

Meeting Summary



Washington County
Transportation Futures Study
Exploring options • Informing choices

Study Advisory Committee Meeting #6

Friday, January 15, 2016

2:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Beaverton Library, 12375 SW 5th St, Beaverton OR, 97005

Members Present

Andrew Singelakis, Chair

Meeky Blizzard

Mark Fryburg

Robert Kellogg

Steve Larrance

Alfonso Lopez-Vasquez

Deanna Palm

Marc SanSoucie

Kathy Stallkamp

Bruce Starr

Mayor Jerry Willey

Phillip Wu

Study Team and Staff

Chris Deffebach, Washington County

Dyami Valentine, Washington County

Erin Wardell, Washington County

Jay Lyman, DEA

Scott Harmon, DEA

Scott Richman, DEA

Bruce Warner, Warner Group LLC

Jeanne Lawson, JLA Public Involvement

Sylvia Ciborowski, JLA Public Involvement

Other Attendees

Steve Hall

Robert Bailey, Save Helvetia

Jeff Petrillo

Ramona Crocker

Brad Perkins, Cascadia High Speed Rail

Peter Wong, Pamplin Media Group

Don Odermott

Rob Dixon, City of Hillsboro

Welcome and Agenda Review

Andrew Singelakis, Washington County Director of Land Use and Transportation and SAC Chair, welcomed committee members. He announced that Alfonso Lopez-Vasquez is retiring and will be stepping down from the committee. Jeanne Lawson, committee facilitator, reviewed the agenda and meeting objectives.

Chris Deffebach, Washington County project manager, set the context for the discussion. She thanked members for all of their comments and suggestions on the transportation investment packages. The Study team revised the transportation investment packages to reflect these comments. At this meeting, members saw these new packages and learned how the team planned to present them to the public.

Jeanne asked the group if they had any edits to the **October 8, 2015 SAC meeting summary**. Members had no edits. Robert Bailey, member of the public, noted that the summary should reflect that his comment about the urban and rural reserves referred to a House Bill, not a court decision.

Land Use Scenarios

Staff Presentations

Erin Wardell, Washington County, and Scott Richman, DEA, made a PowerPoint presentation that reviewed two draft land use scenarios and their implications for land use in the region and Washington County.

- **Historic and Future Growth** – Washington County grew at unprecedented rates in the past, and this trend is expected to continue in the future. Employment has increased and the type of employment has changed, with more jobs in information, financial and professional services. Both scenarios assume that future employment will grow faster than population. This means that more people will be commuting into the County and there will be increased density in corridors and centers to accommodate new jobs. Large employment lands will develop or redevelop.
- **Demographic Changes** – By 2055, we are likely to see a large increase in single person households and households headed by someone 65 and older. There will be an increase in income inequality, less individual wealth, increased racial diversity, and more population growth from people moving into the county as opposed to being born in area.
- **Daily Trips** – By 2055, we expect that 50% of daily trips will start and end in the county, and 50% will come from or to areas outside of the county. Today, about 40% of all trips start and end in the county.
- **Future Travel Behavior** – In the future, we expect to see decreased auto ownership per household, and an increase in ridesharing and telecommuting. More online shopping will mean fewer shopping-related trips, but more local deliveries.
- **Emerging Technology** – Travel technology that is being developed today will likely be the norm in 50 years. Autonomous vehicles will improve efficiency, reliability and safety of the system. The way we travel will change dramatically when cars and infrastructure are all connected and can talk to each other. The question for this Study is: how aggressively do we want to plan for technology changes? The Study team proposes these modeling assumptions:
 - Efficiency of the transportation system will improve by 5% as a result of planned technology improvements and could increase another 10% due to emerging technologies.
 - An increase in electric vehicles will lower greenhouse gas emissions.
 - Expansion of online shopping, telecommuting, and ridesharing will reduce vehicle trips.
 - It will be easier in the future to use multiple modes to complete a trip.

Committee Discussion

Members made the following comments about the land use scenarios:

- **Discussion on implications of increases in diversity:**
 - Refugees and immigrant populations are projected to rise, and these groups have different travel behaviors than the average population. For example, Hispanic populations tend to live in clustered communities and do not engage in online shopping and telecommuting (particularly those engaged in farm work and manufacturing jobs). The land use assumptions need to take into account travel behavior of all types of populations. Staff noted that some of the projected trends are applicable to a wide range of populations and that the increase in migration is predominately from other areas within the US; and that ridesharing and lower auto ownership per household are common among low-income populations.
 - There are two conflicting assumptions in these land use scenarios: an increasing immigrant population (which tends to have larger, multifamily households) and decreasing size of households. Similarly, minorities make up a large segment of the service worker industry and need cars to get to jobs—which would imply more car ownership. The assumptions in the land use scenarios must be accurate so that the conclusions are accurate.
- **Information Requests:**
 - Members requested the following information: The *number* of daily trips today and projected for the future; and the proportion of households today that comprise families with children, single person households, and households headed by someone 65 and older.
- **Interrelation of future trends:**
 - It is important to understand how all of these trends relate to one another. For example, it may be that autonomous vehicles will not be individually owned. If current millennials do not want to own cars, they might want to own them even less as they get older. There is likely an important connection between the projected increase in autonomous cars and the decrease in car ownership. Future demand for use of vehicles will depend on whether vehicles are privately or publicly owned. Staff responded that the Study team will need to make some assumptions. The important issue is not necessarily how many people own a vehicle—but how the use of vehicles impacts travel.
- **Impact of emerging technology:**
 - Members discussed the modeling assumptions for emerging technology. They suggested that the sensitivity testing assume a much greater efficiency gain, such as 25% or 30%. It is also important to understand the impact that increased efficiency will have on transit use and to show that relationship in the reports and conclusions.
 - It may be necessary to plan for separated right of ways for various types of travelers; for example, in order for autonomous vehicles to “sense” where pedestrians are walking, pedestrians must be using crosswalks or other connected infrastructure.

- **Location of jobs and housing:**
 - Growth in satellite communities could put more stress on the transportation system as people travel further to get to jobs in established employment centers.
 - Mayor Willey handed out copies of [a chart](#) that showed the large number of Washington County residents that travel outside of their communities for jobs, and the large number of commuters that come from outside of Washington County for jobs.
 - This Study should be able to evaluate the effects of locating residential and employment areas closer together. For example, sensitivity testing that evaluates the transportation effect of more people living and working within the County—and not traveling far for jobs. On the other hand, dual income households decrease the probability of all household members traveling in the same direction for their jobs.
 - Staff clarified that the land use scenarios do not change land uses. They assume greater employment growth in areas that are currently designated employment and more homes in areas that are currently designated residential.
 - Staff noted that, currently, community plans are resulting in a lot of internal trips, which shows more employment/housing balance.
- **Right of way:**
 - It will be important to reserve right of way to make needed transportation improvements.

Transportation Investment Options

Dyami Valentine, Washington County, reviewed the [draft transportation investment options](#). The current set of options includes a third option to reflect County aspirations in currently adopted plans. Highlights for the three options include:

- A. Current Plans with Enhanced Transportation Demand Management and Transit
 - Assumes increase in efficiency due to technology.
 - Assumes a reduction in car ownership by 2055, and increases in telecommuting, commuter programs, transit subsidies, parking prices, mixed use areas, walkability, ridesharing, and electric vehicle fleet.
 - Assumes a complete bike and walking system on arterials and collectors.
 - Assumes completion of arterials included in adopted transportation plans.
- B. Extension of Current Plans with Arterial Expansion in addition to Option A
 - Includes more separation between roads and bicycles/pedestrians.
 - Includes improvements to rural roadways, and some new connections such as the “Around the Mountain” option and widening Cornelius Pass Rd. to US 30. Also includes a completion of new connection between I-5 and 99W.
- C. Beyond Current Plans with Throughway Expansion in addition to Option A
 - Includes regional bicycle facilities that accommodate longer trips.

- Includes some throughway projects beyond those currently planned. Option C is intended to study the effect of adding capacity on major highways, installing some lanes that give priority to transit and/or freight, adding a new limited access north south route between Hwy 26 and I-5 and a connection through from Hwy 26 north to US 30 and to North Portland to move freight to Portland and PDX on a route other than the Sunset tunnel.

Options B and C include everything assumed in Option A. Option C does not include all of the Option B improvements so as to learn about the impact of investing in the arterial system versus investing in throughways and to better see tradeoffs and inform future decisions.

Evaluation of the three options would also include sensitivity testing for:

- **Freight improvements:** What would be the impact of installing a freight consolidation facility on the west side?
- **Technology:** Testing will include the effect of an additional 5% gain in travel efficiency as a result of increased travel technology.
- **Pricing:** What would be the impact of implementing a road user charge or corridor congestion pricing (such as tolling on corridors or facilities) in reducing vehicle trips?

Committee Discussion

- Option C likely will not work unless it includes portions of Option B. A **new limited access corridor** will only function well if it connects to good arterials that are properly sized to tie into throughways. This new corridor should extend all the way to Hwy 26. Staff responded that Option C does assume some investments in arterials system. Staff will update the map to reflect the new limited access road extended to Hwy 26.
- It is not clear **what transportation problems** options B and C are intended to solve. Staff responded that the three options are not intended to address different transportation problems. They are simply different ways to respond to anticipated transportation challenges. Option B seeks to address transportation problems by spreading travel demand over many arterials. Option C seeks to address transportation problems by concentrating travel demand on the throughways. Both options look at different ways of traveling to Portland and reducing the Sunset Tunnel chokepoint.
- This Study should consider the **transportation needs of the adjacent counties**. Staff responded that the model takes into account adjacent counties.
- Concern that **transportation funding is limited**. Options B and C are both “Option A plus more,” yet policy makers likely will not have the option to do more projects in a future of limited funding. It might have been more sensible to see the options differentiated more in terms of funding level. The Study should help us learn which investments are the wisest to make with limited funding; for example, over the next decades would it make more sense to invest in technology to improve efficiency gains or right of way acquisition? Staff responded that the

intent is to learn through the evaluation about the relative costs and benefits of proposed investments. Starting from a funding perspective has its own challenge, because it would require projecting the amount of funding we *think* we'll have available to fund transportation in fifty years. The evaluation will help us learn if Option A is enough to support our future travel needs. If we find that Option A by itself is insufficient, the evaluation will help us understand how increased investment in technology, throughways, and/or arterials could bridge that gap.

- When providing information to the public, include a reminder of the **evaluation framework** and the **community values** that this Study is trying to meet.
- It would be useful to have a **base map of planned projects/adopted plans**. Staff responded that the team is working on developing these maps.
- All three options should include **separation and protection between vehicles and bicycles/pedestrians** on high speed roadways.
- It is important to **be clear about the assumptions** going into the options.

Jeanne Lawson asked members if they could support these transportation options going forward for public review. **Members said they support moving the options forward for public review.**

Public Outreach Approach

Sylvia Ciborowski, JLA Public Involvement, provided an overview of the upcoming public engagement effort. The Study team will be seeking public input on the following questions:

- What do you think the future might look like in 2055 and beyond? What trends do you think will change the way we get around in Washington County?
- Do the investment ideas seem like the right ideas to Study? Is there anything else that should be considered?

Planned primary outreach activities include an online open house, meetings with stakeholders and organizations, and media outreach using social media, email blasts, press releases, and web announcements. The Study team is also working with community-based organizations to develop a strategy for targeted outreach to underserved populations.

Members were encouraged to provide additional ideas for engagement and names of groups and organizations that should receive a personal update at this time.

Sylvia Ciborowski made a presentation that reviewed the online open house materials and approach to seeking public input on the proposed transportation investment packages.

Committee Discussion

Members suggested the following edits to the [online open house](#):

- Relate the question about future trends to transportation and impacts on travel.
- Update “How will we get around in 40 to 50 years” video with more images of rural areas, freight movement, and bicycling.
- Revise language on the transportation investment options page to be more user-friendly.
- Update throughways map to show new limited access road going all the way to Hwy 26.
- Include information on assumptions included in the transportation options.
- Add these questions:
 - Do you work or go to school in Washington County?
 - How long is your commute to work or school? How do you usually commute?
 - What is your total household income?
- Add a demographic question about income level.
- Indicate when the results of the public outreach will be available.

Members provided the following ideas for public engagement:

- Extend online open house period to four to six weeks.
- Include specific outreach targeted to senior citizens.
- Send reminder emails several times to the interested parties list.
- Reach out to younger populations by engaging high schools, Pacific University, and PCC Rock Creek.
- Involve wine associations, the Washington County Visitors Association, and Washington County Democrats.
- Develop a social media package and send to organizations. Include a 30-second version of the “How will we grow” video.
- Chris Deffebach relayed a message from Pam Treece to stress the importance of getting the word out to users of the transportation system.

Evaluation Measures

Scott Richman, David Evans and Associates, provided a brief review of the evaluation framework and questions that will be used in the evaluation. The evaluation will result in a large amount of data, because it involves testing the three transportation options against two future growth scenarios, with a yet undefined number of criteria. The Study team proposes to use the following questions for the evaluation:

- What actions will be needed to reduce vehicle trips?
- What investments will improve travel time and travel time reliability, especially for goods movement?
- What accessible, active transportation and transit options will be most needed in the future?

- Which actions will best mitigate conflicts and support goals to slow traffic and support more vibrant and walkable communities?
- What investments will best support the rural communities?
- How will investments affect the environment, including air quality, ecosystems and resources?
- How will benefits be distributed by population group, geography, and transportation users/non-users?
- How will investments impact public funding?

Committee Discussion

Members made the following comments on the evaluation framework:

- The evaluation should provide answers to direct, specific questions. For example, the second question could be broken down into a series of specific questions such as:
 - What investments will improve travel time between Beaverton and X destination?
 - What investments will improve travel time for goods movement?
 - What investments will improve travel time for vehicles? For cyclists? Etc.
- The results should differentiate between peak and non-peak travel time.
- The question about public funding will be difficult to address because of the long-term nature of this Study. The way we fund transportation in the future will likely be very different. We likely will not be paying a fuel tax in the next couple of decades, and a road user charge will be much easier to collect with technology improvements.

Scott Richman encouraged members to provide further comments by email to the Study team.

Public Comment

Steve Hall, Citizen: The evaluation measures should use the word “solution” instead of “investment.” It is important that people understand that this Study is about identifying transportation problems—not trying to decide where transportation funding will come from. The online open house should make this point clear. The online open house should include a county map that shows how the county has changed every five years; people could understand that visual. We also need younger voices to weigh in.

Robert Bailey, Save Helvetia: Option C would be destructive to farmland. Loren Behrman is the lone rural representative on the SAC and he is not in attendance. Washington County has engaged Pacific University in a study of rural value. Rural areas have much value. There weren’t any comments today about rural impact. What would be the impact of bisecting the south county area, including importing noxious weed into grass producing area and the impact on farm machinery? Putting lights up leads to uneven crop development, and installing concrete on roads can conflict with farm machinery. Rural drainage can be an issue. The Study team should engage CPOs. It is premature to go out for public comment without the perspective of the rural community in Washington County.

Jeff Petrillo, resident of Washington County: Data is going to change all the time. The Study should result in an output or framework that can be updated from time to time with new data as it becomes available. Otherwise the results could be stale as soon as they come out. Public documents should list the assumptions that are baked into the plan. For example, how much telecommuting is being assumed?

Next Steps

Chris Deffebach explained the next steps in the process. Based on today's comments, the Study team will move forward with public outreach. The SAC will convene again after the team has had time to synthesize the public comments. The next meeting will be held in early March and will focus on the evaluation framework. The Study team will conduct the technical evaluation in the spring. The SAC will meet one or two more times in the summer time before the Study goes through a third public outreach period in fall 2016.

During the evaluation period, the County may provide opportunities for SAC members to hear from guest speakers on transportation, speaking on topics such as: what does equity mean, goods movement needs, what is changing in regards to transit plans, and safety.

Alfonso Lopez-Vasquez made a few brief parting comments. He stressed that diversity in the Washington County community is here to stay, and we need to acknowledge and learn to live with it in the best possible way. He expressed appreciation for the County staff's demonstration of commitment to diversity and equity.