



Open House #2 Summary May 12, 2004

The second project open house was held on Wednesday, May 12, 2004 at the Elmonica School in Beaverton Oregon. The open house was an opportunity for the community to learn about the work completed to date by the Project Advisory Committee and to comment on alternatives being considered for the roadway improvement. County and consultant staff were available to answer questions. The open house started at 5:00 p.m. and went until 7:00 p.m.

To inform the public of the event, approximately 2500 flyers were sent to the neighborhood, the 5 Oaks / Triple Creek Neighborhood Association posted a notice on their web site, a press release was issued on May 4, 2004 to the regional media, CPO 7 published a notice and project update in their April 2004 newsletter and the project web site provided information about the event.

An open house format was used at the meeting, allowing members of the public to discuss the corridor and project issues with members of the Project Management Team (PMT) and the Project Advisory Committee (PAC). Approximately 85 people attended the open house. Attendees were encouraged to meet the members of the PMT and the PAC, and to record their comments about the alternatives being considered on a comment form.

The following items were on display at the meeting:

- Aerial photo
- MSTIP Background Information
- Project Basics
- Project schedule
- Public Involvement Process Chart
- Issues identified by the PAC
- PAC Goals and Objectives
- Existing and forecast traffic volumes
- Existing Land Use Map
- Wetlands and Floodplains Map
- Alternatives considered by the PAC and not carried forward for further analysis
- Typical Sections (60' & 74' right-of-way (ROW))
- 1"=50' drawings of Alternative 1 including 74' ROW, minimum ROW, sight distance option at Emerald Creek Lane and alternate connection at 173rd Ave.
- 1"=50' drawings of Alternative 2 including 74' ROW, minimum ROW, and an alternate connection at 173rd
- Information about the right-of-way acquisition process.

Handouts distributed at the open house included the following:

- Flyer announcing open house
- Open House Comment sheet
- Standard Project Comment Form
- Right-of-Way information brochures

Comment Summary

35 comment sheets were received at the open house.

Following is a summary of the comments received:

WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED

ALT. 1 - 74' ROW

- I feel this alternative would constitute the best approach. Safety issues would be easier to address - feel maximum row would be better to use.
- Will some type of sound barrier be provided to lessen traffic noise?
- Preferred Alternative. It does not compromise safety by keeping planting area between curb and sidewalk.
- We would like this one, but understand it might be too expensive...So [go to #2]
- Works best from standpoint of total road improvements, but would impact fence lines of homes along 173rd. Could cost more in property alteration.
- Prefer Alternative 1 much more than alternative 2. Would like the 74' ROW if possible, but would accept the minimum ROW.
- Looks like best option.
- too wide-
- No. Too close to Elmonica - Safety issue. Traffic mess before and after school.
- Prefer 74' ROW. This choice provides better access to Elmonica.
- For Alternative #1 (and #2 to a lesser extent) please include traffic calming for neighborhood streets (springwater in particular). -Traffic estimates predict cut through traffic will double on Springwater. We would like to deter cut through by adding speed bumps and curb extensions, and possibly access limitations if possible. This needs to be included in this project, not left as a follow-up project that would be reprioritized with the City of Beaverton.
- Ideal. This will give the greatest uses. At least cost. With the growing potential now is the time to minimize the project.
- Effects the removal of more property of those houses along the right of way.
- It's not right to take away more of the people's yards just so there can be landscaping.
- Preferred
- Why disturb every property along the route when other choices use less impact and doesn't destroy front yards etc...

ALT. 1 - MINIMUM ROW

- This seems to make the most sense in creating the desired effect while minimizing property owner impact.
- Same as number 1.
- A poor compromise to reduce ROW. It will hurt in the long run.
- We support this option. It seems to have less impact on the residents in the area as well as preserving wildlife.
- Second choice. Has less impact on adjoining property and would cost more but offer less road improvement.
- Best option - Has the least impact to families in the community.

- OK
- Preferred
- Keeps 30 year-old promises with minimal acquisition.
- No. Too close to Elmonica - Safety issue. Traffic mess before and after school.
- For Alternative #1 (and #2 to a lesser extent) please include traffic calming for neighborhood streets (Springwater in particular). -Traffic estimates predict cut through traffic will double on Springwater. We would like to deter cut through by adding speed bumps and curb extensions, and possibly access limitations if possible. This needs to be included in this project, not left as a follow-up project that would be reprioritized with the City of Beaverton.
- Fewest # houses affected.
- Do not want alt. #1 because it is too close to school.
- This is the best alternative.
- Second Preference
- Yes. Least impact on everyone!
- Best of bad choices.
- This is what has been planned for the 13 years I've been around. I have developed my house according to this. It would not be fair to just suddenly change things.

ALT. 1 - ALTERNATE 173RD CONNECTION

- The better connection because intersections are farther apart.
- From Shadyfir Loop to Walker there should be a sidewalk for walkers and school children.
- No comment except pay attention to sight lines.
- My 1st choice!
- Prefer the connection to Stark Street rather than the other connection, which dead-ends into 173rd.
- Looks like best option.
- This is my preference. Long term quality for area.
- Preferable. No. Too close to Elmonica - Safety issue. Traffic mess before and after school.
- For Alternative #1 (and #2 to a lesser extent) please include traffic calming for neighborhood streets (Springwater in particular). -Traffic estimates predict cut through traffic will double on Springwater. We would like to deter cut through by adding speed bumps and curb extensions, and possibly access limitations if possible. This needs to be included in this project, not left as a follow-up project that would be reprioritized with the City of Beaverton.
- Leaves less developable property than revised alignment below [in #4].
- Same as above [#2].
- Based on the information presented - I like this plan the best.

ALT. 1 - REVISED ALIGNMENT

- Not preferred because intersections too close.

- Overlapping wetlands too much?
- No comment.
- This option is part of Alt. 1 - Minimum ROW again that fits the plan.
- Preferred
- Leaves too small a partition for compatible development in area.
- No. Too close to Elmonica - Safety issue. Traffic mess before and after school.
- For Alternative #1 (and #2 to a lesser extent) please include traffic calming for neighborhood streets (Springwater in particular). -Traffic estimates predict cut through traffic will double on Springwater. We would like to deter cut through by adding speed bumps and curb extensions, and possibly access limitations if possible. This needs to be included in this project, not left as a follow-up project that would be reprioritized with the City of Beaverton.
- Appears to effect the least amount of properties. Leaves more developable property to Essams. Suggest an electric gate at entrance to property at west end of connection to 173rd.
- This would be what I believe best. Even and equally serves the neighborhood need.
- Favor this one.
- Seems to make the most sense.
- Yes.
- Want a bridge over wetlands - Not a culvert. House this would take out is empty. Least impact to people.

ALT. 2 - 74' ROW

- Safety issues with regard to driveways and increased traffic flow/ increased cost to address those issues.
- Not desired alternate, but if this is the final choice, use 74' ROW.
- This seems to be too costly and has a greater impact on the residences along the route.
- Prefer alt. 1 except more homes and property affected.
- No. This option does not better the community, or positively impact the school.
- Given the expense and direct property impact, I do not favor any version of alternative #2.
- No. No - encourages more traffic.
- Prefer 74' ROW.
- For Alternative #1 (and #2 to a lesser extent) please include traffic calming for neighborhood streets (Springwater in particular). -Traffic estimates predict cut through traffic will double on Springwater. We would like to deter cut through by adding speed bumps and curb extensions, and possibly access limitations if possible. This needs to be included in this project, not left as a follow-up project that would be reprioritized with the City of Beaverton.
- Same as below [#6].
- I would not want people's yards to be taken away just so we can have landscaping.
- Like none of the alt. 2 plans. Why spend county money buying expensive property when right of way was paid for 30 years ago.

- See comments on reverse [general comment section].
- Cost outrageous. Not a good plan because it would take out property frontage.

ALT. 2 - MINIMUM ROW

- Not desired. Too many compromises.
- This seems to be too costly and has a greater impact on the residences along the route.
- Prefer alt. 1.
- I favor this option primarily for the sidewalk improvements - a long time safety issue.
- No. This option does not better the community, or positively impact the school.
- Planting strips only cause more use and weed growth. It's not worth doing. Saves school and reuses most of what already is a busy street.
- X (preferred)
- No. Minimum impact - Best choice of all.
- Extremely difficult for houses with driveways on 173rd. 5 houses out.
- The best choice because it's the safest for school children. The min. ROW is better so that people's yards are not affected.
- X (preferred)
- Like none of the alt. 2 plans. Why spend county money buying expensive property when right of way was paid for 30 years ago.
- See comments on reverse [general comment section].
- People will cut through residential.

ALT. 2 - ALTERNATE 173RD CONNECTION

- If alt. #2 is selected, this should be the connection because it helps flow to and from 170th and to 173rd.
- Need stop lights by Bauer School to get out of neighborhood onto 170th St. 3 big alignments are in process close by. Oh mercy!!!
- This seems to be too costly and has a greater impact on the residences along the route.
- No. This option does not better the community, or positively impact the school.
- BAB
- No.
- No - not needed - just encourages more cars by elementary school - safety issue.
- Ugly. 4+ houses out -
- Like none of the alt. 2 plans. Why spend County money buying expensive property when right of way was paid for 30 years ago.
- See comments on reverse [general comment section].
- Worst of all - looks like a motor cross racetrack.
- NO way - Think of kids trying to get to school - too much property being taken.

- I believe that this configuration would only be feasible if a traffic light was placed at the intersection for children walking to and from school. Kids will be walking on the road when there are no guards to monitor their safety in crossing.

GENERAL COMMENTS

- Noise is always a factor in any neighborhood, but efforts to minimize with trees would be good - Progress usually comes with a price and we can't always be guaranteed that our neighborhoods will remain the same over years.
- Concern about traffic near Elmonica Elementary is invalid. Traffic by Vose Elementary and others in Beaverton are as high as predicted here. Fences and lighted crosswalks are appropriate for school safety.
- We would like to vote for alternative #1.
- Please, please consider making a sound wall for the Mirewood neighborhood a part of this project. Any alternative will significantly increase the noise levels in and around our homes. We on 173rd will be experiencing the same increase in noise levels as those homes south of Walker Road. Help! Please consider the Mirewood area part of goal number 1: "Protect and enhance environmental resources; minimize noise impacts on your "goals and objectives" chart.
- People are the most important factor to think of, regardless of the choice made I want to see a lot of trees, lights and speed controls.
- I favor alternative #1, but am concerned about the proximity of the road to the school. Will there be a retaining wall or fence? 2nd concern will be 173rd - will there be any speed bumps or traffic calming devices? Long and straight roads with little traffic = high SPEED.
- Believe should do wider ROW if at all an option. Looks safer.
- Prefer Alternative 1w/ 74' ROW.
- We've lived here since 1988 and have seen the cut-through traffic get worse and worse. Even with traffic calming - a major arterial next to Elmonica will only make this worse and impact the safety of Elmonica students.
- No matter which alternative is chosen, I prefer the 74' right of way. It makes the sidewalks safer to have a buffer between them and the street.
- I want to see in place the route, which has minimum serious impact on the residents of the neighborhood.
- Alt. 3 makes no sense when right of way has already been bought and paid for. The engineers laid out a plan that made perfect sense. Buying the Nielsen property and relocating the business would cost the taxpayers a lot more money.
- It seems to us (wife, Lurene Lange, owner of property) that developments go in before roads and other services are provided for. It also feels like us long term residents are being asked to pay again for roads and services we have already paid for. Is this true or just a misunderstanding? I want to support the community but are the developers paying adequately for service and road need they are creating?

- Make 170th all the way from Baseline (with a light) to Walker with another light. I know people don't like light so close together, but it slows the speeders down.
- My home is the third house from 173rd. I bought the house less than three years ago because it was a fairly quiet area. Three lanes will put my home closer to 173rd. I think it will be more difficult turning left to go toward Walker. I realize there will be a Light at Lisa, but there will still be cars coming from the other side. There is also a hill that makes it hard to see and judge the speed of cars below the hill coming from Walker. Three lanes would not be good in that area of 173rd.
- I definitely prefer alternative 1 with 170th Avenue construction.
- Alternative 1-min. impact - We own property at both ends - (173rd frontyard 170 Backfield area.) We feel alternative #1 is the only practical way. When we bought 12 years ago the easements were already set back and we knew 170th would go past the back. Property N. of Lisa already has the set backs established. Why buy more when we already have these boundaries set.
- Would rather see the Merlo/158th connection finished. Also: 173rd need sidewalks.
- Please put 170th in on alternative 1 minimum ROW.