Glencoe Interchange Project
Stakeholder Working Group Meeting #4

7-9 p.m. Wednesday, May 31, 2006
Jessie Mays Community Hall
30955 NW Hillcrest, North Plains

Draft Meeting Summary

SWG members present
Wayne Holm (Oregon Canadian Forest Products)
Tai Kim (Subway)
Susie Anthony (CPO 8)
Robin Biden (Hillsboro School District)
Paul Coussens (Property Owner)
Marie Finegan (Washington County Farm Bureau)
Bob Jossy (Jossy Farms)
Debbie Raber (City of Hillsboro)
Bob Horning (North Plains Chamber of Commerce)
Clark Berry (NW ACT)
Butch Kindel (Washington County Fire District #2)
David Smith (North Plains Planning Commission)
Nick Kelsay (City of Forest Grove)
Hal Ballard (Washington County Bicycle Transportation Coalition)

SWG members absent
Joe Darby, Stewart Stiles Truck Line

Staff
Lili Gordon, Tim Wilson, Tom Braibish, Amy Gibbons (ODOT)
Marc Butorc, Matt Hughart (Kittleson Associates)
Rick Kuehn (CH2M Hill)
Kristin Hull, Kalin Schmoldt (JLA)

Meeting purpose:
- Learn about future traffic conditions
- Review and develop recommendations about evaluation criteria
- Learn about Interchange Area Management Plans (IAMP)

Welcome and introductions
Kristin thanked all for coming and asked the one member of the public present if he would like to make a statement to the group during the public comment period. He indicated that he would probably have no comment.

Review agenda – Kristin noted one change to the agenda: the IAMP discussion would come before the Future Traffic Conditions report.

Adopt meeting summary – The meeting summary #3 was adopted as written.
Goals, objectives, evaluation criteria

Review revised criteria – Rick Kuehn distributed the "Goals, Objectives, and Evaluation Criteria" and briefly discussed the highlighted changes and additions.

- The first addition discusses the spacing between the interchange ramp and the first intersection where left-turns are allowed. Rick noted that this criterion was different than the previous criterion which specifies spacing between the ramp and the first driveway.

- On the second change, Rick emphasized the addition of "proper transition" and the removed reference to design speed.

- The third change alters the wording slightly but preserves the same idea. A member asked whether "safe" access is specified in the criteria. Rick responded that "safe" could be added, but felt that "safe" was covered by "efficient." There was some discussion of adding "safe" to the criteria, and Rick noted that "safe" could be added in front of "efficient" in most cases.

- The fourth change makes the reference to the comprehensive plan more specific to North Plains.

- The fifth change is the addition of a new objective and two new criteria related to economic development.

A member suggested adding: "Constructed in a way to allow overpass to remain open during construction," which Kristin added as a criteria under Goal 6. A member noted that they should avoid a "Cedar Hills situation" which created a detour for a long period of time. The group expressed consensus that impacts during construction should be minimized. Kristin suggested leaving it to the PDT to determine specific wording.

A member suggested changing the name on the sheet to reflect that the group was looking at "Glencoe Interchange Alternatives." Rick Kuehn said the name on the worksheet could be changed, although the name of the project is simply "Glencoe Interchange." Kristin emphasized that the sheet is a working document, so it is most important that the group understands the purpose.

A member brought up the question of a Gordon Road alternative and expressed concern that he had not heard anything about the option. He noted that the goal of reducing traffic on Glencoe Road might be accomplished by using Gordon road. Rick Kuehn responded that the team has deliberately avoided discussing specific alternatives, but that the workshop scheduled for the first week of June would be the right place to raise those kinds of ideas. Staff assured the SWG that no alternative was precluded and alternatives would be brought up at the meeting next week.

- The final change was the addition of a criteria regarding adequate agricultural drainage.

A member asked whether there should be a public involvement criterion. Rick Kuehn reminded the group that the purpose of the criteria is to help screen and compare options. He noted that a public involvement plan spans the entire process so it would not help to differentiate between options. Kristin said that it would appropriate if the group wanted to write out a public involvement statement or incorporate something into the group charter.

Committee recommendation – Kristin asked the SWG if it was ready to recommend adoption of the goals, objectives and criteria to the Project Development Team. The SWG agreed by consensus. Kristin noted that the changes will be made and a final version would be brought back to the group.

IAMP 101

Presentation – Matt Hughart gave a brief introduction to the IAMP process. It is essentially a 20+ year strategy to protect the functions and safety of a highway interchange. A member requested to have the slideshow emailed to the group. Matt noted that an IAMP was not prepared for the existing interchange because they are a fairly new requirement.

Q & A – A member asked about the implementation process and how IAMPs are dealt with and scheduled. Matt responded by describing how after the IAMP is adopted by the SWG and the PDT, then specific projects and improvements are individually adopted and implemented into the city's TSP.

A member asked about the purpose of the Jackson School Road project. To keep the group moving forward, Kristin recommended that the member talk to Steve after the meeting.

Future traffic conditions

Presentation – Matt noted that everyone should have received a copy of the future conditions memo via email, although he brought copies of the memo as well as Appendix D for anyone who is interested.

Matt addressed the issue raised at the last meeting about how the traffic counts presented were lower than historical counts. Matt noted that he had done some research and found that there is a siphoning of traffic from Glencoe Road to Jackson School Road since the new interchange opened. He indicated that that is at least part of the reason for lower than expected traffic volumes today. He also noted that some of the difference is expected based on daily variations.

A member noted that Matt's findings seem counter-intuitive. Matt noted that it is good that the SWG recognizes that growth is occurring in these rural locations.

A member mentioned that Washington County had completed traffic counts in 2005 and that the data had been correctly compiled and was ready for use. Matt offered to talk afterwards about getting copies of the newer numbers.

Matt then described the methodology used to complete the traffic forecasts. He discussed how different types of new local development are each expected to create varying number of

trips which will be added to the transportation system. Matt noted that he worked with city staff to understand likely potential infill development and new development to determine realistic numbers. Matt explicitly noted when he made assumptions about potential developments which were unplanned. Matt described the process as similar to that used to develop the city's TSP.

A member noted that the presentation describes the Westside industrial area in square feet, and asked why it wasn't represented in acres. Matt responded that trip studies are aggregated based on the size of the building, and the manual uses square footage to correlate building size with number of trips. He noted that only about 30% of each acre of industrial property is used for the building itself, while the rest is used for support structures such as roads, parking and lawn. The member expressed disbelief at the square footage estimates, and Matt offered to review the numbers with him later.

A member pointed out that Hillsboro has annexed 300 acres of industrial land and has approval for annexing more. The member asked how the new trips that will use Glencoe Road are taken into account. Matt responded that, although many changes have occurred since the 2020 model was developed; the update of the model is not yet available. Matt said that he has been working with Washington County to employ the most accurate model possible.

Marc Butorac reiterated that they are working with the best model available. He noted that if it becomes apparent that the current model is inadequate as studies continue, then there will be mechanisms incorporated into the process which will allow the IAMP to evolve as time goes on.

A member noted that he thinks that 2% growth per year is a conservative estimate, and asked about potential commercial development south of the highway. Matt replied that, aside from a small piece of commercial land, there is no planned commercial development south of the highway.

Marc added that it is their mandate to proceed with current expectations. He added that they can create mechanisms to adjust the process if new needs do arise. Rick Kuehn pointed out that the city has taken the official stance that development will occur on the north side of US 26. A member pointed out that some people have interest in seeing industrial growth on the south side of US 26.

Another member indicated that 2% growth seemed small. Matt clarified that Jackson School Road is acting to temper the traffic on Glencoe road, and that traffic volume could be indeed be higher without its influence.

Marc noted that the interchange is a constrained system in that the feeder roads can only accommodate a limited number of vehicles per hour. He noted that because the amount of traffic that can get to the interchange in a one hour period is limited, it keeps the growth potential low.

A member asked how the growth in traffic on Highway 26 would be addressed and whether there is a way to account for people using Hwy 26 who get off and on at Glencoe Road.

Matt said that the assumptions for commercial development are oriented towards the growth of highway traffic because many of the commercial establishments in the area (gas stations, fast food) target regional through travel more than local travel. He added that it is also possible to look at the annual growth of Highway 26 itself.

A member had a clarifying question about whether improvements—such as the addition of signals—need to be made to all of the indicated intersections. Matt explained that the need for signals is not just based on side street delays, but traffic volumes at all hours and the persistence of delays. Marc added that some solutions may minimize the need for signals as well.

A member referred to page 12 of the technical memo where it indicates that the ramp is forecast to operate above capacity. Matt noted that that was an error, and it should say that the *standard* has been exceeded, not the *capacity*. He described the rating for ramps as a "V/C" ratio or volume/capacity and indicated that the ODOT standard is 0.85, while the ramp is currently at 0.88.

June 8 workshop

Workshop plan - On Wednesday, June 8, there will be a combined PDT/SWG meeting which will be in the form of an interchange design workshop. The workshop will talk about different interchange forms, their advantages and disadvantages, and the terms used to define them: diamond, loop, cloverleaf, etc. Aerial photographs will be provided for markup.

The next night will be a public open house, structured like the June 8 SWG/PDT workshop, but seeking input from the public. ODOT and team staff will sift through the collected ideas and present the findings to be screened and evaluated.

A member asked if the aerial map could include the Gordon Road area and whether it would be possible to get data from Washington County regarding the percentage of traffic using the exchange which ends up in Forest Grove and Hillsboro. Matt answered that yes, the map does include Gordon road, and he said he would work with the county modeler to try to get the numbers requested. Matt said that he would try to make some estimates for next week's meeting. Another member also expressed curiosity about the final destinations for interchange users.

Public comment - Kristin again asked for comments from the public, there were two:

- Is the project looking at razing the bridge or raising the existing bridge? Rick responded that the project was looking at rebuilding the interchange to current standards.
- A question was raised about whether ODOT would not allow on/off ramps at both Glencoe Road and Gordon Road. Marc replied that current ODOT rules would not allow on and off ramps at both locations, but noted that there are forms which would work. Matt said that there will be more on the subject at the next meeting.

Next steps and close

- Next meeting:
  7-9 p.m. Wednesday, June 7
  Jessie Mays Community Hall

- Next public meeting:
  5:30-7:30 p.m. Thursday, June 8
  North Plains Elementary School
  Workshop from 6-7:30 p.m.

Action items:

- Distribute IAMP 101 to SWG.
- Distribute adopted purpose and need and evaluation framework to SWG at next meeting.