

PROJECT ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING #7 SUMMARY

The seventh Project Advisory Committee (PAC) meeting for the 125th Avenue Extension Project was held on May 12, 1998, from 6:30 to 9:00 p.m. at Conestoga Middle School Library. The meeting's purpose was to discuss community comments and roadway design preferences (indicated by comments at the Open House and in the survey), and to make recommendations that would narrow down the alternatives and options. For more detailed information please refer to the handouts listed at the end of this summary.

I. WELCOME/PROJECT BUSINESS

PAC members and nine attendees from the Cresmoor/Ridgecrest neighborhood were welcomed. The Cresmoor residents were informed that they could comment to the PAC when Preliminary Alternative #2 (Green Lane Alignment) is discussed. Eric Johansen was ill but sent copies of his recommendations on the various options and alternatives, and asked that they be included in the overall the PAC tabulations for the meeting. They were accepted by the committee as valid.

PAC #6 Meeting Summary: The meeting summary for the PAC #6 meeting was adopted with a few minor revisions that will be included in the final summary and sent to PAC members with their next meeting packet.

PAC Member Reports: Greenway NAC and South Beaverton NAC will hold a joint meeting on May 21, 1998. Joel Howie is on the meeting agenda and will make a 125th Avenue Extension Project presentation. Jim Persey hoped the Greenway NAC would be able to make a recommendation on the narrowed alternatives and options. He will report those recommendations at PAC Meeting #8.

Comprehensive Plan Amendment Process: The Green Lane alignment and/or the connection of Davies Road (east) would necessitate a comprehensive plan amendment. Any change or deviation from the City's adopted comprehensive plan, or functional classification map requires the change to go through the City's comprehensive plan amendment process. This is the most thorough City review process which requires reviewing the issue, its impacts, and need, and how it meets design standards. The process takes at least 120 days and includes hearings and/or meetings with the Planning Commission and the City Council. Anyone can pay the City fees and initiate a comprehensive plan amendment review. If an applicant does not accept the City's ruling, then the case may be appealed to the Oregon Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA).

Tri-Met: Tri-Met has responded verbally to Joel Howie and said that they have no future plans to use 125th Avenue as a bus route.

Public Open House Summary: The project's second Public Open House was attended by 92 residents. The purpose of the Open House was to provide project information to the public, and seek citizen comments and preferences on the latest design alternatives. All of the PAC members attended and assisted

design team members at the information stations around the room. Attendees filled out *Citizen Preference Survey #2* (from the newsletter) after reviewing and discussing the project information. Forty-five surveys were completed and returned at the meeting. Since most of the attendees were adjacent property owners or had residences on possible side street connections, the survey results showed strong favor for the existing right of way Preliminary Alternative #1; depressed roadway; Cross Section “C” with no center median, and 8-foot wide planter strips; and connection of Barberry Drive (west) only.

PAC member comments included:

- ▶ Lots of people I talked to didn’t like Cross Section “B” because it would be inadequately maintained, like Greenway is today.
- ▶ Is the City Council getting regular project documentation and information? (Team response: Yes. They receive the same packet information as PAC members.)

II. CITIZEN PREFERENCE SURVEY #2 SUMMARY

The final Citizen Preference Survey #2 was distributed with a brief tabulation of results. Two hundred and twelve (212) surveys were returned and tabulated. The broader community comments indicated sensitivity to those who live along the corridor.

Respondents favored Alternative #1 even though there was fairly strong support for Alternative #2. It came down to a debate about wetlands vs. people impacts. There was also some confusion over whether the intersection at 125th Avenue/Hall Boulevard is to be signalized. It was not indicated on the design maps and some people selected Alternative #2 solely on the basis that it had a signal and Alternative #1 did not.

The depressed roadway option was strongly favored by nearby property owners although the broader community slightly favored the at-grade option; mainly due to its lower cost. However, many respondents had no preference and deferred this to the adjacent property owner preference. Cross Section “C” was heavily supported because of its lower cost, fewer impacts to adjacent properties, and ease of maintenance.

Barberry Drive (west) was the most favored side street connection, with Stillwell Lane (east), then Stillwell Lane (west) with substantially fewer points in the tabulation process, and then Davies Road scored significantly lower still. The biggest issue seemed to be community connectivity vs. additional traffic volumes in neighborhoods.

III. PAC RECOMMENDATIONS

PAC members were reminded of the committee’s role in the process. Members are to consider that if the road is built, then what is the best design for the community? They were instructed to address design issues, consider their merit, and remember they are not making a determination on whether the project is to be constructed in the near future. That decision will be made by the City Council. Each member was also encouraged to refer to the project goal and objectives for guidance. The committee discussed, then made recommendations on each of the four topics listed below. They agreed that a simple majority vote (by show of hands) would move the option forward for further evaluation. Each member had one vote on each alternative, or option. Voting tabulations are indicated below, and those that moved forward are highlighted by italics.

A. Preliminary Alternatives: Prior to committee discussion on this topic, the residents of the Cresmoor/Ridgecrest neighborhood commented to the PAC. Their comments included:

- (Diana Fisher) I live on Cresmoor Drive. After the Open House we wrote a petition and circulated it through our neighborhood on two Sunday evenings. Every person we spoke to was very strongly opposed to the Green Lane alignment and signed the petition. We have narrow streets and poor visibility on curves. The petition was submitted to the PAC and included photos of the narrow neighborhood streets that would prove unsafe and inadequate to carry additional volumes of vehicles. The petition was signed by 32 neighbors and states, “1) The volume of traffic in our neighborhood would significantly change the character of our quiet residential area. 2) With the high volume of children going to and from Vose School, the safety of our children would be seriously compromised. 3) The proposed routes are not efficient to begin with (this section detailed each street’s impacts).” Refer to the petition for more detailed information.
- (Christy Turner) Ms. Turner needed to leave early but wrote her concerns to be read to the PAC. She has a 9 and an 11-year old who regularly cross the street to get to the park. Kids play in the street on Cresmoor, have basketball hoops at the side of the road, and safety is the biggest concern. Increasing vehicle volumes and speeds would be extremely dangerous.
- (Jim Buck) My biggest concern is about encouraging more cut-through traffic on roads that are inadequate to handle it.
- (Didn’t give name.) The stop signs at Clifford and Anne may cause conflicts. There are many small children in the area. The neighborhood is dark, and when it rains, water collects on Cresmoor near Hall Blvd. This can be dangerous for people unfamiliar with the street. Also, people coming around the corner on Cresmoor go across into the other lane and is dangerous.
- (Nancy Forman) I live on the south end of Green Lane. If the Green Lane alignment is selected, the road will come through my bedroom. This is a very emotional issue for us. We don’t want to move. Already we’ve had trees removed for the Forest Glen Townhouses, and it is noisier as a result. We don’t need even more impacts. It will ruin the environment and livability. Don’t select the Green Lane alignment. Have there been statistics kept on accidents at the Green Lane/Hall Blvd. intersection? They are numerous.
- (Christopher Redmond) I live on Alpine Drive and favor Alternative #1. If Green Lane is truly the best alternative, then something will need to be done to control traffic through the Cresmoor/Ridgecrest neighborhood. Don’t forget the impact of Denney Road. Consider traffic calming on Alpine, Cresmoor, Bel Aire, Blakeney, and Clifford if the Green Lane option is chosen. I think additional traffic volumes on Denney Road due to the completion of the 125th Avenue Extension, indicated in traffic study are very low, and there will be far more vehicles attracted to cut-through the neighborhoods.

PAC member comments included:

- ▶ The attending residents were asked if they were willing to accept the limited access of right turns in and out on Cresmoor if the existing right of way alignment is selected. All residents said it would be acceptable, and that many of them never make a left turn now because it is so dangerous.
- ▶ The handout indicated approximately a one-acre wetland impact with the existing right of way alignment and 0.1-acre impact with Green Lane. The Army Corps of Engineers determines and oversees the mitigation process. Wetlands are often mitigated at three to four times the original

area that is impacted, if mitigated outside the impacted area. It is preferred that mitigations be completed on site, or at least within the watershed basin.

- ▶ I don't think we should build a road to solve one traffic problem by putting on another neighborhood (Cresmoor/Ridgecrest neighborhood).
- ▶ I have never liked the Green Lane alignment. It encourages cut-through traffic on neighborhood streets. Don't push the problem onto someone else.
- ▶ Why can't we just close Cresmoor and use the Green Lane alignment? The impact to the wetland will be too great with the other alternative. (Team response: The State of Oregon will not allow closure of any existing streets along Hall Blvd. This is mandated within the State's Transportation Planning Rule.)

PAC RECOMMENDATIONS ON PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES:

The PAC recommended (12 to 1) in favor of moving Preliminary Alternative #1 (existing right of way alignment) forward. The PAC voted (12 to 1) against moving Preliminary Alternative #2 (Green Lane alignment) forward, and it will be dropped from further consideration.

B. Roadway Options:

PAC member comments included:

- ▶ Will the grade be above houses in some areas with the at-grade option? (Team response: No. It would be approximately 5-feet above the current yard levels for some adjacent residences, between Stations 55-61, and would have sound walls on top of the slope.)
- ▶ For both roadway options, the top of the sound wall remains constant, although the overall height may vary depending upon whether it sits on a slope or a retaining wall. There appear to be more noise reductions with cross section "C" if depressed.
- ▶ The depressed roadway has less visual impact on the community. I realize it is more expensive, but it will keep with the residential character of the area. Aesthetics are the best for the neighbors and drivers.
- ▶ All of the neighbors I've talked with want the roadway depressed.
- ▶ The at-grade roadway does end up being depressed in the Barberry Drive/Green Lane area to lessen the grade, and improve sight distance.
- ▶ It seems that it would be safer if it is depressed. Elevations on both options are the same at Hall Boulevard, but the beginning roadway grade for the depressed section is less steep, than the at-grade option, near the Brockman/Greenway intersection.
- ▶ Neighbors will see some sound walls with the depressed section, but the noise reduction is best.

PAC RECOMMENDATIONS ON ROADWAY OPTIONS:

The PAC recommended (11 in favor, 1 against, and 1 abstain) in favor of moving the Depressed Roadway Option forward. The PAC voted (4 in favor, 1 abstain, and 8 against) against moving the At-Grade Roadway Option forward and it will be dropped from further consideration.

C. Side Street Connections: The team received an update and modification of the original traffic study traffic volumes on Davies (east) and Stillwell (east), within the northeast project quadrant. A closer look was taken at the traffic movements and volumes. A Davies Road connection will not make traffic volumes double. The computer model originally estimated a higher zoning density

in the area and assumed that apartments in the quadrant would not empty directly onto Hall Boulevard. When those items were corrected in the model, it substantially reduced the peak hour volumes at the Davies Road (east), Stillwell Lane (east), and Oxbow Terrace intersections with Greenway.

At the Open House a citizen suggested the connection of Davies Road (west) which would displace several homes, but would not have driveways accessing the new connection. He thought it would be good to have a side street connection halfway between Hall Boulevard and Brockman Road/Greenway. The design team developed three options and presented them to the PAC (see handout). The PAC recommended they be dropped from further consideration because of the financial costs, impacts to existing homes and neighborhoods, and the potential for encouraging more cut through traffic.

PAC member comments included:

- ▶ All the residents living on the west side of the 125th Avenue Extension will cut through on Davies, if it is connected. It is human nature to take this short cut. It will attract more cars than indicated in the study, and many of them will just be going to Albertson's.
- ▶ With this modification in the computer model coming at this late date, I'm wondering what else might be incorrect in the traffic study in other areas. (Team response: We are confident that it is accurate on the west side because there is a potential for increased development in that area, which has been taken into consideration.)
- ▶ Apartment residents will cut through Davies, if it is connected, and will take a right turn onto 125th to Hall Boulevard to avoid taking a left onto Greenway.
- ▶ Stillwell Lane (east) seems necessary for an additional access for Oxbow Terrace residents and as an alternative emergency access. People on this street want the connection. It shouldn't get cut through traffic. (Two additional PAC members said they completely agreed with these statements.)
- ▶ Stillwell Lane (west) has driveway conflicts, and cars will back up waiting to turn left onto 125th Avenue. Barberry, and Stillwell (east) should be connected but not Davies. We need to be careful about creating potential traffic conflicts.
- ▶ Stillwell (west) vehicle stacking conflicts are caused from vehicles traveling along Carr, to Sorrento, to Stillwell, to the 125th Avenue Extension, and also in the reverse direction. The intent is to get traffic off of Sorrento and this connection will only add to it.
- ▶ Once 125th Avenue Extension is constructed, it will remove a lot of traffic off of Carr.
- ▶ Stillwell (west) has numerous problems and won't remove that many cars from other neighborhood streets anyway.
- ▶ It seems reasonable to move 170 cars per hour off of a road Stillwell (west) with driveways that are dangerous, onto Barberry where it will add only 125 vehicles per hour.
- ▶ There are two lanes used by condo owners to access Barberry but no driveways that would have cars backing onto Barberry.
- ▶ A Stillwell (west) connection achieves very little.
- ▶ Is it possible to make additional connections over time if they become necessary? (Team response: This public process would need to be repeated when considering any future connections.)

PAC RECOMMENDATIONS ON SIDE STREET CONNECTIONS:

Stillwell Lane (east) Connection - 12 in favor and 1 against -Moved forward.

Stillwell Lane (west) Connection - 5 in favor and 8 against -Dropped.

Barberry Drive (west) Connection - 12 in favor and 1 against. - Moved forward.
Davies Road (east) Connection - 1 in favor and 12 against - Dropped.

D. Cross-Sections:

PAC member comments included:

- ▶ “C” is the cheapest. Since we voted for the depressed roadway which costs more than the at-grade roadway, it is only right that we try to save on the cross section. This cross section was favored by the community anyway.
- ▶ I’m concerned that cross section “C” might not work between Barberry and Hall. We may need to use a combination in the design.
- ▶ There is an advantage to having some kind of median at intersections for pedestrian use and safety.
- ▶ Are there ways to lower speeds on 125th Avenue? (Team response: Yes. The two-lane roadway discourages higher speed, and so does a median.)
- ▶ A two-lane street does slow speeds, even without a median. All three cross sections encourage lower speeds.
- ▶ Maintenance is an issue and “C” is easiest to maintain.
- ▶ Will light glare be a problem on any cross section? (Team response: In diagramming out the potential for glare, it appears to be very minimal [see handout]. If there are problems after construction, visors or shields can be added to lights where needed. BDR will address this issue and want to know in advance where the problems might occur.)

PAC RECOMMENDATIONS ON CROSS SECTIONS:

Cross Section “A” - 3 in favor and 10 against - Dropped.

Cross Section “B” - 2 in favor and 11 against - Dropped.

Cross Section “C” - 10 in favor and 3 against - Moved forward. The PAC realizes it may be necessary to use a combination of cross sections, to allow for medians only at intersections for pedestrians, and agreed with this variance from cross section “C” where necessary.

IV. OUTSTANDING ISSUES FOR FUTURE CONSIDERATION

Committee members suggested several outstanding issues that need further discussion. They include: traffic calming devices on Barberry Drive (west) and Stillwell Lane (east); funding; sound wall construction prior to roadway construction; potential construction phasing; speeds; and sound walls. These issues will be addressed in a future meeting.

V. WHAT’S NEXT?

June 2, 1998 PAC Meeting #8 (Conestoga Middle School Library, 6:30 p.m.)

July 14, 1998 Public Open House #3 (Elsie Stuhr Center)

(This date was changed to July 14, 1998 after the meeting to provide ample time to adequately prepare for the third Open House.)

Attendees:

Jim Persey
Milton Missfeldt
Byron DeLuca
Randy Smith
Carl Prenner
Kathy Burry
Ed Vilhauer
Dan Maks
Bob Glasgow
Joel Howie
Terry Waldele
Randy Wooley
John Osterberg
Trudy Rippe

Handouts:

Meeting Agenda
Draft PAC #6 Meeting Summary
Public Open House #2 Summary
Citizen Preference Survey #2 Compilation
Estimated Cost Comparison Table
Project Goal and Objectives
Sound Wall Heights and Locations
Davies Road (west) Connection Options
Updated Traffic Volumes
Illumination Diagram
 Citizen Preference Survey #2 Tabulation
Eric Johansen's Comments on Preference Survey
Wetland Impact Map
Retaining Wall Heights and Locations

Community Members:

Nancy Forman
Howard Schaffer
Marlene Schaffer
Diana Fisher
Jim Fisher
Christy Turner
Jim Buck
Joe Selig
Matt Foster
Terry Hanlin