



Meeting #9 – November 30, 2004  
5:30 p.m. – 7:30 p.m.  
Elmonica School Cafeteria  
Revision No. 1

## Attendees

### Project Advisory Committee

- Breiling, John
- Brink, Jim
- Essam, Betty
- Gorski, Matt
- Green, Jerry
- Judy, Mary Alice
- Kane, Vic
- McCoy, James
- Mitchell, Pat
- Raetz, Rick
- Renfro, Jerry
- Rockford, Julie
- Shettles, David
- Trask, Bob
- Yuen, Wes

### Handouts

Plan & Profile strip map

### Project Management Team

- Watkins, Todd
- Ihly, Bill
- Barkouli, Al
- Howell, Leslie
- Morey, Sandy
- Erpenbach, Dan
- Christensen, Neal
- Craig Milliken

### Visitors

- Tammara Engesether
- Gary Prehn
- Patrick Martin

The meeting began at 5:37 p.m.

After calling the meeting to order, Leslie re-acquainted the PMT with the PAC and noted that there were a couple of visitors. She reviewed the meeting agenda and pointed out that none of the visitors wanted to make any comments.

Todd Watkins immediately went through a summary of the progress and updates that pertained to the additional recommendations that came out of PAC meeting #8.

In particular, Todd went over the following topics:

Fence along school frontage – Todd indicated that the County would be working with the school district with respect to their fence along their frontage which would likely be in conjunction with any re-development efforts the school plans for the Elmonica property.

Consideration of sound walls – Todd gave a brief overview of this topic and said that additional information would be presented later in the evening to further explain the sound analysis. He explained the County's policies regarding noise analysis and noise mitigation. In particular, he explained that the majority of the homes in the project corridor were built too recently to be considered for noise mitigation and the few remaining parcels that might be eligible had other technical issues associated with them including sight distance and accessibility, that would make installation of sound walls difficult.

Consideration of raised landscaped medians – Todd showed the PAC that there were two locations where center medians might be possible but their final length and configuration would be dependant on the final lane configuration and local accesses.

School Parking – Todd reminded the PAC that although this segment of road does not allow on-street parking, at the request of some PAC members, the County looked into any opportunity that may be available. The PMT determined that there was no way to shift lanes or tapers to accommodate any on-street parking. Todd told the PAC that the County is committed to working with the school district with respect to this issue.

Todd also mentioned a few other developments including the inclusion of photo radar van bays near the school and the recent proposal of the Nielsen's to develop their property.

With the conclusion of Todd's summary, Craig Milliken from TW Environmental (TWE) spent the next few minutes explaining the noise analysis efforts.

In general, Craig told the PAC that TWE did a preliminary noise analysis during the alternative analysis process (used for the evaluation matrix) and then an in-depth analysis once the alternative was selected. A map was presented with receptor locations and existing and projected noise levels based on current and projected 2023 traffic volumes.

Craig told the PAC that the analysis was being done to fulfill permit requirements that noise be evaluated but Todd pointed out that there is no regulatory requirement for mitigation of traffic noise as part of a road project.

Craig went on to explain that only three areas may be eligible for noise mitigation but that several key elements would have to be considered before mitigation is instituted. In particular, there will be consideration of the wall location because the City of Beaverton prefers the wall to be in the right-of-way thus requiring the purchase of right-of-way. In addition sight distance would have to be maintained if the wall was near an access or intersection. Also, the effectiveness of the wall must be evaluated. A sound wall with breaks for driveways is less likely to be effective in reducing sound. The wall also must be economical based on the cost and overall effectiveness of the sound reduction.

There were several questions and assorted discussions from the PAC including:

Were noise levels along 173<sup>rd</sup> measured? – No, not in its entirety. 170<sup>th</sup> & 173<sup>rd</sup> were measured within the limits of the selected alignment and the predictions were made for the selected alignment because that's where the noise will be concentrated after the project is constructed.

There was some discussion about what the future noise levels on 170th would physically sound like. Craig Milliken pointed out that because of the existing speed and traffic volumes on Walker Road, the area on 173rd just south of Walker Road has existing noise levels around 64 to 69 dba which is similar to what the 2023 noise levels on 170th are predicted to be.

What are some examples of what the noise levels represent? – Craig had several examples of other noise generators and their accompanying decibel level including

<b>Thresholds/ Noise Sources</b>	<b>Sound Level (dBA)</b>
Siren (100 ft) Jackhammer, power drill	130
Lawn mower (3 ft) Noisy motorcycle (50 ft)	100
Normal automobile at 65 mph (25 ft) Vacuum cleaner (3 ft)	70
Large air conditioning unit (20 ft) Normal conversation (3 ft)	60

What are the chances of sound walls being installed?:

- 170<sup>th</sup> & Lisa- There is little chance of sound walls near the intersection because of the proximity to the corner and the sight distance and access issues associated with this location.
- The subdivision near the southern portion of the project-This location would probably not be considered for a wall because the only improvement adjacent to that section of road is the installation of bike lanes, which required the widening of the curb line, by 2 feet.
- Three parcels just north of Lisa- it is still unknown if walls would be appropriate for these parcels.

Why were measurements taken if no mitigation is being done? - Local permit regulations require consideration of noise impacts as part of the alternative analysis. However, road projects are not required to provide mitigation for traffic noise. Measurements provide the PMT and the interested public a measured basis for analysis.

Neal Christensen reviewed the plans that are currently at the 50 percent plan level.

Neal explained that the designers had maximized the use of the right-of-way by including a planter strip wherever possible and then showed widened sidewalks with tree wells wherever there wasn't sufficient room to fit the Beaverton-preferred width of planter strip. He also pointed out that the medians shown on the drawings are maximum length and may be reduced in size, if necessary based on access or lane configurations.

Neal also explained that a comparison was made between a short-span bridge and a culvert for the new creek crossing. He told the PAC that based on the cost and hydraulics of the drainage system, a 12' wide x 6' high box culvert would be the best selection for the crossing. He also told the PAC that the box culvert would be embedded into the stream bed by 1', which is preferred by the permitting agencies, to allow for a natural stream bottom.

He then went into a discussion and presentation of the possible tree and street light options for the project. There was some discussion with respect to the size of the trees and the configuration of the lights to minimize light pollution. Neal told the PAC that the trees shown tonight were on the City of Beaverton's approved list of species for the various applications (i.e. planter strip, median, or tree wells).

Neal showed a display of acorn and shoe box lights and explained the characteristics of each. He indicated that many people prefer the aesthetics of the acorn lights, but they tend to shed more light into the neighborhood, while the shoebox lights cast the light down. Jim Brink pointed out that although decorative, the acorn lights aren't as efficient as the shoebox type because the light is thrown in more directions. It was also noted that because of the shields that are available, 2<sup>nd</sup> story light infiltration is not typically a problem with the acorn lights. He said that what the City found on the Hart Road project was that the street lights that were across the street had more influence with respect to light infiltration into 2<sup>nd</sup> story windows than those lights directly adjacent to the house. Bill Ihly mentioned that acorn lights have also been installed on Farmington Road, Cornelius Pass Road, and Baseline Road if the PAC wanted to see what they look like.

After the tree and light discussion, Leslie asked the PAC members to used sticky dots identify the trees and streetlights that they preferred:

<b>Planting Strip</b>	<b>Number of Votes</b>
Autumn Gold	5
Hungarian Oak	3
<b>Center Median</b>	
Black Tupelo	4
Scarlet Oak	6
<b>Tree Grate</b>	
Pyramidal Hornbeam	6
Raywood Ash	3
<b>Lighting</b>	
Acorn	6
Shoe Box	3

Wes Yuen said that he liked the full width paved sidewalk but Pat Mitchell said he'd be concerned that kids on their bikes would weave in and out of the trees and potentially fall into the street. It was pointed out to the PAC that the road was going to have a bike lane so there will be a buffer between the curb and the travel lane.

Jerry Green said that he'd talk with the school district's safety director about donating extra right-of-way in order to get a full planter strip along the school's frontage. The group discussed the pros and cons of a full planter strip versus tree grates. There were members that preferred each. Todd indicated that the County would work with the City and the school district on this issue.

Jerry also mentioned that the school district has a preliminary design of the intersection at their entrance and would like to get the lane numbers identified. He said he'd forward their preliminary design to the County so that they could see the district's proposal.

Todd then gave an update to some recent project activity:

Transportation Plan Amendment – Todd told the PAC that based on their recommendation from June, the alignment has now been adopted by the Board of Commissioners and the study area designation has been removed from the Transportation Plan.

Declaration of Necessity – Todd told the PAC that the Board of Commissioners recently approved the centerline description through a Declaration of Necessity. Todd explained to the PAC that the Declaration is the mechanism for the right-of-way acquisition process to formally begin.

Todd also told the PAC that he has recently transferred to another division in the Department and that Bill Ihly would be taking over as the project manager for this project. Bill's contact information is (503) 846-7831 or bill\_ihly@co.washington.or.us.

Leslie then asked the PAC what they would like to do for the next public information opportunity. She mentioned that an open house in February was realistic and that there would be opportunities for public interaction with the project through some of the permitting requirements such as the Beaverton Board of Design Review, public hearings, and a presentation to the local NAC. The PAC appeared to be receptive to these opportunities and requested that they be notified whenever a public hearing was scheduled. The PAC indicated that they had worked hard to get to where they were at and wanted to make sure the City and/or County listened to them.

David Shettles asked about school zone signing and there was a brief discussion on the type and location of traffic control devices used in the new school zone. Jim Brink said he would provide the necessary information to the design engineers.

Leslie then asked if the PAC wanted to meet again before the open house. There was a 4 to 4 tie and Pat Mitchell suggested an informal potluck as their next event. Mary Alice Judy said she was willing to host such an event if that's what the PAC wanted. The meeting adjourned at 7:40 p.m.