

**Glencoe Interchange Project  
SWG meeting #8**

7-9 p.m. Wednesday, October 4, 2006  
Jessie Mays Community Hall  
30955 NW Hillcrest, North Plains

**AGENDA**

**SWG members present:**

Robin Biden (Hillsboro School District)  
Stewart King (North Plains Chamber of Commerce)  
Clark Berry (NW ACT)  
Chet Wolter (Josey Farms)  
Tai Kim (Subway)  
Marie Finegan (Washington County Farm Bureau)  
David Smith (North Plains Planning Commission)  
Paul Coussens (Property Owner)  
Derek Robbins (City of Forest Grove)  
Kat Iverson (Washington County Bicycle Transportation Coalition)  
Susie Anthony (CPO8)

**Staff present:**

Tom Braibish (ODOT)  
Lili Gordon (ODOT)  
Aaron Myton (ODOT)  
Rick Kuehn (CH2M)  
Matt Hughart (Kittleson Associates, Inc.)  
Kristin Hull (JLA)  
Kalin Schmoldt (JLA)

**Meeting purpose:**

- Recommendation about preferred alternative
- Local access and circulation

**Welcome and introductions**

**Review agenda** - Kristin thanked all for coming and led a brief round of introductions. She summarized the agenda for tonight's meeting, noting that there will be discussion of the three design alternatives and the PMT's recommended option. Kristin noted that the issue of greatest interest will probably be the local access plan, and explained that the group would not be making a decision on local access tonight, but would be having discussion that would further shape the recommendation to the PDT. That recommendation will be discussed at the next SWG meeting.

Kristin asked if anyone was planning to present comments at the end of the meeting. No one expressed the desire to comment. Kristin said that there would be time at the end of the meeting if anyone wanted to comment then.

**Adopt SWG #7 summary** - Clark Berry asked to be included on the list of attendees for the SWG #7 summary. A SWG member pointed out that Butch Kindel represents Washington Co. Fire District 2, not 1.

### **Analysis of remaining alternatives**

Matt introduced himself and the planning role of Kittleson Associates. He explained that he will revisit the design concepts and alternatives and the process by which they have arrived at this. He described the screening involved and gave a presentation to cover how they reached their recommendation.

Matt briefly covered the three finalist concepts and their characteristics. He then explained how they compared the single-point interchange (#12) with the two diamond forms (#11C and #14A.) That analysis revealed that the single-point interchange could cost up to 50% more than the diamond designs. A SWG member asked how realistic the cost estimates were. Tom Braibish said that the price variability could be 20-30%, but that variability would be consistent across the different designs. He added they had less cost-saving flexibility with the single-point design.

Matt then described how the single-point interchange does not demonstrate any significant benefits over the diamond concepts while the disadvantage—the impact effect on wetlands, access spacing, and compliance with mobility standards—was similar. A SWG member noted that the compressed diamond design appeared to have a greater impact on structures in the SW quadrant than the single-point, and asked why the two diamonds were being compared as one against. Matt pointed out that the apparent impacts to structures in the drawing were misleading because of the resolution and scale of the maps. He said that they were confident they could design around the structures to the southwest.

A SWG member asked if there were any advantages that the single-point interchange has over a diamond. Matt said there were some small advantages in terms of capacity, but pointed out that the diamonds were expected to meet the necessary standards as well. Tom Braibish added that the single-point has the disadvantage of more surface area, more storm water runoff, and would not be as expandable in the future.

For the above reasons, the project team recommended that the single-point interchange be dropped from consideration. Kristin asked for the SWG response to the recommendation, and the group agreed that the decision made sense.

### **Preferred alternative recommendation**

Matt described the next steps of comparing and combining the resulting diamond forms. Through analysis of traffic volumes, they determined that both interchanges were workable. Kristin explained that the team combined the two diamonds designs into one, as there was little difference between the two diamond forms. She noted that the final design would be decided by ramp spacing and signal timing.

Aaron Myton briefly described the natural resources to the north, including streams, floodway, and wetlands. He explained that because the wetlands to the NW were already the result of mitigation, for every acre filled in that quadrant would require six new acres to be created in the NE. In order to minimize the impacts to businesses and wetlands, he

explained how the northern ramps were shifted south, while still trying to avoid impacts to the business in the SW quadrant.

A SWG member asked about the width of the actual footprint for Glencoe Road and how it would affect the McDonalds property. Aaron said that efforts are being made to minimize impacts to the McDonalds property. Tom Braibish added that the diamond design offers increased flexibility for the footprint. Rick Kuehn reiterated that the outside northbound lane on Glencoe has been ruled unnecessary under the revised design, resulting in a narrower footprint, with widening predominantly to the east north of the interchange. Several members of the public expressed concern about the impacts to structures by the new off-ramp in the NE quadrant, Kristin referred them to the ODOT right-of-way personnel present and offered to talk after the meeting.

A SWG member asked about how signal timing compensates for shorter ramp spacing. Tom explained how queuing and signal timing relate, and noted that the signal designers indicated that 400 ft spacing between ramps was appropriate. Tom also pointed out that the ramp angles had been skewed slightly from 90 degrees to further reduce impacts. A SWG member asked about considerations for slow-start trucks. Matt replied that variability in vehicles was considered in their calculations.

A SWG member asked about the new and current grade for Glencoe. Aaron said it was currently 3-4 degrees, and would be remade at 3 degrees. He explained several variations that would be made to compensate for headlights.

### **Local access and circulation**

Kristin explained that the purpose of tonight's meeting is to bring the SWG up to speed on the input from the local access group. Tom noted that the process has been very open and public, and emphasized that what the SWG is going to see is still a work in process. Tom reiterated that they are not making a recommendation yet, although a recommendation is anticipated at the next meeting.

Steve Harry discussed background on the conversation: The Oregon Transportation Commission has rules to ensure that interchanges are safe, operable, and preserve the investment of tax dollars. He noted that the commission is fairly adamant about the rules, understands that building within developed areas can require some flexibility. The discussions with the local access group have brought up potential deviations from these rules.

**Options & Discussion** – Matt discussed the 1,320 ft spacing and why it is what it is. He noted that the great variability of speeds within interchanges can result in a dangerous mix of traffic. He noted that the fewer conflicts in the area of the interchange, the safer and more efficient it will be. Matt also emphasized that strict adherence to the rules is not always possible in urban areas, and the project team has been soliciting input from the SWG and the public as to what exceptions need to be made.

Matt addressed the map and handouts showing the various access options. He noted that there are about 20 streets and driveways with access issues. He explained that the ideas laid out in the handout offer ideas for consolidating those driveways or providing alternative

access. Because the list is was long, he welcomed specific questions, but proceeded to cover the key points only.

One potential deviation would be to allow full access at Pacific Street. The standards would allow some other deviations, such as a right-in, right-out at Highland—as close as 750 ft from the interchange—because it currently presents no significant safety issues. Matt added that straight-across movement is not be allowed with right-in, right out access. A SWG member asked about the possibility of a U-turn at Pacific. Matt noted that some traffic control feature may be necessary to allow U-turns, such as a roundabout. He added that the ability for trucks to do U-turns may be limited on Glencoe as the alignments thus far are not wide enough. Tom Braibish noted that traffic flow issues would be discussed at the next PDT meeting. The SWG member indicated his preference for the ability to make a U-turn at Pacific.

A SWG member asked about considerations for emergency vehicle access on Highland Court. Matt said that the only way to reliably restrict left turns would be to install a median of some sort. He pointed out that such a barrier would not necessarily preclude emergency access by emergency vehicles. Tom said they would be sure to consider emergency access in their discussion, and pointed out that he believed the OTC would support the use of a median.

A SWG member pointed out that the gas stations will rely on tanker trucks and will need the ability to turn around. Tom responded that turnarounds will come down to the use of backage roads and cross-over easements. He talked briefly about future access reconsiderations as properties are developed or change hands.

A SWG member pointed out that a roundabout would adversely impact businesses in the area of the intersection. Matt agreed that roundabouts can create more extensive property impacts. The SWG member also expressed concern about the ability to bypass accidents within a roundabout and the potential future development of in the area around Pacific Street. Tom explained that roundabouts have various passable curbs which allow emergency access, and also noted that roundabouts have a record of reducing serious accidents, though he wasn't aware specific studies pertaining to trucks. Rick noted that roundabouts are able to handle high traffic volumes, and although they slow traffic down, they keep it moving steadily. A SWG member expressed concern with the public not understanding how roundabouts function.

A SWG member asked whether roundabout geometry was even feasible. Matt responded that he did not yet know specific sizes, but estimated that roundabouts could be reasonably 150-200 ft in diameter.

A SWG member asked what a crossover easement was. Tom explained that it is an agreement between property owners to allow traffic to flow through shared parking lots via internal driveways or drive-aisles.

A SWG member asked about how crossover easements occur and who pays the costs. Matt explained that they are voluntary when it comes to existing businesses, but new development can be required to provide crossover easements through the city's development code. Tom

said he would look into who would pay for crossover easements if they were included in the recommendation.

A SWG member asked about pedestrian and bicycle access within roundabouts. Tom noted that cyclists are encouraged to walk their bikes. Pedestrians are provided with striped crosswalks and splitter refuges.

A SWG member asked who makes the final decision regarding local access. Tom explained that ODOT Region 1 will make the recommendation that will have to be approved by the county, the city council, and the OTC. The SWG member asked about potential delays from lawsuits or further objections from members of the public. Steve Harry noted that they have yet to be sued, and said there would be little ground for stopping the project after it is approved. Tom noted the challenges inherent with a rural city dealing with urban scale traffic issues. Steve Harry noted that ODOT is within the law so long as it provides access to businesses in some form. Tom pointed out that the roundabout design serves people coming in off the highway, and there is some question about whether that is the group that needs to be served. He also briefly talked about the relatively newness of the Division 51 policy.

A SWG member suggested that option #7 be a road instead of an access-easement. Another SWG member questioned whether there would be adequate space for a public street. Matt agreed that spacing was tight in some spaces.

A SWG member asked about #14 and why it wasn't on the map. Tom explained that that option impacted wetlands and increased the footprint and embankment necessary to the north. Furthermore, the option was significantly more expensive and less compatible with the diamond designs.

A SWG member asked about the possibility of a roundabout at Highland Ct. Tom responded that Highland is too close to the interchange for a roundabout. Matt explained that queuing for the interchange it would lead to stopped traffic within the roundabout.

Kristin suggested moving to the south side and answering further north side questions at the end of the meeting.

Matt described the rural character of the southern side, and pointed out that it still has urban traffic levels. He noted that Beech Road faces some of the same access issues as Highland Court. He explained that even now it's difficult to turn left from Beech onto Glencoe northbound.

Matt pointed out that a simple solution would be to realign Beech Road. Tom noted that the road curvatures in the drawings were conceptual and not exact. Matt also addressed the challenges of realigning through EFU land. Another option would realign the road along the tax-lot lines. Matt said that a full-access intersection is likely in the area and noted that there are treatments which can resolve some of the issues inherent with such intersections.

A SWG member asked about the appearance of two "Cs" for option 17. Matt said that was an error.

A SWG member expressed concern about the impacts to the Arco station. Tom agreed that they needed to consider access to the five parcels in the southeast quadrant.

Matt briefly described option 20. He noted that restricting Beech to a right-in, right-out would restrict northbound access from Beech and one possible solution would be to create a mini U-turn further down Glencoe. He noted that the option still presents problems as it creates a left-turn across heavy traffic northbound.

A SWG member asked about right-in/out access to Beech eastbound. Project staff noted that there currently is no Beech eastbound and Tom expressed concern that the OTC would not approve of creating a new road. Matt described how some signalized intersections would be infeasible to include on county roads.

### **Public comment**

Kristin again asked for public comments. There were none.

### **Next steps and close**

Kristin noted that it is possible that the next meeting date could change, and noted that the dates are available on the project website.

Matt added that they will continue to look at the advantages and disadvantages of the various options and then meet with the PDT. He said they would bring a recommendation to the next meeting.

### **Next meeting:**

7-9 p.m. Wednesday, October 18  
Jessie Mays Community Hall