

Tualatin Transportation System Plan, Preliminary Recommendations

PREPARED FOR: Tualatin Transportation Task Force

COPY TO: Kaaren Hofmann, City of Tualatin

Alice Rouyer, City of Tualatin Dayna Webb, City of Tualatin

Eryn Deeming Kehe, JLA Public Involvement

Terra Lingley, CH2M HILL Alan Snook, DKS Associates

PREPARED BY: Theresa Carr, CH2M HILL

DATE: February 14, 2013

This memorandum provides a brief overview of the process used to identify preliminary project recommendations for the Tualatin Transportation System Plan (TSP), as presented to the Transportation Task Force (TTF) at its June 21st meeting. Evaluation summaries for each project idea, with the preliminary recommendations, are included at the end of this memo. Maps identifying the location of each project idea are also included.

In May 2012, the TSP's technical team reviewed each of the projects identified as feasible against a set of evaluation criteria. The evaluation criteria are quantitative or qualitative measures that help the team identify how well the project idea is at meeting the TSP's goals and objectives (see Preliminary Evaluation Results memo dated May 25, 2012 for more information on this evaluation) These results were discussed at the May 24th TTF meeting, and with each of the six Working Groups at their third round of meetings, as follows:

- Downtown (June 4)
- Transit (June 5)
- Bicycle and Pedestrian (June 6)
- Industrial and Freight (June 13, mid-day)
- Neighborhood Livability (June 13, evening)
- Major Corridors and Intersections (June 14)

The attached evaluations have been refined to reflect modest changes made during these meetings.

In late May, the technical team conducted a preliminary assessment of whether each project idea should be moved forward into the TSP. All Working Group participants also had this discussion, and participants at Working Group meetings were asked to place dots next to project ideas they thought should or should not move forward, as follows:

- Green dots (participants were given five total) denoted the projects that would provide the greatest value to the community
- Red dots (participants were given five total) denoted projects that should not move forward into the TSP

Working Group participants did not need to use all dots provided. Photos of this dot exercise are on the project website at www.tualatintsp.org. Following the third round of meetings the technical team incorporated feedback from the Working Groups into the attached preliminary recommendations. The attached tables are organized to illustrate the following:

- 1. Projects that should be included in the TSP
- 2. Projects that should only be included as part of an urban upgrade, consistent with design standards for that roadway's functional classification
- 3. Projects that should not be included in the TSP
- 4. Projects that are topics for further refinement in the summer months

(Please note: Many project ideas were discussed at more than one Working Group meeting. The project team strives for consistency in wording, evaluation, and recommendations, but do allow these crosscutting project ideas to be reported under each Working Group topic area.)

At its June 21st meeting, the TTF will review developments from this third round of Working Group meetings, and TTF members will be asked to accept or refine the preliminary recommendations before they are forwarded to the community as a whole for review over the summer months.

Six areas have been identified for further refinement over the summer months:

- 1. Tualatin-Sherwood Road options
- 2. Nyberg Interchange options
- 3. Boones Ferry Road options
- 4. North to South connectivity options
- 5. Herman Road and Tualatin Road options
- 6. Downtown connectivity options

For each of the six areas above, the traffic analysis and conceptual design teams will be evaluating up to three alternatives to be discussed with the Task Force during July and August and with the community over the summer months and at a larger meeting in September. Tradeoffs will be discussed related to traffic, connectivity, right of way, environmental, and cost.