



PLEASANT VALLEY TSP REFINEMENT

CAC Meeting #3

May 10th, 2018, 6:30-8:30 p.m.

Pleasant Valley Elementary School – 17625 SE Foster Rd.

Meeting Purpose: Present the five design alternatives and assessments. Receive input from the CAC on the alternatives and the assessments to help narrow the five concepts to three alternatives for further study.

Time	Agenda Item	Facilitator
6:30 – 6:35	Welcome	Jay Higgins, City of Gresham
6:35 – 6:50	Updates Since Last Meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ CAC Meeting #2 Recap ▶ Approve CAC #2 Meeting Summary ▶ Open Houses ▶ Alternative Development and Assessment ▶ TAC Meeting #3 	Sylvia Ciborowski, JLA Public Involvement Susie Wright, Kittelton
6:50 – 7:20	Five Initial Design alternatives and Assessments <i>Reference: Alternative Overview Packet and Assessment Matrix</i>	Susie Wright
7:20 – 8:20	CAC Questions and Comments on the Five Alternatives and Assessments <i>Questions:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Do you have questions or comments on the assessments? ▶ Which alternative or alternative elements do you like best and why? 	Sylvia Ciborowski
8:10 – 8:25	Public Comment	Sylvia Ciborowski
8:25 – 8:30	Next Steps	Sylvia Ciborowski

Meeting Packet:

Alternative Overview Packet
Alternative Assessment Matrix

Welcome

- Sylvia kicked off with introductions and the meeting purpose

Updates since last meeting

- At the last meeting, the community reviewed evaluation criteria, provided suggestions for changes, brainstormed alternatives, and identified preferred selections.
- A public and virtual open house were held to receive more community feedback

Five initial design alternatives and assessments

- Susie presented the five alternatives. The CAC had the following questions:
 - Alternative 1 – Should Foster Road south of Cheldelin Road connect to the Richey Road area?
 - Alternative 2 – Why hasn't the environmental impacts considered wetlands within the 174th extension? What about the ESRA lands and stream crossing north of Giese Road?
 - Alternative 3 – No questions.
 - Alternative 4 – No questions.
 - Alternative 5 – No questions.

CAC Questions and Comments

- Are these pros and cons the findings of the TAC?
- What happens at Foster west of the study area? What about 174th/Powell?
- Aren't the intersections along Powell already at capacity?
- What should be done at Powell to accommodate increasing traffic?
- Do we have public feedback for the five concepts?
- Who will pay for these capital improvements?
- What are the cross-section assumptions?
- Are there maps that show other new connections? It would be helpful to see this study area in context of a larger area and how improvements here impact a larger area.
- Is alternative 1 the closest to the adopted plan?
- Why is Gresham involved with this plan if 174th and Jenne aren't located in Gresham? Who's paying for this?
- Be prepared to justify the study of 174th at the next Open House.
- Jenne Rd: General questions about who owns Jenne Rd, and which agency would pay for improvements here. Gresham is planning to annex this land into its boundaries: if this happens, how does that impact this project?
- As the team evaluates the alternatives, should ask/evaluate:
 - Traffic impacts of all alternatives
 - How the alternatives fit in with regional plans
- Identify the town center on the maps.
 - How set in stone is the town center/land use plan?
- Suggest including County boundaries on maps

Alternative 1 Comments

- Provides easier phasing for new roadways
- How well does this alternative meet needs for future anticipated traffic growth?
- Like that this alternative stays more true to the original planning effort for the area, with the added benefit of straightening out/improving some intersections
- Suggestions:
 - Giese/Foster/Jenne 4-way intersection (shown in Alternative 3) location is preferred, though this would create an additional stream crossing.
 - Create a 4-way intersection with Foster/172nd/Knapp as well.
 - Create a 4-way intersection with Cheldelin/Richey Road extension/southern Foster leg.
 - Extend Richey Rd south of Chedelin

Alternative 2 Comments

- The habitat fragmentation in Alternative 2 is a major concern, especially with retaining wall on 174th and six stream crossings.
- Lands on Jenne Butte are primarily Gresham-owned.
- Alternatives 3, 4, and 5 don't seem to serve the town center.

- This alternative does provide a good connection to the planned town center, whereas alternatives 3, 4 and 5 do not.
- It seems like it would be too costly to both improve Jenne as a collector and construct the 174th Extension as an arterial.
- Which agency/jurisdiction would pay for construction of the 174th Extension?
- Study the impacts to traffic on Powell if the 174th Extension is constructed.
- Are there opportunities for phasing construction of this alternative?

Alternative 3 Comments

- Doesn't connect well for higher density development.
- Giese/Foster/Jenne 4-way intersection location is preferred.
- Is two lanes enough for Jenne Road improvements to handle future long-term traffic capacity?
- Provides 172nd/Foster connection and alleviation

Alternative 4 Comments

- Disconnection between the two Foster/Jenne/Giese and Giese/Foster intersections

Alternative 5 Comments

- This doesn't appear to alleviate McKinley cut-through traffic

Foster Comments

- What are the neighborhood impacts if Foster is a collector v. arterial?
- What impacts does the Cheldelin Road extension have? If Cheldelin connects all the way to 162nd Ave, then it provides an additional E-W route, in which case keeping Foster as a local road seems more feasible.
- We need a map with jurisdictional lines, town center, regional connections.

Public Comments

- Jim – How much traffic study has occurred?
- John Rydel – What was the original schedule? Have you run traffic counts with the new soccer stadium in?
- Paula Klein – Alternative 3. Jenne wouldn't be used heavily due to Giese and Powell providing east-west connectivity. This seems to work well for a systemwide travel standpoint.
- Jim Gibson – Two questions relative to 174th. Who owns this land? What's the schedule for annexation? Aren't there frontage takes on all the alternatives?
- ? – Aren't there more property impacts north of Giese adjacent to McKinley Estates? What are the key things you're trying to address? You're trying to get traffic away from McKinley – the Giese extension helps remove this. However, Foster is a County Road with high-speed traffic. What has the best ability to minimize traffic on Foster and to move traffic flow.
- Linda Bauer – As far as wetlands, the area around Lakeside Gardens has been established as a wetland area and may want to check with DSL for identified wetland areas. 174th from Giese to Powell – if that's not annexed it'll still be in the County. The County's goals state projects must meet the needs of area residents and reduce traffic on rural roads for cut-through traffic in the area.