



MEETING AGENDA

TRANSPORTATION TASK FORCE

June 21, 2012, 5:30 p.m.

POLICE DEPARTMENT TRAINING RM

8650 SW TUALATIN ROAD

1. **WELCOME AND CALL TO ORDER**
Purpose of the Meeting: Transportation System Plan meeting focused on the preliminary project recommendations.
2. **COMMUNICATION FROM THE PUBLIC**
Limited to 3 minutes
3. **GENERAL ITEMS**
 - A. Accept Meeting #9 Summary
 - B. Announcements
4. **PROJECT UPDATE: TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN**
5. **PRELIMINARY PROJECT RECOMMENDATIONS**
 - A. Presentation
 - B. Discussion
6. **OVERVIEW OF UPCOMING PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES**
7. **COMMUNICATION FROM THE PUBLIC**
Limited to 3 Minutes
8. **NEXT MEETING**
July 12, 2012 - Linking Tualatin

Transportation Task Force

3. A.

Meeting

Date:

06/21/2012

Attachments

A - Meeting Summary



City of Tualatin

Tualatin Transportation Task Force

DRAFT Meeting #9 Summary

May 24, 2012, 5:00-7:00pm

Tualatin Police Department

8650 SW Tualatin Road

Tualatin, OR 97062

Committee Members Present

Alan Aplin – *TPC Representative*

Bethany Wurtz – *Tualatin Tomorrow Rep.*

Bill Beers – *TPC Representative*

Bruce Andrus-Hughes – *TPARK Rep.*

Cheryl Dorman – *Tualatin Chamber of Commerce*

Joelle Davis - *City Councilor*

Nancy Kraushaar - *Citizen Representative*

Ryan Boyle - *Citizen Representative*

Travis Evans - *Citizen Representative*

Wade Brooksby - *City Councilor*

Lou Ogden - *Mayor*

Advisory Participants

Candice Kelly – *Alternate Tualatin Tomorrow Representative*

John Howorth – *Alternate Citizen Representative*

Nic Herriges – *Alt. Citizen Representative*

Committee Members and Advisory Participants Absent

Allen Goodall – *Business Representative*

Amanda Hoffman – *City of Wilsonville*

Brian Barker – *TVF&R*

Charlie Benson – *Citizen Representative*

Deena Platman - *Metro*

Gail Hardinger - *Alt. Business Representative*

Jan Guinta – *CIO Representative*

Judith Gray – *City of Tigard*

Julia Hajduk – *City of Sherwood*

Karen Buehrig – *Clackamas County*

Kelly Betteridge – *TriMet*

Lidwien Rahman – *ODOT*

Monique Beikman - *City Councilor*

Randall Thom - *Small Business Representative*

Steve L. Kelley - *Washington County*

Mike Riley – *Alt. CIO Representative*

Public in Attendance

Joe Libscomb

Staff, Project Team and Special Guests

Cindy Hahn – *City of Tualatin*

Ben Bryant - *City of Tualatin*

Teresa Carr - *CH2M Hill*

Alan Snook - *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 to understand the results of the technical team's evaluation. There are no decisions being made today. In June, the group will discuss the specific projects that should or should not go into the TSP.

GENERAL ITEMS

Accept Meeting #8 Summary

Members approved the meeting summary by consensus.

Announcements

Staff announced that there had been recent meetings related to the Linking Tualatin and the Tualatin TSP processes. A Tonquin Trail meeting was held on May 23 to go over the draft trail plans. The Riverpark CIO had a meeting on May 20 where City staff spoke to members about the Linking Tualatin and TSP projects. Staff and CIO members discussed the land use types adjacent to the neighborhood, and reviewed some of the transportation projects. Staff posted notes from that meeting at www.tualatintsp.org.

There was a Basalt Creek meeting last week. 80 people attended from the south Tualatin area to talk about transportation projects in that area. The meeting included a looping PowerPoint presentation which is posted on Basalt Creek website (www.basaltcreek.com). The presentation included information about the evaluation of three concepts to link 124th Ave to I-5.

Project staff gave their congratulations to Nancy Kraushaar for winning a national award from the Public Works Association. There is a special feature of Nancy at www.tualatintsp.org.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE PUBLIC

None.

PRELIMINARY EVALUATION RESULTS

Theresa Carr and Alan Snook gave a PowerPoint presentation on the preliminary evaluation results of the TSP's feasible project ideas. The main points of their presentation included:

- **Where we are in the TSP Process:** We are currently in the screening step of transportation ideas. Since the last meeting, the project team has finalized its evaluation framework and conducted a preliminary evaluation.
- **Overview of the Evaluation Process**
 - The evaluation process reviews each feasible project idea against a set of evaluation criteria to determine how well the idea meets the TSP goals and objectives.
 - There are seven goal categories: 1) access and mobility, 2) safety, 3) vibrant communities, 4) economy, 5) health and the environment, 6) equity, and 7) ability to be implemented.
 - The technical team used a qualitative evaluation scale (full, half, and empty circles) to indicate how well the idea meets the criteria.
 - How the preliminary evaluation results will be used: Today, members will preliminarily review the evaluation results. The project team will also discuss the evaluation results throughout the third round of Working Group meetings to help develop preliminary recommendations. The Task Force will discuss preliminary recommendations at the June 21st meeting. An online open house on preliminary recommendations will occur in

July and August. Other focused neighborhood meetings and community discussions will occur during this period also.

- Areas for Additional Analysis: The technical team has identified six areas that need additional analysis. The team would like to look at these areas from a corridor point of view or big picture view, rather than looking at discrete, unconnected projects. The technical team will spend the summer months refining these areas:
 1. Tualatin-Sherwood Road
 2. Nyberg Interchange
 3. Boones Ferry Road
 4. North to South Connectivity
 5. Herman Road and Tualatin Road
 6. Tualatin's Downtown Circulation
- Members asked questions and discussed the evaluation process.
 - Mayor Ogden noted that the six areas for additional analysis are the key big issues. Tualatin-Sherwood Road bifurcates the city and damages the community, but it is also the major arterial for the region, so there is a conflict. The Mayor asked how the project team will involve the community in the analysis of the six areas for additional analysis.
 - Theresa Carr responded that the current step in the TSP process includes narrowing down to the set of projects that require more technical analysis. Over the summer (June 21 through end of August), the technical team will look at traffic models, engineering programs, etc., to determine the impact of project alternatives on those six areas and understand how they operate from a traffic and safety standpoint. The process will be iterative; the projects will be run through models, and may be revised or combined and run through the models again. Coffee klatches and tabling events are scheduled from July through September to talk to residents and businesses in specific areas. The project team hopes that those conversations will lead to recommendations by September, but it may take longer to get to an acceptable recommendation.
 - Bruce asked what happens to the projects that are in the existing TSP that are not yet complete. Theresa responded that all of the projects from the existing TSP were integrated into the list of 200 potential solutions. Some have been removed in the screening process.

Evaluation Highlights

Staff reviewed the main trends for evaluated projects and reviewed some specific projects in each Working Group topic area. Projects that have highlighted/underlined codes in the chart represent projects that are within one of the six areas for additional analysis. The technical team will get further information on these projects over the summer months.

Bicycle and Pedestrian

Overall, bicycle and pedestrian projects did well in safety and health categories. Projects were split on whether or not they improved access and mobility. Some did not do well for the equity category because they only benefit a small community, not all of Tualatin.

Examples of projects that score well across all categories include Project A2, A6, and B2. The trail projects also scored well. Project C5 (Tonquin Trail) scored well for all categories. Project C2

(building pedestrian bicycle bridges over the Tualatin River) scored well, except for ability to implement because of cost and location conflicts.

Projects that did not score well include Projects B7 and B18. Project B7 is a project to build a raised intersection and did not score well due to potential conflicts with other modes. There are better ways to improve safety in the area than to build a raised intersection. Project B18 would add a grade separated crossing at 99W, and did not score well except for safety. This project has access and mobility issues, and is difficult to implement due to cost.

Committee members' discussion included:

- A member asked what a bike boulevard is (Project C4). Staff responded that a bike boulevard is typically shared use of bikes and roads on a low-volume street. A bicycle boulevard can be a designation of a facility on a map as a bicycle travel area, or it can include signage on the route and "sharrows" (paint on the road that indicates a bike route). It may also include other advanced treatments such as bike lanes. It may also include putting in more stop signs.
- One member asked whether the equity criteria includes how well the project serves diverse populations. Staff responded that it does. The technical team considered that within the 43 criteria, along with whether the project serves a broad segment of the community.

Downtown

In general, downtown project ideas did well from an equity standpoint because they serve diverse populations that live in the downtown core, and because most people use downtown at some point. Many projects did well from a vibrant community point of view because many of the projects seek to make downtown more vibrant. Some projects helped movement of freight, while others slowed traffic to improve safety for pedestrians.

Staff highlighted some downtown project examples.

- Project A5 would redesign the Fred Meyer and Kmart intersection, including upgrades and pedestrian crossing. This project did well under mobility and access and safety, and did medium from a vibrant community and health/environment standpoint.
- Project B3 did well from a mobility, safety and economy standpoint. However, it would be hard to fit a lane in without making things more difficult for the Fred Meyer.
- Project B7: It makes sense to replace the Boones Ferry Road Bridge over the Tualatin River for mobility reasons, and it can add capacity and include better pedestrian and bicycle facilities for safety. The bridge is owned by ODOT so the city would need to coordinate with them. The bridge was built in the 1960s.
- Project C2 did very well for access and mobility and safety, but would be a challenge to implement because it would be difficult to fit in without having a significant impact.
- Project D2 scored well, but may be difficult to implement. This is a very problematic area, and there are many bicycle crashes here. One of the ideas is to have a separate crossing for bikes and pedestrians, or to have better striping for bicycles. This may include painting the bike lane a different color, or including a buffer bike lane. The idea of a separate bridge for bikes/pedestrians is still on the table.
- Project F2 includes looking for opportunities to open downtown's connection to the riverfront. A lot can be done in the Development Code to require new development or redevelopment to help to achieve this goal.

Committee members' discussion included:

- A member asked why there are so many N/As for the land use projects. Staff responded that the evaluation criteria look at transportation improvements, so they don't apply to land use projects.
- One member suggested that a parking structure could improve safety because it reduces the number of cars looking for parking spots and crashing into bikes.
- One member asked why Project B3 is still on the table if there are so many issues with it. The project staff responded that it is possible to shift the center of the roadway so that all of the impacts are not on the Fred Meyer side. Staff can also talk to Fred Meyer to see if they can route their trucks a different way.

Industrial and Freight

The projects in this category focus heavily on access and mobility and economy.

Examples of projects that did well for access and mobility and economy include Projects A5, C3, and C5. Project A5 also does well for safety because it can move vehicles off of other higher volume roads. Projects C3 and C5 scored well except for their ability to be implemented. These projects help to reroute traffic and reduce congestion.

The project team highlighted some of the other projects. Project D9 scored medium across the board. Project D13 did not score very well because Tualatin-Sherwood Rd does not lend itself to traffic calming. Traffic calming means anything that can slow traffic down, such as stop signs, speed bumps, bulb outs at intersections, etc. Project D6 has lots of N/As because it is so specific. N/A means that the project has a very limited effect. Project D2 did poorly because it can be very cost prohibitive. The impact to be able to implement this can be very high. Aesthetically, sound walls may not be very pleasing.

Committee members' discussion included:

- One member asked whether the health and environment category is weighted more heavily on health or on the environment. Staff responded that this category includes various criteria that are balanced between health and environment. The objectives under health and environment are about alternative transportation options and also air quality. The project team decided not to weigh the objectives to allow for an open conversation about costs and benefits.

Major Corridors and Intersections

Most of these projects scored well for access and mobility, safety and economy. Ability to implement will be difficult for some of the larger projects. Some projects did not score well for equity because they only benefit a small group of people.

Staff highlighted some of the projects in this category:

- Project A4 scored very well for safety, but is N/A for access and mobility.
- Working Group members really liked Project A6 (installing yellow turn signals). This would be more of a policy statement in the TSP, rather than a location-specific project. This is very easy to implement and low cost.
- Project B2 scored very well and might be implemented more easily than other projects. It is also easy to test in the technical analysis. A roundabout takes a little bit more space, so it may be more difficult to implement. Roundabouts are also tricky for trucks.

- Project B3 did not score well, except for access and mobility. Realigning these intersections would be very difficult to implement. The more cost-effective solution is to put coordinated signals at the two intersections.

Committee members' discussion included:

- One member noted that in the 2001 TSP, there was a proposal to bump Sagert Street through a parking lot and eventually meet up with Borland Rd. The project team responded that this option has not really been discussed. It would have lots of property impacts.
- One member asked if the projects in the B8/A5 area would be looked at in conjunction with each other. It would not make sense to put two signals in that one segment of road. The project team responded that the projects in that area would be looked at together, and will be focused on picking the right location for one signal, as needed.

Neighborhood Livability

In general, neighborhood livability projects did well from a safety standpoint and are within the City's control to be implemented over time. Most of the projects improve access and some improve mobility. Several fared poorly under economy because they restrict movement, ROW or reduce speeds.

Staff highlighted some projects in this category:

- Multiple Working Groups have brought up Project A1. This is an area that the technical team will spend time on in the summer months. The project does not fare well under the economy standpoint. It is difficult to implement because it is difficult to enforce.
- Project B6 is an idea to adjust signal timing to give priority to Tualatin Road. However, there are no signals in that area so it is not clear what to adjust signals for.
- Project C6 is a nice idea for connectivity, but scores poorly for most categories because it is difficult to find a good spot to put a new road.
- Project D5 scored very well. This project is in the Clackamas County TSP. There is hope that it will be built within the next 6 years.
- The team could not identify many benefits from Project F2.

Committee members' discussion included:

- One member asked what "eliminating free right turns" means in Project A9. Staff responded that this means the driver would have to stop at the intersection before making a turn. There would be no right on red.
- One member asked whether Project C6 is similar to Project C11 in the Major Corridors and Intersections category. Staff responded that they are not the same, but are related. Both score poorly because of impacts to private property.

Transit

Overall, transit project ideas scored well. The prioritization of project ideas in this category will be very important because the implementation falls largely to Trimet. The Project Team met with Trimet last week to go through these project ideas and see how they could be implemented. Trimet is in an environment of cutting—not adding—service. Trimet has committed that, when they are in a better position, they will replace cut service first. Then, they will try to add service. Providing a pedestrian-friendly environment and greater density will make it more likely for Trimet to add more service to an area. Trimet will also be looking at whether the project provides service to transit-dependent communities, and low income/high minority populations.

The SW Corridor Study is also underway. The TSP will be done before that Plan is complete. The recommendations from the SW Corridor Study will be very important. They will look for ways to integrate local service to regional service. Committee members requested to be reminded about this as it moves forward.

Staff highlighted some transit projects:

- Projects A1 through A5 provide bus service to areas that are not receiving service today. There is a real need from an equity standpoint to provide service to East Tualatin (Project A5), especially for service to the Food Pantry.
- Project A7 has a lot of benefits. Staff envisions this could possibly not be run by Trimet. This can improve economic vitality by connecting two important areas.
- Project B1 does not have much of a benefit. Staff did not evaluate it thoroughly because there are underutilized bike racks in that area.
- Project B2 is different from the SW Corridor Plan project. It is combined with what Linking Tualatin is doing.
- Projects D1 through D5 (park and ride projects) scored pretty well. The TSP probably will not be more specific than this list. It makes sense to identify the best locations in the future once design and funding have been identified.

Committee members' discussion included:

- One member advocated for a transit loop around the city, even though it did not score well. The project should consider a transit loop that does not involve Trimet.
- One member noted that the Chamber of Commerce Shuttle service is an option that has potential for expanding commuter service. This service is grant funded through the Jobs, Access and Reverse Commute Program.
- One member noted that Project A4 seems similar to a project in the Neighborhood Livability category.
- The Mayor noted that the Trimet system is very Portland-centric. The majority of car traffic too goes into the City of Portland. It is difficult to fund local service in Tualatin because there is not a lot of ridership or demand here. Rather than trying to secede from Trimet, maybe we need to understand the financial model that runs Trimet. The Mayor expressed concern that a loop bus in Tualatin won't have a lot of passengers using it.
 - Project staff recommended that the City should designate a liaison to Trimet to communicate the top two priorities, and City of Tualatin needs to do what is necessary to make Tualatin more attractive for increased Trimet service. It is about being an advocate. The Jobs Access and Reserve Commute Program is also a good source for funding.
- One member suggested that the same trolley system could be used for Projects A7 and A10, to show Trimet that we can use the same system to serve both.
- One member suggested that there are projects that the community may want to implement apart from Trimet, because they don't meet Trimet's criteria for expanding service.
- One member suggested adding the Trimet issue as a seventh item to the list of areas for additional analysis.
- One member noted that only 1% of Tualatin residents use the bus. It would be good to know how many people would actually use the bus if it were available.

Next Steps

Members should contact Cindy Hahn with their questions or comments on the evaluation results. Comments will be relayed to the technical team. Members are also encouraged to participate in the

third round of Working Group meetings. The results of those meetings will be provided at the June 21 TTF meeting.

OVERVIEW OF UPCOMING PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

Staff presented ideas for upcoming public involvement:

- Robust project map with all projects on website. Anyone can comment on the online map. It will go live July 1 through August.
- Public event in library in July.
- Presence at Farmers Market (July 13) and Crawfish Festival (August 10).
- Neighborhood meetings in July and August.

Staff wants input from committee members on how effective they think this outreach will be, and are encouraged to provide other ideas for outreach. Members will discuss outreach ideas again in the June meeting. Members can email Cindy Hahn with any other outreach ideas they have.

PROJECT UPDATE: LINKING TUALATIN

Cindy Hahn gave a Linking Tualatin project update. There will be a Community Workshop June 4-7 at the Public Library. On Monday June 4, there will be presentations about what will be happening in the Workshop. On June 5 and 6, there will be targeted discussion on each of the focus areas. Thursday evening will include presentations covering the whole workshop. Cindy encouraged members to attend, and to invite others. The ideas that come from the Linking Tualatin process will get fed into the SW Corridor Plan work, so it is very important. Members who have any questions should get in touch with Cindy.

Next TTF Meeting: June 21st from 5:30 to 7:30pm (*Note the new meeting time*)