



SW 198th Avenue Improvements INTERESTED PARTIES GROUP (IPG)

TVF&R - North Operating Center - Community Center
April 14, 2016 4:00 – 6:00 pm



Meeting No. 3 Notes

Interested Parties Group (IPG) :			
	Members	Representing	
			X
1	Cheryl Mayhew	Resident	X
2	Daniel Hauser	Resident	X
3	Donnie Howard	Resident	X
4	Jessica Leitner	Business owner/Resident	X
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	X

Project Management Team (PMT) :				
	Name	Organization	Title	
13	Matt Costigan	Washington County.	Project Manager	X
14	Magdalena Campuzano	Washington County	Support Staff	-
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	X
18	Scott Harmon	David Evans & Assoc.	Traffic Design Engineer	-
19	Jim Evans	Casso Consulting	Project Manager	X
20	Conor Costigan	David Evans & Assoc.	Roadway Designer	X

No members of the general public present.

1. Welcome: KC Cooper

KC started the meeting and asked if there were any changes to meeting notes or if there was anything to report.

Emily said that she appreciated notes.

Phyllis highlighted that the South Hillsboro development at the extension of Cornelius Pass Road is scheduled to start in 2017.

KC reviewed the agenda. The plan is to walk through three design alternatives:

- 1) County Standard 3-lane cross section (with no centerline shift)
- 2) Narrowed 3-lane section (with no centerline shift)
- 3) Narrowed 3-lane section (shifted from the centerline)

KC then walked through the alternative matrix and described the meaning of the circles in the matrix. An open circle represents something that is sufficient with regard to the criteria. A half-filled circle represents something that is moving toward being preferred and a fully filled circle represents something that is preferred, or best meets the criteria.

The goal of this meeting was to try and identify an IPG preferred design alternative and to identify any adjustments that might be needed before presenting at the Open House on June 2.

2. Draft Alignments and Matrix: Gavin and Jim

Gavin started off by providing an overview of the alternative matrix for reference, starting with Alternative 1 which applied the County Standard 3-lane cross section. Each of the screening criteria was explained using notes for each Alternative.

- A driveway impact is defined as a driveway that is less than 20 feet from the back of walk.
- A setback impact is defined as anything less than 15 feet from the right-of-way (ROW) to the building on the front or the back and 10 feet on the side, as confirmed by Conor
- The primary environmental impacts occur at Butternut Creek.

Alternative 2 applies the minimal section created with the input provided by the IPG at the March meeting. Gavin overviewed the details of the section and highlighted the difference between Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 as noted in the matrix.

Gavin described the difference in Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 regarding property impacts and how the property impact measured in square feet is different due to shifting of the roadway's centerline.

In Alternative 2 there were no shifts to the centerline. Alternative 3 was developed with shifts to the centerline as suggested by the IPG and as appropriate in the judgment of the design team.

Alternative 2's environmental impacts are the least because the widening is equivalent on both sides of the existing centerline and has a slightly narrower cross section.

Alternative 2 and 3 were scored with the understanding that both would have less maintenance cost than Alternative 1 because of the lack of a planter strip.

Phyllis asked for clarification regarding the setback impact - how close can the house be to the ROW or property line? Generally, it is anything less than 15 feet for front and back yards and 10 feet for side yards depending on the location.

Daniel asked what is the difference in the safety scores? It was a judgment based on the lane widths. The narrower lane widths move the traffic closer to the bicyclists and pedestrians, but the narrower width is still within AASHTO guidelines. It just doesn't meet County standards. Consideration needs to be

made for larger vehicles, in this case, buses, but the 11 foot lanes still accommodate buses. 198th is not a designated freight route.

Sheryl asked if the planters provide a safety benefit. Grant stated that there are studies that show that pedestrians “feel” safer with a landscape strip acting as a buffer between the travel lanes. Grant also mentioned that bus stops need 8 feet from curb to the back of the walkway to accommodate the 4-foot ramps for transit riders with disabilities. A landscape strip provides this extra width. Matt brought up the work on Walker Road where there are curb-tight sidewalks. The County is accommodating the bus stop needs by providing a widened sidewalk at bus stop locations and will look for those opportunities here as well.

Phyllis asked about the 6 foot bike lanes and mentioned that she sees them narrower. Gavin explained that 6-foot wide bike lanes are the County standard. Matt also mentioned that because we have 11-foot travel lanes, the County prefers to provide separation between the travel lane and bike lane whenever possible. To have an 11-foot travel lane next to a 4 or 5-foot bike lane reduces that separation. Matt also mentioned that 11-foot travel lanes with 6-foot bike lanes have been accepted by the County Engineer on other projects. Grant stated that 11 foot travel lanes are adequate for TriMet buses.

Ray asked what the maximum and minimum bike lane is. Anthony answered that 4 feet is the minimum for areas with no curb; 5 feet is the minimum for areas with curb. Generally there isn't a maximum but the County is moving toward wider bike facilities. This led to a discussion regarding bike lane widths for rural and urban.

Cheryl asked about Oleson Road and mentioned that she is happy with the islands on that project and liked the landscaping. Matt described the history, mentioning that the landscaping was designed, planted, and maintained by a local community gardening group.

It was asked if the planters can be used selectively. Matt responded that yes they can be constructed where appropriate using the areas that have excess ROW. Phyllis commented that people don't want to be responsible to clean up, and maintain them. The neighbors don't want them. It was mentioned in a previous meeting that landscaping can block the driver's view when exiting a driveway and that trees can shield buildings from the neighborhood residents' natural surveillance.

Phyllis asked what the “total rating” means for each alternative on the matrix. An empty circle is worth a score of zero, a half-filled circle is worth one, and a fully filled circle is worth two. The total rating is a sum of each of the individual criteria scores. It was added only to compare the alternatives. Each alternative was weighed against the criteria list.

The land use application was brought up. The type of land use application will be determined by how much the centerline shifts and environmental/wetlands impacts. The fact that the group is leaning toward no planter strip could be an issue with planning staff during the land use application process. The project needs the support of people that don't want the planter strips to show up to the hearings and support the proposal.

Phyllis mentioned that she likes Alternative 3.

Susan asked if the Land Use hearing is in Hillsboro. Because we haven't had a pre-application meeting with the planning section, the type of application is unknown. Matt said that he would be sure to let members of the IPG know when and where the hearing would be held.

Emily asked if the shifted centerline near Butternut Creek is considered safe. The answer was ‘yes’ – because the centerline shifts are designed to meet the required design speeds.

Ray asked about the difference in property impacts between alternatives. Alternative 2 and 3 are similar but Alternative 3 was developed to reduce the number of setback impacts. Alternative 2 and 3 do not have direct impacts to buildings.

Alternative 3:

Conor and Gavin went over Alternative 3 with the plans in hand and projected the design onto the screen. Starting at Farmington going to the north, there is an initial 2 foot shift to the east up to Oak where the alignment shifts back on the existing centerline. Between Oak and Rosa the alignment follows the existing centerline. At Rosa, the alignment shifts 2.5 feet east in an effort to minimize driveway/setback issues.

North of Deline, the alignment begins to shift 3 feet to the west where it is held until about Celebrity where it comes back to the existing centerline.

From Jaylee to Southview the alignment shifts 11 feet to the west to minimize impacts on the east side and utilize the excess ROW on the west side. As a result and as highlighted in the matrix there are more wetland impacts with Alternative 3 as opposed to Alternative 1 and 2, which both widened equivalently from the existing centerline.

A question was asked about the presence of fish in Butternut Creek. Fish are not believed to be present but nutria have been seen. More information will be forthcoming when the environmental issues are identified

A question was asked about the Water Quality Facility label at Southview. Matt responded that this is an existing facility.

North of Southview the alignment shifts 3 feet to the east. This minimizes impacts to the properties on the west but at the expense of acquiring ROW from the properties on the east. It was noted that there is a retaining wall along several west side properties that encroach into the ROW. Gavin stated that this area will likely have further refinement, as is the case all along the corridor.

Susan asked about the existing sidewalk along this area. Matt responded that what is shown is the proposed sidewalk, roughly in the same location as the existing sidewalk.

North of Kinnaman the alignment shifts west about 5 feet and then moves back to existing centerline at Blanton.

Emily noted that this alignment does not include double left turn lanes onto westbound TV Highway, which was confirmed.

Rhonda mentioned that if 209th has a decent turn lane perhaps it will pull traffic off of 198th.

Phyllis asked what "preferred" meant and who selects the alternative. Ray asked if the IPG has the power to select it and if the project can extend north of TV highway. How does this preferred alignment get moved through the process?

Matt stated that it is up to the project team and the County Engineer to make the ultimate decision on which alternative is selected. County staff will present the preferred alignment to the Board at about 30%.

It was asked if people who don't live on 198th can make comments. Yes, anyone can comment on the project and can attend the upcoming open house. Currently, there has not been much opposition to the project. It is important for people who support the project to show their support at the hearings and at open houses.

Matt provided an overview of Oleson Road as an example where the typical section proposed was not the standard and the public was supportive and appreciative of the final product.

Ray asked what the difference is between Alternative 2 and 3. It seems that there would be a lot less effort involved with the land use process for Alternative 2. Matt mentioned that the land use process will be the same regardless because of the wetland impacts.

Daniel asked about the magnitude of the wetland impacts and how significant it is with the shift. It looks like a bridge will be required. Jim answered that the difference in the larger context is minimal.

Susan Cole asked if there are grants available to supplement funding. Matt explained the MSTIP funding process. There will be a Type, Size, and Location study to determine the cost and technical feasibility of the selected alternative. Depending on financing, the road might be built in phases, which the County would like to avoid if possible.

Donnie mentioned that he had a homeowner association meeting last week and said that there were questions about sound walls and if there are plans to include them. Matt said that there probably will not be walls because the number of travel lanes is not increasing.

Dan asked that in the development of Blanton and Kinnaman realignments make sure that roundabouts are considered.

Ray asked about the 3-lane approaches at Rosa, Deline, and Carlin. Matt said we would continue to look at these. Regarding a realignment of Rosa, he said that it isn't likely.

3. Bicycle Facility Options/Discussion: Matt

Matt provided an overview of the Bicycle Facility Design Tool Kit developed by the County in 2012. He mentioned for context that Commissioner Schouten who serves this community is a bike enthusiast. Matt mentioned that he also is a cyclist and that he rides to work frequently.

The toolkit provided is the abbreviated version. The full version can be accessed online.

Matt highlighted the 4 types of cyclists: 1 – strong and fearless, 2 – enthused and confident, 3 – interested but concerned, and 4 – no way-no how. Bikes need a minimum width of 4 feet to accommodate the envelope of the rider. The County Standard calls for a minimum of a 6 foot bike lane. For facilities, there are nine types of alternatives identified in the toolkit.

Matt said his goal is to do something more than the standard striped bike lane. This would be, at a minimum, a buffered bike lane. Matt suggested providing a 6.5 foot bike lane and reducing the center turn lane to 13 feet in order to get the 1.5 foot buffer and avoid changing the footprint of the roadway. This would be a modification of Alternative 3 on the Collector facility list.

Emily mentioned not being in favor of cycle tracks because of the number of driveways. Matt agreed that with numerous driveways and side streets, cycle tracks would not be a good solution.

Matt mentioned to provide added motorist awareness of bicyclists; the striping could be "profiled." ODOT uses profile striping as an acceptable practice on their roadways. The "profiled" stripe would provide a "rumble" alert to a vehicle crossing the 8 inch stripe. Emily felt it would not be an issue with bikes crossing over the stripe like they would with a "turtle" (raised pavement marker). Feedback from the group was positive.

Matt mentioned that 198th is a designated north-south bike route with multiple side streets along 198th that are identified as neighborhood bikeways. This includes Carlin, Rosa, Celebrity, Southview and Blanton. Kinnaman is also designated as a County regional bikeway.

With the support of the IPG, the design team will move forward with the buffered bike lane as proposed by Matt.

4. Discussion and Next Steps: KC

The next meeting will be Thursday, May 19, 2016. The primary agenda topic will be to cover alternatives for the Blanton and Kinnaman intersection improvements.

As an action item, Alternative 3 will be revised to show the buffered bike lane.

A question was asked if Blanton and Kinnaman realignments are in the budget. The answer was yes.

The bus stop locations will be coordinated with TriMet. Bus pull outs are not planned or advised for this type of facility. Grant explained that for lower speed and un-signalized roadways – it’s difficult for the buses to get out of a bus pull out because of the steady stream of traffic. On higher speed facilities like TV Highway it is appropriate because the pull outs can be located on the downstream side of a signal. The signal then provides additional opportunities for the buses to pull out into traffic.

Bus shelters were asked about. Grant stated that they would locate them where they make sense. There are particular thresholds for trip volumes that have to be met. This will be looked at in the future. They may also have benches attached to the bus stop pole.

Marked crosswalks were asked about. Matt will work with DEA to identify where marked crosswalk(s) might be appropriate with RRFBs (Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon).

Based on discussion and feedback, it seems like there is value in meeting after the Open House. The IPG members are encouraged to attend the Open House to help answer questions and gather input. Written comments are preferred. All information from this meeting will be on the website shortly after the meeting. The Open House will be held on June 2 from 5pm-7pm. The design strip maps will be provided at the Open House along with a looping video of the flyover. Topics will include the buffered bike lane concept, intersection improvements and landscaping, as well as the road alignments. Members of the IPG are interested in debriefing the open house at the June 16 IPG meeting.

5. Public Comment – no members of the general public were present at the meeting

Next Meeting:	Thursday May 19, 2016
Open House #2 (Hazeldale Elementary)	Thursday, June 2, 2016
	Thursday June 16, 2016
	Thursday July 21, 2016
	Thursday August 18, 2016

End of Meeting Notes