



City of Tualatin

**Tualatin Transportation Task Force
DRAFT Meeting #12 Summary
July 19, 2012, 5:00-8:00pm
Tualatin Police Department
8650 SW Tualatin Road
Tualatin, OR 97062**

Committee Members Present

Alan Aplin – *TPAC Rep.*
Bethany Wurtz – *Tualatin Tomorrow Rep.*
Bill Beers – *TPAC Rep.*
Brian Barker – *TVF&R*
Bruce Andrus-Hughes – *Parks Advisory*
Charlie Benson – *Citizen Rep.*
Cheryl Dorman – *Tualatin Chamber of Commerce*
Deena Platman – *Metro*
Judith Gray – *City of Tigard*
Julia Hajduk – *City of Sherwood*
John Howorth – *Alt. Citizen Rep.*
Lidwien Rahman – *ODOT*
Jan Giunta – *CIO Rep.*
Nancy Kraushaar – *Citizen Rep.*

Travis Evans – *Citizen Rep.*
Steve L. Kelley – *Washington County*
Wade Brooksby – *City Councilor*
Ed Truax – *City Councilor*
Nancy Grimes – *City Councilor*

Committee Members Absent

Allen Goodall – *Business Rep.*
Candice Kelly – *Alt. Tualatin Tomorrow Rep.*
Joelle Davis – *City Councilor*
Gail Hardinger – *Alt. Business Rep.*
Kelly Betteridge – *TriMet*

Karen Buehrig – *Clackamas County*
Monique Beikman – *City Councilor*
Nic Herriges – *Alt. Citizen Rep.*
Mike Riley – *CIO Rep.*
Ryan Boyle – *Citizen Rep.*

Public in Attendance

Bob Newcomb
Cathy Holland
Connie Ledbetter
Dolores Hurtado
Kathy Newcomb
Joe Lipscomb
June Bennett

Staff, Project Team and Special Guests

Allice Rouyer – *City of Tualatin*
Ben Bryant – *City of Tualatin*
Cindy Hahn – *City of Tualatin*
Dayna Webb – *City of Tualatin*
Kaaren Hofmann – *City of Tualatin*

Terra Lingley – *CH2M Hill*
Theresa Carr – *CH2M Hill*
Alan Snook – *DKS Associates*
Eryn Kehe – *JLA Public Involvement*
Sam Beresky – *JLA Public Involvement*

WELCOME AND CALL TO ORDER

Eryn Kehe from JLA Public Involvement welcomed the group and thanked them for their attendance. She explained that the focus of this meeting was the Transportation System Plan and would include an overview and discussion of four of the seven Refinement Areas.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE PUBLIC

Cathy Holland mentioned that she has an issue with the North/South connection over the Tualatin River. She said that she had participated in every Working Group meeting and that the connection had been voted down due to the concerns of increased traffic of people using an alternative to I-5. In addition, she cited issues with railroad crossings and potential impacts to Tualatin Community Park as reasons the connection should not be considered. She suggested that two pedestrian bridges at the community park should be included in the report.

Kathy Newcomb spoke about the recent meeting of the Transit Working Group. She indicated that having 25 minutes to respond to 18 items was not nearly enough time. She also said that the relationship between Linking Tualatin and the SW Corridor Plan was not adequately explained. There is a mix up between local transit and High Capacity Transit, which should be the focus of transit on 99W. She mentioned that someone at the Working Group meeting said that Sherwood is not interested in High Capacity Transit. She was later assured by a Sherwood employee that Sherwood is interested and has one full-time employee dedicated to the SW Corridor project, and also that the Sherwood planning director and mayor are attending SW Corridor meetings. Kathy thanked Alice for some other special help, and also thanked Cindy Hahn and Cathy Holland for completing the survey of bus riders.

Eryn thanked the members of the public for their comments. She mentioned that the results of the July 17th Transit Working Group will be shared with the Task Force at the August 16th meeting. She also let Kathy Newcomb know that Julia Hajduk from Sherwood is a member of the Task Force and could help answer any other questions about Linking Tualatin that she has.

GENERAL ITEMS

Accept Meeting #11 Summary

There were no questions or comments about the meeting summary, members accepted the meeting summary by consensus of those members that were present at Meeting #11.

Announcements

Ben Bryant from the City of Tualatin let the group know that the 124th Avenue project has been included in a recommended projects list that the Board of Commissioners will vote on July 24th.

Eryn mentioned that improvements were made to the Online Forum that will make the site easier to understand and use. As a way to narrow a search, she suggested searching for a specific address and click on the projects near the address. She also asked for help in distributing bookmarks to help spread the word about the Online Forum.

REVIEW OF REFINEMENT TOPIC AREA ANALYSIS

Eryn let the group know that the refinement areas are complicated and that there will be differences in opinions. She asked the task force members to remember the meeting protocols that allow for differences in opinion. Everyone needs to show respect for each other. Tonight's meeting will be a safe space for everyone to share their ideas and to change their minds as well.

Eryn introduced Councilor Nancy Grimes and Councilor Ed Truax who were in attendance in place of Councilors Davis and Beikman.

Eryn mentioned that the project team will be looking for feedback and discussion on the refinement areas. The goal is for the Task Force to reach consensus to move the refinement area option forward for further discussion on the Online Forum and at the Summit in September. Approval today is not approval to include it in the TSP, but is merely approval to move it forward for further discussion.

Theresa Carr gave a brief PowerPoint Presentation that included:

- Process Status
 - Refine Project Recommendations phase of Step 3
- Progress Since June 21st Meeting
 - Mobilized project team for additional analysis on refinement areas
 - Organized team meetings to share information and package options
 - Discussed options with City and Agencies
- Seven Refinement Topic Areas
 - Nyberg Interchange
 - 65th Avenue
 - North to south connectivity
 - Herman Road and Tualatin Road
 - Tualatin-Sherwood Road
 - Boones Ferry Road
 - Tualatin's Downtown Circulation
- Presentation Organization
 - Goal Statement
 - Description and sketch of possible solution
 - Considerations – Local traffic/safety, City-wide traffic, Design considerations/constraints, Environmental/policy considerations
- Role of TTF
 - Discuss as a task force the tradeoffs of various solutions
 - What are the benefits of doing something vs. doing nothing?
 - What are the impacts?
 - Weigh in on potential solutions
- Overall Context
 - The TSP is in preliminary recommendations state through September
 - We hope to reach resolution on some items tonight
 - We don't expect to reach resolution on everything
 - The conversation continues through online, August TTF, and September Summit

Nyberg Interchange

Goal Statement: Address safety at the Nyberg Interchange for all modes.

- Possible Solutions (with map)
 - A. Paint bike lanes
 - B. Redesign bike lane at east end of interchange
 - C. Skip striping on bike lane at west end of interchange
 - D. Improve lane signage west of interchange
 - E. Move guardrail on SB off-ramp
 - F. Disallow right turns on red from SB off-ramp

G. Redesign WB-NB movement to enhance safety

H. Redesign NB off-ramp to discourage traffic getting off and then right back onto I-5

- Technical Findings – Local traffic/safety, City-wide traffic, Design constraints/considerations, Environmental/policy considerations
- Technical Team Recommendation: Move option forward to Transportation Summit

General Discussion:

- There was a general discussion about “F. Disallow right turns on red from SB off-ramp”. It was noted that eliminating right turns on red could have safety implications to the mainline of I-5. Task force members expressed concern that eliminating right turns would lead to frustration for drivers and that moving the guardrail could improve visibility leading to improvements in safety. Members expressed concern with Option “F” and thought it should be removed and/or phased in.
- There was a general discussion about bike lanes. Lidwien Rahman said that ODOT has little experience with painted bike lanes and there are concerns with the safety and maintenance of the surface. It was noted that adding grit to the paint was a possibility. A member expressed the need for the bike lanes to extend beyond the interchange area to allow for better bicycle connections.
- There was a general discussion about improved signage in the interchange area. Members expressed the need for improved signage for pedestrian safety and traffic movement.

The package, with “F” removed, was approved by consensus.

Nyberg Interchange – Added East to South Lane

Goal Statement #2: Reduce congestion on Tualatin-Sherwood Road for eastbound drivers.

- Possible Solution (with map)
 - Add a new lane on Tualatin-Sherwood Road in the eastbound direction from Martinazzi to I-5
- Technical Findings – Local traffic/safety, City-wide traffic, Design constraints/considerations, Environmental/policy considerations
- Technical Team Recommendation: Approve as a long-term solution (10-20 year timeframe)

General Discussion:

- There was a general discussion about high costs and marginal benefits. Members expressed concern about the impacts to the “Nyberg development” and the cost of a retaining wall. Members expressed the need to know more about potential costs of the project.
- There was a general discussion about impacts to pedestrian and bicycle environment, adding lanes will further impact the difficult pedestrian crossing from Fred Meyer to K-Mart.
- There was a general discussion about the efficacy as 124th might divert some traffic and improved signage further west on Tualatin-Sherwood Road might improve queuing.

The technical team will get more information:

- Impacts to “Nyberg properties”
- Impacts to I-5 southbound mainline and I-205 eastbound
- General project costs
- Pedestrian impacts

- Improved signage impacts

65th Avenue

Goal Statement: Provide north-south connectivity east of I-5 and address forecasted future congestion along 65th Avenue.

- Possible Solutions
 - Option 1: Extend 65th Avenue north into River Grove only
 - Option 2: Widen existing section of 65th Avenue only
 - Option 3: Extend 65th Avenue north and widen existing section
- Technical Findings – Local traffic/safety, City-wide traffic, Design constraints/considerations, Environmental/policy considerations
- Technical Team Recommendation: Approve Option 3

General Discussion:

- There was a general discussion about the high cost of crossing the river and wetlands. Other members noted that the project will only get more expensive with time if planning doesn't occur now.
- There was a general discussion about what communities north of the river want. It was noted that in the current Regional Transportation Plan, there is a five-lane facility crossing the Tualatin River with connections to Durham. TTF members expressed concern about the willingness of the communities north of the river to accept and want an arterial beyond the bridge. The project is also in the Washington County Transportation Plan, it was noted that including a project in the TSP will leave the possibility open for the project and allow other jurisdictions to prepare accordingly.
- There was a general discussion about the ability to phase the projects. It was noted that phasing was an option but that the improvements should be thought of as a package as the extension of 65th Ave. will add traffic that will warrant other improvements along 65th Ave.
- There was a general discussion of the 65th Ave. extension potentially reducing traffic along other arterials like 99W, and Boones Ferry Road and the positive benefits for those roads.
- It was noted that 65th Ave. south of Sagert would be considered an Urban Upgrade project so that the roadway could meet current standards.
- It was noted that the size of the new tennis facility near 65th Ave. and Nyberg was taken into consideration when modeling traffic impacts along 65th Ave. and Nyberg.
- Members expressed concern about the road becoming a throughway from Wilsonville to Tigard, with Tualatin getting impact with little local benefit. Other members expressed the potential of the project to bring people from Wilsonville and Lake Oswego to events and businesses in Tualatin. It was noted that only about 20% of the users would come from beyond the city. Other members expressed the need for connectivity throughout the city and cited improvements to Boones Ferry Road, which will allow for more flexibility with improvements to that road.
- It was noted that if the TTF votes in favor, the project will move forward for further public discussion on the Online Forum and at the September Summit. In addition, the TTF will be able to weigh in at the October TTF meeting and council will be able to weigh in at TPAC and TPARK more than once.

Option 3 was approved by consensus.

N/S Connectivity

Goal Statement: Improve north-south connectivity west of I-5.

- Possible Solutions
 - Option 1: Extend west of railroad tracks, east of country club
 - Option 2: Widen Boones Ferry Road
 - Option 3: Extend 90th to north
 - Option 4: Extend west of country club
- Technical Findings – Local traffic/safety, City-wide traffic, Design constraints/considerations, Environmental/policy considerations
 - Only Options 1 and 2 are Technically feasible
- Technical Team Recommendation: More input needed, revisit at August TTF

Theresa read from the Implementation Plan of the *2035 Regional Transportation Plan* to add clarification for the need for the project: “...identify replacement solutions for the Tualatin Road project as part of the next Tualatin TSP update. The planning work will consider alternative alignments and designs across the Tualatin River near the I-5/Lower Boones Ferry Road Interchange to mitigate impacts...”

Eryn read Judith Gray’s (City of Tigard’s representative) email on the subject: “The Hall Boulevard (North-South) connection was included in Tigard’s 2002 TSP. We considered it again when we updated our TSP in 2010 and determined that we should **preserve the opportunity** for a possible connection in the future. So it remains in our TSP. Granted, the Hall Boulevard extension would be a difficult project, and Tigard doesn’t have plans to pursue it any time soon. But we are planning for the year 2035...a full generation into the future. Many of the problems we deal with today are a result of past failures to plan for a well-connected, efficient roadway network. From Tigard’s perspective, keeping this in the TSP simply preserves this opportunity so that future generations aren’t stuck with even more costly and impactful options.”

Roundtable Comments:

- **Steve L. Kelley** noted that there were two different proposals, an extension of Hall and to widen Boones Ferry Road. He noted that the Hall extension is on the County’s and Tigard’s TSP and is included in the Regional Transportation Plan.
- **Travis Evans** commented that he likes the added connectivity but expressed concern with the expense of the project and the increased traffic at Tualatin-Sherwood Road and Boones Ferry Road intersection.
- **Bill Beers** noted it is a neighborly thing to do to coordinate planning with Tigard to ensure the connection between Tigard and Tualatin will match.
- **Deena Platman** noted that Metro has identified it as an outstanding issue in the RTP but the decision should be made at the sub-regional level and the cities involved should be comfortable with their decisions.
- **Councilor Truax** said that the added connectivity would be a benefit but expressed concern with added traffic, high cost and other impacts that could make it unpalatable to the community.
- **Nancy Kraushaar** suggested that it should be a smaller road as the PM peak projections barely warrant the extra lanes.
- **Bruce Andrus-Hughes** noted that while there would be no Right-of-Way impacts to Tualatin Community Park, there would be a significant increase in traffic in front of the park.
- **Jan Guinta** said that she agrees with Councilor Truax’s comments. She said that she read Tigard’s TSP and noted that they have the project in their 2040 timeline. She expressed

concern for a very expensive and difficult project that might include a grade separation from the railroad and was unsure how such a large project could be tied into the existing street network. She mentioned that the City needs to see a return on its investment in WES. Emphasis should be placed on promoting WES and on Option 2.

- **Councilor Grimes** said that she shared the same concerns as Councilor Truax. She also said that if an extension of Hall is done, it should be complete in tandem with improvements to Boones Ferry Road.
- **Alan Aplin** mentioned that Option 1 seems like the most logical place for the project but noted how complicated and expensive it would be, as well as increased traffic at Tualatin-Sherwood Road. He said that if it is built that it should be coordinated with the reconstruction of the railroad bridge at the same time.
- **Cheryl Dorman** noted that there are several alternatives but no single alternative will fix the problem. She noted that planning for the future needs to be done and different ways to fix the problems should be explored. Different ways to get to and from I-5 need to be explored, despite the controversy.
- **Charlie Benson** mentioned that there will need to be another connection over the Tualatin River in the next 20 years, alternatives to existing roads are needed.
- **Councilor Brooksby** shared Councilor Truax's opinions. He said that it sounds like a good project but it is too expensive. He also expressed a concern for future maintenance costs of any facility.
- **John Howorth** suggested that it should be kept in the plan to ensure proper coordination with Tigard. He mentioned that a lot of the local problems are regional problems and many of them could have been solved with the Western Bypass.
- **Bethany Wurtz** said that despite the issues, it should be kept in the long-term plan. Between the extension of 65th Ave. and the extension of Hall, she asked which project would have a greater overall benefit? She expressed concern with the modeling showing a moderate decrease in traffic along alternate routes, as she would think that locally there would be a slight increase. It was noted that the Boones Ferry Bridge will not need to be replaced in the 10-20 year timeline.

Theresa mentioned that she has been authorized by the City to pull together some preliminary costs for the 65th Ave. crossing and Option 1 of the N/S Connectivity Project, so she will bring that information back to the group's next TSP meeting

Eryn mentioned the Online Forum will be updated to reflect the decisions made by the TTF.

Communications from the Public

Joe Lipscomb let the group know that he is a resident of Tualatin and lives across the street from the Police department. The Tualatin or Herman Road option that will be discussed at the next TTF meeting is a road to nowhere. He mentioned that it stops at the Golf Course and the last ½ mile of road includes three 90-degree turns, many driveways and the future Tonquin Trail, all contributing to an unfeasible project.

Kathy Newcomb noted that a goal of a previous group, Central Urban Renewal District, perhaps two or three years ago, was to reduce downtown traffic. A N/S connection will bring more traffic congestion to downtown. She let the group know that she had previously misstated the capacity of the Barbur Blvd. Park and Ride, it will have around 400 spaces. She also noted that historic structure that the project team noted could possibly be moved to make way for Option 1 of the N/S connectivity project is one of the oldest houses in the state of Oregon. She noted that an arterial

near the park would damage the park with increased air pollution. She said that building roads will not reduce congestion, that there needs to be a shift to improve transit options.

Dolores Hurtado let the group know that a transportation plan should have some emphasis on transit improvements as they could help with some congestion. She said that a N/S connection would have to cross two railroad tracks and be next to the park. She mentioned that currently people are very happy with the multi-use path and a busy road just across the railroad track could ruin the peaceful nature of the trail. She said that the community needs to look at beyond just connecting cars.

Next Meetings

August 16, 2012 – Linking Tualatin

August 23, 2012 – Transportation System Plan

Meeting adjourned.