

# Meeting Summary



Washington County  
**Transportation Futures Study**  
Exploring options • Informing choices

## Study Advisory Committee Meeting #8

Thursday, September 15, 2016

2:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Beaverton Library: Cathy Stanton Conference Room, 12375 SW 5th Avenue, Beaverton OR 97005

### Members Present

Loren Behrman

Meeky Blizzard

Maria Caballero Rubio

Mark Fryburg

Robert Kellogg

Steve Larrance

Deanna Palm

Marc San Soucie

Andrew Singelakis

Kathy Stalkamp

Bruce Starr

Pam Treece

Mayor Jerry Willey

### Study Team and Staff

Chris Deffebach, Washington County

Dyami Valentine, Washington County

Erin Wardell, Washington County

Jay Lyman, DEA

Scott Harmon, DEA

Adam Argo, DEA

Andrew Mortensen, DEA

Bruce Warner, Warner Group LLC

Jeanne Lawson, JLA Public Involvement

Sylvia Ciborowski, JLA Public Involvement

### Other Attendees

Commissioner Greg Malinowski

Robert Bailey, Save Helvetia

Allen Amabisca, Save Helvetia

John Charles, Cascade Policy

Don Odermott, City of Hillsboro

Andy Smith

Michael Finnegan

Sam Louke, 175<sup>th</sup> Neighborhood Association

Jake Mintz

John Kitchens

## Key Meeting Outcomes

As part of the committee meeting, SAC members were asked to reflect on the evaluation findings and consider:

1. What are the **top two findings** we need to highlight as we move forward to share the results with the public?
2. What is **one question** you would want to ask the public through the fall 2016 public outreach effort?

Members both wrote down answers to these questions and discussed them as a group. The following is a summary of key themes from the discussion and written responses.

**Questions to Ask Public:** The following is a summary of the top questions that SAC members would like to be answered through the public outreach. Their input most focused on three topic areas: 1) changes in travel behavior, 2) impacts of technology, and 3) reaction to pricing strategies and appetite for paying for investments.

- **Change in Travel behavior:** What would it take to get you to use transit, bike, walk, or carpool instead of driving alone?
  - How frequent (i.e. 5-minute, 10-minute, 3-minute) would transit service need to be for you to use it regularly?
  - How far would you walk to get to X destinations [a restaurant, work, transit stop, store]?
- **Pricing and appetite for paying more:** Examples of questions could include:
  - Would you be willing to pay [some amount] to get [some improvement to the transportation system/commute times]? Are you willing to pay some higher tax or fee to fund a comprehensive transportation solution (multimodal investments in highway and transit broadly defined)?
  - How do you [and future generations] feel about congestion pricing, tolling, or a VMT fee? What would the impacts be?
  - Do you have other revenue-generating ideas besides those studied?
- **Technology:**
  - How much do you think self-driving vehicles will reduce traffic congestion in the future?
  - How much of the County's funding focus should be on bringing in technology as opposed to the other investments?
- **Evaluation of packages/projects and link to community values:**
  - What plan/package would have the most positive impact to the *greatest number of people*? Which would benefit *you* the most?
  - What kind of investments/what specific investments should we make to meet future travel demand? Why? [What value does that investment meet; what goal does it accomplish?]
  - Which of the 10 community values are most important to you?

- What type of transportation investments should the County be making over the next 50 years so that your children and grandchildren benefit from these values?

**Messages to Share with Public:** The following is a summary of the key messages that SAC members said stood out as important should be shared with the public.

*\*Note: These statements are observations and comments from SAC members, not findings.*

- General
  - We will have a significant increase in projected trips (of all modes) over the next 50 years due to increase in population and employment. We have a dire need to improve the transportation system to meet this demand.
- Land Use and Mode Choice
  - Land use changes over the past 20 years are moving us in the right direction: vehicle miles traveled per capita is decreasing, and bike/ped and transit use is going up. We have the opportunity to capitalize on this — and continue this trend, with the right investments.
  - Access to alternative transit, bicycle, walking options will increase as the region densifies (this is a positive outcome in terms of equity).
  - Total VMT increases as the roadway system becomes more efficient.
- Transit
  - Extending the light rail to Hillsboro would reduce traffic congestion on Hwy 26 and reduce bottlenecks at the tunnel.
  - There will be limited transit access to parts of Tigard, Tualatin and Sherwood.
- Roads/Freight:
  - The North-South Parkway: messaging should provide distinction between the two options (inner and outer alignments), and any difference in their impacts on the transportation system.
  - Northern Connector would pull over 60% of trucks out of US 26 tunnel.
  - Show how the investments improve/don't improve vehicle congestion.
  - Clearly explain difference between the options: North-South Parkway, I-5/99W Connector, Northern Connector and how they benefit their neighborhoods when coupled with transit and active transportation investments.
- Active Transportation: Provide quantitative data on results.
- Pricing: Explain tolling, VMT, congestion pricing and their impacts.
- Technology: Could have a significant impact on vehicle delay but the specifics are not yet clear.
- Packages: Package C offers significant benefits/performance over the other packages.

## Full Meeting Summary

### Welcome and Agenda Review

---

Andrew Singelakis, Washington County Director of Land Use and Transportation, welcomed committee members and introduced Maria Caballero Rubio, a new SAC member who has been participating on the Health & Equity Work Group.

Jeanne Lawson, committee facilitator, reviewed the agenda and meeting objectives. She noted that the purpose of today's meeting is to review key findings from the evaluation, discuss initial reactions and key findings that stand out, and to identify what questions members would like to ask the public during the Fall public outreach effort.

Chris Deffebach, Washington County, reviewed the schedule of milestones for the remainder of the Study process. The SAC will meet again on October 13, when they will hear more about the evaluation findings and review the materials that the County will use in the Fall public outreach. The County is also offering to meet with SAC members in small groups to review individual questions about the findings. After the Fall 2016 public outreach effort, the SAC will meet again in December to discuss what the public said and what questions to ask in the statistically valid telephone poll. The County proposes a final SAC meeting for January 2017 to hear the polling findings, and discuss any final comments that members would like to share with the Board of County Commissioners.

Jeanne asked the group if they had any edits to the **March 3, 2016 SAC meeting summary**. Members had no edits.

### Where We've Been

---

#### Staff Presentation

Dyami Valentine, Washington County, briefly reviewed the history of the Study and key milestones that have taken place. He reminded members that this is a study—not a plan—and will likely lead to further study. The study began as an opportunity to think big and be aspirational, and think beyond the usual 20-year funding horizon. Key milestones have included:

- **Developed land use scenarios:** The Study team analyzed potential future land uses. Existing land use plans anticipate more mixed use environments in urban centers. We expect urban reserves to develop, and high population and employment growth. The Study team developed two potential growth scenarios: one that is based on current trends ("Scenario 1") and a second that assumes even greater population and employment growth based on technology and a growing economy ("Scenario 2").
- **Developed transportation investment options:** The Study is evaluating how to invest in the transportation system in order to meet that future growth. The Study team worked with the

SAC, technical staff, and the public to put together a list of projects to study. The projects are multi-modal and encompass transit, roadways (major roads and throughways), active transportation (bicycle and pedestrian), and trip reduction strategies (including demand management, ITS, and pricing strategies).

- **Developed three packages:** The Study team organized these investment options into three packages for study purposes:
  - Package A: focuses on transit and demand management strategies
  - Package B: focuses on improving major roads (arterials)
  - Package C: focuses on the regional system and adding capacity on throughways
- **Evaluated the packages:** The Study team then evaluated the packages using the evaluation measures that are based on the community values that were developed at the beginning of the Study.

## Committee Discussion and Questions

- A member asked if the proposals for high capacity transit on Tualatin Valley Hwy assumes that transit would take up a travel lane. Staff responded that no, the modeling assumes there would be additional right of way in place for transit.
- A member clarified that the transportation investment options include an option to build a new northern arterial from Hillsboro to Forest Grove, parallel to TV Hwy.
- Staff clarified that two North-South limited access corridors were studied: one further west in rural areas and one closer in.

## Evaluation Results

---

### Staff Presentation

Andy Mortenson, David Evans and Associates, presented key highlights from the evaluation. The presentation was organized into six topic areas. ([See PowerPoint](#) for more details and related graphics.)

#### 1) Land Use

- Consistent with adopted land use plans, we expect our **cities will become more urban and dense** in communities and employment centers where more people and jobs are expected, such as Beaverton, Hillsboro and in the Tualatin and Wilsonville area. We expect to see higher mixed use in those centers.
- By 2055, we will see **increase in total number of total** trips in Hillsboro, Beaverton, Tualatin and Tigard centers. We see more travel demand in the urban crescent. The number of bicycle, pedestrian, and transit trips will increase in these centers. Although we'll see an overall *increase in total vehicle trips* in 2055 as compared to today, the rate of **vehicle trips per person will continue to decline** over time as a result of our land use planning, and due to better match of

employment and housing. More people in the future will find a way to travel by bike, walking and transit because in the future there will be more opportunities to work, recreate and socialize in places that are closer to where they live. This trend has already started to occur, and is a reflection of what's in local adopted plans. In Land Use Scenario 1, we see a 10% reduction in vehicle miles traveled per person by 2055; in Scenario 2, we see 13% reduction.

- We expect [more transit trips in the future](#). Today there are roughly 70,000 transit trips per day, and we expect that to increase to 190,000 per day by 2055.
- Committee Questions and Clarifications:
  - Staff clarified that the graphics on page 3-6 in the Draft Final Report show the *historic* increase in daily person trips. They show the difference in total North-South and East-West trips between 1985 and 2010. The arrows are not meant to correspond to a specific geography or road use; they just show general North-South and East-West travel patterns. The PowerPoint slide referenced today indicates the projected number of trips for the next 50 years.
  - A member commented that it would be useful to not show travel in the freeway corridors when there can't be that much capacity use in the freeways.

## 2) System Effects

- [Future traffic conditions will worsen](#). Traffic on I-5, I-205, Hwy 217, TV Hwy, and North-South arterials will worsen by 2055 for vehicle trips. By 2055, we will see a 50% increase in vehicle trips (from 2 million trips today to 3 million trips, and slightly higher in Scenario 2). This means we'll see increased vehicle hours of delay and slower speeds. As a result of congestion on key highways, we'll see more cut through traffic on local and neighborhood streets.
- As a result, [freight shippers will experience reduced reliability](#). Even at mid-day (which is when freight aims to travel to avoid PM peak travel), there will be increased congestion that could cause problems for freight at key portals, like the Vista Tunnel.
- [Pricing can help](#). The Study considered two pricing strategies:
  - Tolling on highways (corridor congestion pricing) like US 26, or I-5: We found that if toll lanes are installed on highways and *managed well* (meaning priority is given to HOV and freight trucks), this could improve flow on highways and reduce cut-through traffic.
  - Road user charge: A flat road user charge would not have a significant change to the way we finance roads. But if we apply a variable fee that is based on geography and time of day (i.e., target areas/times of day with highest levels of congestion) we could achieve as much as 15% reduction in vehicle miles traveled.
- [Technology can help](#). The Study considered two "what if" scenarios: what happens if we assume a 20% or 40% increase in capacity of our road networks as a result of autonomous vehicle technology (i.e., self-driving cars)?

- An increased use of autonomous vehicles could lead to [fewer lane miles over capacity](#). We expect that between 2010 and 2055, without autonomous vehicles we will experience a 4-fold increase in lane miles over capacity on freeways and even worse on arterials. Self-driving cars could significantly reduce the number of lanes that would be over capacity by 2055, particularly on arterials.
- Without autonomous vehicles, we expect vehicle hours of delay to increase by 50% or more on freeways and arterials by 2055. If we assume a 20% or 40% increase in capacity due to technology, [we see a reduction in vehicle hours of delay](#).
- We find that traffic on collector roads will go down, illustrating that investments on highways and arterials help reduce cut-through traffic.
- The findings also suggest that we could experience an increase in vehicle miles traveled.
- Committee Questions and Clarifications:
  - Members clarified that the 20% and 40% increase in capacity figures are shoulders of an arbitrary selection.
  - One member drew the conclusion that as vehicle delay improves, more people will choose to drive (thus increasing vehicle miles traveled). Increased use of autonomous vehicles corresponds to less traffic, thus more people could choose to drive. Staff noted that the study did not test the impact on personal behavior.
  - Members suggested that outreach materials about this finding specify that the 20-40% increase in capacity would come as a result of autonomous vehicles being able to drive closer together, as compared to regular vehicles.

### 3) Roadways & Freight

- [Arterial and highway trade-offs compared to Package A:](#) The presentation showed a chart that demonstrates how well Packages B and C perform as compared to Package A. The key findings are that:
  - Package B helps reduce vehicle hours of delay as compared to package A, and Package C reduces vehicle hours of delay even further.
  - Crash conditions worsen with Packages B and C.
  - Labor force access improves with Package B, and even better with Package C.
  - Some routes studied in both Packages B and C are inconsistent with adopted plans.
  - GHG emissions increase with Package B, and even more with Package C.
  - We see improved air quality impacts with both Packages B and C due to reduced vehicle hours of delay
  - New routes in Packages B and C would have negative impacts on natural resources.
  - Committee Questions and Clarifications:
    - A member asked how other evaluation criteria will be reflected in the evaluation results. Staff responded that the full evaluation will show how the packages perform for evaluation performance measures (including cost and impact on communities/livability).

- Members asked what considerations were used to evaluate “risk of crash fatality.” Staff responded that the main factor was the speed of vehicles (i.e., higher speeds lead to higher chance of fatality). The evaluation report does recognize that fatalities could decrease due to use of autonomous vehicles technology, but this was not included in the modeling (qualitative finding only). If technology does improve safety, the assumption is that it would improve safety across the board (for all packages).
  - Staff clarified the environmental results. Air quality improves under Packages B and C because roadway investments in these packages reduce vehicle hours of delay. However, both packages increase the total vehicle miles traveled as compared to Package A, which results in higher GHG emissions.
  - A member requested that the team provide more quantitative results for these measures (beyond the “+” and “-” reporting structure). Staff noted that the report will provide more detail.
  - Staff explained the “consistency with adopted plans” measure. Package A is meant to be a continuation of existing plans and goals, and so is not in conflict with adopted plans. Building a new road through rural areas (assumed in both Packages B and C) is inconsistent with state law, and thus inconsistent with adopted plans. It also conflicts with some community livability goals and has a negative impact on rural communities.
  - Staff noted that highway improvements in Package C have the effect of reducing delay on some arterials as well.
  - Staff clarified that this chart provides results for each package based on land use Scenario 1.
- **Major North-South Roadways:** The Study evaluated a number of options to improve North-South traffic flow, including:
  - **Northern Connector:** This is a route that would widen Cornelius Pass Rd north of Hwy 26 and then build a new connection to Columbia Blvd from Cornelius Pass Road. The results show that building this connection would take 60% of truck demand out of the Sunset tunnel. Freight would use the connection to access port facilities on the Willamette River and PDX Airport.
  - **North-South Parkway:** The team modeled two general alignments for a North-South limited access high speed facility (an outer and inner alignment). This route would see high auto vehicle use and would reduce vehicle demand on adjacent arterials. For example, building a new inner alignment would likely take traffic off of Hwy 217. For the outer alignment, the highest demand for the facility would come from the south. For the inner alignment, the highest demand would come from the North.

- **Around the Mountain route:** This route would receive a good level of vehicle use, but not as much as a new North-South Parkway. It would help pull some traffic off of adjacent arterials, but the effect is more localized.
- **Widen Hwy 217:** The modeling found that Hwy 217 remains a critical piece for the region. There will be increased demand on Hwy 217 in both packages B and C. As we add capacity to Hwy 217, it fills up—even when we build new roads elsewhere. Building the Northern Connector or North-South Parkway would take some trucks off of Hwy 217 (and Hwy 26).
- **Committee Questions and Clarifications:**
  - Members asked for current traffic volumes on southern roads like Scholls Ferry, as well as for northern roads.
  - Staff clarified that the North-South Parkway inner alignment option would turn into an arterial before connecting to Hwy 26.
- **US 26/Barnes/Cornell/Canyon Cutline:** The evaluation projected future vehicle, freight, and transit volumes at the Vista Ridge Tunnel and adjacent roads (Canyon, Barnes, Cornell).
  - **Vehicles:** Today, approximately 40,000 vehicles traveling across that cutline at PM peak hours. By 2055, this would only increase to about 45,000 vehicles. Even under Scenario 2, we don't see a great increase in vehicle travel on this cutline in the future. This is due to the fact that without new capacity a lot of people switch to using transit on Hwy 26 instead.
  - **Freight:** The evaluation found that building the Northern Connector would result in a significant decrease in truck traffic on Hwy 26.
  - **Transit:** Adding more capacity to the Hwy 26 light rail line (Package C) results in a significant increase in use of transit on Hwy 26. Today, there are 10,000 daily trips on that light rail line during PM peak. This would more than double even with no improvements. Package C would add an additional 20% in transit use.
- **Roy Rogers/Scholls-Sherwood/New North-South Connector Cutline:** Today there are about 6,000 vehicle trips daily at PM peak hour; by 2055, we expect this to double to around 12,000 PM peak vehicle trips. Freight and vehicle trips would increase significantly under Package C. Transit would also increase significantly (because this cutline includes a new transit corridor that does not exist today).
  - **Committee Questions and Clarifications:** A member commented that the 2-hour PM peak period is not a sufficient time period to study for this corridor. This corridor has heavy traffic from 2-7pm, much more than just 2 hours.
- **Findings on freight mobility:** The evaluation found that, in general, managing new capacity on freeways for freight along with transit and HOV traffic resulted in higher speeds overall, but no significant improvement in reliability. This was primarily due to the fact that managed lanes saw

similar congestion as the general purpose lanes. In order to provide better freight mobility, it may be necessary to manage more aggressively through pricing or other strategies. The evaluation also showed that a much greater increase in shipping than expected would be needed to justify building a Westside consolidation facility at Hillsboro Airport.

#### 4) Transit

- **Transit findings compared to Package A:** In general, the investments included in Package C lead to greater transit enhancements that provide access to households, labor force, and low income households, as well as improved transit travel time benefits as compared to Package A.
- **Transit Accessibility:** The presentation included a map that shows projected transit accessibility under Package A, using Scenario 1 (current trend). Package A investments would lead to very good transit access for the centers of Hillsboro, Beaverton, Tigard and Tualatin, but not very good transit access for new growth areas like South Hillsboro.
  - **Committee Questions and Clarifications:** A member noted that the map seems to show only low-income areas in centers, not rural areas. Staff replied that the map shows the largest shares of low-income residents based on modeled household allocations. The evaluation also used a modeling tool to attempt to determine where future low-income areas will be located. The model showed that due to redevelopment, Aloha Reedville might not be a low income area in the future, as it is today.
- **Long-distance bus service between Hillsboro and Sherwood:** This service would likely not lead to sufficient ridership to justify a new service run by TriMet or a public transit agency. It may be something that a private system would be willing to serve, and charge a premium fare.
- **Transit Accessibility for Low-income areas:** Planned transit investments in Package A do a very good job of servicing neighborhoods with high concentrations of low-income households.
- **US 26 Corridor:** The evaluation shows that the US 26 corridor is the largest concentrated transit market. Nearly 25% of this cutline is picked up by transit in the future (more than doubling of what we see today). The transit share further increases under Package C. Investments of transit in this corridor would greatly improve transit travel time such that by 2055, transit travel time from Hillsboro to Portland during the 2-hour PM peak hours would be equal to that of driving.
  - **Committee Questions and Clarifications:** A committee member advocated for a transit system that gets Washington County travelers *through* Portland faster, not just *to* Portland. Downtown Portland may not be the hub in the future, and we should think about ways that transit travelers headed east could circumvent downtown Portland. Staff replied that this would be something for the region to address: would transit improvements in Washington County necessitate tunneling or express service through parts of downtown Portland?

#### 5) Walking & Biking

- **Active transportation accessibility:** Package A would provide significant biking and walking coverage throughout the County, with 78% of the County having good access to sidewalks and bike facilities within a short distance to get to destinations for work, play, and social reasons. We expect that the active transportation index would be higher for the city centers than in outer areas.
- **Potential for converting drive trips to active transportation trips:** The evaluation found that by 2055, there will be over 200,000 daily travel trips under 3 miles (under Package A). Trips shorter than 3 miles all have the potential to be converted to bike/walk trips.

## 6) Cost Opinion

- It is estimated that building the full suite of transit, road, and bike/ped investments under each package would cost as follows: Package A would cost around \$10 billion; Package B would cost around \$13 billion, and Package C would cost around \$23 billion. These are planning level gross estimates in 2016 dollars, including capital costs only. The team will provide refined figures including right of way costs at the October SAC meeting.

## Committee Discussion

*SAC members were asked to reflect on the findings and discuss:*

3. *What are the **top two findings** we need to highlight as we move forward to share the results with the public?*
4. *What is **one question** you would want to ask the public through the fall 2016 public outreach effort?*

**Key takeaways/findings that stood out:** Members said that the following results stand out as important:

- VMT per capita has been declining in the region/county over the past few decades, and a lot of that is due to our land use planning and increase in non-auto opportunities. It would be useful to see even more detailed data on this topic, especially how bike/ped improvements help move the County towards the projected VMT per capita reduction.
- The Cornelius Pass improvement leads to an incredible improvement for freight.
- Extending light rail to Hillsboro could significantly reduce traffic on Hwy 26 and the Sunset Tunnel bottleneck.
- The Northern Connector could help reduce traffic through the Sunset Tunnel, as well as act as another East-West route in case of natural disaster.
- Access to increased bike/walk options will improve. It appears that people will stay closer to where jobs are rather than moving out to rural areas.
- The future looks positive. The investments in the packages could solve a great number of our transportation problems. This future looks good, with lots of transit, bike and walking use.

- Several members commented that the “all of the above” approach (i.e., investing in all modes) makes sense. In the future, doing nothing, or continuing to invest as we have in the past 20 years, is a disaster for our communities because more people will move here and we have to invest differently. We will need many investments across modes to serve future citizens. Thinking about transportation as a system—not segregated modes—is important.
- We don’t know the exact impact of technology. It will be important to look further into the research and invest in technology. We’ll need to answer: how much of our funding should we spend on the technology aspect as opposed to other investments?
- Tigard, Tualatin, and Sherwood areas do not seem to have good transit access. This will stand out for the public and they will want to know why none of the transit investments are serving these areas.
- Traffic conditions will worsen in the future. Highlight for the public the map on page 12 of the report.
- Future employment and population will be concentrated in the “inner crescent.” Focus on presenting findings that show how the investments would address travel in that inner crescent. Highlight the future growth scenarios maps (pages 4-4 and 4-5 of the report).

Members would like to see **more details, data and clarification** around the following topics:

- Several members noted that it will be important to [see all of the packages weighed against the community values](#), in order to truly discuss tradeoffs. Staff noted that a greater level of detail including values evaluation will be available in the Study report prior to the October SAC meeting.
- A look at how congestion pricing impacts the transportation system.
- More analysis on active transportation, which seems to have received less attention than other modes. Staff noted that there are limitations in the model, which means that findings for active transportation cannot be as detailed as for roads and transit.
- There is a need to look at **return on investment**. It makes sense to rank investments to see what gets us the best bang for our buck.
- The 20 and 40% increase in capacity figures due to technology felt random. There should be some data to substantiate this choice, or at least an acknowledgement that these are just best-guess figures.
- Information about the different impacts/results for the two North-South Parkway options.
- When presenting the information about person trips through the six cut lines, preface the presentation with a larger map and explanation of what the cut lines mean. Also present the findings for all six of the cut lines, or at least explain that there are not significant findings for the other cut lines not presented.

- Analysis on resiliency of the investments in case of earthquake disaster. Staff noted that one of the evaluation measures looks at redundancy of roads.

Members would like to **ask the public** the following questions

- The outreach effort should focus on broad framing questions that will encourage people to think imaginatively. It is difficult to be a futurist, and asking the public to think in that mode will be challenging. Questions could target what would lead to changes in travel behavior. For example: What would it take in terms of frequency, availability, and responsiveness for you to take transit every day? What would it take for you to use an Uber-style system as opposed to buying a new car? Staff noted that these kinds of questions have been asked through other studies. The outreach for this Study should be focused on people who have been tracking the project.
- Several members suggested asking the public about pricing. Questions could include:
  - How would you prefer to pay for these investments (if you could choose between a tax, user fee, or some other idea)?
  - How do you feel about a VMT fee and toll roads? (To gauge public appetite for these kinds of pricing strategies). This might be a good question for the polling.
  - One member noted that we need to approach this subject cautiously. County residents have voted more than once to pay more to get some specific transportation investment. However, if we ask about specific types of taxes (like a VMT fee or toll) without providing education around what this means and what it would pay for, people will likely say they don't support it. It might be more appropriate to ask: Would you be willing to pay an increased fee or tax to get a balanced basket of investments that would accomplish high level goals of [X]?
- Ask public whether they think new technology such as autonomous cars and intelligent systems will make a significant difference. Some people think it will make our planning irrelevant, and we'll need to know whether the public buys in.
- A member expressed concern about previous online open house responses. The people who participated are not representative of County demographics. We need roadway users to participate in the online open house, and we can reach them by using signs on roadways to promote the online open house. The data we get has to be representative, or else it is not useful. Staff noted that the online open house is not meant to result in a representative sample of public opinion. Rather, it is a tool for people who are interested to provide feedback, and for the County to hear about what issues and concerns people have. The telephone polling scheduled for this winter will be scientifically valid.

## Public Comment

---

**Ron Swaren:** The Western Arterial Hwy, which would connect Oregon and Washington, makes sense. It could be planned to have mass transit. Double decker buses could serve 4,000 transit users daily for a \$40 million investment, which is a much better return on investment than light rail. The Western Arterial Hwy solves so many problems. The other option is to do lots of improvements on Hwy 26 which would have many spillover traffic issues. A lot of transportation infrastructure could be prefabricated. For example, a world famous engineer is able to develop bridge designs for half of the cost of what people expected. We can also do inexpensive tunnels using the Swiss model.

**Allan Amabisca,** Member of Washington County Rural Roads and Maintenance Committee and Save Helvetia: The focus should be on making the future road system safer than it currently is. Question to ask the public should be: What safety concerns do you have in using transit? What improvements in the area would facilitate your use of transit?

**Robert Bailey,** Save Helvetia: Save Helvetia objected to the Taking Stock Report because the values statement is insufficient. We encouraged that there be a rural values assessment. There apparently has been such a study conducted but not yet received by SAC members. The North-South Parkway is modeled on rural land because rural land is cheaper. Even though rural reserves are protected, there will likely be an economic incentive to put the parkway on rural lands. Hopefully the rural study will show the damage that would do to agriculture. 80% of today's conversation has been plan based; which may confuse the public and go against the statement that "this is a study, not a plan."

**John Kitchens,** Hillsboro resident: In plans and visions, what is more easily measured is what we tend to focus on and build. The "Trade-offs compared to Package A" charts could be interpreted by the public in many ways. The Study should think of more creative options. For example, when considering pricing strategies, perhaps consider charging less for transit tickets which would encourage greater transit use. In the future, cars will likely be narrower and we could fit more car lanes on roads without widening. There are many ways to use space on roads more efficiently.

## Next Steps

---

Chris Deffebach explained next steps for the Study:

- County staff will follow up with SAC members to discuss scheduling small group meetings to further review the evaluation results.
- The next SAC meeting is scheduled for October 13, 2016.
- At the end of the process (likely at the December SAC meeting), members will be asked to submit short letters to reflect on the Study for submission to the Board of County Commissioners.