



## Technical Advisory Committee Meeting# 3 Meeting Summary

April 5, 2011

2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue North Operating Center  
20665 SW Blanton Street, Aloha 97007

### Committee Members Present

Marah Danielson, ODOT  
Bill Holmstrom, DLCD (for Anne Debaut)  
Heather McCarey, Westside Transp. Alliance  
Laura Kelly, City of Beaverton (for Margaret Middleton)  
Tom Mills, TriMet  
Josh Naramore, Metro  
Don Odermott, City of Hillsboro

Amanda Garcia-Snell, Wash. Co. (for Kathleen O’Leary)  
Shelley Oylear, Wash. Co.  
Cassandra Ulven, Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue

### Committee Members Absent

Hal Bergsma, Tualatin Hills Parks & Rec. Dist.  
Swede Hays, ODOT Rail  
Julie Webber, Wash. Co.  
Aisha Willits, Wash. Co. (also on PMT)

### Project Management Team and Staff

Geneva Hooten, David Evans and Associates, Inc. (Consultant Project Assistant)  
Scott Richman, David Evans and Associates, Inc. (Consultant PM)  
Jeannine Rustad, City of Hillsboro PM and PMT member  
Nate Scott, ODOT PM and PMT member

### Other Attendees

Jeff Bachrach  
Brad Choi and Doug Miller, City of Hillsboro  
Canh Lam, ODOT  
Robert McCracken and David Winship, City of Beaverton

#### Action Items for Project Team:

- Scott will send meeting notes to the TAC and CAC by Friday, April 6.
- Finalize Needs, Opportunities, and Constraints Report and distribute to the TAC

#### “Homework” for Committee Members

- Send Jeannine suggestions about how to best present the Solutions Development improvement concepts to Metro and City Councils, and Washington County Commissioners

## Welcome and Agenda Overview

Scott welcomed everyone to the meeting and reviewed the revised agenda that he distributed to the TAC via e-mail on April 3rd. Most of this meeting will consist of an interactive work session exercise as part of a process for each TAC member to see the full “menu” of improvement concepts in order to make a quick judgment about whether these concepts should or should not continue forward and be further refined in the process, or whether more discussion is needed for particular concepts. The

group will be split into small groups to go through each of the improvement concepts with staff members, reconvene as a group, and debrief the group's input.

General updates are as follows:

- An updated *Project Workplan* was provided. The TVCP is moving along and a transportation system solutions package is being developed (Task 4). The plan is for the TAC to meet one more time to provide input and recommendations on the draft TV Hwy Corridor Plan (TVCP).
- The CAC will be going through a similar solutions concepts input exercise as the TAC will experience today at their third meeting next Tuesday (April 10th).
- The PMT is working towards a public open house that will be held on Tuesday May 8<sup>th</sup> and the second Policy Group meeting (scheduled for Thursday, May 24<sup>th</sup>). Briefings with the cities of Beaverton and Hillsboro Councils, the Metro Council, and the Washington County Board of Commissioners have also been scheduled in advance of the next PG meeting.
- The end product will be a corridor plan that will be incorporated by amendment into the Regional Transportation Plan.

## **Review of the Needs, Opportunities, and Constraints Report**

The consultant team will incorporate the relevant input received thus-far on the *Needs, Opportunities, and Constraints Report*. Scott has provided the TAC with comments received to date, plus Shelly Oylear will provide comments she discussed with Scott prior to this meeting. The Needs, Opportunities, and Constraints Report in conjunction with the TVCP Goals and Objectives are being used to develop the initial solutions package.

Josh commented that the Report does not go into the same level of detail concerning safety concerns as the *Existing Conditions Report*. He suggested that the theme of safety could be better integrated throughout the *Needs, Opportunities, and Constraints Report*, and translated into the initial solutions concepts.

## **Solutions Development Evaluation Group Exercise**

Scott directed the group to the *Solutions Development Memo* (provided) and explained how the TAC's input will shape the Solutions Development process. Scott explained that the PMT attempted to group each of the initial improvement concepts listed in the three matrices provided in advance to the TAC into three planning priorities that are aligned with state and regional policy. The PMT has considered each of the concepts in relation to criteria (project objectives) and given a scoring about whether it best meets criteria (yellow), partially meets criteria (orange), conflicts with criteria (red), or is not applicable to the criteria (gray). In addition, the criteria were grouped into those that are most critical (must be addressed), critical, and values that the TVCP will strive to address.

The improvement concepts were identified from the public involvement process, stakeholders interviews and input, and technical experience and best practices. Definitions of each concept are provided in the *Draft Improvement Concept Descriptions* provided as a tool to the TAC members to facilitate their input. The group will be split into three groups that will go around the room to vet each of the improvement concepts. The PMT is looking for a consistent Yes or No recommendation from all three groups, but recognize that there still may be undecided or split results. Improvement

concepts that received a strong yes or no were categorized as such, while the remaining concepts need further discussion.

The group's comments are as follows:

- Laura asked about the priorities: In the *Solutions Development Memo* the Priority 1 is to include the existing system (on TV Hwy) while Priority 2 is to make improvements off of TV Hwy, although this is not translated into the Matrix.
  - Scott responded that the Memo's wording will need to be brought up to date to better reflect the broad definition of each priority.
- Tom asked if priority 1 is low hanging fruit. Which priorities have the most weight?
- Scott explained that the project team has an obligation to fulfill priority 1 (as explained in the regional plans and the Oregon Highway Plan) but we are aiming to reach a solutions package that will be a combination of improvement concepts from all three priorities (see Figure 1 in the *Solutions Development Memo*).
- Nate prompted the group to think of the time frame of improvement concept implementation: short, medium, long term.
- Public comment about impacts to the utilities. Water runs along TV Hwy so there are utility issues that conflict with some of these concepts. Whatever concepts are enacted will have a high cost impact on existing utilities.
- Scott responded that the prioritization of improvement concepts between now and 2035 will include the cost and impacts which will take into account such impacts to the utilities
- Josh asked for a draft of the timeline of improvement concepts (near-term, mid-term, long-term) once that is ready.
- Shelley asked about the alternative mobility standard. What is the timeline on this?
  - Mara explained that changes to the standard will happen hand in hand with this project.
- Group members expressed interest in seeing a visual for the grade-separated crossings of TV Hwy. How will bicycle and pedestrian facilities be handled? What about access to transit?

#### **Priority 1 Comments:**

- Change "Apply" to "Develop" alternative mobility standards for TV Hwy.
- The TAC participants unanimously support the signal prioritization for transit concept. This also benefits emergency services (change to "Transit and Emergency Vehicles"). Acknowledge direct relationship between signal prioritization for transit concept and enhance existing #57 bus service, plus enhance existing bus service (other routes) in TVCP area (i.e. not mutually exclusive).
- Clarify that enhance existing bus service applies only to current routes, but not #57 (that is stand-alone option) and could include increased frequency on North-South routes.
- Consider Express in addition to Frequent bus service on #57 route.
- Consider different transit vehicles (e.g. low-floor) and automated fare collection to expedite boarding/deboarding and avoid need to deploy lift mechanisms, plus smaller buses as appropriate to meet corresponding demand under enhance bus service options.
- Land use designations and associated code changes to desired development densities are also needed to achieve needed ridership to support and sustain enhanced transit service.
- ODOT will not implement signal optimization along TV Hwy. This concept needs to be vetted and clarified. The TAC participants had mixed support for this concept. Signal optimization in locations away from TV Hwy may be more viable.
- Unanimous support for Adaptive Signal Control, but do not limit to SCATS. Don Odermott mentioned more cost-effective system could be employed.

- Add “Alternative Signals” option to incorporate upgraded pedestrian signals that meet ADA requirements, including audible indicators and digital countdown.
- Could employer programs include provision of private ride-sharing service? Be more specific with this definition.
- TAC participants unanimously supported addition of way-finding signage for non-motorists, and there was a suggestion that this should be oriented to directing people to safe routes and crossings. Consider multi-lingual signage.
- The majority of TAC participants support upgrading lighting along TV Hwy. However, this needs to be defined more specifically. Consider that there are multiple tiers and types of lighting, including higher level illumination to improve visibility of the roadway, lighting at intersections, and pedestrian scale lighting focused at specific nodes (e.g. bus shelters).
- Who will pay for lighting? Where is it most needed? Also, need to account for operations and maintenance costs.
- Clarify the intended purpose of installing security cameras at bus stops (undecided support or not from the TAC on this option). These would have to be incorporated into shelters. We need to carefully consider costs vs. benefit. Security cameras have not been proven to be effective at reducing crime on transit vehicles or at transit stations.
- The majority of the TAC participants do not support addition of red light violation cameras. They a complex and controversial political issue, and may not be effective in their application within the TVCP area. Instead, most TAC participants voiced support for a different concept: “Automated Speed Enforcement” in targeted locations where excessive speeding degrades safety.
- Suggest adding variable speed signs.
- Provide more clear description of “real time traveler information”. It needs to be targeted to multiple users and modes, and describe the types of tools that it could include.
- Discourage large variable message signs that would further degrade already unattractive TV Hwy surroundings from an aesthetic standpoint.
- Clarify that Access Management through driveway consolidation would continue to be implemented as redevelopment occurs, and not as a project that would close driveways.
- Bundle overall transportation safety education with railroad safety education, and target to TV Hwy. Some questioned how effective rail safety education would be at reducing pedestrians trespassing and drivers encroaching onto RR track.
- The majority of TAC participants do not support using public funds to install secure fencing along the PNWR track between designated crossings. Less than one train per day operates on the line, and we need to work towards solutions that facilitate more safe access across the RR track. Consider this only if done concurrently with additional RR crossings.
- Do not limit the concept to “preserve a minimum one-mile length of future train storage track for PNWR” to the segment between 229<sup>th</sup> and 209<sup>th</sup>. There may be other locations near, but not directly within the TVCP area that could serve this purpose. The majority of TAC participants agreed that this is not as important as improving N-S connectivity. Consider comprehensive costs vs. benefits of preserving a one-mile segment.

### **Priority2 Comments:**

- Nate explained that each group grappled with the designation of various improvement concepts being labeled as priority 2. Some TAC members argued that specific improvement concepts should be moved to priority 1 or 3.
- Laura stated that she has an issue with Transit- and Pedestrian-Oriented Development if the incentive is included as part of the solutions package without the infrastructure improvements to back it up. How will this be addressed?
- Nate received questions from TAC members about raised medians. Do these raise speeds? Does increasing capacity at intersections raise vehicular speeds?

### Priority 3 Comments:

#### TRANSIT

- Add a Business-Access and Transit (BAT) lane on TV Hwy westbound
  - What about queue jumping?
  - Some were supportive of the BAT lane but not if it means a third lane
  - Will it be targeted
  - Wording should be changed to only be along parts of TV Hwy and just the North side
- Add new frequent bus service on parallel streets North and South of TV Hwy (e.g., Alexander, Blanton)
  - Not enough demand
  - Would this cut out #57 bus service?
  - The neighborhood streets would need considerable infrastructure improvements
- Implement fixed or flex guideway system such as Light Rail, streetcar, or Bus Rapid Transit
- Use existing RR Right-of-Way for commuter rail
  - TAC was split
  - Will commuter rail serve businesses/communities along TV Hwy?

#### MULTI-MODAL/OTHER

- (to be added) Overcrossings of the RR tracks (like the Fort Vancouver example)
- (to be added) Add Signalized mid-block crossings on TV Hwy
  - This should go with pedestrian refuges (P2)
- Add a cycle track on TV Hwy
  - Freight concerns
  - Will there be enough room at each intersection for turning?
  - Should be changed to be on South side only
- Transit and pedestrian-oriented development (market response)
  - Support depends on what sort of land-use and infrastructure changes are made
  - This should be moved to Priority 2
- Add undercrossing of RR tracks for pedestrians and bicyclists (between 209th and 160th)
  - Concern that this would be extremely costly and may not be safe for users
- Add a grade separated crossing at TV Hwy and Cornelius Pass Rd.
  - General comments about the grade-separated crossings include poor in-fill opportunities, bad environment for pedestrians, bifurcation of communities, etc.
  - What will this mean for bikes/peds?
- Add a grade separated crossing at TV Hwy and 185th
  - General comments about the grade-separated crossings include poor in-fill opportunities, bad environment for pedestrians, bifurcation of communities, etc.
  - What will this mean for bikes/peds?
- Add a grade separated crossing at TV Hwy and 170th
  - General comments about the grade-separated crossings include poor in-fill opportunities, bad environment for pedestrians, bifurcation of communities, etc.
  - What will this mean for bikes/peds?
- Add a grade separated crossing at TV Hwy and Murray Blvd.
  - General comments about the grade-separated crossings include poor in-fill opportunities, bad environment for pedestrians, bifurcation of communities, etc.
  - What will this mean for bikes/peds?
- Create a couplet between Cornelius Pass Rd. and 170th (makes Alexander one-way WB and Blanton one-way EB)

- Too disruptive to travel patterns with minimal benefit (nearly unanimous “No” from TAC)
- Improve existing east-west parallel routes for all modes
  - Favorable of more connections
- Develop new North-South arterial and collector links
  - Will these really be new? Or just enhanced?
  - Consensus that more connectivity is good
- Add a High-Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lane
  - Only effective with pricing preferences which would not work on TV Hwy
  - HOV is meant for a principal arterial
  - Insufficient demand
  - Difficult enough to enforce on actual freeways
  - No one seemed willing to give up a lane of traffic or willing to add another lane
- Relocate and cut/cover RR within TV Hwy median and use existing RR Right-of-Way for multi-modal use
  - Too expensive; not worth it

## **Review of Stakeholder Interviews**

---

Jeannine reviewed the summary of stakeholder interviews. There were sixteen citizens interviewed and their main interests include more frequent transit service, more vibrancy within the area, and greater safety and mobility. Seven businesses were interviewed and these stakeholders discussed pedestrian safety, the traffic issues, and difficulties in making left-hand turns. The freight stakeholders cited issues with movement and local delivery. The full report of the stakeholder interviews is forthcoming with several stakeholders still to be interviewed.

## **Next Steps and Adjourn**

---

- Jeannine asked the TAC for feedback on how to present this information to each of the City Councils. She is receptive to suggestions.
- Scott suggested that the PMT needs to discuss how best to take the input gathered at today’s meeting and transform it into the next steps for the project.
- A member of the PMT will send out draft meeting notes to the TAC and CAC by Friday, April 6.