



*City of Tualatin*

## **Tualatin TSP Transportation Task Force**

### **Meeting #8 Summary**

**April 19, 2012, 5:00-7:00pm**

Tualatin Police Department

8650 SW Tualatin Road

Tualatin, OR 97062

#### **Committee Members Present**

Alan Aplin – *TPAC 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*

Jan Guinta – *CIO Representative*

Joelle Davis – *City Councilor*

Karen Buehrig – *Clackamas County*

Kelly Betteridge – *TriMet*

Monique Beikman – *City Councilor*

Steve L. Kelley – *Washington County*

Talia Jacobson – *ODOT*

Travis Evans – *Citizen Representative*

Wade Brooksby – *City Councilor*

#### **Advisory Participants**

Candice Kelly – *Alternate Tualatin Tomorrow Representative*

John Howorth – *Alternate Citizen Representative*

Mike Riley – *CIO Representative*

#### **Committee Members Absent**

Allen Goodall – *Business Representative*

Amanda Hoffman – *City of Wilsonville*

Bethany Wurtz – *Tualatin Tomorrow Rep.*

Judith Gray – *City of Tigard*

Julia Hajduk – *City of Sherwood*

Nancy Kraushaar – *Citizen Representative*

Randall Thom – *Small Business Representative*

Ryan Boyle – *Citizen Representative*

Gail Hardinger – *Alt. Business Representative*

Nic Herriges – *Alt. Citizen Representative*

#### **Public in Attendance**

Cathy Holland

Dolores Hurtado

Kathy Newcomb

Candice Kelly

Karen Riley

Two others (illegible names)

#### **Staff and Project Team**

Cindy Hahn – *City of Tualatin*

Alice Rouyer – *City of Tualatin*

Dayna Webb – *City of Tualatin*

Ben Bryant – *City of Tualatin*

Paul Hennon – *City of Tualatin*

Allen Snook – *DKS*

Theresa Carr – *CH2M Hill*

Terra Lingley – *CH2M Hill*

Eryn Kehe – *JLA Public Involvement*

Kelly Skelton – *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 would be the review, discussion and acceptance of a list of projects to evaluate based on the TSP goals, objectives and evaluation criteria. Eryn mentioned that tonight's meeting agenda was reordered to accommodate people who needed to attend a CIO 1 meeting happening later that night.

It was explained that they would be see the technical team's revised list of feasible projects, give their feedback on the refinements, and then the list would go to TPAC and City Council. This initial screening by the technical team was based on feasibility criteria, fairly conservatively. Only the really infeasible projects (due to time/money constraints) have been taken off the list. Tonight's discussion focuses on the items proposed for removal from the list.

## **ACCOUNCEMENTS**

Aquilla had her baby boy on April 17; his name is Thelonius (Theo).

Jan asked how the technical team and working group feedback will come together. Eryn said that the technical team used all the feedback from the working groups to help make their recommendations. She also said that the working group's feedback will continue to be useful in the evaluation process.

## **COMMUNICATION FROM THE PUBLIC**

Kathy Newcomb said that she appreciates the amount of work invested in the project; however, she thinks it has moved quickly and there remain many unanswered questions at the working groups. She does not feel that the public outreach has been adequate because many citizens cannot physically make it to the meetings even though they are very interested in the project. Open houses are just not an efficient way to reach people.

Eryn agreed that there were a lot of questions at the work groups, but many of them could not be answered yet. The working groups will meet again. The evaluation process will take a few months, allowing time for the project team to answer many of these questions.

## **FEASIBLE PROJECTS DISCUSSION: TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN**

Terra started her presentation by reviewing the screening process, the results, those items that have been removed from the list, and next steps.

**Timeline:** The timeline shows an adopted TSP by December, the project is tracking fairly closely to the original schedule. We are one-third of the way through the workings groups, still screening options, and will move into preparing the TSP recommendations.

**What progress has been made?** Work in March focused on generating a long list of potential project ideas. There were 248 distinct ideas spread over the 6 working group topics which were gathered at working groups, an open house, the March 15 Task Force meeting, online comment map on website, and smaller discussions with CIOs, Allied Waste, Chamber of Commerce, and City staff.

**Screening:** Screening helps form a feasible set of project ideas to move forward into evaluation. The project team organized the ideas into three different "bins".

- Project ideas to be evaluated by the TSP
- Project ideas to be forwarded to others (agencies, City departments)
- Projects that do not address a need and/or not feasible to construct

**Tualatin's TSP Process:** We are currently halfway through Step 2 (Develop and Evaluate Solutions)

**What is a feasible idea?** Screening questions:

1. Is the project transportation related and does it address a known transportation deficiency or opportunity? (e.g. lighting projects, economic development projects)
2. Is it within the City? Is it within the City's control to implement?
3. Is it technically feasible to build this project? (e.g. interchange standards)
4. Is the idea cost prohibitive? Are there more cost effective ways to addressing the same need?

### **The Screening Process**

- Second round of working group meetings (Occurred March/April 2012)
- Participants were asked to provide input on feasibility of project ideas
  - Red - not feasible
  - Yellow – Not sure/have questions
  - Green – feasible, move forward into evaluation
- Comments recorded for all red cards
- Engineering team used working group notes to assess feasibility of project ideas

### **SCREENING RESULTS**

Eryn explained how today's screening discussion would work. The committee will discuss a list for the six topic areas one at a time. Each list contains the items that the technical team recommends to remove from the list. Voting committee members (agency committee members voluntarily abstained from voting) at the table were asked to hold up a sign indicating the "vote" on the item. The more agreement achieved, the stronger the recommendation will appear to TPAC and City Council.

- Green indicates: "yes, I agree with, and support, removing this item from the list"
- Yellow indicates: "I do not entirely agree, but I will not stand in the way of consensus "
- Red indicates: "I disagree with the technical team, this item should stay on the list"

If more than 50% of the committee shows a red card, the item will remain on the list.

### **Bike/Ped - Ideas Screened Out**

ID	Project	Based on what screening question?	Action to be taken
A5	Improve lighting at Jurgens Rd. and Hazelbrook Rd	1 (transportation related, addressing an identified need)	Forward to engineering
B1	Add a pedestrian overcrossing between the Community park and Tualatin Commons	1 (transportation related), 4 (cost)	Consider upon future development
C3	Add a pedestrian shortcut between Hazelbrook Rd and 99W	1 (addressing an identified need)	Consider if a future development occurs at this location

- Terra clarified that forwarding to engineering means it is not a transportation issue, but a safety issue for the City to review.

- One yellow card regarding considering upon future development. Terra clarified that the TSP can include policy-related issues like future development, beyond the nuts and bolts.
- **Final vote: 14 green votes**

### Industrial & Freight - Ideas Screened Out

ID	Project	Based on what screening question?	Action to be taken
A3	Provide an undercrossing for Nyberg through traffic under I-5 to avoid signal/conflicts. Create an urban interchange	2 (ability to implement), 4 (cost)	None
A4	Reconsider the connection between 99W and Tualatin-Sherwood Rd (note: in Sherwood)	2 (ability to implement)	Forward to City of Sherwood
A8	Close 90th Ave to 18-wheel trucks	1 (addressing a transportation problem)	Reassess during review of functional classification plan
A10	Create a loop road around central downtown, with a turn radius that works for trucks	1 (addressing a transportation problem), 4 (cost)	None
B3	General – Provide bus from Clackamas MAX stop to WES for employees	1 (addressing a transportation problem)	Forward to TriMet
C1	Add connection and entry to I-205	3 (technical feasibility)	None
C2	Provide direct connection between Herman Rd & Boones Ferry Rd. Consider a tunnel	2 (ability to implement) 4 (cost)	None
C1	Add interchange at Norwood Road	3 (technical feasibility)	None
D4	Move industrial area to the SW area, change to multi-family residential, or buffer existing neighborhood better from industrial area	1 (transportation-related)	Forward to Planning

- After initial voting, there was one red card on C1. The Committee member didn't agree that it's technically infeasible. It is very difficult for anyone in South Tualatin to get on I-5, sometimes they have to go south to Wilsonville to get on the highway.
  - Allen clarified that this idea is infeasible because it is a cost issue, and it would be a difficult design because of tight spacing between freeway exits.
  - Steve from Washington County said this issue has been part of the regional discussion for 10-15 years, it's currently on Tualatin's TSP plan, if it's taken off here it will be studied under the Basalt Creek plan. This satisfied the member that raised his red card.
- **Final vote: 14 green votes**

### Neighborhood Livability Ideas Screened Out

ID	Project	Based on what screening question?	Action to be taken
A2	Improve lighting on Hazelbrook Rd	1 (transportation-related)	Forward to Engineering
A7	Improve sight distance and reduce speeds at Boones Ferry Rd and Arapaho Rd	1 (does not address a transportation problem)	Forward to Engineering

A10	Require a stop before vehicles turn right onto Boones Ferry Rd between Mohawk St and Greenhill Lane	3 (technical feasibility)	None
B7	Add two right turns onto I-5 northbound from Nyberg St	2 (ability to implement)	Forward to ODOT
C4	Add I-5 Interchange with Norwood Rd	3 (technical feasibility)	None
C5	Limit Siletz to exit only at Boones Ferry Rd and 105th Ave to minimize cut-through traffic.	1 (not included in TSP analysis)	Revisit upon completion of Boones Ferry Road analysis and recommendations
D1	Consider a pedestrian overcrossing on Boones Ferry Rd	4 (cost)	Assess more effective, lower cost solutions to pedestrian safety
F1	Consider ways to lessen noise from 99W and I-5 on nearby residences	1 (transportation related)	Forward to Engineering
F3	Intersection of Ibach/Graham's Ferry is confusing; rename road or better signs; need better lighting	1 (transportation related, addressing a transportation problem)	Forward to Engineering
F4	General – Add gateway signs to announce CIOs	1 (transportation related)	Forward to CIOs
F5	Move industrial area to the SW area (no direct truck route), change to multifamily residential, or buffer existing neighborhood better from industrial area	1 (transportation related)	Forward to Planning
F6	Create small, neighborhood commercial for residents to walk to	1 (transportation related)	Forward to Planning

- No discussion.
- **Final vote: 12 green votes**

### Major Corridors and Intersections – Ideas Screened Out

ID	Project	Based on what screening question?	Action to be taken
A7	Improve sight distance and reduce speeds at Boones Ferry Rd and Arapaho Rd	1 (does not address a transportation problem)	Forward to Engineering
B4	Consider a traffic loop in downtown (one way, right turn only)	1 (addressing a transportation problem) 4 (cost)	Look at other options to address downtown circulation
B7	Consider removing ramp signals at Nyberg interchange	1 (does not address a transportation problem) 2 (Ability to Implement)	Look at other options to address congestion at Nyberg interchange
B1	Consider redesigning the Nyberg interchange into a full cloverleaf	2 (ability to implement) 4 (cost)	Look at other options to address congestion at Nyberg interchange
B1	Add a southbound left turn and right turn lane to Nyberg interchange	1 (does not address a transportation problem) 4 (cost)	Look at other options to address congestion at Nyberg interchange

B1	Restrict trucks to right lane, widen travel lanes	2 (ability to implement)	None
B25	Limit access and grade separate the intersection of Tualatin-Sherwood Rd and Boones Ferry Rd	1 (addressing a transportation problem) 4 (cost)	None
C3	Construct a new road between Tualatin High School and Byrom Elementary School	1 (does not address a transportation problem)	Look at other options to address school congestion
C5	Improve intersection at 99W and Tualatin Rd	1 (does not address a transportation problem)	None
C6	Extend Tualatin Rd to Lower Boones Ferry Rd	3 (technical feasibility)	None
C8	Add on/off ramps from I-5 to Norwood Rd	3 (technical feasibility)	None
C9	Widen Sagert St to 2 lanes each way with pedestrian median	1 (does not address a transportation problem)	None
C10	Extend Helenius Road (Grahams Ferry Rd to Norwood Rd)	3 (technical feasibility)	None
C11	Create street grid in Bridgeport	1 (does not address a transportation problem) 2 (ability to implement)	None
D3	Tualatin-Sherwood Rd/Martinazzi Ave – Adjust signal timing, add a red light camera	2 (ability to implement)	Forward to Washington County – potential project already underway
D4	Adjust signal Timing	2 (ability to implement)	Forward to WA County – potential project already underway

- Theresa Carr clarified that many Nyberg projects on the list were removed, but many are still on the list for moving forward; these relate to site distance and eastbound-to-southbound movement onto I-5.
- After initial voting, there was one red card on C9: As the area grows to the east Sagert will be used more. The pedestrian crossing issue is still on the list, but he was concerned about the increased traffic on Sagert, which won't be addressed if C9 comes off the list. The current TSP plan has Sagert designated as a major arterial, which means it will be a 4-5 lane roadway.
- Another committee member raised a concern about impacts to residents and local schools/park if Sagert was widened. All of these comments prove to her that there needs to be further study, which makes an argument for keeping it on the list.
- The group voted (11 green/1 red) and agreed to put a portion of C9 (widen Sagert Street to 2 lanes each way / pedestrian median was still removed) back on the list/map to be forwarded to TPAC and City Council.
- Committee member who showed a red sign was worried about B25 being removed because it is a bad crossing, and going to be bad in the future. Theresa said there are lower-cost ideas staying on the list that will address the crossing and its issues. No further action was taken on this item.
- **Final vote: 12 green votes**

### Downtown – Ideas Screened Out

ID	Project	Based on what screening question?	Action to be taken
A3	Add a grade separated railroad crossing on Tualatin-Sherwood Rd	1 (addressing a transportation problem) 4 (cost)	None
B2	Provide secondary exit from park, and provide additional parking	3 (technical feasibility)	Look at other options to improve circulation at park
B4	Add a travel lane on I-5 northbound (between Tualatin and OR 217)	2 (ability to implement)	Forward to ODOT
B5	Create a one-way circulator loop roadway around downtown	1 (addressing a transportation problem) 4 (cost)	Look at other options to address downtown circulation
B6	Reduce ambient noise along Boones Ferry Rd in downtown	1 (transportation-related)	None
B8	Add HOV lanes on Tualatin-Sherwood Rd	2 (ability to implement) 3 (technical feasibility)	None
C3	Connect Nyberg Rd through the Commons	1 (addressing a transportation need)	Look at other options to address downtown circulation
C7	Extend Lower Boones Ferry Rd across Tualatin River	3 (technical feasibility)	None
D5	Create a pedestrian sky bridge that connects downtown retail businesses and the park	1 (transportation-related) 4 (cost)	Consider upon future development

- A committee member was concerned that there aren't other items on the "keep" list that address downtown circulation, Terra pointed out a few that do (C4, C6)
- **Final vote: 12 green votes**

### Transit – Ideas Screened Out

ID	Project	Based on what screening question?	Action to be taken
A9	Add bus line from Yamhill Transit District to WES	2 (Ability to Implement)	Forward to Yamhill Transit District and TriMet
A11	General –leave TriMet service area	3 (Technical Feasibility)	Assess ability to improve transit service in Tualatin first, and then reconsider the need for this idea
A15	Provide transit service to Lake Oswego	1 (Addressing a need)	None
B1	Eliminate freight rail trips during rush hours, to avoid interrupting bus and WES service	2 (Ability to implement)	Participate in future regional discussions around increasing WES frequency (B3)
B3	Increase WES frequency	2 (Ability to implement)	Participate in future regional discussions around increasing WES frequency

B5	Extend WES to Salem	2 (Ability to implement)	Participate in future regional discussions on this topic
B6	Oregon Passenger Rail between Portland and Eugene	2 (Ability to implement)	Participate in future regional discussions on this topic
B7	SW corridor High Capacity Transit	2 (Ability to implement)	Participate in ongoing regional discussions on this topic
B8	Add a WES Station in south Tualatin	1 (Addressing a need)	Reconsider upon future build out of Basalt Creek area
B9	General – Add more spaces for bicycles on WES trains	2 (Ability to implement)	Forward to TriMet
B11	Follow the existing rail line with High Capacity Transit	2 (Ability to implement)	Forward to Metro for ongoing SW Corridor and other regional transit discussions

- Theresa commented that many topics that were taken off the table for Transit are still part of a regional conversation between agencies to implement project ideas. Tualatin needs to be sure to actively participate in these conversations through projects such as Linking Tualatin.
- Bus lines are still on the list because they still want to go through the evaluation process.
- A committee member suggested leaving A9 and A15 on the list. Eryn took the vote first.
- **Final vote: 10 green votes; no other votes**

(Agencies abstained from voting)

**In Summary:** We started with 248 project ideas. Of the 60 ideas proposed to be screened out...

- 19 will be forwarded to other agencies or City departments
- 6 to be reconsidered again in the future
- 6 will be considered as part of regional conversations
- 4 will be woven into other project ideas being evaluated.

#### Next steps:

Action	Timing
Discuss results of TTF screen process with City Council	April 23
Evaluate feasible project ideas	Late April through Mid-May
Discuss evaluation results to Task Force	May 24
Hold 3rd round of working groups to develop preliminary recommendations	June 4- June 14
Discuss preliminary recommendations with Task Force	June 21
Public outreach on preliminary recommendations	Late June through August

#### GENERAL ITEMS

- Eryn said that the upcoming summer months will focus on online conversations, public events, and neighborhood outreach to talk about this preliminary list and evaluation of those projects.
- **Meeting Summary #7 Approval:** No changes, summary approved.



- **Next Meeting:** May 24<sup>th</sup>, a lot of materials will be sent in advance so please come prepared. Linking Tualatin is doing a Charrette process from June 4-7. More information to come about when Task Force members are invited and encouraged to participate.

### **COMMUNICATION FROM THE PUBLIC**

Cathy Holland thanked the committee members for serving on the committee, and the consultants and City staff for keeping up with the process and their hard work.

Meeting adjourned.