

Murray Boulevard Improvement Project Highway 26 to Cornell Road

SWG MEETING NOTES

MEETING # 1

DATE: March 1, 2007

TIME: 5:00 to 7:30 p.m.

LOCATION:

Village Baptist Church
300 SW Murray Blvd.
Beaverton, OR 97005

IN ATTENDANCE:

SWG MEMBERS

Virginia Bruce
Martha Moyer
Hal Ballard
Sheila Hobernicht
Elaine Ledbetter
John Ragno
Martha Heilman
Mary Gingell
Terry Tobin
Xander Smit
Mike Appel
Rick Edmonds
Jerry Renfro
Laura Kelly
Jerry Green

**PROJECT MANAGEMENT TEAM
(PMT)**

Alex Sander, Washington County
Tony Roos, WRG Design
Susan Davis, WRG Design

STAFF

Kristi Crippen, WRG Design
Corey McManus, WRG Design
Jan Wilson, Washington County

**MATERIALS SENT
PRIOR TO MEETING:**

Welcome Memorandum
Agenda #1
Open House Summary
Draft Ground Rules
Draft Roles and Responsibilities
MSTIP Flyers

**MATERIALS PROVIDED
AT MEETING:**

Project Binder
Draft SWG & PMT Contact Information
Exhibits

- Project "Givens" and Design Criteria
- County's Typical Section
- Existing Conditions Roll Plot
- Project Schedule
- Project Process

Notes

AGENDA ITEM #1: WELCOME

Susan Davis welcomed Stakeholders Working Group (SWG) members to the meeting and thanked them for their willingness to serve on the committee and let them know it was appreciated.

AGENDA ITEM # 2: INTRODUCTIONS

Everyone present introduced themselves and provided some background about their interest in the project.

AGENDA ITEM # 3: REVIEW OF AGENDA

Susan Davis reviewed the agenda for the evening and went over the purpose of the first meeting, which was to orient SWG members to the project and brainstorm project issues.

AGENDA ITEM # 4: REVIEW OF PROJECT NOTEBOOK

Susan reviewed the notebooks distributed to the SWG members. The notebooks contained the following information:

- Project “Givens” and Design Criteria
- Existing Conditions – NW Cornell Road/Murray Boulevard
- Open House Summary
- Project Limits Map
- Citizen Participation Organization (CPO) Map
- City/County Boundary Map
- 2020 Washington County Transportation Plan Maps
- Cedar Mill West Community Plan
- County’s Typical Section
- Transportation Planning – Programming-Project Implementation Processes
- Public Involvement Ordinance
- Project Schedule
- Project Process

AGENDA ITEM # 5: PROJECT OVERVIEW

Background and Scope. Alex Sander provided background on MSTIP, which is also included in the project notebooks. He emphasized that MSTIP funds can only be used for a defined set of improvements. He reviewed the scope of the project for the Murray Boulevard improvements, which includes five lanes with bike and pedestrian facilities. As identified in the 2020 Transportation Plan Classifications, Murray Boulevard is a five-lane arterial. North of Cornell, Murray is a two-lane neighborhood route, with needed lanes at the intersection of Murray and Cornell. The configuration of intersection is dependent on the traffic report which the group will go over at the next meeting. Alex reported that the open house held in November of 2006 provided background on the project and provided an opportunity for those that were interested to apply to be on the SWG. A summary of the Open House was included in the SWG Notebooks and the SWG members were encouraged to read the summary on their own, so they could become familiar with the issues raised by the public so far.

Project Process and Schedule. Susan Davis described the public involvement process for the SWG, and the approximate schedule. She referred to two handouts that were included in the SWG notebooks that illustrate the process and schedule for this project. Poster sized exhibits of these handouts were also presented.

While reviewing the schedule Jerry Green asked about the City of Beaverton land use process and how those would fit into the project. Susan Davis responded that land use processes would begin at the start of final design. Laura Kelly, a SWG member representing the City of Beaverton, stated she could help answer questions regarding the process and timing of City of Beaverton land use applications. Alex Sander mentioned that the project will need to go through the County's land use process as well.

Hal Ballard mentioned that the schedule provided only went through the Fall of 2008 and asked if the project would be done at that time. Tony Roos stated that the construction schedule depends on design and could be longer or shorter than shown. He doesn't believe the project to be overly lengthy as it is fairly straight forward. He also offered to supply an itemized schedule showing each step in detail if requested.

AGENDA ITEM # 6: SWG PROTOCOLS

The Project Management Team (PMT) provided posters with examples of ground rules and roles and responsibilities used by previous project committees. Susan Davis lead the group through an exercise designed to help the SWG generate ground rules. The activity was broken up into two general categories; Ground Rules and Roles and Responsibilities.

Ground Rules. There was general consensus among SWG members that the ground rules listed on the poster were appropriate for this SWG. Jerry Green recommended adding a rule asking that people do not carry on side conversations during the meeting and also asked the PMT to provide meeting materials no less than one (1) week prior to SWG meetings to give the SWG members time to review.

Virginia Bruce asked that everyone speak loudly and clearly.

Hal Ballard asked that instead of raising hands that people turn their place cards over when they wish to speak. Susan Davis led the SWG members in a discussion regarding the amount of public comment time at each meeting. The SWG came to the conclusion that public comment time would be limited to a total of ten minutes and each individual would be limited to two minutes and would be conducted at the end of each SWG Meeting.

Martha Moyer asked how the SWG meetings would be announced and if they would be published on the website. Jerry Green was concerned with the scheduling and wanted to know if the meetings would be on a regular monthly schedule so they could be published by the CPO. Susan Davis responded that the scheduling of the next meeting would be discussed at the end of the current meeting.

The group also discussed if written comments by the public were acceptable and Hal Ballard suggested adding a comment box and forms at each SWG meeting. The SWG agreed to make all the additions.

- Respect the views of others
- Concentrate on issues, not personalities
- Treat others as you would like to be treated
- Listen carefully with the intent of understanding
- Don't interrupt others
- Don't have side conversations
- Don't dominate the discussion; let others present their views

- State your issues honestly and clearly as early in the process as possible
- Be constructive and provide positive ideas or alternatives
- Read materials in advance and be prepared for discussions.
- Commit to attend all meetings and participate fully
- Have a meeting agenda and start and end the meetings on time.
- Ask questions if you are confused.
- Place cell phones and pagers on silent mode.
- Leave the room if you need to answer or make a phone call.
- Provide public comment time at the beginning of each meeting. (Limit to ten minutes total, two minutes per each individual.)
- Speak loudly and clearly.
- Have written public comment cards available to public.

Roles and Responsibilities. Susan Davis presented the draft Roles and Responsibilities and asked for feedback from the SWG. At this time SWG members were also encouraged to report back to their constituents (organizations, neighbors, co-workers) and make an effort to represent them at the SWG meetings. SWG members were advised that although they are welcome to share individual views with the media, it is appropriate to defer to the PMT team in situations where it is necessary to represent the position of the SWG as a whole.

Susan Davis informed the SWG that the meeting minutes would be compiled and sent to the group prior to posting them on the County website so that the SWG has time to review and make changes prior. Susan then asked SWG members how they would like to handle a scenario where a SWG member were unable to attend a meeting. The SWG agreed not to allow replacements if a SWG member is absent. During this discussion it was brought up that if any SWG member had out of town travel planned to let the PMT know. The SWG also asked the PMT to let them know if there would be an upcoming vote at the next meeting.

Alex Sander reviewed the County's decision to change the name of public involvement committees from Project Advisory Committee (PAC) to Stakeholders Working Group (SWG).

There was general consensus of the roles and responsibilities listed on the poster.

Stakeholders Working Group

- Represent their organizations interests and perspectives by reporting back to organizations (where applicable)
- Review materials provided by the PMT
- Actively participate and strive to attend all meetings
- Endeavor to have no surprises. Communicate all relevant information at the SWG meetings or through the PMT between meetings
- Advise Washington County regarding identified project issues (where applicable)
- Let PMT know of planned out of town travel
- Comments to press not on behalf of entire SWG

Project Management Team

- Define project scope and parameters;
- Manage scope, schedule and budget
- Set agendas for meetings and run meetings efficiently
- Provide meeting summaries
- Provide information to the SWG for consideration and evaluation

- PMT to provide SWG Members with materials no less than one (1) week prior to meeting.
- Point of contact for media and elected officials
- Implement SWG recommendations where feasible
- Inform group if they will be voting ahead of time

AGENDA ITEM #7: PROJECT “GIVENS”

Tony Roos, Project Engineer with WRG Design, presented the Project “Givens” and Design Criteria which was included within the SWG project notebook and was presented as a poster-size exhibit. He described the existing conditions, referring to a full size roll plot showing the project limits on both Murray Boulevard and NW Cornell Road. The roll plots illustrated the existing right-of-way, businesses, power poles, utilities, travel lanes, bike lanes and landscaping. He presented a poster size exhibit of the Washington County 5-lane Typical Cross Section and mentioned that it was also included in the SWG project notebook. Tony explained that alignment and tapering of the improvements were dependent on the traffic study and other consultant studies.

Terry Tobin asked if the 98-foot right-of-way shown in the Washington County Typical Section was mandated. Tony responded that is a given therefore that is where he will start with design to find what will work.

Susan Davis pointed out that 10-foot sidewalks are required per the Cedar Mill West Community Plan which is considered an overlay zone and therefore it supersedes the Engineering Design Standards

Hal Ballard asked whether the City of Beaverton standard 5-foot bike lane would apply or if the Washington County standard 6-foot bike lane would apply to this project. Tony Roos responded that the County standard would be the starting point for design. Alex Sander stated that 5-foot bike lanes would be acceptable to the County if right of way necessary for the project is tight.

Mary Gingell asked about crosswalk standards and who or what determines the location of crosswalks. Tony Roos responded that the crosswalks will be at the intersection and there will not be any mid-block crosswalks on this project.

Virginia Bruce commented on the nice light poles that were used on a previous MSTIP project (Cornell Road, Saltzman to Murray) that are set up for hanging flower baskets and asked if that is a possibility for the Murray Boulevard improvements. Tony stated that the light poles have not been decided on and that is an item for SWG input. Alex Sander added that the County standard for road improvements are 35-foot high cobra head lights. Virginia then stated that light pollution is a concern. Martha Moyer responded that Acorn lighting can be night sky friendly with a cover and that light pollution is a real issue north of Highway 26.

Mike Appel asked about sidewalk design and if there would be sidewalk on the east side of Murray Boulevard heading into the adjoining neighborhood north of the Murray Boulevard/Cornell Road intersection. Tony Roos responded that there would be a sidewalk in that location.

Jerry Green asked about project limits and the possibility of changing the school zone signage around Sunset High School. He stated that he felt the existing signing was not adequate. To facilitate traffic flow he suggested removing the current 7 a.m. to 5 p.m. 20 mile per hour speed signs and replacing it with a flashing light radar speed sign keeping the 20 mile per hour limits during certain time frames versus all day.

Hal Ballard asked about the Cedar Hill West Community Plan documentation and what effects it would have on the project. Susan Davis informed the SWG that the Cedar Hill West Community Plan excerpt is an item that was included in the SWG project notebook.

Jerry Renfro asked about the median location and type. Tony Roos responded that there may be mountable medians used in the design to mitigate access management.

Jerry Green commented on the County Design Standard requiring access spacing within 1,000 feet of an intersection. Tony Roos responded that recommendations can be made to the County. Jerry felt that was not much flexibility given on access spacing standards. Alex Sander stated that the County will typically combine a driveway but can not eliminate access to a property unless the entire property is purchased by the County.

Hal Ballard asked about the involvement of ODOT on the improvements that are within 1,300 feet of Highway 26. Tony Roos responded that ODOT will have a small involvement in the project but that no permits will be needed from ODOT.

Jerry Renfro asked about the access points to the existing Safeway shopping center at the northwest corner of the intersection and the possibility of closing the two accesses closest to the intersection. He added that emergency response time would be better at peak times with that change. Tony Roos responded that access issues would come into play at final design but to close two access points would most likely anger existing businesses.

Tony Roos went on to explain that with the road improvement work there will be upgrades to water, storm water and illumination. There will also be utility relocation. Alex Sander added that under grounding utilities is done at the utility's own cost. Jerry Green asked if the City of Beaverton requires under grounding utilities. Laura Kelly said that the City of Beaverton does not require this.

Jerry Green questioned an inter-tied signal system. Tony responded that the signals would be inter-tied, that the County now uses video detection versus loop detection.

Sheila Hobernicht commented that there are pedestrian "hot spots" at the intersection. She asked Jerry Renfro if he had access to any incident reports he could share with the SWG. Jerry responded that he could not share specifics but he could research the number of incidents. Corey McManus added that standard procedure of preparing a traffic study includes pedestrian accident data.

AGENDA ITEM #8: BRAINSTORM PROJECT ISSUES

Susan Davis guided the group through an issues brainstorming session. She asked the SWG members to express any issues, concerns, and questions about the project. Below is a summary of the issues:

- Landscaping and trees – how can SWG influence decisions?
- Cedar Mill "gateway" feature such as an entrance monument – consider one south of Science Park Drive
- Extend left turn lane heading south on Murray Boulevard with flashing left turn signal
- Continuity with previous improvements (Cornell/Barnes)
- Turn lane backs up heading north on Murray Boulevard turning westbound onto Cornell
- Tri-Met bus stop locations/spacing/shelters
- East of Murray Sunset Shopping Center ingress/egress
- Construction may cause traffic to divert to Dale, undeveloped area without sidewalks

- Construction will “train” traffic to cut through neighborhoods
- School traffic causing extra delays during construction – can construction be done in Summer?
- Can construction be scheduled at night as opposed to peak times?
- Access to businesses during construction
- Right of way acquisition – has it been determined yet?
- Define project limits north Murray Boulevard
- Define project limits on Cornell Road
- Home Depot access – will it change?
- Minimize impact to existing businesses
- Will Science Park Drive be extended?
- Signal light timing interconnected with existing signals?
- Will construction work in phases or all at one time?
- Would like bus turn outs or move stops away from intersection
- Buildings being affected by the construction – will they be remodeled or removed?
- Take out “bump” in Murray Boulevard

Susan Davis explained that the PMT would organize these issues and develop an evaluation matrix of issues that the SWG can use as a discussion tool at the next meeting.

Susan also mentioned that the PMT would send SWG members notes from this meeting and asked that SWG members review them and contact the PMT with any corrections.

AGENDA ITEM #9: SCHEDULE NEXT MEETING

Next Meeting Thursday April 5th from 5:00-7:00, the location will be confirmed at a later date.

Meeting Adjourned at 7:30