ages)</li> <li>Healthy community</li> <li>Promote healthy lifestyle</li> <li>Air quality</li> </ul>	
<b>Vibrant/Vitality</b>	<b>6 Dots</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vibrant City Center; accessible to pedestrians and cyclists</li> <li>Downtown vitality</li> <li>Vibrant Community</li> </ul>	1 Dot
<b>Equity</b>	<b>5 Dots</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Social Equity</li> <li>Equity: Fair distribution of benefits and burdens; fair share of transit</li> <li>Equitable community</li> </ul>	1 Dot 1 Dot
<b>Mobility</b>	<b>6 Dots</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mobility</li> <li>Mobility, so people can get across town; economic health</li> </ul>	
<b>Long-term Planning</b>	<b>6 Dots</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plan for future, not now!</li> <li>Long-term viability</li> <li>Continuous improvement forever, never stop improving</li> </ul>	
<b>Protect the environment</b>	<b>3 Dots</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Protect park land</li> <li>Environmentally sustainable community</li> <li>Environmental stewardship</li> </ul>	
<b>Quiet, small town feel</b>	<b>2 Dots</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Peaceful, quiet</li> <li>Small town feel</li> </ul>	
<b>Not Categorized:</b>	
Develop bike + walk design tool kit to provide appropriate treatments at Tualatin locations	1 Dot
Fiscal responsibility	1 Dot

Transportation infrastructure should match demand	1 Dot
Non-auto access to services	
Get cars off the road	
Reduce frustration	
Avoid mixing incompatible uses	
Emergency vehicle access	
<b>Total Number of Dots</b>	<b>129 Dots</b>