



**NW Bethany Boulevard Improvements  
Project Focus Group Meeting #8 Notes**

**Meeting Date: April 14, 2011**

**Time: 5:00-7:15 p.m.**

**Location: Sunset Presbyterian Church**

**FOCUS GROUP MEMBERS:**

Doug Alvarez	√	Paul Enriquez	√
Debra Ashe	√	Bob McMillan	√
Hal Ballard	√	Charles Murphy	√
Chris Biggs	√	Steve Murray	√
Ann Bryan (Amy Barton filling in)	√	Jeff Oberst	
Robert Bueermann	√	Sandra Peterson	√
Stephen Collins	√	Norm Rose	√
Rob Saxton	√	John Hartsock	√

**PROJECT MANAGEMENT TEAM:**

<b>Washington County</b>			
Matt Costigan	√	Jan Wilson	√
Brian Irish	√	Magdalena Campuzano	
<b>Howell Consulting</b>			
Leslie Howell	√		
<b>WHPacific</b>			
Wayne Bauer	√	Ken Rehms	√
Sarah Heller	√	Mike Smyth	√
<b>Kittleson &amp; Associates</b>			
Wade Scarbrough	√		
<b>Michael Minor &amp; Associates</b>			
Michael Minor	√		

**OTHER ATTENDEES:**

Approximately 30 others (see sign-in sheet for names)
---

**Welcome and Introductions – *Leslie Howell (Howell Consulting)***

Leslie welcomed everyone to the meeting and reviewed the night's agenda. (Copies of the agenda were made available for the audience). Leslie reminded the audience that this is a committee meeting with time available at the end for public comments. The audience is asked to hold comments until then. Leslie reminded the audience that the Project Management Team would be available after the meeting to answer specific questions one-on-one.

Amy Barton will be representing Ann Bryan tonight.

Leslie reviewed tonight's meeting agenda and mentioned that there is a lot on the agenda. This will include:

- Items in the issues bin
- Design update; copies of the exhibits presented tonight were provided to each PFG member and will be posted to the project website
- Environmental studies update
- Permit applications update
- Project schedule
- Bethany Overpass update
- Public comment period
- Next PFG meeting date

Leslie asked the group for any corrections to the meeting notes from PFG #7. A question was asked if the statement on page 2, third bullet regarding extending the project south to Cornell Road conflicts with the statement that the south part of the project is in the City of Beaverton? Matt replied that at the BCC meeting in February, they voted to extend the overall project to Cornell Road to coordinate with the Bethany Overpass project. The south end of the Bethany Blvd project is NW Bronson Road. The Bethany Overpass project will extend south to recent improvements just north of NW Cornell Road. Matt had received a comment from Micki Sparr regarding her comment on page 9 of the public comment period. This should read "nearly 87%" instead of 80%. This will be revised in the final meeting notes. Other than this change, the meeting notes were approved by the PFG. Meeting notes will be posted to the project website.

Items from the "issues bin" from the last meeting were reviewed.

- **Photos of noise walls.** There are samples of noise walls included in the PFG member packets, and Michael will be discussing those later tonight.

**Design Update – *Matt Costigan (Washington County) and Wayne Bauer and Mike Smyth (WHPacific)*****Pedestrian Crossings – *Matt Costigan (Washington County)***

Jim McClure had previously asked about potentially putting in a rapid flashing beacon at Telshire Drive, similar to what they have in Claremont. Matt talked with the County Traffic Engineer, and he is not keen on the idea of a flashing beacon, but they are willing to consider it. It would require a design exception.

Concerns with the flashing beacons are:

- With multiple travel lanes, similar to the one installed on TV Highway at SW 178<sup>th</sup>, the outside lane will stop for the pedestrian, the pedestrian starts to cross, and the inside lane continues on through without stopping. This is a potential safety issue.
- This would require a design exception, and it is unlikely to be approved. Despite that, Matt is willing to put it together if the PFG wants it.

The Telshire intersection will be a legal crossing with curb cuts at all four corners. The crossing will not be striped or signed as a crossing, per County policy for uncontrolled intersections. Matt noted that a striped and signed pedestrian crossing was installed on Saltzman Road due to high pedestrian activity and the close proximity to the library and St. Pius School.

The preference from a safety standpoint is to have pedestrians walk a block or so to a controlled intersection and cross there, especially for school children. Even so, it is likely that people will cross at Telshire.

Question: There is a dedicated entrance through Telshire into Oak Hills. I have concern if this crossing is not striped.

Answer: If a flashing beacon is installed, the crossing would be striped. The Claremont crossing is striped and has a refuge island in the median.

Question: At the TV Highway / 178<sup>th</sup> crossing, it feels like there is a really long flashing time. Can the one on Bethany be timed without adding a significant delay to traffic? I encourage you to time it well.

Answer: Yes, it can be timed and adjusted accordingly. The Claremont one was adjusted after it was installed.

Question: Can we have an island at the other locations?

Answer: This will be discussed later

A comment was made by a PFG member that in Claremont, the average age is 79, and most people do not move quickly due to knee replacements and other surgeries. As a result, the timing may have been adjusted to compensate for this. Another comment was made by a PFG member that he had seen someone hit the button to cross and then walk away without crossing.

Question: I have a concern for the false sense of security that a flashing beacon may give. I support the idea of a crossing, but I don't think we can expect traffic to stop.

Answer: True, pedestrians have been hit in marked crosswalks because they feel a false sense of security.

There was discussion among the PFG members about the possibility of moving the crossing north to Ridgetop Lane due to the increased safety by being able to provide a refuge.

Matt asked the PFG if we wanted to move forward with the rapid flashing beacon? The response from the PFG was yes, move forward with the design exception and the possibility of adding a rapid flashing beacon at Telshire Drive or Ridgetop Lane, wherever it works best.

Matt mentioned that there will not be pedestrian crossings of Bethany at Audrey Drive or Emily Lane because of the medians. Pedestrians will be encouraged to cross Bethany Blvd at the Oak Hills signal.

Question: Will there be signage to say these are not crossings?

Answer: The County standard is to install the "crosswalk closed" signs. This would be accompanied by the physical barrier of the median.

#### Right-of-Way Impacts of Adjusting Bike Lane and Median Widths – Wayne Bauer (WHPacific)

Wayne gave an overall update of the design plus introduced several design options that the design team has been considering. At the last PFG, the design update covered shifting of the centerline and narrowing of the lane widths. If there are any questions on any of that, he encouraged people come up after the meeting and they would answer specific questions one-on-one.

Refinements to the design since the last PFG meeting include the realignment of Bronson Road to increase the left turn storage length and decrease the pedestrian crossing distance. The design team developed a design to move the intersection slightly north and still stay within the right-of-way along Bronson Road. We also looked at the details of the island. These changes do not increase right-of-way impacts but do improve the intersection geometry and operation.

Question: I thought we decided to get rid of the island?

Answer: An island is needed. The intersection will function differently than it does today with the signal installed. Traffic will have 2 lanes for right turns. Traffic will be stopped and pedestrians will get a signal which takes away the weaving. There will not be the free right turn movement that exists today.

The design team also took a hard look at the Avondale Drive intersection. Because of the angle of the alignment and where sound walls have to be located, we looked at the left turn movement and sight distance required to see around the wall and around the angle of the alignment. The sight distance criteria were not met with sound walls located at the right-of-way, due to the angle of the roadway at the intersection. We are proposing to block the left turn movement out of Avondale Drive due to sight distance concerns. Every other intersection, except Ridgetop Lane, met the sight distance criteria.

Question: If that is blocked, how do people get out of the neighborhood to go north?

Answer: With no left turns allowed at Avondale Drive, people would either need to travel west and north through the neighborhood to Oak Hills or make a right turn onto Bethany and then turnaround or possibly a u-turn off Bronson Road to be able to head north on Bethany Blvd. Allowing left turns at Avondale Drive would require moving sound walls back, resulting in property and cost impacts associated with providing that movement.

Question: That is a big concern with the neighborhood. What is the alternative?

Answer: It would require additional cost for right-of-way due to moving the sound wall back. That can still be considered. We are trying to get feedback because there are property and cost impacts in order to achieve left turns.

Question: Nobody wants to drive through the neighborhood. I am concerned if the left turns are taken away. It is a non-peak issue because nobody tries to go that way during peak times.

Answer: We would need right-of-way to move the sound wall back to meet sight distance standards. We want to discuss this with you and get your input.

Question: Why are there no left turns out of Emily Lane? Can that be opened up?

Answer: The original plan was to use Avondale Drive as the outlet. If that outlet moves to Emily Lane, there is widening that is required to provide the left turns. That has ripple effects and would start the 5-lane section earlier. The right-of-way impacts shift as well. In order to have the left turn out, you would need to have the left turn in also. There would need to be room in the median to provide this. To revise the Avondale Drive intersection, we would need to look at the right-of-way impacts and the sound wall locations. We haven't looked at the details yet.

Question: Can 160<sup>th</sup> get extended to Bronson Road?

Answer: That is a possibility in the long run, as that property could be developed. It might be difficult to extend that to Bronson Road because of the close proximity to the Bronson Road / Bethany Blvd intersection.

Question: Can we get rid of or shorten the sound wall? How much does that affect the sound levels?

Answer: It is a possibility and we would need to weigh the impacts and benefits of the change. We need to ask for input from the property owners. Are they okay with the sound levels being slightly higher than what they are today? The traffic numbers are 15 cars turning left per hour today.

As a result of the discussion and input from PFG members, the design team will look at other options to allow left turns out at Avondale Drive.

#### Medians – Wayne Bauer (WHPacific)

The design team looked at the medians based on the comments from the last PFG meeting to look at the possibility of providing landscaped medians. We looked at the area near Telshire Drive. The current design shows a 4' median including width of the median and required setbacks. We looked at the tapers and found that the right-of-way is wide enough for a 5' median in this location. As a result we are able to add landscaped median here. There are concerns with emergency service access, so it may need to be a concrete median.

Question: How does that affect the flashing beacon as far as sight distance goes?

Answer: Yes, that wouldn't help the crossing as far as sight distance is concerned.

Question: On the map, what is shown as landscaping?

Answer: The green areas are the landscaping.

Question: Is the road still being regraded?

Answer: There will be some regrading at the crests of vertical curves, but no substantial regrading as the profile turned out to be a reasonable match. There may be about one foot of difference near Telshire Drive. We are trying to avoid cutting down the road to avoid utility relocations. We have checked sight distance criteria to ensure that the design meets standards.

#### Bike / Pedestrian Treatments – Wayne Bauer (WHPacific)

Wayne mentioned that the design team prepared several options for the PFG members to consider for the combination of bike lane, sidewalk, tree, and sound wall locations.

- **Option 1: Curb-Tight Sidewalk** – Curb-tight sidewalk with trees and illumination poles in the 2.5' area behind the sidewalk. This is the option that has been shown on all of the alternatives to date.
- **Option 2: Separated Sidewalk** – Move the sidewalk back next to sound wall and have a planter strip as a buffer for pedestrians. The trees and illumination poles would be in the planter strip.
- **Option 3: Widened Sidewalk with Treewells / Planters** – This option is a hybrid of the other two with 7.5' wide curb-tight sidewalk and tree wells instead of a continuous-width planter.

Question: What is the difference between Option 2 and Option 3? I do not see a picture of Option 2.

Answer: Option 2 and Option 3 are shown on the same exhibit, with Option 2 in the top view and Option 3 below. The difference is the tree wells vs. planter strip.

#### Landscaping – Mike Smyth (WHPacific)

Mike introduced himself as a landscape architect with WHPacific. He explained that what he is presenting is the design team's "first look" at landscape concepts. They tried to find the most challenging area to prepare options, and found that between Emily Lane and Oak Hills Drive, where we have a 2.5' planter area. Mike explained that the exhibits correspond to the sidewalk options and show a plan view and a section view. Another exhibit shows different options for the narrow shrubs. For Options 1A, 1B, and 1C, the larger area at the upper left is the same for all three, and the narrow areas show the different treatment options.

- **Option 1A: Curb-Tight Sidewalk** – This option has narrow street trees on center with columnar shrubs between the trees and low-growth shrubs around the trees. In the wider planters, there is room for more creativity.
- **Option 1B: Curb-Tight Sidewalk** – This option has no narrow street trees, just narrow shrubs.
- **Option 1C: Curb-Tight Sidewalk** – This option introduces breaks to include climbing vines on the sound walls. If there is concern for vegetation on the sound walls, an alternative to this is a green screen, which is installed 1' in front of the walls. It keeps vegetation off the walls and allows for a greater variety of plants. There are about 3-4 options for vines, and about 8-10 options for the green screen.
- **Option 2: Separated Sidewalk / Planter Strip** – This option uses the continuous separated planter as an opportunity for larger shrubs and groundcovers. There are pockets at the base of the sound walls for vines, if the PFG members are not opposed to it. This would help to soften the hardness of a wall and provide green into the space.
- **Option 3: Tree Well Planters** – This option has the tree wells at back of curb and offset planters at the base of the sound walls. This creates a pedestrian flow that is more of a serpentine flow.

Question: What is the plant material between the bike lane and pedestrians?

Answer: The specific materials have not been considered yet. We are still thinking in terms of spaces, not materials.

Question: If Option 2 is a viable option, I think you would need to have low-lying shrubs, so it is not in conflict with the pedestrians for safety and security reasons.

Answer: We will keep that in mind.

Question: How tall are the small to medium shrubs?

Answer: Typically, nothing is over 3' tall, about waist height, to provide visibility into the space. In the median, we want to ensure visibility across the median.

Mike explained that the median options generally include a tree in the middle with shrubs. For the 10' width option, there is more room to vary plant heights and layouts. For the 5' width option, it would be simpler, such as a double row of shrubs.

Question: For those without the handouts, could you show where those median areas are on the big map?

Answer: The 2' curbed median is north of Avondale Drive to Emily Lane. The 5' landscaped median is north from Avondale Drive and ties into the 2' curbed median. The 5' landscaped median is also from Ridgetop Lane north. The 10' median is from Emily Lane to the 5-lane section at Oak Hills Drive, at Audrey Drive, and from Telshire Drive to Ridgetop Lane.

Question: When you drive Bethany Blvd, Telshire and Oak Hills both have interesting entrances to their neighborhoods. Would these be saved or would this all become one neighborhood?

Answer: We would like to celebrate the individual neighborhood entries and will try to keep the separate styles of each within the overall landscape theme.

Question: As far as the foliage at the walls, who would maintain that?

Answer: The construction contractor is responsible for maintenance during the plant establishment period, but after that it falls to the County. Matt mentioned that on the Saltzman project, two HOA's took over maintenance from the curb back. The County has a new "Adopt-A-Landscape" program where groups can take over the landscape maintenance along County roads.

Question: I have noticed that arborvitae die in patches and they are hard to maintain. What is your plan for this?

Answer: Ideally there is depth in the landscape to overcome shrubs that die. Narrow planters can be more challenging to maintain.

Question: At the intersections, does the separated sidewalk impact visibility of pedestrians?

Answer: There are certain guidelines that we have to look at for sight distance. Typical treatments include limbing trees and scale the size of plant material.

Question: There was a discussion on cycle tracks previously, with questions on safety for bikes and pedestrians to have separation from cars. Are there any pros or cons on these or other locations where they've been used?

Answer: We will discuss cycle tracks in more detail later in the meeting. We're not sure where that will go from here forward. We're looking for direction from the PFG on preferences. Russ Knoebel introduced himself as a principal engineer with Washington County, and gave an overview of where the County is going with this as a whole. The current County standard is to have the bike lane striped next to traffic. The County is in a transition period while they look at different concepts like cycle tracks. The County has hired Alta Planning Group to work on research and develop concepts for bike lanes. The County will not have design standards in place before the end of this project, but there is an opportunity to look at options as part of this project.

Leslie asked the PFG members for their input and preferences on the landscape options. She mentioned that if any of the PFG members, audience, and neighbors would like to provide input, email Matt Costigan by May 1, 2011.

PFG Input:

- I like Option 1A with the columnar shrubs
- I like Option 3 with the separation of sidewalk and the larger trees to create separation
- I like the concept of Option 2, but I'm not sure how well it will look in 5 years when half of the arborvitae are dead
- I like Option 1A for the diversity of the plant material
- I like Option 2 for the less concrete, the better
- I do not like Option 3 because it is void of green space
- I like Option 1A without the arborvitae because they die and are a maintenance problem
- I like Option 2 or 3 because the trees are closer to the road and it helps narrow the concrete feel
- I like Option 2 because kids need separation for safety
- I like Option 2 because the traffic is moving faster, so move the pedestrian back
- I like Option 1
- I like Option 2

Question: With the planter boxes and vines, will those stay green or are they seasonal?

Answer: They would be deciduous plants, so would be seasonal.

Question: What is the cost for the Adopt-A-Landscape program? Paul Enriquez offered to share what he has found for maintenance costs for arborvitae to the group.

Answer: It is a free program. The County waters up through the establishment period, then the HOA would take over with the Adopt-A-Landscape program. If the plants die, it would be up to the HOA to replace them.

Question: There is the long 2' median. Can we talk about making it a 5' median?

Answer: The design team looked at median widths and bike lane widths. At Avondale Drive, in particular, the widening adds right-of-way acquisition. At a critical point, the 8' setback changes to only 3' with the additional roadway widths with both a widened median and change to 6' bike lanes. We are trying to minimize right-of-way acquisitions. We can move forward with the additional roadway widths, if the PFG is interested.

A member of the PFG commented that there will be push back for additional right-of-way.

Question: This is just a sample, so where would the greenery start? What is the "welcome" to the neighborhood / project?

Answer: From Bronson Road north, there would be landscaping. There may be a different feel at Bronson Road since that wider area is slated for a water quality facility. We have presented a sample area and would carry the theme through the whole project.

Question: Do you know the cost of right-of-way acquisition to Oak Hills?

Answer: We have not determined the right-of-way cost by neighborhood; however, the rough preliminary calculation is approximately 6,000 SF for the combination wider median and bike lanes currently shown on the plan view. Right-of-way costs depend on the widths and the acquisition costs and are not known at this time.

#### Illumination – Fixture Types – Wayne Bauer (WHPacific)

Wayne explained that the preliminary illumination options are in the handouts. The design team has looked at standard flat-lensed cobra and decorative lights. The cobra head style light is a common standard roadway light. The decorative light shown is by Hadco and is a small-scale decorative light similar to the Saltzman project lights within the Town Center area.

Question: What is the impact of light on the houses?

Answer: The cobra styled lights would be shielded and have a flat lens to limit lighting of adjacent property.

The lights will be folded into the tree spacing to blend in. The design team is still looking at the feasibility of the decorative pole. It may not be able to meet the required lighting for the 5-lane section. We are checking to see if a taller pole can be manufactured, as right now the decorative pole is 20' tall and the cobra is 35'. As such, there is a caveat on that design option. Typical spacing from other recent projects is 120' for cobras (from the recent 185<sup>th</sup> project) and 75' for decorative (from recent Saltzman project). A PFG member suggested driving Saltzman Road at night to see the lighting effect.

The County uses a Type B, PGE light. PGE has a master list of lights for the County to choose from, and the County pays a flat rate for energy usage. The County is looking at the working with PGE to see if the more decorative lights can be LED.

Leslie asked the PFG members for their input and preferences on the illumination options.

**PFG members comment that Cobra lights are not preferred and are not attractive.**

Question: Do cobra lights exist in the neighborhoods?

Answer: Yes, but it depends on the development. In the case of Oak Hills, the answer is no, they have a different style.

Question: Right now are there any street lights?

Answer: There are a couple of existing lights that are on the arms on the wooden utility poles.

Question: What does Claremont have for lights?

Answer: Not sure, but it is likely cobras.

Question: Does either option work better with the trees?

Answer: When the trees mature, the smaller lights fit better.

Question: Where do the lights on the power poles fit in?

Answer: The spacing of new lights would be coordinated to fit with the old lights. On Saltzman, the lights are 250W High Pressure Sodium (HPS), and the cobras would be 150W.

#### Cycle Tracks – Wayne Bauer (WHPacific)

Wayne provided a brief overview of cycle tracks. He mentioned that the design team looked at something that would use similar spaces as conventional bike lanes and sidewalk. It wouldn't be the same due to increased widths. He explained that a cycle track is a sidewalk and bike lane outside the curbed street area. The options under consideration are:

- **Option A: One-Way Raised Cycle Track & Separated Sidewalk** – This option raises the bike lane and separates the sidewalk with a planter area between the two.
- **Option B: One-Way Raised Cycle Track & Curb-Tight Sidewalk** – This option places the sidewalk by the bike lane, with the planter area by the sound wall.
- **Option C: Separated Cycle Track & Separated Sidewalk** – This option moves both the bikes and sidewalk to the back with the planter area in front.

All of these options requires more room and widens the right-of-way. These options will be discussed at a higher County level, as Russ mentioned. The design team will carry the cycle track options forward to a certain point, but will remain focused on the overall design.

Question: On Option A, how is the bike lane dimensioned? It seems like the gutter is included in the bike lane width even though no one rides there.

Answer: We tried to keep the spaces similar and how they fit with the sound wall. More space is taken at the face of the cycle track to widen to accommodate all of the pieces.

Hal Ballard, who represents the Washington County Bicycle Transportation Coalition, gave his input on the cycle track design options. He mentioned that he falls into the category of “fearless” bike riders. Option C is difficult for bicyclists as they can only make turning movements at intersections because of the planter strip. He does not like the separation of this option. Option B has no buffer for the pedestrians. Option A is his preference as it has the ramped curb and separation.

Question: I am concerned about safety and families. As a family, where would they ride?

Answer: Hal answered that typically children under age 12 should ride on the sidewalk for safety.

Question: Is extra room needed for all three options?

Answer: Yes, there are additional curbs and shy distance for 3' each side for a total of 6' total width.

Leslie asked the PFG members for their input and preferences on the cycle track options. Of those PFG members who spoke regarding this issue, they indicated that Option A is overwhelmingly supported.

Question: Since we have shrunk the lane widths, could we widen here?

Answer: All of these options are not County standards, so there is room to work out the details.

## **Environmental Update – Michael Minor (Michael Minor & Assoc.) and Wayne Bauer (WHPacific)**

### Results of Air Quality Analysis - Michael Minor (Michael Minor & Assoc.)

Michael reported on the status of the air quality report. He mentioned that air quality is worse at signalized intersections and idling cars because of the long delays. At the three signalized intersections, Bronson Road and Oak Hills Drive are okay, but West Union Road has backups. Regardless, none of the three locations have will have any air quality impacts.

With improvements to air quality over the past years, air impacts rarely occur. To analyze the air quality we put receivers on the sidewalks at the end of the car backup locations. We run analysis for carbon monoxide and other pollutants, and the analysis is substantially below criteria. The national air quality standard for one hour of carbon monoxide is 35 particles; preliminary results show 4 particles. For an eight hour average, the regulations are no more than 9 particles; preliminary results show 3 particles.

The air quality report also includes a section on construction air quality. Michael recommends watering to keep dust down and that is typically sufficient.

The air quality report will be posted to the project website when it is completed and reviewed.

### Noise Analysis Including Wall Types - Michael Minor (Michael Minor & Assoc.)

The noise study is not finalized, because the design is not settled. Adjusting lane widths moves the sound walls and changes their height. The preliminary study has shown a range of 7'-9' for sound wall heights. The locations have not changed since the last PFG and are shown as a blue line on the map. The walls are shown flanking around the corners at intersections.

Michael discussed the noise wall aesthetics exhibit, which showed 11 different types of wall treatments. He mentioned that #6 is a typical standard highway post and panel type sound wall. Several of the options look like fences but are also a post and panel type wall. Number 1 is a post and panel wall with nicer looking posts and a decorative top.

Construction would consist of augering holes to set the posts, and then a crane would drop the panels in place. Pre-fabricated post and panel walls are relatively easy to construct. Over the past few years, designers have started to get away from the standard post and panel wall, and are using textured wall treatments to improve aesthetics of a project. Some look like fences, and some like stacked cinder blocks, but all are made out of a concrete mixture and textured.

Question: Does one type or another have a different sound benefit?

Answer: No. That depends on the material type, such as a wood fence vs. a concrete wall. The denser material better stops the low-frequency sounds. The material needs to have a certain amount of pounds per square inch before it is classified as a sound wall.

There are cost issues associated with some of these walls. Cost depends on material, style and quantity. For this corridor, the price should be reasonable. We are not sure what can be used yet, and do have to consider cost and constructability.

Question: Does the County have a preference?

Answer: The designers have their own personal preferences, but the design team wants to have input from the PFG on what they prefer.

Question: Would the wall type tie into Claremont?

Answer: Claremont has a lot of fences, so we may consider a fence-style wall to tie the areas together. The Claremont developers were required to meet the County standards which typically limit walls to 6' or less.

Question: The walls in front of Oak Hills are 12'-14' tall because ODOT put them in. They look like #6?

Answer: Yes, those are similar to #6.

Leslie asked the PFG members for their input and preferences on the sound wall type options.

PFG Input:

- NO: 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10
- YES: 1, 2, 7, 9, 11

Question: Would the wall type be uniform for the whole corridor?

Answer: Yes, that would be preferred for constructability.

Question: What is the timeline on the noise study?

Answer: Need to finish the road design before the noise study can be finished, because the noise analysis depends on the design elements and locations.

Status of Cultural Resources Report – Wayne Bauer (WHPacific)

The Cultural Resources report was completed by AINW and has been posted to the project website. As part of the process, AINW is submitting the report to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) for feedback, not for formal review and acceptance. This is because Oak Hills is still in the process of seeking Historic District status.

Question: What specifically is being submitted to SHPO?

Answer: This report.

Question: When will that be submitted to SHPO?

Answer: It is estimated to be submitted within a week or so.

Question: I talked to SHPO and asked them about Section 106 requirements. What is the timeline for determination of eligibility and finding of effect?

Answer: We are looking to SHPO for guidance on what they see the process to be. SHPO will review the report and provide direction to the team as to the next steps. They may ask the team to prepare a determination of eligibility and finding of effect. This submittal will start that whole process.

**Next Steps / Schedule Review – Wayne Bauer (WHPacific)**

County and Beaverton Permits

We have an Article VII pre-application conference next Monday with County staff. We anticipate a Category B process. This will be confirmed at the pre-application conference.

We will also go through the City of Beaverton Public Transportation Process. We will try to tie this in with the Bethany Overpass project, so that one application is submitted covering both projects. This permit is a separate process from the County process.

Design Schedule / Continued Design Work

There are still decisions that need to be made to set the design. We are moving towards an overall design plan submittal at the 50% preliminary plans level. The tentative submittal date will be out about 3 months in July 2011.

We are looking for input on design preferences to be able to move forward with the overall design effort. At the August PFG meeting, we will present how the 50% design came together. Please provide any comments on the items presented tonight to Matt by May 1<sup>st</sup>, so your feedback can be incorporated into the design.

**Update on Bethany Overpass Project – Russ Knoebel (Washington County) and Mel Sears (Parsons Brinkerhoff)**

Russ Knoebel mentioned that he had presented information about the Bethany Overpass project at PFG #2 (Sept. meeting). The County looked at four design options.

- **Option 1** – This option only restriped the pavement. This would be a short-term solution that would last about 2-5 years.
- **Option 2** – This option added an additional NB travel lane along with bike and pedestrian facilities. This would be a mid-range solution and would last about 5-10 years.
- **Option 3** – This option added an additional NB travel lane and SB turn lane along with bike and pedestrian facilities. This would be a long term solution, adding 28' to the eastern side of the bridge.
- **Option 4** – This option would realign Bronson Road as a stand-alone. This would impact homes and would not offer much improvement relative to the impact to the neighborhood.

Typically for a bridge project, the designers get one chance to widen a structure. As a result, the County is looking at a long-term solution and prefers Option 3.

At the Board of County Commissioners meeting in February, the Board voted in favor to extend the Bethany project down to Cornell Road and to include the Bethany Overpass project with the Bethany Blvd project. The County has hired Parsons Brinkerhoff (PB) to head up the design effort on the Overpass project, and Matt will be the overall project manager of both projects. The County is interested in gathering input on both projects.

Mel Sears introduced himself from PB, and explained that PB is an engineering firm that is over 100 years old. They have a lot of ODOT design experience. They also have Mark Hirota on their design team who used to be the ODOT state bridge engineer and worked on the design of the original overpass.

He gave an overview of their design team members:

- DKS & Associates – traffic
- WHPacific – survey
- JLA Public Involvement – public involvement
- Mason, Bruce & Girard – wetland mitigation

The overpass is unique in that it is an ODOT facility with a County road on top of it within the City of Beaverton jurisdiction. This project is not on ODOT's priority list, so the County decided to take the lead on it.

Traffic counts were taken in March. The geotechnical exploration started Wednesday and they should be out there for another week.

There will be coordination meetings between ODOT and the County design team, as ODOT has to approve the final design. Tualatin Hills Parks and Recreation District (THPRD) would like a north-south trail connection across the bridge, so we will be coordinating with them as well. Clean Water Services (CWS) will need to approve the water quality and water quantity treatment designs.

We will be scheduling an Open House this summer to present the 30% design. Final design is expected in 2012 to coincide along with the Bethany Blvd project for construction in 2012.

Question: Will this project include work to the on- and off-ramps?

Answer: No improvements to the ramps are included as part of this project. It will just be the bridge structure. The County is working with ODOT to address issues with the ramps. ODOT is considering adding a 3<sup>rd</sup> lane on the off ramp west bound from the Cornell Road exit, continuing to Bethany Blvd. The County project will be adding a 3<sup>rd</sup> lane at the Bethany Blvd. intersection for a second right turn lane for west to northbound traffic. That is the only improvement to the ramps as part of this project.

Question: How far south does this project go?

Answer: It will tie into the recent County improvements just north of NW Cornell Road.

Question: How far north does this project go?

Answer: The connection at Bronson Road needs to be coordinated between the two projects.

Question: Did you say it would be 28' wide?

Answer: Yes, the bridge would be widened 28' to the east. Highway 26 has height restrictions for bridges, and the roadway grade increases heading west. That requires the widening to be on the east side of the existing structure.

Question: As for the on-ramp towards Portland, people turning onto Cornell Road backs up traffic on the ramps. How many cars can that signal accommodate?

Answer: That signal can accommodate 700 – 1500 vehicles per hour. That is adjustable, but it is controlled by ODOT. The current widening project will result in 3 lanes for the on-ramp and will delete the HOV lane.

Leslie added that a copy of Mel's presentation handout will be posted to the project website.

### **Public Comment Period – *Leslie Howell (Howell Consulting)***

Leslie asked for public comment from those in the meeting audience.

Darla Castagno – Passes because the historical report is not in with SHPO yet.

Fran Bates – Do you know what the estimated cost of the overpass is?

*Response:* It is estimated right now at \$13 million. The County received \$3 million back from ODOT from money the County had in the Hwy 26 widening project. The additional \$10 million came out of excess from the Bethany project that shifted to the overpass project.

The Oregonian quoted Andrew Singalakis that the \$10 million was going to the North Bethany project. Is that correct?

*Response:* The Oregonian must have misquoted him, because the \$10 million is going to the NW Bethany Overpass project, not North Bethany.

Michele Schnorr – I have a question for forward thinking as far as potential cut-thru traffic during construction. Is the County willing and interested in participating with the homeowner’s association to provide traffic calming or speed radar in the neighborhoods to discourage cut-thru traffic?

*Response:* The County has put out speed trailers to help with curb speeding during construction. This was done on the Saltzman project, and it worked well.

Paul Haggstad – I’m concerned with the center median at Audrey. Audrey feeds two streets and a lot of homes. If there is no option for left turns out, then traffic will increase in the neighborhood.

**What’s Next? – Leslie Howell (Howell Consulting)**

Leslie mentioned that the draft meeting notes will be emailed out to the PFG members for review, similar to the December notes, since there is a gap between now and the next PFG meeting. After review, the minutes will be finalized and posted to the project website.

The exhibits shown tonight will be posted to the project website. Leslie reminded everyone to review the exhibits and options and provide input and comments via email to Matt by May 1, 2011.

Leslie mentioned that the PFG members will be emailed when new reports are posted to the project website.

**Conclusion – Leslie Howell (Howell Consulting)**

Leslie thanked everyone for their comments and mentioned that the next PFG meeting will be either August 4<sup>th</sup> or 11<sup>th</sup>. She asked if anyone had a preference for either date and no one did. Matt will send an email out to the PFG confirming the date so everyone can get it on their calendars.

**Items added to the “issues bin” for the next PFG meeting:**

- none

**End of Meeting Notes**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Next PFG Meeting: To Be Decided - Thursday August 4<sup>th</sup> or 11<sup>th</sup>, 2011, from 5:00 to 7:00 p.m.**