

Glencoe Interchange Project  
SWG Meeting #5

7-9 p.m. Thursday, July 13  
Jessie Mays Community Hall  
30955 NW Hillcrest, North Plains

MEETING SUMMARY

Staff present:

Lili Gordon, Tom Braibish, Tim Wilson, Aaron Myton, Amy Gibbons, Steve Harry (ODOT)  
Rick Kuehn (CH2M Hill)  
Matt Hughart (Kittelson & Associates, Inc.)  
Kristin Hull, Kalin Schmoldt (Jeanne Lawson Associates)

SWG members present:

Paul Coussens (Property owner)  
Robin Biden (Hillsboro School District)  
David Smith (North Plains Planning Commission)  
Marie Finegan (Washington County Farm Bureau)  
Clark Berry (NW ACT)  
Tai Kim (Subway)  
Larry Lund (Oregon Canadian Forest Products)  
Rick Dobbs (Washington County Fire District #2) – Alternate  
Kat Iverson (Washington County Bicycle Transportation Coalition) – Alternate  
Bob Horning (North Plains Chamber of Commerce)  
Nick Kelsay (City of Forest Grove)  
Susie Anthony (CPO 8)  
Bob Jossy (Jossy Farms)

SWG members absent:

Debbie Raber (City of Hillsboro)  
Joe Darby (Stewart Stiles Truck Line)

**Meeting purpose:**

- Review interchange alternatives from public meeting, and SWG and PDT workshop
- Review screening of alternatives and confirm alternatives to move forward for more detailed analysis

**Welcome and introductions**

**Review agenda** – Kristin began the meeting by thanking participants for coming. Kristin noted that there was much on the agenda to discuss and verified that everyone had received the packet in the mail. Kristin noted that the complete set of 84 ideas gathered at the SWG meeting and the public workshop had been consolidated into 33 unique ideas which were shown in the packet.

**Adopt meeting 4 and 4b meeting summaries** – A member noted that the word “interchange” was omitted on page three of the meeting 4 summary. There were no other comments.

Kristin added that the interchange workshop summary could be found in the packet.

Rick Kuehn noted that the technical team reviewed the designs and could not identify any possible designs that had not been identified through the workshop process that should be considered. Kristin complimented the group for being so comprehensive.

### **Evaluation process**

Kristin briefly discussed the “Steps to Preferred Interchange Concept” handout. She noted that the group is currently between phase 2 and 3 where the options must be pared from 24 to 12 or so. After the screening evaluation is completed, Matt will complete traffic operations analysis to further narrow the options to those that can accommodate forecasted levels of traffic. Kristin noted there could be more than five options left after that step.

Kristin reminded the group that it is advising the PDT. She told the group that reaching consensus is important and that a unified voice carries more weight than individual feedback.

### **Interchange designs and screening**

Matt led the group through a detailed explanation of the process used to advance the various conceptual drawings (outlined in Tech Memo #4). Matt described how the design sub-team took the 84 sketches and combined them into groups of general forms and common themes. He explained that many concept sketches came up more than once and could be consolidated into 33 unique “block diagram” concepts. Matt noted that some of the ideas had been modified to meet basic design standards—such as making interchange ramps enter Glencoe Road at 90 degree angles—but he added that these changes were mostly minor.

He explained that the design sub-team then reviewed the 33 block diagrams and eliminated those that did not meet the project’s purpose statement. This process narrowed the field to 24 designs. The nine options set-aside because they did not meet the purpose statement included:

- **Concept #6** – Doesn’t serve traffic that wants to go North on Glencoe Road from Hwy 26 West, nor traffic that wants to go East on Hwy 26 from Glencoe Road southbound.
- **Concept #11a** – Doesn’t address deficiencies for Glencoe Road.
- **Concept #11b** – Doesn’t address queuing and sight distance related deficiencies for the on and off ramps for Glencoe Road.
- **Concept #19** – Creates an inefficient interchange which forces detours through frontage roads and other streets.
- **Concept #23** – Takes away existing movement and is inefficient as an interchange.
- **Concept #24** – Fails to address deficiencies at Glencoe.
- **Concept #25** – Fails to address the structural deficiencies at Glencoe, and Rick pointed out that it also removes existing access to Glencoe Road.

- **Concept #26** – Fails to address safety or over-crossing issues, height, or sight distance issues.
- **Concept #27** – Fails to address deficiencies at Glencoe.

A member asked about the dotted line which appears in the NE quadrant of many of the concept maps. Matt said that the line demonstrates that some realignment of the existing road in the NE quadrant of the interchange will probably be necessary under that design option.

A member asked how concept #24 was eliminated based on not addressing capacity deficiencies since traffic analysis had not been completed. Tom Braibish explained that the option had been eliminated since it would not address structural deficiencies at Glencoe Road. Kristin proposed revising the report to remove the reference to traffic operations and the group agreed.

Tom noted that the PDT has recommended setting aside options that use Dersham or Gordon roads. He pointed out that those alternatives did not meet the screening criteria as well as the other (non-Gordon/Dersham) options did. Tom reminded the group that the concepts were all reviewed carefully to determine which alternatives best satisfied the most goals. He noted that ODOT staff had looked at the screening criteria in a different way from the consultant team and that the two screening methods resulted in the same set of concepts to advance to the next stage. He explained that is validated the results.

Tom and Kristin explained that the SWG could talk more about the Gordon Road options during the SWG recommendation agenda item, but that the PDT thought it was important to address upfront since there had been interest from the SWG in considering a Gordon Road option. Kristin then invited the group to take ten minutes look at the designs posted around the room.

After the group reconvened, Matt moved on to the next step “High Level Qualitative Evaluation,” that uses the formally accepted evaluation criteria. He explained that, since this is the screening level evaluation, the criteria were considered at generalized level.

Matt focused on the evaluation criteria list and summarized the goals. Matt noted that they chose not to look at Goal #6: Project Development because the criteria do not apply at the screening level. For example, Matt noted that it did not seem fair to judge the concepts on cost because cost estimates could not be developed at the current level of detail. Matt also noted that some evaluation criteria were not considered at this level because they were either too specific or would be impractical to apply. The rest were scored to indicate whether the concepts had a positive, negative, or no impact.

A member asked about how impacts to EFU (exclusive farm use zoning) land were measured. Matt responded that they looked at whether the concept divided parcels which would be a more significant impact than just encroaching on the edges of parcels. Kristin noted that, at the next level of evaluation, there will be more specificity regarding the actual degree of impact. Rick Kuehn noted that while exact impacts are unknown, a more stringent evaluation will come.

A member asked why freight movement and emergency response time were not being considered. Rick pointed out that all of the options could probably be designed to accommodate freight and emergency response, so using those criteria would not eliminate any options.

A member asked what the difference was between freight “movement” and freight “mobility.” Rick explained that there were two different ways of saying the same thing.

Matt noted that supporting data describing the scoring for each option were available upon request but noted that they are quite lengthy. Tom Braibish offered to post the appendices on ODOT’s FTP site, and noted that the SWG could review them if they wanted to examine the rationale behind each score.

Matt drew attention to the table of concepts and their scores. Matt described the table that showed which options satisfied the most criteria under each goal. Matt pointed out that none of the concepts achieved pluses in the “Natural and Cultural Resource” category, acknowledging that there will be inevitable impacts with all of the options.

Matt then pointed out which concepts satisfied the most criteria under four, three, two, one, or none of the goals. Kristin noted that the group should feel free to ask about the options which the PDT and project team have not recommended. Matt then briefly described each of the twelve recommended options:

- **Concept #1** – Parclo AB
- **Concept #3** – Single loop, Parclo A (NE quadrant)  
A SWG member pointed out that westbound traffic wasn’t an issue. Matt agreed, and noted that the group should be thinking about how each concept addresses traffic issues. He noted that Concept #3 may not score well at a more detailed level of evaluation because its design increases efficiency for a low-demand direction. Kristin noted that specifics will emerge with the traffic evaluation.

Another SWG member asked about how aesthetics were judged. Matt responded that they had looked at whether the proposed interchange forms would be out of character with the area. He cited as an example the flyover feature in Concept #9 which creates a high structure which might not appear to belong in North Plains as much as it would belong in downtown Portland. Matt agreed that the criteria was subjective, but pointed out that they tried to make it as objective as possible.

- **Concept #7A** – Single loop, Parclo B (NW quadrant)  
A member asked if the loop ramps could be any tighter than those shown. Aaron Myton noted that the loops shown were about the same radius as the loop ramp to Cornelius Pass Road which is about as tight as they can be.

A SWG member asked whether it would be possible to bring the westbound Hwy 26 off ramp to intersect at a position south of the where the westbound Hwy 26 on ramp begins. Matt said that doing so would create the need for more signals and flow

regulation. Rick added that such an intersection could violate driver expectations. Marty Jensvold also noted that there were emergency access reasons for keeping on ramps directly across from off-ramps.

A SWG member asked about doubling up lanes to alleviate the need for longer ramps. Matt noted that dual turn lanes can solve other problems by relieving the need to queue vehicles, but added that he didn't know specifically yet where double turn lanes could reduce ramp lengths. Kristin noted that the next set of drawings will show lanes.

- **Concept#7B** – Single loop, Parclo B (NW quadrant)

An audience member noted that this concept does not allow a quick turnaround for vehicles wishing to reenter the highway and asked why the concept wasn't eliminated as was a similar Gordon Road option. Matt acknowledged the point and responded that there may be the potential for a U-turn, and said that the impact probably is not as severe in this concept as it was on Gordon Road.

- **Concept#7C** – Standard diamond
- **Concept#8** – Two loops, Parclo B
- **Concept #9** – Diamond with flyover
- **Concept #11C** – Rebuild ramps and Glencoe Road

A member asked about the 0/- rating on the bike and pedestrian criteria. Matt noted that all traffic signals can have a pedestrian phase, so they could all accommodate pedestrians and bikes, but none of the concepts provide grade-separation. He pointed out that Concept #8 has the possibility of limiting or impeding the ability of pedestrians to cross the ramp terminals.

- **Concept #12** – Single point urban interchange

Tom Braibish noted that when multiple signals are used, they must be timed so that traffic can clear out or have adequate room to wait for the signal to change. A member asked about the use of smart signals that can sense when traffic gets backed up. Kristin encouraged the group to finish discussion of the concepts and leave the discussion of operational details for later.

- **Concept #13** – Roundabout interchange
- **Concept #14A** – Tight Diamond (Glencoe overpass)
- **Concept #14B** – Tight Diamond (Sunset Hwy overpass)

Kristin asked the group if they would like to discuss any of the concepts that the PDT suggested setting aside. The group asked to discuss #2, #16, #17 and #22.

- **Concept #2** – Similar to concept #1 but with the Glencoe Road shifted east. The concept scored negatively because it would divide parcels and impact businesses north of Hwy 26.
- **Concept #16** – Creates a cloverleaf which would allow the opportunity to eliminate left-hand turns. Matt said that full cloverleaf interchanges are more conducive to high demand intersections as in freeways. He added that not only is the concept out of character, but it would create dangerous merging areas in the middle of the cloverleaf.
- **Concept #17** – A member asked about why the concept gets a minus for proximity to driveways. Matt noted that the concept creates the need for a frontage road to connect businesses to Glencoe and would close driveways on 213 to the north of US 26. The member noted that the drawing wasn't intended to deposit traffic into the residential area, but rather create a T intersection. Matt said that would create an inefficient intersection, divide farmland to the south of US 26, and affect businesses to the north of 26.

After hearing the explanation for why these were set aside, the SWG agreed with the preliminary PDT recommendation.

- **Concept #22** – Provides an additional interchange at Gordon Road. A member noted that some SWG members were interested in providing an option at Gordon Road, and noted that Gordon will be reaching capacity within a few years.

The group was somewhat split about whether this option deserved further study.

A member asked clarification on why all of the Gordon Road concepts have been eliminated. Matt noted that they found that every option except #22 had failed to address the deficiencies at Glencoe Road. Another SWG member noted that the roads were too close together for two interchanges. Tom added that all the criteria should be looked at and noted that the option performs moderately to poor on most of the goals. Tom noted that a Gordon Road option could improve traffic flow, but asked why a new structure should be created when traffic issues could be addressed in a single interchange.

SWG members noted that a Gordon Road interchange would be an improvement for various surrounding communities, but might increase traffic by the school. Another SWG member noted that access from roads and driveways on Gordon Road would be affected by a new interchange.

A SWG member asked if it would be necessary to close the intersection of Commercial Street at Gordon Road if there was not a signal to go north on Gordon Road. Rick Kuehn noted that interchange spacing requirements do not differentiate between signalized or stop sign intersections, and added that the standards do require that spacing not be worse than

before the improvements. The SWG member noted that an interchange at Gordon could improve conditions on both Gordon and Glencoe roads.

Kristin asked how the group was feeling about including Concept #22 and the group was split. Kristin said that the PDT would pass the option on for the operational analysis if the group felt strongly about it, but noted that the PDT had already looked very closely at the option. Kristin proposed tabling the discussion and allowing the PDT to decide what to do in light of the SWG discussion.

A SWG member said he thought it was unreasonable to spend more time on the Gordon Road considerations, and Kristin asked that the SWG let the PDT make the call on the option.

### **SWG recommendation**

**Concept #3** – A SWG member pointed out that because there is less need for westbound access, Concept #3 should be removed from consideration. The SWG agreed.

**Concept #9** – A SWG member said that Concept #9 was an inelegant solution to the problem and could create a high overpass. Rick Kuehn noted that the PDT had wanted to consider the option in case it was discovered that a similar design was necessary from a traffic operations point of view. However, he noted that as the other options seem able to accommodate the traffic numbers, this design appears to be less necessary.

Matt noted also that there may be some advantages to this form concept which are not obvious. He advised keeping the option in at this point because it accommodates the highest demand at the p.m. peak, could potentially reduce the necessary width for the overpass itself, and could increase the utility of the overpass to pedestrians.

A SWG member pointed out that this option would create an uninterrupted flow of traffic on Glencoe southbound that could create access problems for people who live and work along the road. Kristin noted that about three members were opposed to the concept but the rest of the SWG seemed willing to let the PDT do their analysis.

**Concept #13** – There was concern that the concept wouldn't work. Most of the group made the recommendation to drop the option. A member said that it would be dangerous for people in a freeway state-of-mind to try to use this style interchange. Another member said the concept could be useful to look at if it was not too much trouble. Kristin recommended passing the concept on to the PDT.

**Concept #14B** – A member pointed out that said this style of interchange can be unfriendly to pedestrians and seemed unrealistic. Kristin pointed out that that it was not necessary to exclude options, as they've already been pared down to thirteen or so. Tom acknowledged that there were indeed some practical considerations. A member asked about the use of cost as a criterion. Kristin reminded the group that cost was not a factor at this point and recommended passing the concept on to the PDT.

Kristin summed up, noting that the SWG will recommend dropping concept #3 while passing on #9, #13, #14B, and #22 to the PDT for further review.

### **Public comment**

A member of the audience said that he felt concept #2 should be reconsidered because it provides a nice realignment without affecting businesses and could allow for improved connectivity during construction. Several SWG members noted that the concept would require the removal of many businesses. Matt added that because a grade and corresponding embankment may be necessary, the impact on businesses may be greater than it appears.

A member asked why all of the options which realign Glencoe Road were rejected. Kristin responded that the predominant reason was because of the impact to local businesses. Matt also pointed out that shifting the alignment could still create a situation where vehicles have to back-track to access businesses which are close to the highway.

### **Next steps and close**

Kristin thanked all for coming and noted that the recommendations will be passed on to the PDT.

- Next meeting:  
7-9 p.m. Wednesday, August 2  
Jessie Mays Community Hall
- Next public meeting:  
5-7:30 p.m. Thursday, August 17  
Jessie Mays Community Hall