

Murray Boulevard Improvement Project Highway 26 to Cornell Road

SWG MEETING NOTES

MEETING # 2

DATE: April 5, 2007

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

LOCATION:

Cedar Mill Community
Library
12505 NW Cornell Road
Portland, OR 97229

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

GUESTS

Wade Scarbrough, Kittleson & Associates
Matt Wiensfeld, Kittleson & Associates

**MATERIALS SENT
PRIOR TO MEETING:**

Agenda #2
Contact Information
Ground Rules
Roles and Responsibilities
Draft Traffic Study Executive Summary

**MATERIALS PROVIDED
AT MEETING:**

Existing & Recommended Lane Configurations
List of Pros & Cons
List of SWG Issues
Exhibits

- Existing & Recommended Lane Configurations
- List of Pros & Cons
- Cross Section Acetate
- Project "Givens" and Design Criteria
- County's Typical Section
- Project Schedule
- Project Process

Notes

AGENDA ITEM #1: WELCOME & REVIEW AGENDA: PURPOSE OF TONIGHT'S MEETING

Susan Davis welcomed Stakeholders Working Group (SWG) members to the meeting. Susan asked the SWG if they had received the previous mailers including the summary of SWG Meeting #1 and the Draft Traffic Study Executive Summary. All members responded they had received both mailers. Susan then asked if the Draft Traffic Study Executive Summary had also been received via e-mail and if e-mailing of materials worked for the SWG members. All members responded that email works. Susan informed the SWG that the County was in the process of posting the summary from SWG #1 on the website. Martha Moyer asked for the URL link to the website and Susan responded that she would send it.

AGENDA ITEM # 2: SUMMARY OF TRAFFIC ANALYSIS

Susan Davis introduced Wade Scarbrough and Matt Wiesenfeld from Kittelson & Associates and informed the SWG that they would be going over the summary of the Traffic Analysis. Wade Scarbrough proceeded with his presentation, noting that the SWG had received the Draft Traffic Study Executive Summary and had time to review it. Wade explained that the analysis included existing conditions and traffic counts. The focus for the study was a broader area than the project area in order to look at the bigger picture. A few additional intersections were included west on Cornell to Science Park Drive and east on Cornell to Dale Avenue but they are not necessarily part of the project. The study showed problems on Murray Boulevard, two intersections showed as over capacity and failing. County standard level for an intersection is E, one level above F, which is 45 seconds of delay. Capacity is the amount of cars that *can* actually get through the intersection, whereas volume is the amount of cars that want to get through. The existing congestion at the Murray Boulevard/Cornell Road intersection is causing back up at additional intersections on Cornell Road. Safety data show that crash rates are not abnormal and are actually below average. The Murray Boulevard/Cornell Road intersection will be designed for 2030, per the County's 20 year design horizon. In order to project future traffic volumes output data from the County is used and includes household and commercial data to forecast traffic. Everything will be over capacity with future growth predictions. Wade then presented and summarized Figure 1 from the Draft Traffic Study Executive Summary showing lane recommendations at the intersections included in the study. The recommendations were as follows:

- NW Murray Blvd/Cornell Road – Add second northbound left turn lane
- NW Murray Blvd/Cornell Road – Add eastbound through lane
- NW Murray Blvd/Cornell Road – Add westbound through lane
- NW Murray Blvd/Science Park Drive – Add northbound through lane

Wade also went over Table 1 Approximate Timeline for Future Improvement Needs that was also included in the Draft Traffic Study Executive Summary.

The group briefly discussed the issues at the 143rd and Science Park Drive intersections with Cornell Road. Both intersections are outside of the project limits and possible realignment strategies.

Laura Kelly asked if the projections accounted for the expansion at Sunset High School. The Project Management Team (PMT) responded that they did not have any knowledge of a school expansion. Laura Kelly informed everyone that a Pre-Application Package had just been submitted to the City of Beaverton for an expansion that would change the current enrollment from 2,000 students to 2,300 students. Xander Smit stated there is school vehicular and pedestrian traffic utilizing Science Park Drive. Wade responded that the County growth data did show some growth on Science Park Drive. Alex Sander responded that the main focus is on motor vehicle traffic.

Sheila Hobernicht asked if the crash rate data in the traffic analysis included pedestrian and bicycles. Wade responded yes, if the accident was reported, but he would verify that information. Sheila expressed her main concern being a blind spot where motor vehicles are not yielding to pedestrians at the southeast corner of the intersection by Jiffy Lube.

John Ragno questioned the recommendations on Cornell Road north of Murray Boulevard because no improvements were shown. He asked about the extension of the right turn lane onto Murray Boulevard. Wade stated that yes they were recommending extension of the right turn lane and that they had provided WRG with queue lengths.

Xander Smit asked about the lack of sidewalk, approximately 30 feet on the north side of Science Park Drive, at the intersection of Murray Boulevard and Science Park Drive. Tony Roos stated that was definitely something to be looked at.

AGENDA ITEM # 3: OVERVIEW OF DESIGN OPTIONS AND DISCUSSION

Prior to the presentation of design options Tony Roos explained the design option process to the SWG. Tony stated the PMT would take tonight's comments from the SWG to the County. The County will ultimately make the decision on alignment options by looking at all impacts, traffic projections and the community pulse. The County engineer may even require further analysis. Tony also stated that the Access Management Plan prepared by Kittleson & Associates will be completed and presented to the County and at the next SWG meeting.

There were three options presented for Cornell Road Centerline/Hold 98 Foot Right-of-Way, North Alignment and South Alignment. The County Standard is 98 Foot Right-of-Way. Holding that standard to centerline keeps existing centerline in place and shifts impacts equally to both sides. North Alignment shifts more impacts to the north while South Alignment shifts more impacts to the south.

Centerline/Hold 98 Foot Right-of-Way – Pros

- Less impact on Sunset Mall (Safeway)
- Aligns with previous improvements on Cornell
- No right-of-way impact to Sunset Mall
- No right-of-way impact to Jiffy Lube

Centerline/Hold 98 Foot Right-of-Way – Cons

- More impacts to Cedar Mill Place (landscaping, signage, parking)
- Impact to Apollo Pools
- No 10-foot sidewalk on North side of Cornell (between Murray and approximately Dale), conditioned to developers.

North Alignment – Pros

- Less impact to Cedar Mill Place
- Less impact to Apollo Pools

North Alignment – Cons

- More impact to Sunset Mall (Safeway). Lose entire row of parking.
- Does not align with previous improvements on Cornell
- More right-of-way impact to Jiffy Lube

South Alignment – Pros

- Similar to "Centerline"
- Saves existing curb on north

South Alignment – Cons

- Similar to “Centerline”
- More impact to Cedar Mill Place

Hal Ballard stated that the Sunset Shopping Center was affected with all options, except for the North Cornell Alignment. Sheila Hobernicht commented that with the North Alignment Sunset Shopping Center lose all parking and sidewalk is at front of building.

Alex Sander explained that the project has been looked at and it is hard to avoid impacts to the Sunset Shopping Center, at the very least parking is impacted and right-of-way will have to be paid for. The County has had discussions with the owner but nothing is definite. There may be full acquisition depending on what option is better for alignment. Pros and cons are not a simple matter.

John Ragno asked about parking requirements and if relocation of parking is an option. Alex Sander responded that the County pays for land and impacts to businesses and tenants.

Mary Gingell asked how many small businesses are located within the Sunset Shopping Center and how many residential tenants? Alex Sander responded that he was not sure.

Alex Sander stated if the building is acquired the question then comes up if the building will remain and be remodeled or if it will be removed. He stated the County may have to relocate tenants. There are right-of-way statutes that the County will follow. Relocation assistance exists for both residential and commercial tenants Compensation is offered if comparable location is not found. There are several categories of compensation.

Sheila Hobernicht asked if it would be considered imminent domain if the seller is not agreeable. Alex responded that if an owner is agreeable, County would consider purchase. (Sunset Shopping Center is currently on the market.) The property is appraised by an appraiser and then negotiations begin. The County can proceed with legal action if the right-of-way is needed and the owner is against selling.

There were four options presented for Murray Boulevard: Centerline/Hold 98 foot Right-of-Way, East Alignment, West Alignment and Alternative Fit (Reduced Lane Widths). The County Standard is 98’ Right-of-Way. Holding that standard to centerline keeps existing centerline in place and shifts impacts equally to both sides. East Alignment shifts more impacts to the east while West Alignment shifts more impacts to the west. Alternative Fit (Reduced Lane Widths) is an option derived due to the pinch point between Plaid Pantry and Sunset Humdingers. This option reduced travel lanes by 1 foot, changing 74 foot paved area to 66 foot paved area. The County has not approved this idea but there may be the possibility of fitting the roadway in between buildings.

Centerline/Hold 98 Foot Right-of-Way – Pros

- Less impact to the west side
- No impact to Plaid or Key Bank

Centerline/Hold 98 Foot Right-of-Way – Cons

- More impacts to east side (Beauty Supply, Sunset Humdingers, Sunset Shopping Center)
- Impacts to trees on east side (Cedar Mill Professional Building, not affecting parking).
- Impacts to Miller Paint and Jiffy Lube driveways and parking

East Alignment – Pros

- Similar to “Centerline”

East Alignment – Cons

- Similar to “Centerline”

West Alignment – Pros

- Less impact to east side (esp. Sunset Humdinger/Sunset Shopping Center)

West Alignment – Cons

- More impact to Plaid Pantry/Key bank
- Some impacts to Sunset Shopping Center
- Limits Cornell North Alignment option
- Impacts to Safeway parking spaces/circulation

Alternative Fit (Reduced Lane Widths) – Pros

- Reduces total impact (esp. Sunset Humdinger/Plaid Pantry)
- Potential to save trees near medical offices
- Lane widths similar to City Standards

Alternative Fit (Reduced Lane Widths) – Cons

- Reduced lane width may require design variance (from 12 foot lanes to 11 foot lanes)
- Requires reduced sidewalk widths in front of some buildings (minimum 5 foot in some areas)
- Some impacts to Sunset Shopping Center
- Requires 5 foot bike lane
- No space for overhead utilities
- Some impact to Plaid Pantry (County would have to relocate stockroom exit door)

Tony Roos also explained that the length of the right turn lane queue length heading north on Murray east onto Cornell was determined per Kittelson & Associates Traffic Study and shortening it would not help the congestion.

Mike Appel asked from an emergency vehicle stand point is the Alternative Fit a true option? Tony Roos responded that the lane widths closely mirror City of Beaverton Standards and that in fact many cities are going with the smaller lane widths. Jerry Renfro added that TVFR helped write the City of Beaverton Standards.

Elaine Ledbetter stated if a semi with a 70 foot trailer was headed from Murray to Cornell that it would not be able to make the 90 degree turn. Tony responded that a program called Autoturn is used to determine if a truck can get around corners and curb lines, if there is an issue there is the option of no through trucks.

Sheila Hobernicht added that she heard another pro to the Alternative Fit is that narrow lanes calm traffic. Wade confirmed that drivers are more cautious and there is a potential for a slight reduction.

The group discussed the under grounding of utilities and if it was possible on this project. Alex Sander responded that the law reads that utilities have a right to locate in the County right-of-way but must move for road improvements. Utilities are not required to go underground. There is significant County cost if they had to go underground, but there is the possibility of other cost options. Virginia Bruce questioned what process was used to have the utilities under grounded on the Barnes/Cornell project and stated that it

would be more consistent if also done on this project. Alex Sander explained that on the Barnes/Cornell project many things come together. City of Beaverton required underground on Barnes Road, a City road. Utilities, City and County all put in for the costs. Alex also added that it lengthened construction time.

Tony Roos stated that at this time the objective is identify impacts and what is important to the community.

Jerry Green referred to the reduced lane widths and asked what the City's Standard was in regards to utilities. Tony responded there is a PUE (Private Utility Easement) at the back of sidewalk.

Jerry Green also asked if economic development was being encouraged with this project. Is the County trying to get underdeveloped properties to redevelop. Alex Sander responded that the County's primary objective is to make the intersection work better. Economic development would be a secondary objective. Jerry Green stated that the SWG may choose to use as a strategy.

Virginia Bruce asked if anyone had any knowledge of what was happening to the vacant gravel lot at the southwest corner of the intersection. Alex Sander responded that inquiries have been made by someone whom is interested in a commercial development at that location, but they are waiting for the intersection improvements to be completed.

Jerry Renfro asked if driveway accesses would be changing. Tony Roos responded not at this stage but that will be determined when the Access Management Plan is complete.

Susan Davis stated that she would like to have input from everyone about what is important them.

John Ragno stated that he feels for the tenants but the Sunset Shopping Center is an old building and he would not mind if it was gone.

Sheila Hobernicht was concerned with the availability of low income housing in the area to ease the impact on the residential tenants' in the Sunset Shopping Center building.

Virginia Bruce stated the project area is part of a Town Center designation per Metro. Typically, cities encourage redevelopment. Virginia feels that since the area is not in an incorporated city, there is lack of direction for redevelopment, but she would love to see redevelopment taking place.

Martha Heilman stated she was delighted to see the alternative option and hopes it gets serious consideration. She prefers less rather than more.

Jerry Renfro is concerned about traffic safety and response times. Emergency vehicles will have to be in two lanes making the corners with an added 5 foot median. Location of the median is a concern, trucks are 68 feet long and make wide angle turns, need 20 foot width to make turns, reduce width within median. He prefers wide lanes.

Martha Heilman stated another possibility would be reducing sidewalk widths, broad sidewalks are pleasant, but she prefers good access for safety vehicles versus broad sidewalks. Martha Moyer asked if a raised median is a given. Tony Roos responded that a raised median would be used to prevent cars from crossing four lanes of traffic. Alex Sander added a planted median would not be plausible here because of lack of room.

Martha Moyer added that she would also like to second John Ragno's comment in regards to the Sunset Shopping Center.

Hal Ballard stated for the sake of discussion that sidewalk safety factors are involved with sidewalk widths not just pleasantry.

Mary Gingell asked if the County was to purchase the Sunset Shopping Center would they keep it or sell the remainder. And if sold would they decide who purchases it and what is developed. Alex Sander

responded that if the County did buy it they would use what property is needed then sell the remainder. Martha Moyer stated that it would have to be redeveloped under the Town Center guidelines.

Terry Tobin asked if the Sunset Shopping Center is saved there would be no parking, if businesses want to relocate can the lanes be tapered and widened at intersection. Or if the Sunset Shopping Center can't be saved can the lanes be widened after the Sunset Humdinger. Wade Scarbrough responded that either of those options would cause a kink in the road and widen the radius, thus would not be an option that would work.

Jerry Green offered the observation that this is an urban, developed area, If City of Beaverton standards are close or equivalent then why not adopt their standards. Tony Roos responded we are not following exact City standard, it is similar to, but not exact. At no time will the City of Beaverton standard be fully adopted, rather it would be handled as request for a variance from the County standards if needed.

Jerry Green stated he'd like to see the project built for more community benefit, would like to look towards an option that is built to enhance the environment, not just the numbers.

Hal Ballard asked if there was a budget estimate and if so was the purchase of property included in the budget. Alex Sander responded that there is an approved amount of \$10.5 million. It is a rough estimate that anticipated right-of-way to be a substantial cost. The purchase of Sunset Shopping Center could be accommodated as well as other sites if needed. Jerry Renfro stated that he appreciated Jerry Greens' comments. He prefers not boxing in a standard that it makes quality engineering tough. He also stated that TVFR helped to write County standards as well.

Susan Davis stated that everything that was heard tonight will be taken to the County. The PMT will come back to the SWG in 5 to 6 weeks for the next meeting with the County's results.

Mike Appel stated that he was excited about the possibility of the Sunset Shopping Center being redeveloped and upgrading the area.

Hal Ballard stated that he has no problem with a 5 foot bike lane.

Martha Heilman asked about the east alignment option on Murray Boulevard and what Terry Tobin's thoughts were on losing trees at the Cedar Mill Professional development. Terry responded that he is not terribly concerned as long as parking and access aren't lost and the landscaping is replaced. He stated that the building owner would like to see the trees saved.

Rick Edmonds' concern was not losing Safeway parking.

Sheila Hobernicht asked if there are width/spacing requirements for driveways/access. Tony Roos responded that there are standards that are based on property frontage.

Xander Smit stated his concern was the lack of sidewalk to driveways. He did agree with Virginia Bruce's point that remodeling/redeveloping the Sunset Shopping Center would enhance the area.

AGENDA ITEM #4: OTHER ITEMS

Susan Davis asked Martha Heilman to briefly describe her concerns with the McDonalds' landscaping. Martha Heilamn asked what was going on with the lack of planting then one month later it is all complete. Who is responsible and what occurred? Tony Roos responded that McDonalds and contractor wanted to complete the project whether it gets ruined with the Murray Boulevard improvements or not they just wanted to be done.

Marth Heilman asked about sign standards. Susan Davis responded that she would look into sign standards including temporary sign standards. Rick Edmonds stated a lot of the signing is for the grand opening will go away. John Ragno also asked about sandwich board requirements.

Jerry Renfro stated that he was sorry to be advocate for closing two of the Safeway accesses; his only complaint is that people use the accesses to cut across.

Virginia Bruce asked about billboards and whether that is part of the town center guidelines. Susan Davis said she would also look into that.

AGENDA ITEM #5: SCHEDULE NEXT MEETING

Next Meeting Thursday May 10th from 5:00-7:00, the location will be confirmed at a later date.

Jerry Green asked that the meeting location being included on the agenda.

Meeting Adjourned at 7:30