



Meeting Summary

185th (TV Hwy to Kinnaman) Project

Project Focus Group

3rd Meeting Thursday, May 15, 2008 5:30-7:30 p.m.

Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue Office, Classroom #1
20665 SW Blanton St., Aloha, OR 97007

Meeting started approximately 5:30 pm

Sign-in sheet circulated. Attendees:

MEMBERS	✓ Present - Not present
Arguello, Andy	-
Childs, Matt	-
Clark, Tim	✓
Garcia, Liles	✓
Horowitz, Ralph	✓
Brady, Matt (for Kayfes, Randy)	✓
Kleier, Debbie	✓
Massingill, Chris	-
Nevills, David	✓
Norberg, Mark	✓
Pump, David	-
Raetz, Rick	✓
Renfro, Jerry	-
Sinclair, Jennifer	✓
Springer, Tammy	-
Welte, Peter	-

STAFF
Bauer, Wayne (WHP Project Manager)
Egan, Christine (JLA)
Oakes, Pat (County CPM Project Manager)
Rehms, Ken (WHP)
Wilson, Jan (County CPM Admin Specialist II)
Joe Younkings (County CPM Interim Division Manager)
OTHER
Rex Nere (Public)
Peter Lunsford (Public)
Randy Kayfes (attended only first part of the meeting)

Introductory Comments

Pat opened the meeting with Introductory comments:

- Because of the nature of this meeting, Pat indicated his intent to tape record the meeting to aid in later transcribing of the meeting Summary. The tape would later be recorded over with other future County meetings. There were no objections to tape recording the meeting.
- Schedule Update: no change from last meeting. Realistically the County is looking at 2010 for the main construction. There could be a possible early bid let late Spring 2009 with some preliminary/early work Summer 2009. If the project design development can keep pace for a Spring 2009 bid, there is a small chance that we could be put in line for Summer 2009 primary construction.
- Reminder: Ultimate project design alignment decision is the County's responsibility. Managers with subject matter expertise are continually updated regarding project design development. Ultimately, combining that expertise and input, the County Engineer makes

Meeting Summary

185th (TV Hwy to Kinnaman) Project

Project Focus Group

3rd Meeting Thursday, May 15, 2008 5:30-7:30 p.m.

Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue Office, Classroom #1
20665 SW Blanton St., Aloha, OR 97007

the final call. The County Engineer continues to be involved in reviewing the design details for consistency with County standards.

- Ultimate goal of this meeting: alternative evaluation matrix completion and alignment choice input from PFG
- In the next couple of weeks, staff recommendation along with PFG input will be presented to the County Engineer for a decision.

Attendees made individual introductions to the group.

Public Comment

Peter Lunsford - Peter introduced himself as being from "Washington County Peak Oil". He stated this project is a "very, very bad idea." He explained that the global supply of oil will diminish drastically within 10 years. That shortage will significantly affect gas and property tax revenues and cost of asphalt. Asked that if the project had to proceed to consider only improvements related to bus pullouts, bike paths and large sidewalks for use by non-vehicle means. He asked to delay a project decision for three years when everyone could see the impacts that their organization is predicting.

Review/Acceptance of 2nd PFG Meeting Summary

By consensus the group agreed that approval of the 2nd PFG meeting Summary be delayed until the next PFG meeting as advance draft copies were not received by at least 2 members (Ralph H. and David N.). Copies were provided to them for review.

Discussion and Completion of Alternatives Comparison Matrix

Christine reviewed intended flow of this evening's meeting:

- Wayne to review updates to the matrix and provide needed clarifications
- Matrix scoring procedures
- Identification of benefits and issues for the alignment options
- Additional concerns will be noted
- Recap above
- Review the 5 lane option

Meeting Summary

185th (TV Hwy to Kinnaman) Project

Project Focus Group

3rd Meeting Thursday, May 15, 2008 5:30-7:30 p.m.

Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue Office, Classroom #1

20665 SW Blanton St., Aloha, OR 97007

Added clarification from prior meeting Summary

Alignment options being considered include the following:

Interim 3-lane roadway primarily on the West side of the right-of-way titled, "**3W Alignment**"

Interim 3-lane roadway primarily on the East side of the right-of-way titled, "**3E Alignment**"

Full 5-lane roadway centered in the existing right-of-way titled, "**5F Alignment**"

From the last meeting Wayne reviewed the matrix that was presented and updates that have been added since. Updates include:

- Added numbers for estimated costs (right-of-way acquisition and construction), utilities, earthwork, trees impacts, wetland areas impacted, easement costs, driveways and property access.
- Explanation of the separation of the 3W and 3E alignment options from the 5F alignment option. The 5F alignment is not within either the project budget or scope limitations, so cannot be included in the initial review. The initial review and evaluation will be on the 3 lane alignment options. The 5F alignment option will then be considered when the assumption of the scope and funding limitation has been removed.
- Truck mobility category was added.
- Traffic Access and Safety separated into different sub-categories

After members reviewed the updated matrix, member questions included:

Liles G. - Asked if the older horse-shoe driveway residence next to the funeral home was a historic property or not.

Response: Staff has not yet completed a review of state records due to availability of those documents.

Rex N. - Is there any size limit of trucks when considering truck mobility?

Response: Only limitation is what is legally allowed on the road by state law. 185th is identified as a truck mobility corridor.

Wayne and Ken reviewed coding and numbers used under the Driveway/Property Access sub-category. This line addresses property access impacts resulting from the project work. The explanation of the coding is at the bottom of the matrix in the legend. Identified that driveway impacts were based on the criteria of a 20-foot setback from the back of sidewalk.

Ralph H. - Regarding the driveway/property access, he noted that the totals for 3W and 3E entries did not total the 5F entry.

Meeting Summary

185th (TV Hwy to Kinnaman) Project

Project Focus Group

3rd Meeting Thursday, May 15, 2008 5:30-7:30 p.m.

Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue Office, Classroom #1

20665 SW Blanton St., Aloha, OR 97007

Response: Wayne agreed and clarified that there one driveway that is impacted with all three alignment options causing that to appear as mathematically incorrect. This also happens in calculating the number of utility poles impacted along the roadway.

David N. - What about properties that lose area due to right-of-way acquisition and subsequently do not meet minimum land use area requirements for zoning?

Response: Staff clarified that a lot under the 8500 square feet (SF) minimum caused by the right-of way acquisition would be allowed a land use variance for lot development based on past County practice. This excludes actions by the owner at his own discretion (i.e. sub-dividing a lot into sub-standard lots). Ken said there are six lots in the project area currently under 8500 SF. Ken subsequently clarified variances are allowed by the County if a County action caused a lot to be reduced to a sub-standard size. If the parcel was sub-standard size prior to the right-of-way action, the owner still has the burden of variance justification for developing the sub-standard parcel.

Pat reviewed information provided at the last meeting regarding alternate mechanisms for consideration of project impacts on individual properties. The list included seven procedures for review, identification, mitigation or compensation of individual items that an alignment choice may not specifically address. He mentioned this with the hope that the group's matrix evaluation would focus on overall evaluation and comparison of alignment options comparison rather than individual owners' concerns that might be addressed in other ways.

Wayne provided copies of a summary of the project team's initial ranking of the evaluation categories. The rankings reflected the project team's experience using similar matrices and input previously gathered from the general public and the PFG. This matrix is meant to be a possible starting point for the PFG to evaluate the three options. It is expected that many of the categories will not be controversial and that the group's discussion will focus on a few categories where evaluations might differ.

Wayne reviewed various categories and how they were evaluated using the "Preferred", "Acceptable" or "Neutral" ratings. He clarified that members can chose to modify ratings if they reach different conclusions.

Member questions:

David N. - Many of the staff initial evaluations did not favor one alignment.

Meeting Summary

185th (TV Hwy to Kinnaman) Project

Project Focus Group

3rd Meeting Thursday, May 15, 2008 5:30-7:30 p.m.

Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue Office, Classroom #1

20665 SW Blanton St., Aloha, OR 97007

Response: That is correct. Various categories had numbers that were relatively close to each other or really had no effective difference between the alignment options.

Mark N. - When will the 5F alignment be considered?

Response: It will be discussed toward the end of the meeting after the 3E and 3W alternatives are evaluated.

Pat took an opportunity to introduce Joe Younkins who was in the back of room. Joe is the Interim Division Manager for Capital Project Management.

Mark N. - How are easement areas and cost determined? They are much smaller than right-of-way acquisitions.

Response: The process of determining temporary construction easements and slope easements was reviewed. These are determined by grading behind the sidewalks.

Several members asked questions and made comments among themselves regarding bike impacts. General consensus was that bike requirements were met with all alignments.

David N. - There might be slightly increased impacts on the 3E option considering that there are more driveways for bikers to cross over as they move along the roadway.

Tim C. - Asked about sidewalks that were straight on one side and weaved around on the other side.

Response: On the interim side of the roadway for both of the 3 lane alignments, the bike paths and sidewalks were placed to avoid existing drainage, trees, etc. to avoid undue impacts where possible.

Mark N. - Asked about drainage impacts to bikers. Where would drainage (catch basins) be placed?

Response: Ken reviewed design considerations for curb drainage inlets design to handle accumulated roadway drainage. The inlets do have grates in the street.

Ralph H. - Commented that the West side has more businesses. How is that taken into consideration?

Meeting Summary

185th (TV Hwy to Kinnaman) Project

Project Focus Group

3rd Meeting Thursday, May 15, 2008 5:30-7:30 p.m.

Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue Office, Classroom #1

20665 SW Blanton St., Aloha, OR 97007

Response: Wayne explained that the entire corridor is zoned Commercial Office. As current and future owners make decisions regarding their properties, it is very hard to evaluate now what those decisions will be. This was a tough category to evaluate. Additionally, there was a category added under the Community Involvement regarding Business Organizations such as the Hillsboro Chamber. Neighborhood Organizations were potentially represented by CPO#6. It was agreed that there are business interests on the PFG and they can provide that feedback at this meeting.

David N. - Expressed concern about construction impacts to his business.

Jennifer S. - Commented that construction affects both sides of road.

Response: Wayne agreed that construction will have impacts. He reviewed construction staging to minimize or address those impacts.

David N. - Since there is likely to be more construction on one side, he would favor construction on the other side.

Rick R. - Reviewed constraints and benefits of construction staging with 3 versus 5 lane construction. It is easier to stage construction of the 5 lane improvement.

Response: Ken added that an interim 3-lane construction inherently makes construction impacts long term (i.e. the 2nd final construction stage to build the 5 full lanes involve another completely independent and separate construction project thus prolonging construction impacts).

Ralph H. - Commented that "3 lanes down the middle" has been eliminated. That design could reduce some business impacts due to construction.

Response: The longer term Transportation Plan vision for 5 lanes was reviewed. The construction of a centered 3-lane project would be substantially more expensive considering what has to be torn out when the 5-lane final project is constructed.

Liles G. - Options involving the Aloha Post Office should be evaluated considering its influence in the project area.

Meeting Summary

185th (TV Hwy to Kinnaman) Project

Project Focus Group

3rd Meeting Thursday, May 15, 2008 5:30-7:30 p.m.

Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue Office, Classroom #1

20665 SW Blanton St., Aloha, OR 97007

Response: Staff clarified that previously the Post Office representative reported that his agency was reviewing options to coordinate possible post office building site work with the SW 185th project work. Consideration of the Blanton realignment in vicinity of the Post Office was beyond the scope of the current project consideration.

Rick R. - Commented that one of the goals of the meeting was also to collect or identify any "fatal flaws" that the County should be considering. County would like to avoid surprises later in the project.

Wayne summarized that there did not appear to be any significant differences of the group's input and evaluation from that which staff initially presented. Wayne proposed to move on to the Pros and Cons exercise for the two three lane options.

David N. - Asked about the redevelopment rating initially being proposed as Neutral for both alignment options.

Response: Wayne commented that during a prior project (170th Avenue), there was a substantial road realignment where various sub-standard lots were acquired and resold as groups and then redeveloped. This project has less dramatic right-of-way issues and the differences are less pronounced.

Christine explained the next exercise was to work through a Personal Preferences Discussion (i.e. what members think about the options). Christine asked members to write down on a piece of paper up to five benefits and five issues for either three lane option. Input would be accumulated or totaled with colored check marks on the front display chart.

Tim C. - There are zero negatives. He felt that 3W flows better (than 3E) at Post Office.

Debbie K. - She felt the Post Office access should be added as another category.

Response: The Post Office access was added to the matrix under Other.

Tim C. -
a. 3W provides uniform pedestrian safety for students
b. The meeting's initial public input (Peak Oil) seemed to implicitly endorse either of the 3 lane options (and not doing the 5 lane project)
c. Under redevelopment potential, he supported 3W as it would cause his side of the road to get finished with permanent improvements sooner than the other side.

Meeting Summary

185th (TV Hwy to Kinnaman) Project

Project Focus Group

3rd Meeting Thursday, May 15, 2008 5:30-7:30 p.m.

Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue Office, Classroom #1

20665 SW Blanton St., Aloha, OR 97007

- Dave N. -
- 3E is a plus due to possible negative impacts to businesses (including his) on the West side.
 - 3W is a plus because West has more redevelopment potential (lots are bigger).
 - 3E is a plus for driveway accesses.
- Matt B. - He mentioned that #1 concern is student safety.
- Response: Staff explained his issues were previously listed and discussed at the PFG's second meeting. In light of that, staff proposed that the specific concerns of the school district could be reviewed at the end of the meeting or at the next meeting for resolution of how they might be addressed
- Ralph H. -
- 3W is a minus for Driveway/Property Access (thus a plus for 3E).
 - 3W is minus for Side Street Access (thus a plus for 3E).
 - 3W is a minus for tree impacts (thus a plus for 3E).
 - 3W is a minus for Traffic Access (thus a plus for 3E) (i.e. related to PO access/usage).
- Jennifer S. -
- 3E is a plus for Side Street Access.
 - 3E is a plus for tree impacts.
 - 3E is a plus for wetlands impacts.
 - 3E is a plus for fewer driveway impacts.
 - 3E is a minus for Construction Costs.
- Liles G. -
- 3E is a plus for tree impacts (thus a minus for 3W).
 - 3W is a plus for Construction Costs (thus a minus for 3E).
 - 3W is a plus for right-of-way costs (thus a minus for 3E).
- Rex N. - Was not sure if he could add to the evaluation. Group did not have a major concern if Rex (as a public, non-member) participated. Staff agreed to mark his chart input with a circle to differentiate his input from PFG members.
- 3W is a plus for Utilities (thus a minus for 3E).
 - 3W is a plus for Traffic Capacity (thus a minus for 3E).
 - 3W is a plus for Hydrology/Drainage (thus a minus for 3E).
 - 3W is a plus for Construction Costs (thus a minus for 3E).
- Debbie K. -
- 3E is a plus for Easement costs (thus a minus for 3W).
 - 3W is a plus for Construction Costs (thus a minus for 3E).
- Mark N. - With regards to bike access and safety, either alignment option was a wash from his perspective.

Meeting Summary

185th (TV Hwy to Kinnaman) Project

Project Focus Group

3rd Meeting Thursday, May 15, 2008 5:30-7:30 p.m.

Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue Office, Classroom #1

20665 SW Blanton St., Aloha, OR 97007

Matt B. - The school is interested in permanent sidewalks being installed. Because there are 5 lane improvements proposed in the vicinity of the high school, his preference was neutral since all options include adding sidewalks on both sides.

Mark N. - He amended his input adding the following:
a. 3W is a plus for Construction Cost (thus a minus for 3E).
b. 3E is a plus for wetlands impacts (thus a minus for 3W).
c. 3E is a plus for trees impacted (thus a minus for 3W).

Wayne totaled total green (plus) and red (minus) check marks for each alignment option to visually compare and contrast the PFG's evaluation. Summary of marks:

	3W Alignment	3E Alignment
Green checks	11	13
Red checks	7	5

* Above includes public comment (Rex N.)

Jennifer S. - Commented that categories have different weights and are not all equal as the simple addition of check marks would imply.

Response: Staff acknowledged this. This matrix drill is meant to be an indicator to hopefully identify differences between the alignment options.

Wayne asked for a room vote by raised hands on alignment preference. Result:

3E Option: 4 votes in favor

3W Option: 3 votes (+ 1 non-member vote [Rex N.]

Christine reviewed Informed Consensus. This is a concept of everyone working together to find a choice that everyone can live with.

Christine asked members who voted in favor of the 3W alignment to articulate some of their reasons for preferring one over the other:

Debbie K. - 3W has slightly less impact to her property.

Tim C. - 3W causes improvements to be constructed on the side of the road near his property first so that his family can use them sooner.

Liles G. - 3E has smaller lots on the East side thus project impacts will be greater to those parcels. 3W has less [negative] impacts to the parcels.

Meeting Summary

185th (TV Hwy to Kinnaman) Project

Project Focus Group

3rd Meeting Thursday, May 15, 2008 5:30-7:30 p.m.

Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue Office, Classroom #1

20665 SW Blanton St., Aloha, OR 97007

Jennifer S. - At the last meeting, she originally thought 3W was the best choice. After reviewing diagrams and how traffic would be impacted, she realized the better improvements for all modes would be the 3E alignment option. She further commented that of the side streets affected, the 3E causes all three of the middle side street intersections to get some improvements. 3W only causes two intersections to be improved (Vincent and Pike).

Wayne commented that he saw a slight group preference for the 3E alignment. Pat summarized that it was apparent that the two alignment choices were fairly balanced with no noted critical flaws, and that the PFG had a slight preference for the 3E alignment.

Attendees agreed to continue the meeting past 7:30 pm for another ten minutes to review inclusion of the 5 lane alignment option in the review.

Matt B. - He commented that the school is opposed to the 5 lane option as that means longer crosswalks. The school district tries to provide crosswalk guards to longer crossing; however, high school students often avoid guarded crossings thus creating a more unsafe crossing situation. If 5 lanes were chosen the district would probably launch a formal protest.

Response: Staff provided clarification that all three alignment options include 5 lane improvements on 185th at the Kinnaman intersection. Matt acknowledged that he was aware of that.

Note: In a subsequent email communication from Randy Kayfes at the Beaverton School District, he clarified that Matt's above comment was in error and was the result of a miscommunication between himself and Matt. Randy indicated that the District has no plans to protest. PO
--

Wayne reviewed the matrix again with the 5F alignment option included (i.e. no limitation on scope and funding).

Time C. - Tim asked about past references to an Aloha Town Center.

Rex N. - Explained that at TV Hwy there is a Town Center designation and that this look and feel should extend south down 185th Avenue. He felt all overhead utilities should be put underground.

Response: Staff explained that there is a large added cost to underground utilities. Pat clarified that the cost of burying utilities would not be a direct project cost. Cost for underground utilities is borne by others (typically the utility companies themselves).

Meeting Summary

185th (TV Hwy to Kinnaman) Project

Project Focus Group

3rd Meeting Thursday, May 15, 2008 5:30-7:30 p.m.

Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue Office, Classroom #1

20665 SW Blanton St., Aloha, OR 97007

Debbie K. - She commented that if a 5F option were guaranteed to happen in the future, she preferred to get that work over with.

David N. - 5 lanes is coming and acknowledged it will be difficult.

Ralph H. - If the full project does not happen, constructing down the middle of the existing right-of-way makes most sense and minimizes impacts. He said staff has refused that option.

Response: As previously explained, they noted not considering the construction of a 3 lane section down the middle of the existing right-of-way is considered the most economical use of public money to avoid "throwing away money."

Rick R. - He commented that the County's Transportation Plan ultimately calls for the 5F option long term. He reviewed that implementation of the Transportation Plan is not a "pick and choose" option. It is part of a long term, integrated plan. He cited examples on Saltzman and Bethany where less than full Transportation Plan improvements were constructed. Local residents at those sites are now furious about the impacts of those less-than-complete improvements (i.e. traffic cutting through neighborhoods, parking cars across the street, etc.).

Debbie K. - Asked about net cost of doing 5 full lanes all at once versus 3 lanes in two phases.

Response: Wayne said the cost would increase by \$1 million or more if done in two phases due to additional work and inflation.

Liles G. - Commented that the project is 5 lanes at the high school and at the Post Office. He said it was not that much additional cost to build to a 5 lane section for the entire project area. Doing it all now is a good idea.

Rex N. - Doing the 5F alignment option now is better economically.

Wayne collected a member group vote regarding inclusion of the 5 lane option with the other 3 lane options:

5 lanes: 5 votes in favor

3 lanes: 3 votes in favor

Meeting Summary

185th (TV Hwy to Kinnaman) Project

Project Focus Group

3rd Meeting Thursday, May 15, 2008 5:30-7:30 p.m.

Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue Office, Classroom #1
20665 SW Blanton St., Aloha, OR 97007

Next Steps

Pat reviewed the next steps for the next PFG meeting:

- After this meeting, the Project Management Team (PMT) will present the County Engineer with staff and PFG input regarding an alignment decision.
- PMT will proceed with final design development for ultimate construction in 2009 or 2010.
- County Project Manager will present the alignment selection at the fourth PFG meeting on July 10, 2008.
- Answer questions.
- Collect input.
- Prepare for open house.

Schedule next meeting

Next meeting will be July 10, 2008, 5:30-7:30pm at the Aloha High School Faculty Room.

Tim C. asked if staff was planning to collect informal preferences from those PFG members who were not at tonight's meeting, and share that feedback with the entire Group. The response was that they will be asked to provide their input, but that missing the meeting not allow including their preferences in alternative evaluation process.

Public Comment

None

Meeting concluded at approximately 7:45 pm. Various PFG members remained after the meeting to talk with PMT staff. The last PFG members departed at 8:15 pm.

Meeting summary consolidated/drafted by Pat Oakes, PM.