



Addendum to Community Advisory Committee Meeting# 2 Summary – Committee Comments

January 4, 2012

Introduction:

Members of the Community Advisory Committee (CAC) were asked to provide feedback prior to December 7, 2011 on the following documents:

- Arterial vs. Throughway Issues Paper
- Draft Evaluation Framework
- Segment Maps

The following is a compilation of all the comments received from CAC members.

A. Arterial vs. Throughway Issues

Steve Larrance

Email November 29, 2011 (hand delivered post-CAC meeting)

- On page two “Important Facts about TV Highway Today”. The statement is made and later that statement is relied upon as fact for decision making purposes that “60% of the trips on TV Highway are local to the corridor.” I questioned that statement at the Oct. CAC meeting and at the open house and was told by ODOT staff that the number was from the Metro model and was not a counted or measured amount. I believe that number to be significantly incorrect for possibly the entire corridor and absolutely incorrect for certain segments of TV Highway and during portions of the peak usage period. It would be entirely misguided to rely upon the 60% local trips info when making important policy decisions regarding the future use of TV Highway.
- Also on page two is the average daily trips (ADT) discussion between whoever “Andy” and “I” are. I can tell you because I was there that the 1980’s prediction of 60,000 daily trips on TV Highway by 2010 was definitely based on the highway being larger than four lanes due to the fact that all adopted Transportation Plans in the 1980’s called for the addition of lanes within that time frame. Those same plans included a west side I-205 type north/south limited access corridor that intersected with TV Highway near Cornelius Pass Road. The fact that service level “F”

congestion during peak use is the norm today on TV Highway is inherently related to the lack of additional lanes. More trips would be on TV Highway if it were not full and moving at a crawl today during a.m. and p.m. peak use hours. Instead those would be user trips, many of whom are not local trips, are leaking onto the more local neighborhood street system in Aloha and Reedville and on the rural road system. A policy decision to not add to the capacity of TV Highway would automatically mean more of these “misplaced trips” especially in light of the additional 30,000 to 40,000 new neighbors, daily trips that the urbanization of South Hillsboro will create.

- On page three in the section labeled “From stakeholder interviews of the Policy Group and Senior Staff” the third bullet labeled “Future Development in the Corridor” ... “envisions that complete communities (consistent with Metro 2040) will develop along the corridor...resulting in TV Highway being used for more local, as opposed to through, type trips....” Well, just the opposite has already happened with Metro’s approval of urban expansion onto the planned South Hillsboro area. That area of several thousand acres is the only large opportunity for a destination jobs area to be built along the TV Highway corridor so commute trips could stop at that point. The area is instead planned as 30,000 to 40,000 new residents but only around 700 new jobs created. The majority of those are mall retail store type employment. Don’t believe me, just read from the Metro Chief Operating Officer’s Oct. 2011 report. It says “Urbanization of South Hillsboro will not contribute to balancing the jobs to housing ratio or promoting walkability and a compact urban form...” For eleven years during the long South Hillsboro planning process CPO #6 asked for large scale employment opportunities to be part of the plan as our adopted Aloha-Reedville-Cooper Mt. Community Plan envisioned. What we got was thousands of more bedrooms and tens of thousands of more commuters. Just like Aloha, but more dense.

So the idea that TV Highway trips will become more local and stay within the corridor has already been squandered. The only opportunity has been wasted by adopting an almost exclusively residential plan for South Hillsboro. And likewise, the adoption of South Hillsboro urbanization means that all government supporting that adoption must now support increasing the capacity of TV Highway.

The high scores received during initial evaluation in the 1990’s of South Hillsboro as a place to urbanize were based upon the adopted Regional Transportation Plan which showed a six lane TV Highway with grade separated intersections. This made it look like the increase in trips created by South Hillsboro could and would be able to be placed onto the system.

And now it appears to me that we are likely to get the worst of all worlds. South Hillsboro’s tens of thousands of new commuter trips, no new jobs close by, no new lanes for TV Highway and no west I-205 [type bypass] to take the through trips off the neighborhood streets. You might be able to call that planning, but you can’t call that good planning or good policy.

Rick Van Beveren

Email, December 01, 2011

- I endorse the reclassification of TV Highway from Throughway to Arterial and the concept of creating a “super grid” of multimodal three and five lane arterials and “frontage” roads to serve the area. The reclassification is an acknowledgement of the fiscal constraints as well as a practical recognition of how the corridor is used.
- Reclassification brings us to an important question: Should the Arterial continue to be under the jurisdiction of ODOT vs. some other governmental entity (cities of Hillsboro, Beaverton and Washington County). If it remains under ODOT and is reclassified, are resources actually going to be made available by the State of Oregon to make the need improvements? Can all effected jurisdictions collaborate on a corridor improvement plan and fund it, or at least the priority projects that address highest priority safety and capacity concerns? Are grants available...is Washington County able and willing to take the lead as “champion”?

Debra Dunn

Email, December 01, 2011

- What is the difference between an arterial and a principal arterial?
- On page two you have defined Arterial and Throughway, however, the terms Principal and Major Arterial are not defined. In order to make a recommendation on how to classify TV Hwy we will need definitions?
- Important facts about TV Hwy today: What is the source of this information?
- Resources Footnote: Need to list parallel road improvements made since 1980s. Westside Max opened in September 1998; 57 Bus changed to frequent service in 2004. List improvements in TSPs not yet constructed.

Kat Iverson

Email, December 2, 2011

- I would keep TV Hwy an arterial. If throughway means eliminating all access except at a few, grade separated intersections, then either all the businesses would have to be eliminated or the houses behind them would have to be eliminated to provide alternate access to the businesses.
- However, I'm wary of the RTP's vision of building "a well-connected network of 'complete' streets that prioritize safe and convenient pedestrian and bicycle access." (page 4) I don't see why pedestrians and cyclists should take priority over other road users, though I would welcome the resultant elimination of bike lanes. (Everyone knows that bike lanes actually prioritize motor travel by getting cyclists out of motorists' way and allowing them to travel at high speed without getting stuck behind slow moving bicycles)
- I'm also wary of the reference to complete streets. Does that refer to the plan of the National Complete Street Coalition? The plan that supposedly makes all streets safe

for everyone of any age? That is nonsense on it's face. The only way to make a street safe for very small children is to make the speed limit 5mph, and that kind of restriction makes no sense at all.

B. Draft Evaluation Framework

Kat Iverson

Email, December 02, 2011

- 1A. Yes to more sidewalks, particularly on the north side.
- 1B. Emphatic no to off street bike facilities. Even a [Copenhagen study](#) concedes that sidepaths are hazardous, though they downplay the risks. No to on street bike facilities unless the facility is an 11 foot or 16 foot wide shared use lane.
- 2A. There are no barriers now
- 2B. Good luck with getting better service from TriMet
- 3A. I Heartily approve. Pedestrians need to learn how to cross the road. Cyclists need to learn how to ride in traffic. Motorists need to learn road sharing. Railroad trespass may be illegal, but it is not hazardous. There is only ever one train at a time, so it is easy to see and avoid.
- 3B. You can't build facilities that are comfortable for everyone. As for safety, see 3A above.
- 3C. Education--see 3A above
- 3D and 3E. Can't be done without reducing the number of places they cross paths.
- 3F. Bike lanes increase the number of places bicycles and motor vehicles cross paths, so potential conflicts can most easily be reduced by removing the bike lanes.
- 3G. Not feasible. The only way is to ban pedestrians or to build grade separated crossings and that means many steps and even longer ramps up, across, and down the other side. Pedestrians don't want the extra effort involved.
- 6. I support 6.
- 7. Wishful thinking. You can't make people give up their cars. If bike travel increases it will likely be people switching from bus to bike rather than from car to bike, so increasing both bike and bus travel is unlikely.

Build new, and lengthen existing, bus pads on the south side. Bus drivers often stop without pulling over to the curb lane, creating potential for bike/passenger collisions. Ask the bus drivers, but I suspect they do that because of the absence of a concrete pad; if the driver pulls to the edge of the road, the passenger dismounts

onto gravel. The pad should be three to four car lengths long at stops on the upstream side of traffic signals. The driver will often let people off up to three, or even four, car lengths from the stop if the light is read and there is a short queue of cars ahead of him.

Damian Miller

Email, December 07, 2011

- Goal 1: Highly appreciate TAC suggestion of adding objectives for bicycle & transit *mobility*. Felt that early focus was on vehicle mobility, bike/ped safety. While of course bike/ped safety is an urgent issue in the corridor, from my perspective, pretty much the only way one can improve/maintain vehicle mobility is by improving bike/ped/transit mobility. *So that fewer people choose an SOV for trips that don't need to be made in an SOV (e.g. local errands, short commutes, longer commutes to destinations like downtown Portland with good transit service), so that road capacity dedicated to vehicles is available for freight, transit, and long-distance trips.*
- Goal 2, objective 2A/2B: Language about "density of crossings and linkages" and "reducing barriers" does capture the overall goal. I applaud the inclusion of goal 2B - rethinking the purpose of transit service in the corridor in terms of key destinations (current service is, of course, aligned around access to Beaverton and on to downtown Portland - which may not match potential transit trip demand in the corridor).

But if the objectives are going to go into that level of specificity, I might suggest some additional language on what connectivity looks like from a bike/ped/transit perspective:

- Absolutely minimize situations in which infrastructure asks pedestrians to go out of their way to reach destinations, or to cross the Highway.
 - Identify major destinations (e.g. employers, schools, retail, transit stops, and large housing clusters) and provide cyclists within a reasonable biking distance (2 miles? 4 miles?) with a choice of low-stress through routes *parallel* to the highway, or safe, convenient, and direct access *on* the highway.
 - Make it easier to walk or bike to the bus. In thinking about improvements to pedestrian access to transit, we need to be thinking about them as *connectivity* as well as *safety* improvements. But thinking about connectivity this way also means thinking about, say, bike parking facilities at bus stops - that people are already leaving bikes flimsily chained and uncovered at bus stops is testament to the demand for this.
- Goal 4: I want to be sure that language about access to jobs and businesses is about access for *all modes*. In other words - we often see a discourse that implies that any potential for reduced vehicular access is a blow to economic vitality. I'd argue that the relative *inaccessibility* of jobs and businesses in the corridor via anything other than a private vehicle represents an ongoing barrier to economic vitality; we just don't notice it 'cause we're used to it.

C. Segment Maps

Damien Miller

Email, December 07, 2011

- In terms of needs - this meshes pretty well with the goals of the Draft Evaluation Framework. Speaking from my perspective, top needs would include:
 - Reliable, attractive, & convenient transit service.
 - Safe & convenient bike/ped access to & connectivity with transit.
 - Low stress, parallel bike routes that provide access to major destinations, as well as
 - Safe, direct bike access *on* the highway to these same destinations.

- Re: Constraints - well, they seem pretty obvious - Funding, barrier effect produced by the RR (from pedestrian & cyclist perspective, we are, of course, very sensitive to detours & lack of direct access), political difficulty of demonstrating value of access via modes other than private vehicle - when people are unused to having a choice!

- Opportunities:
 - On transit - look at what's being done in similar corridors like Woodhaven Blvd in NYC, Geary Blvd in SF. Work with TriMet to do what is possible in the near term to improve quality of transit service- e.g. developing something akin to [NYC's "Select Bus" service](#) - not exactly the "bus rapid transit" that transit enthusiasts dream of, but a world of difference from what it used to be like to take the bus on these major arterials in outlying parts of the city or metro area. I hope my experience getting to our last meeting - where I beat the bus, on my bike, all the way from Beaverton to 209th, while cycling slowly with an injured knee - underlines the need to think broadly if we are to make transit something that is a viable alternative that people will choose if they have the choice.
 - Now: I've gone into much more specific detail here based on my experience trying to get around the corridor via walking/biking/transit. Here's a list, from west to east, of locations w/ specific opportunities I pulled out in a quick scan of the segment maps.

- Segment A:
 - Maple & 21st: Identify & develop as parallel bike route, providing access to Sunset Esplanade from SE Hillsboro neighborhoods, Shute Park/Library area, and on to downtown Hillsboro.
 - Possibly work w/ Sunset Esplanade to improve pedestrian access to stores from bus stops, improve bike safety conditions in their lot. (*I see large groups of shoppers - with purchases - making their way across a very ped-unfriendly lot to the bus stops every day - in spite of the barriers. This might actually represent a business opportunity to them, if they can see it.*)
 - TV Hwy & 24th, TV Hwy & Sunset Esplanade main entrance: Provide bike access to shopping center from bike lanes on the Hwy by providing facilities

(bike loop & waiting area) for cyclists to make compound left turns into shopping center & onto 24th. (Rather than having to use pedestrian facilities, an arrangement that is ultimately unsafe, and unfair to peds).

- TV Hwy & 24th: complete bike lanes all the way through intersection, allowing cyclists on river rd. safe access to the shopping center.
 - River Road/Witch Hazel/Brookwood/Alexander: Identify & develop as parallel bike route.
- Segment B:
 - River Road/Witch Hazel/Brookwood/Alexander: Identify & develop as parallel bike route.
 - TV Hwy & Imlay: Obvious need for ped crossing improvement & safer transit stop off the hwy, but also opportunity for some sort of bike parking facility on north side of Hwy.
 - TV Hwy & Imlay: This is the first of many locations where there is an obvious demand for ped access from transit to destinations to the south, on the other side of the RR. Currently there is informal access. I'd ask that the project team, before simply cutting off ped access to transit from the south, look at how conflicts between RR infrastructure and ped access to transit are handled in older, east-coast cities, where pedestrian/transit mobility and RR infrastructure have long coexisted.
 - TV Hwy & 214th, south side bus stop: I consider this the most dangerous, ill-sheltered, and uninviting bus stop in the entire corridor. Obvious need for pedestrian crossing improvement, bus shelter, possibly bike parking north of hwy. Potential for connection to current short trail and possible future bike corridor through Trachsel Meadows park.
 - TV Hwy & 209th: Among everything else you'll hear - need for bike lanes on 209th, potential for bike parking facility north of hwy. This is most frequent location where one sees bikes chained to the bus stop.
- Segment C:
 - TV Hwy & 192nd, TV Hwy & Burger King: Ill-sheltered, unsafe bus stops on south side of hwy. Obvious need for pedestrian crossing improvement, bus shelter, possibly bike parking north of hwy. Possibly retain just one of these close stops, along with improved crossing? As above - before closing off informal pedestrian access from the south, look at how conflicts between RR infrastructure and ped access to transit are handled in older, east-coast cities, where pedestrian/transit mobility and RR infrastructure have long coexisted.
 - TV Hwy & 187th, north side: This stop is sooooo close to 185th; it starts to have an impact on transit mobility and convenience when bus stops are so closely spaced. Consider consolidating this and stop on 185th with a single stop on the NW corner of TV Hwy & 185th. That way bus could move through intersection, stop, and not have to wait through another cycle of the light.
 - TV Hwy & 185th: This is the first of 4 major intersections that present the biggest barrier to the attractiveness, convenience, and competitiveness of

transit. Any improvement that can move the bus through the intersection faster should be considered. While I could fantasize about a reserved bus lane through these major intersections, it might be more realistic to think about 3 obvious improvements:

- "Right-turn-only, except bus" lanes - get the bus up to the light (if you need an example, there's one on Barbur & Terwilliger in Portland)
 - Move bus stops to far side of intersection - so that bus is not waiting through an additional cycle of the light after picking up/discharging.
 - Consider giving buses signal priority
-
- TV Hwy & 185th: Obviously: no bike lanes on 185th approaching TV Hwy - difficult to safely reach transit stops & shopping destinations on a bike.
 - TV Hwy & 178th: Bike parking north of Hwy would combine well with improved crossing! As above - before closing off informal pedestrian access from the south, look at how conflicts between RR infrastructure and ped access to transit are handled in older, east-coast cities, where pedestrian/transit mobility and RR infrastructure have long coexisted.
 - TV Hwy & 170th, TV Hwy & Millikan: See notes above on TV Hwy & 185th - need to move the bus through the intersection. Location of existing stops on far side of intersection w/ 170th **does** make a difference compared to 185th. That said - the problems at 185th & Murray are another order of magnitude compared to these intersections.
 - TV Hwy & Murray: See notes above on TV Hwy & 185th. Murray & 185th usually compete for longest time for bus to get through the intersection.
 - TV Hwy & Murray: Poor/unsafe bike facilities on Murray.
 - TV Hwy & 142nd: Ill-sheltered, unsafe bus stop on south side of hwy. Obvious need for pedestrian crossing improvement, bus shelter, possibility for bike parking facility, maybe south of RR, since I'm guessing this stop primarily serves business and residential destinations to the south.

D. Plans and Policy Executive Summary

Steve Larrance

Email November 29, 2011 (hand delivered post-CAC meeting)

- Alternative Mobility standards: Draft policy changes include replacing "mobility standards" with "mobility targets." This sounds to me that what is being proposed is replacing our existing system of "level of service standards" levels A through F. Condition F is failure which is currently deemed acceptable for multiple hours during pm peak use period. So presumably the new target system would not mention failure. As a former elected official I do realize how difficult it is to speak in public about allowing failure but I also think it is important to retain the existing system so the public and our elected officials are constantly reminded of what we are purposefully throwing away by neglecting our largest public investment, the road system.

E. Redevelopment

Rick Van Beveren

Email, December 01, 2011

- As a (small scale) business owner, developer and owner and manager of commercial properties in the vicinity of TV Highway and Cornelius Pass Road (Reedville Café, Catering, Center and Reedville Crossing) I am painfully aware of the challenges associated with running successful small retail businesses on the TV Highway corridor and aggregating small parcels for neighborhood scale retail development. Yet I believe redevelopment is ultimately the best way to consolidate access points and preserve capacity while meeting other community objectives of enhanced livability, density, economic prosperity and aesthetics.
- It is difficult to balance the sometimes competing objectives of preserving through capacity and enhancing safety with community redevelopment. If access and visibility to arterial traffic is too restrictive and/or costly and inconvenient, businesses fail. If access points are too numerous, safety is compromised and through capacity is undermined. Obviously future driveway accesses that serve individual business should be granted or preserved only when reasonable options for joint access with others are exhausted.
- I do believe the businesses and property owners along TV Highway should recognize their role and responsibility in enhancing the corridor...with appropriate and thoughtful maintenance of driveways, sidewalks, bus stops, parking lots, landscaping, signage(particularly on the street) and buildings. This might be accomplished through stronger code enforcement, higher articulated community standards and possible incentives. It is also obviously in the property and business owners' economic interest to maintain their premises.

E. Access to Transit

Rick Van Beveren

Email, December 01, 2011

- Transit is one key to the continued functioning and future performance of the reclassified arterial. The corridor really needs to be upgraded with respect to safe and convenient pedestrian access to transit (for the foreseeable future, bus stops).
- As TriMet Board President, I have had an opportunity to discuss some of the more challenging aspects of accessing bus stops on TV Highway this with TriMet management. The TAC member from TriMet, I am certain, can inform the design of pedestrian routes to bus stops including sidewalks and safe crossing of the rail line. A number of innovative pedestrian crossings of rail lines have been tested on MAX lines (and in ODOT rail right of way) and depending on the specific use and geography of locations, appropriate design can be used to make crossings safer. The

challenge for all would be identifying priority routes and crossings and finding the resources to accomplish this task, given current fiscal constraints.

- De-conflicting vehicle, transit, pedestrian and bicycles modes as much as possible would serve to make the corridor safer. Improving smaller parallel arterials (e.g. Johnson, Alexander, Shaw and Blanton) with sidewalks and bike paths with connections to TV Highway would give options to those with local trips (who constituted the majority of users, apparently) and enhance safety measurably. Dedicated bus lanes or BRT options are probably impractical on a five lane facility, at least for the foreseeable future but some other measures like those listed above and ITS may help buses move through the area more safely and efficiently.