



SW 198th Avenue Improvements INTERESTED PARTIES GROUP (IPG)

TVF&R - North Operating Center - Community Center
June 16, 2016 4:00 – 6:00 pm



Meeting No. 5 Notes

Interested Parties Group (IPG) :			
	Members	Representing	
1	Cheryl Mayhew	Resident	X
2	Daniel Hauser	Resident	-
3	Donnie Howard	Resident	X
4	Jessica Leitner	Business representative/Resident	-
5	Phyllis A. Beber	Resident	X
6	Raymond Eck	CPO 6 representative	X
7	Rhonda Larson	Resident	X
8	Sheryl Macy	Resident	X
9	Susan Cole	Resident	X
10	Anthony Davies	Washington County E&CS	X
11	Emily Hackett	Washington County Bicycle Transportation Coalition	X
12	Grant O'Connell	TriMet	-

Project Management Team (PMT) :				
	Name	Organization	Title	
13	Matt Costigan	Washington County	Project Manager	X
14	Magdalena Campuzano	Washington County	Support Staff	X
15	Sara Smith	Washington County	Support Staff	-
16	Gavin Oien	David Evans & Assoc.	Project Manager	X
17	KC Cooper	David Evans & Assoc.	Public Involvement Facilitator	-
18	Scott Harmon	David Evans & Assoc.	Traffic Design Engineer	-
19	Jim Evans	Casso Consulting	Project Manager	-
20	Tara Heesacker	Washington County	Right-of-Way Supervisor	X

General Public:			
	Name	Representing	
	Pat Gore	Resident	X

1. Meeting Overview – Matt Costigan

Matt opened the meeting informing the group that KC Cooper had a previous engagement and that Jim Evans was out ill – so it was just going to be Gavin and Matt running the meeting.

Matt started the meeting asking if there were any comments and/or corrections to IPG #4 meeting notes. No one had comments or corrections. Notes for IPG #4 will be finalized and posted to the project web site.

Matt provided an overview of the agenda. No changes to the agenda were requested. Matt noted that there was one person from the general public in attendance. Matt informed the IPG that the project website will be updated in the next few days to include all of the meetings notes, agendas and presented materials. Nobody had changes to the agenda.

2. Open House (OH) debrief – IPG members comments – Matt Costigan

Matt started the debrief of the open house stating that we had 109 persons in attendance, including IPG members and that the Edwards Center facility worked very well after the school cancelled our reservation and that Jessica and the Edwards Center staff were very helpful..

Matt asked the group what the general feedback was from the open house and what stood out as issues or concerns. For reference, Matt provided a tabulation of the comments received and “draft” responses. Matt asked what did the members heard at the OH.

- Phyllis heard concern about the existing trees being removed and that it would eliminate a noise and dust barrier from the road. She also heard a few concerns about the width of the proposed road. Matt stated that we usually don't mitigate for noise on 2 lane roads widened to 3 lanes because technically the capacity of the road is not being increased and studies would show that even though one lane moves closer, moving the other lane farther away actually reduces noise levels. And with the current number of driveways along SW 198th, noise walls would be ineffective. Matt mentioned that a noise analysis would be performed once a final alignment is selected;
- Susan heard concern about the logistics of staging construction on the traffic and the services like garbage, mail delivery, and school bus routes. Matt responded that the County will have lane closure restrictions that will minimize the impact during commute times and that the contractor is required to allow for services like garbage and emergency vehicles.
- Sheryl heard a dislike about the roundabouts due their impacts;
- Cheryl also heard concern about the impacts but spent time with people walking through alternatives and the work that the design team and the IPG did trying to minimize impacts, and this seemed to help them see that we are trying to minimize impacts;
- Ray also heard a dislike for roundabouts, a dislike for bike lanes, requests for bus pullouts, and a concern about when the work on 209th would get done. Matt mentioned that the City of Hillsboro has been working on advancing a project which would construct an interim left turn at 209th. The full improvements at this intersection are not scheduled until year 2019;
- Susan mentioned she too heard concerns about the 209th intersection and that it would increase due to the construction on 198th;
- Rhonda heard about the construction schedule in general. Concern if the 198th construction will coincide with any work done on 209th.

Matt mentioned that most of these concerns were submitted as comments from those attending the open house. The open house meeting will be summarized and posted on the project website.

The summary of the 57 comment forms received at the open house also gave the group how the public liked the various design alternatives:

- SW 198th Avenue design alternatives:
 - Alternative 1 - County standard 3-lane widened equally about the roadway centerline - 31%
 - Alternative 2 - Reduced 3-lane widened equally about the roadway centerline - 24%
 - Alternative 3 - Reduced 3-lane shifting of the roadway centerline - 45%

- SW 198th Avenue/SW Blanton Street intersection design alternatives:
 - Alternative 1 - West leg realignment - 81%
 - Alternative 2 - East leg realignment - 15%
 - Alternative 3 - Standard roundabout - 4%

- SW 198th Avenue/SW Kinnaman Road intersection design alternatives:
 - Alternative 1 - West leg realignment - 71%
 - Alternative 2 - East leg realignment - 27%
 - Alternative 3 - "Dog-bone" roundabout - 2%

3. Right-of Way Process – Tara Heesacker

Tara provided an overview of the R/W process. She handed out a printout of board shown at the open house that shows the right-of-way (ROW) process and County brochures.

Tara explained that currently we are in the "preliminary engineering phase" out of which a Declaration of Necessity will be presented to the County's Board of County Commissioners for approval based on the centerline and design alternative selected. Once the limits of the improvements are determined, the design engineers will provide legal descriptions and exhibits of the areas needed for the improvements.

A County right-of-way agent (R/W) will be assigned to a project. The agent then will contact the property owners and start ordering appraisals of the impacted properties. Tara explained that these appraisals are done by independent appraisers hired by the County. Appraisers will contact the property owners to let them know they will be working on their property and in some cases they will schedule an appointment with the owners so they can walk with him/her during the appraisal.

At the same time, the limits will be staked on the ground correlated with the exhibits so that the property owners and appraisers can see physically on the ground what the impacts will be. This allows the appraisers to start to develop an "opinion of fair market value" based on comparable properties in the area. Once an appraisal is complete and the report prepared, the R/W agent will meet with the property owners to present the offer letter and a copy of the appraisal.

It was noted that the right-of-way process is based on constitutional law and Oregon statute. Through this process, condemnation is not preferred and the County works to address the owners concerns in order to avoid condemnation. The need for the project is provided through the alternative analysis process and the Declaration of Necessity. This process provides good documentation, if the acquisition goes to litigation. Tara noted that the public need is usually not in dispute - usually the dispute is about the compensation. The process must follow the rule that it must serve the "greatest public good and least private injury".

For incidental impacts caused by the project, such as temporary impacts or things like trees that are indirectly impacted because of construction activities, these would also be covered under temporary

construction easements. Any trees removed and mitigation for them would be covered under the planning approval process or through the negotiations with the property owners. Sometimes efforts are made to avoid particular trees and in these cases the County hires an arborist to give recommendation on whether it's possible to save a tree and what measures are needed.

The effect of the project's influence on valuation was questioned and what considerations are made. The short answer is that the project's influence is not considered as part of the valuation. Damages are evaluated. In some cases proximity of the improvements to the property can be compensable depending on proximity. The appraisers work hard to find "paired sales" comparisons that have similar impacts relative to codes, setbacks, etc. It should be noted that these appraisals are not comparable to a refinance appraisal. These are much more detailed and range from 75-100 pages in length.

4. Kinnaman Alternative 4 – Gavin Oien

Gavin provided a handout for a concept alignment (Alternative Alignment No. 4) that was developed for the SW 198th/Kinnaman intersection and an updated evaluation matrix. As he explained the concept, he used the matrix to highlight the differences between this concept and the previous three design alternatives. This concept was developed as a hybrid between Alternative 1 and 3, using the west leg realignment of Alternative 1 and the use of a roundabout configuration from Alternative 3. This concept was developed as an idea from the previous meeting but prior to the feedback received at the open house that showed very little support for roundabouts. In the analysis, it was pointed out that the impacts assessed were not quantitative but were qualitative based on an understanding of the other alternatives. In the evaluation, it shows that this alternative has more property impacts than the other alternatives. Because of this and the low support for roundabout alternatives, this alternative will not be recommended for advancement.

5. Bike/Ped Recommendations – Matt Costigan

Matt provided an update on the discussion regarding the bike lane width recommendation. The proposed section based on previous feedback is 6.5' bike lanes with a 13' center turn lane. Initially it was 6' bike lanes with a 14' center turn lane but to create a buffer, the center turn lane was reduced to 13' and added 6" to each bike lane, keeping the same curb to curb width. In discussion with the bike/ped coordinator, she recommended 7' buffered bike lanes which would require an additional half of foot from adjacent property owners as the County Engineer was not willing to go less than 13' on the center turn lane.

The IPG strongly recommended keeping the 6.5' bike lane and 13' center turn lane as proposed. The purpose is to minimize impacts and this goes contrary to their recommendation. Matt said that he would pass on this "strong" recommendation.

6. Signal Warrant information – Gavin Oien

Gavin handed out a sheet that discussed the signal warrant analysis at Blanton and Kinnaman and discussed the results. He highlighted the fact that in the current analysis neither Blanton or Kinnaman meet signal warrants based on the requirement that the either the 8-hour volume or the 4-hour traffic volume warrants peak hour volumes are met within 3 years of opening. The analysis did show however that Blanton does meet warrants if the eastbound to northbound Intel traffic at the Shaw intersection were reassigned to Blanton. Redirecting Intel traffic will require some coordination discussions with Intel.

7. Public Comment – Matt Costigan

Matt suggested modifying the remaining agenda to allow for public comment before discussing next steps. Pat Gore introduced herself and stated that she lives on the SW corner of Pike and 198th. She stated that she is opposed to Alternative 4 and the other roundabout alternatives. She stated that it is not the right context and that it would unnecessarily impact her house and property. Already she will be surrounded by 3 roads and is worried about the impact of having the roads around her property. A roundabout will only make it worse.

8. Next Steps – Matt Costigan

Matt covered the next steps associated with the project. Based on the feedback, the design team will be advancing the concept design and integrating Alternative 3 for 198th (the reduced section with realigned centerline) and Alternative 1 for both Blanton and Kinnaman (realignments of the west legs of the intersections). This integrated concept will be eventually presented to the Board of County Commissioners as the preferred alternative and with their approval the project can then move into final design.

In addition, the project team will work on negotiations with Intel to reassign the eastbound Intel traffic to northbound traffic to Blanton, making the existing Intel access a right-in/right-out only.

The design team will also work on a time and date to meet with the IPG in the fall to go over the final concept that will be advanced and presented at the next open house. This means that we will not have IPG meetings in July or August but will look for a time in September or October. At that time, discussions can be held to see if and how the IPG wants to continue to be involved.

Next Meeting:	September 15 or 22, 2016 (tentative)

End of Meeting Notes