



SW 198th Avenue Improvements INTERESTED PARTIES GROUP (IPG)

TVF&R - North Operating Center - Community Center
February 18, 2016 4:00 – 6:00 pm



Meeting No. 1 Notes

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

Project Management Team (PMT) :				
	Name	Organization	Title	<input type="checkbox"/>
13	Matt Costigan	Washington County.	Project Manager	<input type="checkbox"/>
14	Magdalena Campuzano	Washington County	Support Staff	<input type="checkbox"/>
15	Sara Smith	Washington County	Support Staff	<input type="checkbox"/>
16	Gavin Oien	David Evans and Assc.	Project Manager	<input type="checkbox"/>
17	KC Cooper	David Evans and Assc.	Public Involvement Facilitator	<input type="checkbox"/>
18	Scott Harmon	David Evans and Assc.	Traffic Design Engineer	<input type="checkbox"/>
19	Jim Evans	Casso Consulting	Project Manager	<input type="checkbox"/>

No members of the general public present.

1. Welcome and Introductions: KC Cooper

Each person introduced themselves giving some information on how they related to the project (what general area or if they represented a group) and the outcome they expect from this meeting:

- Emily Hackett, representing Washington County Bicycle Transportation Coalition, interested in accessibility and safety for bikes and pedestrians.

- Sheryl Macy, resident near the north end, interested in making 198th safe for walking.
- Jessica Leitner, representing the Edwards Center, interested in improving the 198th/Kinnaman intersection to allow better accessibility to public transit
- Anthony Davies, representing Washington County's Engineering and Construction Services. Interested in structures and adherence to county standards.
- Phyllis Beber, resident at the north end. Interested in getting rid of the roadside ditches, reducing accident rates on 198th.
- Donnie Howard, resident at the south end. Also interested in seeing the ditches go away but also improving the safety of the road (installation of turn lanes), as well as safe bus stops.
- Raymond Eck, representing CPO 6 (currently Vice-Chair of URMDAC and on the Aloha-Reedville Community Council). Used to live off of Rosa and would be interested in improving this area.
- David Hauser, resident at south end. Interested in improving the safety for all users and improving the area's livability.
- Cheryl Mayhew, 45+ year resident of the middle segment. Interested in getting out of driveway safely without having to count vehicles.
- Rhonda Larson, 25+ year resident at the north end. Interested in improving the livability and improving the drainage, especially relating to her property
- Grant O'Connell, TriMet, is concerned with accessibility as part of the road design.
- KC Cooper, David Evans and Associates, meeting facilitator of the IPG.
- Jim Evans, Casso Consulting, Project Manager for the design team and consultant to Washington County.
- Scott Harmon, David Evans and Associates, Traffic Engineer for the project
- Gavin Oien, David Evans and Associates, Project Manager for the consultant overseeing the design of the proposed improvements. Interested in the public involvement process to be open and fair.
- Matt Costigan, Washington County, Project Manager overseeing the project through design and construction. Acknowledges that not everyone will be happy with the proposed improvements but is hopeful that once the project is complete, everyone will see the benefit of the project for the entire community.
- Magdalena Campuzano, Washington County, Administrative Assistant for the project.
- Sara Smith, Washington County, Administrative Assistant for the project

Project Notebooks (binders) were prepared for all the committee members. Members should bring their notebooks to future meetings. Additional information will be handed out for their notebooks at future meetings

IPG Meeting Schedule

KC went over the upcoming IPG schedule through August. While it is not anticipated that we would meet this many times, we did need to reserve the meeting room for the future meetings just in case.

All members agreed on the time and place of the next two meetings: March 17 and April 14, 2016

Project Criteria (handout)

The handout listed items that staff thought identified issues from the comments received at the December open house. The first six criteria listed were to be used as a guide for the group and were not prioritized or weighted. Additional criteria (*in italics*) were added by the group for consideration

- Meet the County Road Standards – the project has to be designed meeting these
- Add other multimodal opportunities – sidewalks and bike lanes will be part of this project
- Maximize safety for all modes- will be a priority
- Be cost-effective
- Minimize impacts to property
- Minimize environmental/landscaping impacts
- *Mailbox locations on same side of street as the house it serves (when project is completed)*
- *Cost of ongoing maintenance after completion of the project*

2. Project Overview: Matt Costigan

Matt first thanked all the members for volunteering to be on the committee and taking time to attend these meetings. Feedback from the IPG is beneficial to the County and its consultants.

Background and Funding:

This project is funded through the Major Streets Transportation Improvement Program (MSTIP 3D). Matt gave a brief overview of MSTIP program since its inception in the late 80s and examples of completed projects (Brookwood, 170th, Oleson Road, Bethany Blvd).

The overall budget for this project is \$14.3 million:

- Design: \$2.0 million
- Right-of-Way: \$2.0 million
- Construction: \$10.3 million

Project scope is to construct a County standard 3-lane roadway with bike and pedestrian facilities while realigning intersections at 198th/Blanton and 198th/Kinnaman. If full improvements can't be constructed, look to complete major sections of roadway. At a minimum, construct interim safety improvements that would include bike/ped facilities

Schedule:

- 2016: Preliminary Design: Identify a preferred alignment by late summer/early fall;
- 2017: Final Design: Begin design on preferred alignment
 - Begin right-of-way acquisition
 - Permitting (land use and regulatory agencies)
- 2018/2019 Construction
 - Bid project in early 2018, complete by late summer 2019

Question was asked about the possible acquisition of properties because of the project, how did that process worked, and if the changes on the road will affect/increase taxes. Matt and Jim gave a brief description of what the right-of-way process is for the County. The plan will be to bring a ROW agent to one of the IPG meetings to give an overview of the process.

3. Technical Review: Jim Evans, Gavin Oien, and Scott Harmon

Gavin went over County standard 3-lane cross-section handout that was included in the binders and several design concepts such as:

- Cross Section and possible variations (reduction of travel/center turn widths or potential elimination of certain items to reduce impacts and roadway footprint)
- Roadway centerline definition – this is the center of right-of-way that road width is based off of and may not be the same as the middle of the road
- Sidewalks on both sides – this is a requirement and could only be reduced to one side for special circumstances
- Bike lanes on both sides – similar to sidewalks, elimination of one side would only be for special circumstances

Gavin gave a brief overview of work that has been completed to date, such as:

- Surveying: crews identifying right-of-way centerline and property corners, collecting existing features such as utilities
- Aerial photos: used to develop a base map of the terrain
- Geotechnical work: pavement “thumping” and soil boring collection
- Mapping wetlands, habitat areas and water quality areas

Question was asked about the level of the road; in some places it is too high and makes driveways steep. Gavin explained that it would generally match the center line but will depend on each location. Other concepts to consider are sight distance and depth of underground utilities.

Another question asked was why the need for a planter strip - these “waste” a lot of space, and then the maintenance will be an added cost too. Matt explained that the planter strips serve as a buffer for pedestrians from the travel lane.

Matt and KC explained that these are part of the features that may or may not be part of the design alternatives (they will be examined during that time). Jim added that another item needed for consideration will be the location of water quality swales considering the storm water drainage problem in the area.

A question was asked about marked crosswalks. While all intersections are legal pedestrian crossings, the County standard is not to stripe it unless it is a signalized intersection or a school zone. Striped crosswalks give pedestrians a false sense of protection.

Another question was asked about the use of flashing lights for a crossing. This could be investigated but would need to be a high pedestrian usage.

A question was asked about safe routes to school and would school buses continue to be used by both Hillsboro and Beaverton once 198th is improved and sidewalks are installed. Discussions with each school district’s transportation office would need to take place.

Several members asked if all the utilities are underground to which staff replied that they are not. Water, gas, sanitary and some storm are underground but electric, phone and cable are overhead.

Scott distributed a **Traffic Terminology** handout that gave an overview of traffic terms and definitions and how some of these are used in the development of existing and future traffic data. Scott identified SW 198th as a County Collector that provides access and circulation between surrounding residential, commercial and industrial areas and the arterial system.

Scott also reviewed the **traffic boards** handouts that were presented at the December open house and how to read existing traffic and future traffic volumes and movements for each particular intersection. Scott explained that the average daily traffic (ADT) on SW 198th is about 15,000 vehicles per day with about 5% trucks. As you move farther south, the ADT drops to about 6,000 with about 2% trucks. Scott stated that local deliveries could be the reason why the north end has higher volumes than the south end. The counts don't differentiate between big trucks and smaller delivery trucks. 85% of vehicles drive 38 mph. Scott further explained that 85% of the traffic is travelling at or below, and 15% of drivers exceed this speed.

Scott explained the difference between the posted speed limit, which for 198th is 35 mph, and design speed. Speed limit is the regulated speed limit and design speed is what the roadway's geometry is designed for. Matt mentioned that the proposed design will be done according to the posted speed of 35 mph. The IPG was told that the speed limit is set by the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and not by the County.

Scott reviewed crash history and stated that the majority of crashes occurred at the larger intersections: TV Highway, Kinnaman, and Farmington and were mostly rear-end crashes with some side swipes (turning in front of another vehicle). Several members mentioned accidents that had happened in the area. Scott explained that the data comes from only reported accidents and that other crashes could have occurred where an accident report was not filed.

Scott also reviewed the criteria for traffic signals. In forecasting future needs, Scott identified there is a need for a traffic signal at Kinnaman and will need to look more closely to see if a traffic signal at Blanton is also warranted (it has been identified as being needed by 2040 but will try and identify approximate threshold year).

A question was asked whether the traffic coming through 209th via Kinnaman and the upcoming developments in Hillsboro (South Hillsboro) are considered in these factors to which Scott replied they are.

4. Next Steps: Matt Costigan

Matt went over the IPG meeting process: typically meeting notes are sent out for review along with a preliminary agenda for the next meeting electronically, and asked members if this would work – all agreed. Matt also explained that all the IPG notes and presented materials and handouts will be posted to the project's website approximately one week after each meeting.

Matt discussed the "Issue Bin" – something that comes up during the meeting is added to the "Issue Bin" for response at future meetings: Here is the Issue Bin list from this first IPG meeting:

- Mailboxes on same side of street as house (resident wouldn't have to cross)
- Construction staging/detour plans
- Right-of-Way process
- Discussion with Intel about parking lot access to increase capacity for left turn lane (potentially dual NB to WB left turns)
- Discussion with school district representatives regarding safe streets

Matt handed out a summary of the December 2015 open house and gave a brief overview: about 90 people attend. The purpose of the meeting was to introduce the project to the neighborhood and solicit IPG members. Issues were recorded on strip maps and via comment forms with responses from the project team.

Matt gave brief overview of the upcoming IPG meetings and potential open houses (Spring 2016 for presenting various alignments and Fall 2016 for presenting preferred alignment). Matt also mentioned that the design team is willing to come out and discuss the project with residents or HOAs if anyone is interested.

Ray Eck mentioned that for the next IPG meeting he will bring sidewalk projects information and general information that can relate to the project.

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

Next Meeting:	Thursday March 17, 2016
	Thursday April 14, 2016
	Thursday May 19, 2016
	Thursday June 16, 2016
	Thursday July 21, 2016
	Thursday August 18, 2016

End of Meeting Notes