



**Tualatin TSP Transportation Task Force**  
**Meeting #4 Summary**  
**February 2, 2012, 5:00 p.m.**

Tualatin Police Department  
8650 SW Tualatin Rd  
Tualatin, OR 97062

**Committee Members Present**

Alan Aplin – *TPAC Representative*  
Bruce Andrus-Hughes – *TPARK Representative*  
Charlie Benson – *Citizen Representative*  
Cheryl Dorman – *Tualatin Chamber of Commerce*  
Deena Platman – *Metro Transportation Planning*  
Joelle Davis – *City Councilor* Judith Gray – *City of Tigard* 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*

**Advisory Participants**

Nic Herriges – *Alternate Citizen Representative*  
Candice Kelly – *Alternate Tualatin Tomorrow Representative*  
Jan Guinta – *CIO Alternate for Mike Riley*  
Zack Pelz – *City of West Linn*

**Committee Members Absent**

Allen Goodall – *Business Representative*  
Amanda Hoffman – *City of Wilsonville*  
Bethany Wurtz – *Tualatin Tomorrow Representative*  
Bill Beers – *TPAC Representative*  
Brian Barker – *TVF&R*  
Julia Hajduk – *City of Sherwood*

Karen Buehrig – *Clackamas County*  
Kelly Betteridge – *Trimet*  
Lidwien Rahman – *ODOT*  
Mike Riley – *CIO Representative*  
Gail Hardinger – *Alternate Business Representative*  
Wade Brooksby – *City Councilor*

**Public in Attendance**

Kathy Newcomb  
Joe Lipscomb  
Steve Titus

**Staff and Project Team and Alternates**

Cindy Hahn – *City of Tualatin*  
Alice Rouyer – *City of Tualatin*  
Aquilla Hurd-Ravich, *City of Tualatin*  
Kaaren Hoffman, *City of Tualatin*  
Ben Bryant, *City of Tualatin*

Alan Snook – *DKS*  
Theresa Carr – *CH2M Hill*  
Eryn Kehe – *JLA Public Involvement*  
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. She explained that the focus of today's meeting is the Tualatin Transportation System Plan (TSP). Members then introduced one another.

## **Communication from the Public**

Kathy Newcomb from Citizen Involvement Organization (CIO) 1 made a public comment. She requested that all members and staff become familiar with what the CIOs are and where they are. She noted that only seventeen out of the forty-nine TTF members are actually residents of Tualatin. Different CIOs will have interest in specific projects in Tualatin. She noted that as an example, CIOs 5 and 6 would be interested in projects on Boones Ferry Rd. She added that the 99W Corridor project was highly unsuccessful because there was no citizen involvement when the three arterials were joined. A lot of money is being spent on the Tualatin TSP and TTF, and we want it to be successful. One thing that will help bring success is by knowing who and what the CIOs are. The CIOs can help get information out. CIOs are new and need help from the TTF to engage them. Copies of a map of Tualatin's CIOs was distributed.

## **General Items**

### ***Approve Meeting #3 Summary***

One member noted that on page 4 of the meeting summary, the Downtown group is omitted from the list of Working Groups and needs to be added. Another member commented that the summary is very well written and helpful. With those changes noted, the meeting summary was approved.

### ***Announcements***

Travis Evans announced that his wife had a baby girl three weeks ago. Congratulations Travis!

Eryn announced that the Tualatin Year of Transportation Kick-off Open House is scheduled for Thursday, February 16. She handed out flyers for the event and encouraged members to distribute them.

Cindy Hahn from the City of Tualatin announced that Clackamas County is hosting a meeting this Saturday, February 11 to discuss the Stafford Triangle. The meeting will be held from 9am-12pm at Apple Creek Middle School. All adjacent city mayors and councils have been invited.

### ***Transit Working Group—February 9***

Cindy announced that the first meeting of the Transit Working Group will be held on February 9 from 5-7pm at the Tualatin Police Department. The meeting will be focused mostly on the Linking Tualatin project, but the group will also discuss and take comments on other transit concerns. The Transit group will meet more often than the other Working Groups, and will cover all transit concerns at some point in the process. Cindy added that an agenda for the February 9 meeting is on the City webpage, in the same page as the TTF agendas. Registration is not required to attend any Working Group meetings, and all are welcome.

## **Recap of TSP Process**

Theresa Carr of CH2M Hill directed members to the handout *Tualatin TSP: How Today's Work Ends with a Plan* which graphically explains the TSP process. Theresa explained the graphic, noting that it shows where we're headed and why we are doing a TSP in the first place. The graphic draws a connection between the work being done today and the end product.

Theresa explained that Tualatin is going through this TSP process for three reasons: 1) The TSP will create a long-range transportation vision for the community; 2) The TSP establishes short, medium and long term community priorities to help achieve this vision; and 3) Having an adopted TSP makes it easier to go after certain types of grant funding and makes Tualatin eligible for certain types of funds.

Theresa showed members where we are in the TSP process today. Currently, we are identifying needs and understanding opportunities. In this phase, staff and consultants gather data, talk to community members, and analyze existing conditions. Step 2 includes developing and evaluating solutions. A lot of this will be done by the Working Groups reporting back to the Tualatin TTF. Step 3 includes making recommendations, which is an iterative process. The initial set of recommendations may need to be tweaked after going through a community process. Step 3 also includes prioritizing the recommendations. Step 4 will finalize the TSP.

A committee member asked if there will be an opportunity to provide feedback on the existing conditions report. Theresa responded that members were asked to provide feedback in January, but they can still provide feedback. Staff is very close to finalizing the existing conditions report, so members should provide feedback as soon as possible to Cindy. Theresa added that, even after the existing report is finalized, the project team can take into account any information that members provide.

One member doubted that the project team will get meaningful feedback at an open house because the public will not have read the existing conditions report beforehand. The Working Group will provide better feedback. Theresa responded that the online comment map provided lots of good information from the community on what is and is not working well.

## **Accept Goals and Objectives: TSP**

Theresa directed members to a table of goals and objectives in the meeting packet. She noted that the red track changes are based on feedback from this group at the last meeting.

Theresa reviewed the main changes to the goals and objectives:

- *Access and Mobility*: Added “mobility” to goal category name to reflect members’ comment that accessibility includes mobility. Also added an access-specific objective.
- *Economy*: Changed goal category to simply “Economy” rather than “Support Local Economy.” This was in response to comments about how much the framework should focus on the local versus the regional and state economy. This group’s consensus was to change the goal category to “Economy” and then use the goal language to reflect the emphasis on the local economy, while referencing the importance of the regional economy.
- *Health/Environment and Equity*: Removed the term “alternatives” and instead use term “options” because this process will not necessarily compile a list of alternatives. The objectives column clarifies that options are only potential at this point.
- *Ability to be Implemented*: Changed goal category name from “Ability to be Built,” in response to a public comment that “built” is not accurate, because some projects aren’t going to be construction projects at all. The second objective for this category was revised to reference regional and state goals and policies. A new objective was also added to reflect local, regional, and state values in terms of making best use of the existing network before building new roads. This objective also reflects the current economic climate, as building new roads can be very expensive.

Committee members discussed the goals and objectives.

***Discussion on Ability to be Implemented objective# 2: Ensure consistency with existing community, regional, and state goals and policies***

- Members commented that the term “ensure consistency” should be revised because goals and policies are always changing, and because it is practically impossible to “ensure” consistency. They felt that “ensure” is too strong a word.
- One member suggested the term “consider.” Another member responded that “consider” does not mandate any result; it only directs decision-makers to think about existing goals and policies, but not to be consistent with them.
- Theresa commented that the purpose of this objective is to flag any project that is inconsistent with regional or state goals.
- Another member added that consistency with other goals and policies is often necessary in order to get funding for a project.
- One member suggested using the term “evaluate.” Other members agreed.
- All members came to consensus to change the objective to read: “*Evaluate* consistency with existing community, regional, and state goals and policies.”

***Discussion on Ability to be Implemented objective# 5: Focus on transportation options that make best use of the existing network over building new roads***

- One member noted that the Tualatin TSP is a 25-year plan and perhaps should not reflect the current economic climate, since the economy may improve and it will be more possible to build new roads in the future.
- A couple of member noted that, while building new roads is not a regional goal now, this may change in the future. They feel that the goals and objectives should reflect what this committee and the public values, not what current elected officials value. While it is important to take regional and state goals into account, in the end the TSP is Tualatin’s plan and should reflect the community’s values.
- Most members agreed with the idea of efficiency that is expressed in this objective. They recognize that it is good policy and more sustainable to maximize current facilities before building new infrastructure.
- One member suggested removing the phrase “over building new roads” because it makes a value judgment. Other members agreed that the sentence should include the efficiency goal, but should not do so to the exclusion of building new roads. Another member added that the word “roads” should be removed because it takes the focus off of transportation options.
- One member noted that in order to qualify for some types of funding the TSP will have to be consistent with regional and state policies.
- One member suggested replacing the term “focus on” with “consider,” so that this objective does not become the main conversation. Another member suggested using the term “evaluate.”
- A couple of members agreed that this objective should not close off opportunities that may be coming to Tualatin that are outside of or in addition to the existing network.
- Theresa and Eryn added that this objective is only one objective among many. Any planning process may have seemingly opposing objectives. The goals and objectives create a framework for discussion about tradeoffs for a specific project that is being considered in the future. Decision-makers can see how well or poorly the project does against the goals and objectives, and can have a conversation about which objectives are most important to the community. Decision-makers and the community at large can still choose to approve a project, even if it does not meet every objective.

- Eryn suggested revising the objective to read: “*Consider* transportation options that make best use of the existing network.” All members agreed with this revision.

## Overview of Findings from Future Conditions Analysis: TSP

Alan Snook of DKS Associates gave a PowerPoint presentation on the Tualatin TSP Future Conditions Analysis. The PowerPoint included:

- What is “future conditions”?
  - The planning year horizon for future conditions is 2035. Staff is trying to identify future needs, opportunities and constraints for all modes of travel in the future
  - Includes future planned land uses and expected projects/improvements
  - Balances community needs with infrastructure needs
  - Helps prioritize identified improvements
- Major elements of future conditions
  - Mode choice
  - Land use
  - Future improvements
  - Future forecasting
  - Community values and inputs
  - Prioritization
- Land Use Overview: There will be much more employment growth as compared to housing growth projected by 2035.
  - 9% projected housing growth for 2035 (10,340 households in today’s Metro model, to grow to 11,270 households in 2035)
    - Location of housing growth: mostly in east of I-5 and north of I-205
  - 31% projected employment growth for 2035 (23,620 existing jobs to 31,040 jobs in 2035)
    - Location of employment growth: industrial area in Tualatin Rd and Herman Rd.
- Assumed Future 2035 Roadway Projects
  - Projects include:
    - Durham Rd: Widen to 5 lanes (outside Tualatin)
    - Herman Rd: Widen to 5 lanes
    - Tualatin-Sherwood Rd: Widen to 5 lanes
    - 124<sup>th</sup> Ave: Road extension
    - I-5 Auxiliary Lanes in each direction (just completed)
    - Tonquin Rd: Widen to 3 lanes
  - These projects are on a financially constrained list. They are not funded, but are reasonably likely to be funded based on funding sources. These projects are taken into account in doing the future forecast.
- PM Peak Period Motor Vehicle Trip Activity
  - How many trips start and end in the City of Tualatin
    - Existing: 12%
    - 2035: 9%
  - How many trips start/end in Tualatin and go outside of Tualatin
    - Existing: 61%
    - Future: 56%
  - How many trips go through Tualatin
    - Existing: 27%

- Future: 35%
- Existing PM Peak Intersection Operations and 2035 PM Peak Intersection Operations
  - Definitions:
    - Level of Service: means how well traffic flows on the road (free flowing versus stuck in traffic)
    - Volume to Capacity Ratio: indicates how “full” the roadway is of cars
  - Many intersections have high volume to capacity ratios and poor level of service
  - Begin to see chokepoints to access interchanges
- Working Groups will work on solutions to problems that have been identified through future conditions study.

Committee members discussed the future conditions analysis findings.

### ***Discussion on Land Use Overview***

- One member commented that the analysis seems to show a huge disparity between housing and employment, and wondered if it takes into account the possibility of multi-family homes.
- One member commented that the expected location of future housing growth does not seem to make sense.
- Aquilla Hurd-Ravich from the City of Tualatin clarified that there are a couple of vacant lots east of I-5 and north of I-205, which are both in the City of Tualatin UGB and zoned residential. This is where the expected residential development will occur. The land is currently owned by the hospital, but is a planning district for low-density residential, although this could change in the future.
- Alan Snook added that the future conditions analysis is based on the Metro regional planning model, but that things could change in the future.
- One member added that a piece of land east of Boones Ferry was brought into the UGB as industrial land. The City and Metro agreed that if a bypass is put in, there could be residential development up to that point in conjunction with Wilsonville. The changes with the Basalt Creek project could also change the projections.
  - Theresa Carr responded that the City, Metro, and consultants have had conversations about how the future conditions may be different from what is reflected in the latest version of Metro’s model. The future conditions analysis assumptions do take into account the Basalt Creek Study, the Tonkin Trail project, and other projects.
- Eryn summarized that members feel that some of the land use figures seem surprising, but that the future conditions might change based on other plans and projects.

### ***Discussion on Existing and Future Peak Intersection Operations***

- Many members commented that the existing intersection operations presented do not appear to match reality.
  - Alan responded that the level of service data is based on average delay. There may be particular movements at individual intersections that the project team should individually analyze apart from the average.
- Another member added that the intersection of Sagert Road and Borland Road is failing because there is a stop sign there instead of a stop light.

## Working Group Sign-Up

Eryn directed members to Working Group handout in their meeting packet, which explains the various Working Groups. Theresa explained that the first round of Working Group meetings will be scheduled in the next week or so.

Theresa gave an overview of each of the Working Groups:

- *Major Corridors and Intersections*: This group will look at congestion, safety, and connectivity, especially at specific key intersections and corridors.
- *Neighborhoods and Livability*: This group will address issues of traffic congestion and safety of the collector street networks and neighborhoods, and connecting transportation to livability.
- *Transit*: This group will help identify projects, solutions and recommendations for transit within the Linking Tualatin project and the city as a whole, as well as looking at transit into Portland.
- *Bicycle and Pedestrian*: This group looks at recreational facilities, linking recreational facilities to city streets, and bike commuting.
- *Industrial and Freight*: This group looks at transportation needs from an employee standpoint and asks how employees get to work. It will look at freight trips and access to regional networks.
- *Downtown*: This group will focus on connectivity and making sure that it is easy to get around downtown.

Each Working Group will meet three times, except for the Transit Group, which will meet five times. Each meeting has a particular goal:

- *Goal of Meeting 1*: Identify potential ideas, projects, and programs. The meeting will begin with a summary of existing and future conditions.
- *Goal of Meeting 2*: The technical team will provide concepts in graphic form to the Working Group, and the Working Group will evaluate how well the concept meets goals and objectives.
- *Goal of Meeting 3*: Develop recommendations and get a sense of prioritization among projects.

Eryn noted that these meetings are open to anyone. Staff hopes that participants will want to attend all three meetings for each topic, since the conversation will be more effective that way. However, participants are free to just come to one meeting.

Eryn sent around a sign in sheet and asked that at least two TTF members sign up for each Working Group. The results are below:

**Major Corridors and Intersections**—Jan Guinta, Cheryl Dorman, Travis Evans, Joelle Davis, Charlie Benson, Alan, Aplin

**Bicycle and Pedestrian**—Jan Guinta, Bruce Andrus-Hughes, Nic Herriges

**Neighborhood Livability**—Jan Guinta, Joelle Davis, Charlie Benson, Candice Kelly

**Industrial and Freight**—Jan Guinta, Cheryl Dorman, Bruce Andrus-Hughes, Randy Thom

**Transit**—Jan Guinta, Cheryl Dorman, Joelle Davis, Charlie Benson

**Downtown**—Jan Guinta, Travis Evans, Candice Kelly

## **Discuss February 16 Open House**

Eryn gave a brief overview of the upcoming February 16 open house. She listed the outreach for the open house and explained that the meeting will be used to recruit members of the public for the Working Groups. The open house will include a raffle and kids activities, and is drop-in style.

## **Communication from the Public**

Kathy Newcomb made a public comment. She suggested that staff write up working group meeting summaries so that people can make comments without having to come to meetings. She explained that CIO 1 is hoping to designate 20 people to read and make comments. She added that the last TSP process occurred about 10 years ago, and she understands that the current TSP is a 10-year plan. She feels that 2035 is a bit far out. There will probably not be a lot of funding available in the next 5-8 years, so alternatives to building roads should be the main focus.

### **Next Meeting:**

February 23, 2012

5-7pm

Meeting adjourned.