

**MINUTES**  
**Troutdale City Council – Regular Meeting**  
**Troutdale City Hall – Council Chambers**  
**104 SE Kibling Avenue**  
**Troutdale, OR 97060-2099**

**Tuesday, August 23, 2005**

**1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, ROLL CALL, AGENDA UPDATE**

Mayor Thalhofer called the meeting to order at 7:03pm.

**PRESENT:** Mayor Thalhofer, Councilor Gorsek, Councilor Ripma, Councilor Thomas, Councilor Canfield, Councilor Kyle, and Councilor Daoust.

**ABSENT:** None.

**STAFF:** John Anderson, City Administrator; Jim Galloway, Public Works Director; Rich Faith, Community Development Director; Marnie Allen, City Attorney; Debbie Stickney, City Recorder.

**GUESTS:** See Attached.

**2. CONSENT AGENDA**

**2.1 ACCEPT MINUTES:** April 19, 2005 Work Session, April 26, 2005 Regular Meeting, April 26, 2005 Work Session, May 10, 2005 Work Session, June 28, 2005 Work Session and July 26, 2005 Regular Meeting.

**MOTION:** Councilor Daoust moved to adopt the Consent Agenda. Seconded by Councilor Gorsek. Motion Passed Unanimously.

**3. PROCLAMATION:** Proclaim September 9, 2005 as Job Corps Day.

Mayor Thalhofer read the proclamation.

**4. PUBLIC COMMENT**

None.

**5. PUBLIC HEARING / ORDINANCE (Introduced 7/26/05):** An Ordinance to adopt an updated Transportation System Plan to replace the 1995 Transportation System Plan and repealing Ordinance Nos. 636 and 686.

Mayor Thalhofer opened the public hearing at 7:08pm and read the ordinance title.

Rich Faith, Community Development Director, stated this is a continuation of a public hearing that was held on July 26<sup>th</sup> regarding the adoption of a new Transportation System Plan (TSP). At the last hearing I provided a comprehensive review or summary of the Plan pointing out the major highlights and our consultant from DKS Associates also made a presentation. We are not going to go through that again tonight, however, I did include a copy of my staff report from the July 26<sup>th</sup> meeting. Also at our last meeting our consultant from DKS Associates submitted a memorandum with recommendations for some modifications to the proposed Plan. That recommendation for modification was to incorporate some of the points that came forth from their I-84/Frontage Road Improvements Study. Exhibit A-3 attached to my written staff report is a copy of their memorandum that was provided at the last meeting with the recommended modifications. As you know there was considerable public testimony at the last meeting and the majority of that testimony focused on the project of extending Hensley to connect to 21<sup>st</sup> Street going through Sunrise Park. That particular road project is shown on our current TSP and is simply being carried forward in the proposed document that is under consideration. There were a number of letters that were submitted at the last meeting; copies of those letters are attached as exhibits to my written staff report. There was also testimony regarding the potential widening of Troutdale Road/Buxton Avenue to three lanes. There were residents that testified expressing concerns about that road widening and what impact that might have on their properties and the need for perhaps some additional right-of-way. In response to those concerns the Public Works Director prepared a memorandum that was circulated to you in which he provided information speaking to that particular issue. A copy of that memorandum is attached as Exhibit A to my written staff report. At the last meeting we also received correspondence by email from Sheila Ritz who is the City Administrator for Wood Village posing questions about the 242<sup>nd</sup> connector that is reflected in our Plan. That email is attached as Exhibit B to my written staff report. In her email she was questioning or speculating why the connector would be shown there. It was here speculation that perhaps it was done merely for consistency with the Regional Transportation System Plan (RTP). However, she did state in her email that she thought that we could still be consistent with the RTP by showing the connector but including a footnote or other language expressing your lack of support or opposition to that connector since the City of Wood Village does oppose it. I did a little follow-up on the basis of her comments and contacted Metro because we did put that in there to be consistent with the RTP at Metro's insistence and because the State Transportation Planning Rule states that local transportation plans must be consistent with a regional transportation plan. I asked Metro what it would mean if we took that out of our plan thereby making our plan not in conformity with the RTP. They said there are ramifications if we were to do that. If Metro chooses they could contact the State Department of Land Conservation and Development and bring that to their attention and ask them not to acknowledge our Plan, which needs to be done by forwarding it on to the State for them to acknowledge that it is in compliance with the Transportation Planning Rule and the RTP. In doing that Metro could ask that it not be acknowledged by the State and they could also withhold regional transportation funds if our plan is not consistent with the RTP. However, they also said that they didn't see much likelihood that they would do that and as a compromise they see no reason why we couldn't leave it in the Plan but include language or a footnote if you wish to express opposition to that connector as requested by the Wood Village City Administrator. We did receive a more recent letter from Metro this week (copy provided in the packet) signed by Robin McArthur,

Metro's Regional Planning Director, reaffirming their desire that we keep that connector in our TSP to comply with the RTP and that there is money being set aside or earmarked for a refinement study to look at that connector and other possible north/south corridors in this area of the region. We also, at the July 26<sup>th</sup> hearing, received a letter and testimony from Fairview's Community Development Director, Tamara DeRidder, and in her letter and testimony she recommended various revisions to our proposed Plan and expressed their support for the 242<sup>nd</sup> connector in the Plan. That letter is Exhibit F in my staff report. However, since the last hearing we have received a new letter from the City of Fairview (Exhibit J to the staff report) that modifies its earlier recommendation. In this letter the City of Fairview has now taken a neutral position regarding the 242<sup>nd</sup> connector. All of the letters, written comments, and petitions that have been submitted to the City, both at the last hearing and since that time through August 16<sup>th</sup>, were included and labeled as Exhibits B-J to my staff report. Since August 16<sup>th</sup> we have received four additional letters or emails, copies of those have been provided to you this evening (copies included in the packet). We did receive a petition in opposition to the extension of Hensley Road through Sunrise Park. The proposed TSP was reviewed at a public hearing by the Planning Commission on June 15<sup>th</sup> and they are forwarding the TSP to the Council with a recommendation for adoption. A copy of their findings is included as Exhibit A-1.

Councilor Ripma asked if we were to remove the 242<sup>nd</sup> connector from our Plan you mentioned that Metro was unlikely to oppose it when it is sent to the State for acknowledgement, they might but they were unlikely to, and the State acknowledges our Plan, wouldn't that be a good first step to getting that off of the Plans at Metro and everywhere else? Wouldn't that be a strong statement, stronger than a footnote?

Rich Faith replied yes it would be but I think that it also would be prudent for the City to lobby Metro when they do their next update of the RTP to have it removed. I think that would be the next step that needs to be taken.

Councilor Ripma stated we have been doing that for years. If we were to adopt the Plan without the 242<sup>nd</sup> connector and it turned out that the State does not acknowledge our Plan, do we get another chance to correct our erroneous ways and put it back in with a footnote instead?

Rich Faith replied it is my understanding that if our Plan is not acknowledged there would be a letter sent to us from the State telling us why it is not being acknowledged and what the corrective action would be.

Councilor Ripma asked if we were to change our Plan by removing the widening of Buxton and maybe portions of Troutdale Road would that result in Metro fighting us at the State or having the State not acknowledge our Plan?

Rich Faith replied I don't believe that the widening of Buxton to three lanes is reflective of the RTP. There is nothing showing in the RTP regarding this project so we are not obligated to show that in our Plan.

Councilor Ripma asked what if we remove the Hensley extension, is that showing on the RTP?

Rich Faith replied no it is not.

Councilor Ripma stated so those are things we are free to do without jeopardizing acknowledgement from the State and the 242<sup>nd</sup> connector would take a little more courage.

Rich Faith replied that is correct.

Councilor Ripma stated I was not at the hearing on July 26<sup>th</sup> but I have read all of the testimony and have talked to citizens about this.

Councilor Canfield stated I think I remember that Multnomah County wants to vacate the 242<sup>nd</sup> extension, is that right?

Rich Faith replied yes.

Councilor Canfield asked if the City objected to the vacation could Multnomah County still vacate it?

Rich Faith replied my understanding is that the way the state right-of-way vacation law is written is that because this right-of-way is within the city limits of Troutdale they do need a resolution from the Troutdale City Council stating that it would be in the public interest to vacate the right-of-way. Without that resolution their hands are tied in terms of finalizing a right-of-way vacation.

Councilor Canfield stated so basically the decision is left up to us?

Rich Faith replied that is my understanding according to the officials I spoke to at Multnomah County.

Councilor Daoust stated like Councilor Ripma I was not at the July 26<sup>th</sup> hearing but I have read all of the material and all the testimony that was given.

Councilor Gorsek asked currently the City of Gresham is working on a north/south corridor study, right?

Rich Faith replied that is correct.

Councilor Gorsek asked can you tell us what the four or five major corridors are that they are considering for priority movement of people north and south through East County?

Rich Faith replied I believe there were four alternatives that were studied, 257<sup>th</sup>/Kane Road, 242<sup>nd</sup>/Hogan, 223<sup>rd</sup> and 181<sup>st</sup>.

Councilor Gorsek asked and they are still in the process of this right?

Rich Faith replied they are close to completion. Our own consultants are also retained by Gresham to do that study.

Councilor Gorsek asked the removal of the 242<sup>nd</sup> connector would have a substantial impact on that decision in terms of which road they would use wouldn't it?

Rich Faith replied I am sure it would have an impact but whether it will totally kick it out I am not sure. It is my understanding that even if it is vacated as long as it is on the RTP they are not ruling out the possibility that the project still might take place sometime in the future.

Councilor Gorsek asked when we are talking about the north/south study this also ties into the question of the truck route designation to Highway 26 doesn't it?

Carl Springer, Consultant with DKS replied not as part of that.

Councilor Gorsek asked do we know which corridor is the preferred route right now?

Carl Springer replied the decision about the truck route was not a part of the north/south study. The only discussion was the fact that the current truck route was inadequate according to those who drive trucks so they are looking for new alternatives. There wasn't a specific recommendation one way or the other about which corridor that would be.

Councilor Gorsek asked which corridor are they using currently?

Carl Springer replied up 242<sup>nd</sup>, down to Glisan and up to 207<sup>th</sup> or they run all the way along Burnside to 181<sup>st</sup> then on to I-84.

Councilor Gorsek asked this north/south study they are doing, how much power and clout does that study have in terms of how it affects us?

Carl Springer replied the north/south study is not a document that gets adopted by any body. It is a concept study that is really a precursor to any formal plan that could be adopted by any of the jurisdictions in East County or Metro or anybody else. Before anything is really concrete and carries any weight I think there needs to be another study done. I believe the intent of the study was twofold. One was to reestablish the point that there is a need for better north/south service in East County. Some people are of the mind that the current system is adequate and will be adequate for quite some time. So the first challenge was to get the various cities and the communities to agree that there is a need. The second part is to start to look at possible alternatives to meet that need. It was never the intent of the north/south study to just pick one route. It has to be more of a collaborative process and one that has a much higher level of public involvement. This study was really more of a technical exercise than anything else.

Councilor Gorsek asked from a traffic analyst's point of view, would it be wise to vacate properties that could be used for that purpose?

Carl Springer replied my presentation that I made last week to the Mayors of the three cities, basically concluded that we found that the need for the north/south corridors, at least the northern half of the corridors from Powell to I-84, was more than what could be provided by any one corridor. So we believe that in the end you are going to need multiple corridor improvements. From our point of view by knocking one of those out by that kind of action certainly sets you back and forces you to make other choices that you'd rather not make. It is not enough to improve the 257<sup>th</sup> corridor and solve all of the problems I guess is what we are saying.

Councilor Ripma asked the decision whether to funnel traffic into your city to benefit cities to the south, does that enter into your thinking at all? Is that something that a city is allowed to consider based on livability or economic development, or do we just have to consider more traffic and more noise just for the sake of sprawl?

Carl Springer replied that is tough to answer. You have choices and you certainly have influence over the facilities that the city has control over. The way I look at a transportation system plan is we are not necessarily influenced by where the city boundaries are. We are looking at it as a regional system. What I also know is that the growth to the south is likely to occur and is likely to occur something like what they are forecasting. So, the do nothing scenario is that if you don't accept any improvements and don't make provisions for it, traffic is going to grow regardless of whether you do any improvements. Our forecast, at least on the arterial systems is that volume will be going up in the range of 40% to 50% compared to where they are today. In one sense it sounds like you are protecting livability by staying away from some of these improvement projects, but I think what we as planners try to do is we try to figure out rationale ways to move that traffic without violating livability knowing that there is going to be a much higher demand than there is today so you have to look for new solutions.

Councilor Ripma stated I am saying that the cities that benefit from it, the cities that are driving it like Gresham, they can put it through their city not ours.

Councilor Thomas asked since the 242<sup>nd</sup> connector is already on the TSP does it make sense to take it off based on what you already know?

Carl Springer asked regarding what?

Councilor Thomas stated the increased traffic on 257<sup>th</sup> alone.

Carl Springer asked so is your question should we take it off because we know that traffic is going to grow?

Councilor Thomas asked does it make sense to take it off?

Carl Springer stated I advocate that it is premature to take it off. I don't have any vested interest in any of that stuff, I just know that from a regional perspective you are giving away one of your options. I would rather keep as many options as possible for regional planning.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated much of what we are discussing right now will be discussed in the next agenda item also. How far can we go with this discussion because there are folks coming from Multnomah County to testify on the next agenda item that are not here yet, but they could testify on this agenda item as well since this seems to be a big part of this item.

Marnie Allen, City Attorney stated one option is the Council can decide to leave the 242<sup>nd</sup> connector in the TSP and still decide to adopt the resolution vacating the County right-of-way. Another option would be, depending on how long this public hearing goes it may be that the folks from the County may arrive before you finish receiving public testimony at which point you may want to invite them to speak to you regarding 242<sup>nd</sup>. Should the Council decide that you don't want to leave the 242<sup>nd</sup> connector in our Plan and part of that is because of the information you receive and a belief that the demand and regional needs can be better met on a road in another jurisdiction, that discussion should be reflected in the record and maybe a note included on the Plan so that when our Plan goes to DLCD to be acknowledged there is some rationale as to why you removed 242<sup>nd</sup> from our Plan.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated perhaps the staff from the County will arrive before we close this public hearing.

Councilor Canfield stated in the draft TSP there is a table that shows the significant employment growth for Troutdale to the tune of approximately 10,000 jobs. What kind of affect will those jobs have on the north/south routes?

Carl Springer replied the majority of the employment growth in Troutdale is north of I-84. Are you asking is it a driving force for the north/south improvements?

Councilor Canfield replied I just wanted to clarify that there is more to the north/south routes than just what is happening south of us.

Carl Springer stated I think it is the long range commuters and it is also the guy that is only going five blocks to the shopping center and then back home. I can tell you that in a lot of communities where the perception is that the through traffic is the dominating factor, it is actually usually the reverse; it is the local traffic that is the majority.

Councilor Daoust asked item number four on the Motor Vehicle Master Plan, construct a 2-lane access controlled roadway from Marine Drive/South Frontage to 257<sup>th</sup>/Outlet Mall tying in behind the truck stops, was there any testimony at the last meeting or any concerns voiced from the truck stops about putting that road behind them and taking some of their parking space?

Rich Faith replied when this proposal went to the Planning Commission we sent individual notice to all of the property owners and businesses along Frontage Road informing them

specifically about this project. We had only one business owner that even called or attended the hearing expressing any interest in that issue. That was the owner of the Comfort Inn Motel and they were more concerned about the alignment and whether it would affect any portion of their property. I have heard nothing from either Travel Centers of America or Flying J Truck Stop.

Councilor Gorsek asked in terms of that particular road how does the \$1 million from the Federal Government tie into that? Does that tie into part of the supporting back road or study for the interchange?

Rich Faith replied that \$1 million was secured through the most recent transportation bill and it was at the request of the Port of Portland to look at what things could be done to improve the current situation there. My understanding is that the money is somewhat fluid in terms of how it is spent and it is not necessarily locked into one particular type of improvement. There are other things that are spelled out in conjunction with the actual road construction there such as some modifications at the interchange itself at Graham Road/257<sup>th</sup> and Frontage Road. From what I have been told the money could be used for those improvements but I think it was principally intended to do further study or engineering work in terms of how Frontage Road could be modified and improved but I don't believe that it is tied to any one particular project.

Mayor Thalhoffer asked is there anyone here that would like to speak to us on this issue?

Annie Gorsek stated we think that kids should have a say in extending Hensley Road through Sunrise Park. Sunrise Park is one of the only parks in Gresham and Troutdale that allows dogs in it, plus it would be a lot more dangerous for both kids and dogs.

Rachel Fylan stated if there was a road through our park it would also be a lot noisier. It is so peaceful there now. Please keep it that way.

Annie Gorsek and Rachel Fylan stated please vote no.

Leon Koistinen stated I live on Sunrise Circle and my street connects directly to 21<sup>st</sup> Street. My comments are regarding the potential liability to the City of Troutdale if you approve connecting Hensley with 21<sup>st</sup> Street and turn it into two lanes. I refer to potential lawsuits that may be filed against the City should the residents directly below or on the south side of 21<sup>st</sup> have erosion problems resulting in either mudslides or landslides. Your study talks about the potential of 2,000 vehicles using the street daily which may put additional stress on the hill. Already there is an erosion problem. I brought some photos with me to show you the decline (photos not submitted into the record). I am not an attorney or an engineer. If you take a look at the decline it could be a potential problem and I don't know if anyone has brought this up before or not. You will also notice that there isn't very much room to add an additional lane and that would certainly add undo stress on the declining hill which may result in potential slides. I see potential liability issues for the City if this proposal were adopted. I ask the City of Troutdale to vote no on extending the street. If all you wanted to do is to save the



drivers two to five minutes drive time by bypassing Stark or Cherry Park Road this proposal makes absolutely no sense to me.

Loel Laughlin stated I live on Buxton and I am concerned with the widening of Buxton. I was never notified of this widening until I received a flyer on my door about this meeting. I see no reason for three lanes on Buxton. If people need to move faster they can use Kane, it is a straight shot to the freeway. If they do widen Buxton, will I be compensated for my property? Right now I know the majority of people do not go the speed limit on Buxton. The speed limit is 25mph and it is a school zone. You have to be real careful trying to get out of my driveway because cars are flying over the hill. You need to really think about this.

David Wheaton stated as I understand it the Council does need to update the Transportation System Plan. The extension of Hensley is in the current plan. As you know some of us in the neighborhood went through this about ten years ago and voiced objections at that time. I know I sent in a letter myself. In the last ten years the City has intentionally made this wildlife park for a number of reasons, primarily to encourage wildlife and part of that had to do with its previous use I can only assume. Part of the park was built as a green area with a trail and a bridge for walking and biking for the local community. Keeping the road extension in the Plan will increase neighborhood tensions with the City. This proposed road would destroy the efforts the City has made over the last ten years for the wildlife habitat and the walking and biking activities currently enjoyed by many would be eliminated. At the last meeting a member of DKS Associates admitted that the street would be difficult to design and that the street would carry what he considered minor traffic loads. Given that information it would seem that it would be an expensive street to design and build with minimal benefit to the community. It would seem that scarce resources would be better used elsewhere. The community does not support the TSP with the Hensley extension as currently proposed. Design would be expensive with little benefit. The road reduces and eliminates benefits currently enjoyed by the community. Wildlife habitat would be reduced or eliminated. I would like to request that the Council adopt the TSP with modifications that would eliminate the Hensley extension.

Jim Davis showed the Council current photos of Sunrise Park. (Copies are included in the packet.)

Alan Nelson stated I have lived on Buxton for seven years and I am here to comment on the widening of Buxton. I can see a need for some traffic control at the bottom of the hill. I would like to suggest if you would like to widen something how about the bridge that crosses that Sandy River. I just don't see a need for putting a third lane all the way from downtown up to Stark. It is my understanding that the Plan calls for straightening out the "S" curve at Cherry Park. The information that I have received on this is from neighbors, rumor and different places. I am a little bit disappointed that I never heard anything from the city that these things were coming up, especially something as intrusive as this. It would have been a courtesy to notify the public about it. Again, I want to state my opposition to the widening of Buxton.

Don Chambers stated I am here on behalf of my Mother-in-Law. They have lived on the corner of 7<sup>th</sup> and Buxton for close to four years. In the time that they have been there the

road has already been widened. Currently she feels that there is plenty of room for bicycles on the sides of the roads. The turnout lane, I really don't think that will help things and she didn't either. I have traveled up and down this road for years and I haven't seen a lot of accidents on this road. I don't really see where putting this turnout in the middle will benefit you that much. I think there are better ways to spend your money. As far as putting bicycle lanes in, that hill is pretty steep to be riding up and down and not many people will want to traverse that. My Mother-in-Law wanted to let you know that she didn't think it was a good idea and a number of her neighbors feel the same way.

Karen Davis stated I live on SW Hensley. I am here on behalf of the Hensley Road extension. I spoke to you in opposition at the first hearing. I was involved in circulating the petition. I also want to say that I support the folks that are here in opposition to the widening of Buxton, I don't see any sense in that either. Primarily why I am speaking to you tonight is because one of our neighbors on Fox Court, Laurie Clark, could not be here tonight and she asked me to read this list of the animals and birds she has seen in Sunrise Park and her backyard since 1993. Karen Davis read the list of animals and birds. Her letter also stated, "my love for Sunrise Park and the never ending joy and ah I feel everyday when I open my blinds keeps me grounded and sane. I feel blessed by the beauty that is in my backyard."

Jerry Park stated I am a 31 year resident off 7<sup>th</sup> and Buxton across from Helen Althaus Park. 31 years ago Buxton was a pretty quiet street and 7<sup>th</sup> was almost a gravel road. I am concerned about the increase of traffic that I think would be encouraged by turning Buxton into a three lane road. I am also concerned about the safety of the children. As it is now it is difficult to get traffic to stop at the cross walk on 7<sup>th</sup> and Buxton. More traffic will only make this more dangerous for the children. There are so many residential streets that come onto Buxton and Troutdale Road it is not like 257<sup>th</sup> where there isn't quite so many. We have an issue of a dangerous situation by increasing the road to three lanes. It would be better if we could just put a light at the bottom so people could get in and out of Buxton a little easier and try to keep that traffic going up 257<sup>th</sup>.

Jeff Vanderberg stated I have lived on SW 15<sup>th</sup> for almost 22 years. It used to be a dead end street until Stuart Ridge was built. Besides the increased traffic, which I think we are all use to by now, the foot traffic has really increased and that has also brought problems. My car has been vandalized once not to mention all of the liter that is left in the greenway next to my house and that is exactly what is going to happen if you put a road through the park. We are already use to it on SW 15<sup>th</sup> so just let us keep it, why give it to someone else.

Anne Main stated I live on Buxton. I also had not heard about the widening of Buxton/Troutdale Road until a neighbor told me about it. I helped circulate the letters because I am opposed to the widening of Buxton. I live right as the hill comes up and levels off. I have a daycare right there which I have had for about twenty years. I know for a fact that the majority of the cars do not go 25mph. I have watched the Troutdale Police sit on 6<sup>th</sup> and Buxton repeatedly and ticket cars for speeding. I take my daycare kids to Helen Althaus Park and at that crosswalk it is absolutely amazing how many cars do not stop there. I have to go into the middle of the road to stop the cars so I can get my kids across the street. If there are three lanes it is going to be so dangerous for the children. I have heard rumors that

at the berry fields at Troutdale Road and Stark Street there will be apartments built so they will need to widen that. Why can't traffic go up Cherry Park to 257<sup>th</sup> where there is already a light at the bottom of the hill and there are not near as many neighborhood roads up the hill. My dad use to work for Multnomah County and originally when 257<sup>th</sup> was put in it was to take the traffic off of Buxton. I don't understand why the traffic can't go around, maybe the folks that live on Cherry Park won't like my idea, but to me it just makes more sense instead of going down here to the middle of town.

Male stated I am here again in opposition to the widening of Buxton. I agree with Councilor Ripma, why should Troutdale take all the blunt of people building to the south of us, it doesn't make any sense. Widening Buxton doesn't make any sense to begin with. Taking away the "S" curve, that came up during the last Planning Commission meeting. They talked about if they do widen the lanes they are going to bring up the speed limit or something to that affect and they said what are we going to do about the "S" curve and they said they would take it out. Is this the last time that the public can voice their opinion on this matter?

Mayor Thalhoffer replied this is the second reading and we can and probably will vote tonight.

Male stated the public just doesn't know about this. Everybody that I have spoken with is very surprised that things are happening in our city of this magnitude and they haven't heard about it. There is going to be a lot of angry people if this is approved and they find out by bulldozers going down the street.

Shane Park stated I live on 11<sup>th</sup> Circle in Strawberry Meadows and I have been a resident of Troutdale since 1973. My father testified already. I use to live on 7<sup>th</sup> Street and there is a real problem crossing Buxton at the cross walk at 7<sup>th</sup> Street right now. The vehicles do not stop at the crosswalk. Even when I have my child in a stroller and we are partially in the street they do not stop. That is a dangerous situation. My wife and I are very fearful that if Buxton and Troutdale Road became three lanes that it would encourage more cars to use Troutdale Road as a north/south connector instead of 257<sup>th</sup> which would increase the volume creating even more of a difficult problem. Like some of the other residents, most of the residents in Strawberry Meadows didn't even know that this was occurring. It is quite a problem to pull out of Strawberry Meadows if you use 13<sup>th</sup> Street and turn onto Troutdale Road. Again widening to three lanes would make this even more difficult. As it is the speed at which people travel is not 25mph even though the speed limit is 25mph. To make a left hand turn off of 13<sup>th</sup> onto Troutdale Road is very dangerous. Often times cars are traveling 35mph to 45mph not 25mph. If the "S" turn was taken out it would encourage traffic to go even faster on that road and magnify our problem and make it even more of a dangerous situation. Many of us walk or bike Troutdale Road towards the Dairy Queen and there is that narrow section where Beaver Creek passes under Troutdale Road, that is extremely dangerous. Please lets not increase the volume of traffic.

Terry Kneisler, Superintendent of Reynolds School District stated I have only been around for two years but from what I understand we moved the bus stop off of Buxton Road to create some safety which prompted students, particularly middle school students, to come across Buxton Road to come over to the elementary school to catch the bus. I want you to keep in

mind the fact that those students will have to continue to do that. Any time we have kids crossing a more involved street, which is what it appears you may be creating here, increased safety precautions need to be put in place particularly when we are talking about adolescents. The very fact that we are going to be asking middle school kids to cross an increasingly high traffic road will require the combination of some mechanisms to slow down traffic as well as crossing guards that we have in place. Most of the elementary kids, if they are going to be walking, they are walking from the east side of Buxton and we are picking them up closer to their homes, but the middle school kids cause some alarm for the School Board and I wanted you to be aware of that.

Chuck Maxwell stated I have lived on SW 25<sup>th</sup> for 10 years which happens to be on the southern border of Sunrise Park. We purchased the property because of the park and I think we even paid a little more money for that view. The livability of that park is really why I am here. I don't know how you are going to get anybody to turn into the SW corner of that park without having to take a house out. I think you are also going to destroy the walking trail around the park. You are literally going to turn it into a U-shaped walking trail. I think in the long term you are going to take a jewel out of Troutdale, which is Sunrise Park. I would like to see more money invested in this park because I think it attracts kids and activities that are good for the city. I just hope that you vote no on that particular piece of this Plan.

Shelley Fenton stated I live on SW 20<sup>th</sup> Way. My backyard backs right up along Hensley. That road does not need to be widened or extended. The park is just such a beautiful place. The first time I walked through it I was just amazed at the view of Mt. Hood. A few weeks later when I was walking through the park I nearly stepped on a big turtle that was crossing the gravel path. I am amazed at the wildlife. Has there been an endangered species study done on the wildlife that is currently living in the park? If not, I think there needs to be one done. The safety issues of cars traveling down that road straight down that hill, there are so many children going to that park. I see no real reason for that extension; there are plenty of ways to get through. I do challenge you to ask who wants that road to go through. I think if you ask those folks here to stand up if they do not want that road to go through, I think the majority of the audience would stand up.

Michelle Card stated I live on SE 4<sup>th</sup> Street on the corner of 4<sup>th</sup> and Buxton. We bought our house from my husband's parents who lived there for a very long time. If I had heard about this plan before I think I would have tried to make a much bigger stink about it a lot sooner. I apologize for not knowing about it. I just don't see how you can widen that road without taking out someone's home and if it is not someone across the street it's going to be my home. No offense but I have just spent every waking hour this past three months putting a new coat of paint on it. I hate to see you take it out, I need my home. I can't go anywhere else. Please don't take my home away from me. Please don't widen that road, we don't need it. There is a beautiful, wonderful, huge road just right on the other side. Why would anyone want to widen this road? Why would they want to make three lanes? I have been down there in the morning and I have seen the backup of the people trying to turn left, if that is the problem then take Cherry Park to 257<sup>th</sup> where there are lights and turn signals. Please don't bust up the road.

Rod Park, Metro Councilor stated this is tough because it is about peoples homes. I do appreciate the work that you are doing because you are on the front line. It is very difficult as you are trying to make these decisions. We are forced to look at how we are able to provide mobility. There is a truism about our society that we like our neighborhoods and we like to drive places but we don't like people driving through our neighborhoods yet we want to get to places. It puts us in a very difficult position when we are trying to make these types of decisions. I appreciate your work and your staff working with Metro on this TSP. You have a very difficult task in front of you.

Ron Dwigguns stated my wife and I have lived in Troutdale for 30 years on Beaver Creek Lane adjacent to the park. We walk our dogs there several times a week. With all of the construction going on in our city, I think the least you can do is leave that space for us and our animals.

Olga Moen stated I live on 9<sup>th</sup> Circle. I am a new resident in Troutdale. As I am listening to what the folks are saying, the question that I have is, were the folks notified about the widening of Buxton and how, and the same with the Hensley extension? I travel Buxton every morning and the traffic is much faster than the 25mph speed limit. I agree with everyone else, don't widen that road. There is no reason for it. In fact I think speed bumps would be the best thing there. I have seen the bus picking up the folks that are in wheelchairs on 7<sup>th</sup> and if you widen the road people will be trying to go around the bus, they go around anyway into oncoming traffic. Secondly, the Hensley Road, my husband and I both love running in that park. We take our dogs with us. The park is just the right size for the community. Don't change it. It needs to stay there. We don't need anymore roads. I agree with everybody else, if you want to go fast use 257<sup>th</sup>. We run on both Buxton and on 257<sup>th</sup>, people drive 70mph on 257<sup>th</sup> and it is scary. I can see that happening on Buxton where people will start driving upwards of 50mph. I hope you listen to all of us and don't do any of it, leave it just the way it is.

Becky Lindsay stated I live on 20<sup>th</sup> way. I helped circulate the petition. I have a suggestion. It seems like nobody really wants the Buxton Road widening and nobody really wants the road to go through the park. How about you take the money and the transportation plan for those two projects, put in a few traffic calming measures, add another police officer on staff to slow people down and keep Troutdale livable. I think that is what is really important to people here. If you make it less livable we are all going to suffer property value loss and we will have more property crime. Hensley is right by the high school. If you put Hensley Road through I can guarantee you that I am going to be keeping the Troutdale Police Officers busy every night with calls about speed racing. They are going to go down in that park and they are going to be doing things that we don't want them to be doing in it. We need to make it a good place to live and keep it as it is.

Mayor Thalhoffer closed the public hearing at 8:30pm.

Marnie Allen, City Attorney stated there was discussion earlier about the Council wanting to hear from the County regarding the 242<sup>nd</sup> connector. It would be important if the Council

were to decide to take 242<sup>nd</sup> out of the TSP to reopen the public hearing and have the County's testimony included in this record because it may end up before the DLCD.

Mayor Thalhoffer reopened the public hearing at 8:31pm.

Terry Kneisler, Superintendent of Reynolds School District stated it was about three to four months ago when we worked cooperatively with the City to look at the property that the County was putting up for sale. It worked quite well in terms of cooperation in that the City had some interest in keeping the County's property that was to the north of Halsey available for commercial or industrial development. The School District had some interest in that property at that time but in the spirit of cooperation has turned its focus to the areas immediately to the south of Halsey surrounding the McMenamans Edgefield property. As time went on it became apparent that we were looking at sitting to the immediate east of McMenamans for the possibility of both a high school or a middle school site. Development in the City of Troutdale continues to grow and impacts our already sizeable high school and our already packed middle school. In addition we know that both Sweetbriar and Troutdale elementary schools are currently at capacity and we were given the opportunity to look at the property immediately to the west of the McMenamans Edgefield property. On that property already exists the Arata Creek School as part of the Multnomah County ESD program, the Morrison Center School, the Edgefield Children's Center and two other buildings that are educationally oriented. The Arata Creek property was not part of that parcel but the others all were. The Morrison Center in particular offers a great opportunity for us to use that for an elementary school. The Edgefield Children's Center might well be used for a charter school as well as using some of the other buildings for alternative schools. As we looked at that, and the right-of-way that comes through the property, we noted that if that were to be turned into something similar to Glisan that would be a very noisy corridor coming right next to four separate school facilities. Having just worked out with ODOT the mitigation of noise for the Wilkes School, which has had I-84 run next to it for twenty years; I would hate to be in a position of having an additional major thoroughfare run right next to four separate schools. In particular the elementary school where noise is a negative to students learning how to listen and in turn read and speak. That is to say nothing of the fact that where the right-of-way is presently sited would separate the school from the Wood Village Park which Wood Village has said we would be able to use for the elementary schools recreational area. So there is little question that the School District finds the notion of the right-of-way being maintained and ultimately having a major thoroughfare come through there as being a negative. We think it is a remarkable area and to have a major thoroughfare running through it would both hamper our ability to educate and secondly change a really special area that I know McMenamans enjoys as one of our destination spots in the County. We are in a position right now of being ready to purchase that property as well as the right-of-way. I would encourage you to affirm the decision of the County to release the right-of-way for use despite the support for the Metro area Transportation Plan. The School District wishes to keep that as a pleasant area for children and educational purposes.

Lynn Dingler of Multnomah County stated we have presented to our commission the recommendation to sale the property and they have accepted that. They have also recommended, as a result, to sale the property to the Reynolds School District. As part of

that action we have looked at the development potential and we did a fairly extensive study about the existence of that right-of-way. We have gone through a whole series of issues. One of the first questions that has to be asked is, is there an actual demonstrated need for the right-of-way. Mr. Abrahamson has managed to study this and came to the conclusion there was no short term or identifiable need in the future that we could see for that right-of-way. The cost is a major issue. The big issue is of course asking who is going to pay for it. When we walked around and interviewed ODOT and Metro and we have talked to your staff, it won't come as any surprise that everybody said not us. The design takes the road down through our property and ends on Halsey. The question of where it goes is rather significant. There are no funds foreseeable for the project. Probably the biggest issue is, are there alternatives. There are apparently alternatives. There is a Federal Highway designation for a freight route that comes down Burnside and turns right on 181<sup>st</sup>. We have a number of alternatives that are functioning very well. We can not see the necessity to losing this development. The big issue we are concerned with is we want the money for it, but the reality is by leaving this right-of-way in place we constrict the development of what we believe would be a significant asset to the community bringing people in and providing tax revenue for the City of Troutdale. The Springwater Plan in the City of Gresham seems to have cut the freight designation out of their section of the plan. Currently for the next twenty years there are other answers that are cheaper and significantly less disruptive to the communities, particularly the communities of Troutdale and Wood Village.

Ed Abrahamson of Multnomah County's Land Use and Transportation Department stated we did a study and we suspended the study because we did a traffic analysis in 2001 and the traffic analysis didn't demonstrate a need for that road given the conditions that we foresee for the next twenty years. Our Board has taken a look and they have said there isn't a demonstrated need. Metro asked, do you see a need for it or funding for it in the next twenty years? The answer to that was no. As Lynn pointed there are routes that still get you between US 26 and I-84. Is it worth the cost or are there other things you could do with the money that might improve things better and the answer to that is maybe but probably yes given what it would cost to develop it in the current alignment and what it would serve. There is always another study around the corner that may shed light on it. Will it shed more light? That is hard to say. As Lynn pointed out the City of Gresham just did a major concept plan for the Springwater area and in the Transportation System Plan for the Springwater area they eliminated any thought of a connector at the south end, which was a major point of the Mt. Hood Parkway and the 242<sup>nd</sup> Avenue connector as it goes south between I-84 and US 26.

Councilor Ripma asked do you have a suggestion for how we should best go at this? I realize we have another agenda item that will make a decision on the 242<sup>nd</sup> connector right-of-way, but for the purpose of the TSP, you have experience with the State, are we better off leaving the connector in the Plan and adding a note that we do not favor the route. Or do you think it would be better for Troutdale to actually delete it?

Ed Abrahamson replied leaving it in the Plan with a note seems to work well. We don't want to eliminate it entirely because things do change. There may be other alternatives that come up that may service it and if we leave it in there it serves as a placeholder.

Councilor Ripma asked if we left it in the Plan with a note, and lets say we were to vacate the right-of-way, would that allow you to go ahead and sell the land?

Lynn Dingler replied we could go ahead and sell the land. The objective is to vacate the right-of-way. It will not cloud the title, however, it might give our buyers some pause.

Terry Kneisler stated just so you know, I think the buyer would have some pause. There are not too many properties you would want to purchase that have a future roadway coming through it. It is a buyers beware. The School Board would have to determine whether or not the purchase of the right-of-way would be of any value to them if they feel that it could be developed at any time.

Lynn Dingler stated I would suggest an alternative that recognizing the concern for a north/south connector within your TSP would give you an opportunity to recognize the need and the potential objective of establishing that somewhere down the road. However, simply vacating the right-of-way and taking it off doesn't change that particular issue. So whether it is coming down any particular area is to be decided in the future.

Councilor Ripma stated so recognizing the future need but deleting the specific dashed lines in the Plan, is that what I am hearing?

Lynn Dingler replied that is correct.

Councilor Thomas stated I am a bit puzzled in that the numbers that I read, primarily Metro stuff, says we need six more additional lanes of traffic for north/south. Apparently their traffic studies indicate that is necessary. Why aren't yours the same?

Ed Abrahamson replied a couple of reasons perhaps. They are talking about more localized traffic. Six travel lanes can be accomplished a lot of different ways. What we saw when we did the 242<sup>nd</sup> Avenue study is that we had a connection with I-84 that was not a full interchange, its only half of an interchange and the interchange that exists at 238<sup>th</sup> Drive was more appealing and they wouldn't be using the 242<sup>nd</sup> Avenue connector. It didn't show the number of vehicles using it that would justify its construction. There is also another study on the horizon. There was the Springwater study that was done recently that demonstrated that six additional lanes were needed somewhere between 181<sup>st</sup> and 257<sup>th</sup> Avenue. There is also a third study that is just now gearing up. That will give us an opportunity to take a look at what the freight need really is in the region and in Multnomah County in an effort to try to get some more localized information to get better information on how to create routes through East Multnomah County. I think that will be something that will benefit us that will show us a little bit closer where the trucks really are traveling and would like to travel. But the modeling that has been done so far hasn't demonstrated that freight need for a new road.

Councilor Thomas stated lets say that the 242<sup>nd</sup> connector option is tossed out and according to what I have here we would be looking at roughly another 10,000 cars per day on 257<sup>th</sup>. Is that road capable of handling that? I know the intersection is not, it can barely handle what it has now.



Ed Abrahamson replied 257<sup>th</sup> compared to a lot of the other roads that go north/south through E. Multnomah County has very few access points. We have been trying to protect access to that road so it is pretty free flowing and the improvements between Division and Powell Valley Road, which are in the State Transportation Improvement Plan for construction in 2008, will only further improve that. We recently completed improvements to 257<sup>th</sup> and Orient. Once you fix that bottleneck between Division and Powell Valley Road you've got a better connection there. There is work that is being looked at right now for improving the interchange at 257<sup>th</sup>, which is part of your TSP. People are using 207<sup>th</sup> more and more. One might say we get a lot of traffic in E. Multnomah County because when you are traveling west on I-84 if you don't get off at 181<sup>st</sup> where is the next exit to get off of I-84. One might say if you made an interchange at 122<sup>nd</sup> it might take a lot of the traffic, not so much the freight traffic, but a lot of the motor vehicles out of E. Multnomah County.

Councilor Thomas stated as you know Tri-Met hasn't been the most friendly to us out here as far as alternate traffic plans, so the choice we have is coming up with a way to move vehicles. I am not sure that your study collaborates with what I am hearing from other places. It doesn't make sense to me as to why yours would be so much different than Metros.

Ed Abrahamson replied I don't know that it is so much different, what they say is we need six lanes. They didn't say where those six lanes should be. There are a number of arterials that run north/south. Tri-Met hasn't been out here but the pressure is pushing them out here. Right now Metro is considering another corridor study. One of those corridor studies is in the 242<sup>nd</sup> Avenue and 257<sup>th</sup> Avenue areas. The emphasis is moving out to the east side for studying and relieving transportation pressures out here but we haven't seen a demonstrated need yet anywhere. We have perceived some, the Mt. Hood Parkway twenty years ago and the state dropped that. We perceived the 242<sup>nd</sup> Avenue connector. Maybe we will get something out of the corridor study. But the six lanes that came out of the Gresham study did not pinpoint where those lanes should be.

Councilor Thomas stated but if you take that right-of-way and later on when the study happens then how do you get the right-of-way back?

Ed Abrahamson replied well it is expensive, you have to buy it.

Lynn Dingle stated actually I would offer that you don't get it back because if development has taken place it would probably skew the cost benefit way beyond any reasonable level. However, the problems with 238<sup>th</sup> Drive now have to do with turn radius and slope. It would seem more efficient to address those issues rather than cut an entirely new right-of-way through potentially valuable land that will return things to the community such as taxes.

Councilor Thomas stated the school district isn't going to provide any taxes for us.

Lynn Dingle replied right. It is going to be very difficult twenty to twenty-five years down the road when we actually get some money to say lets go do this project.

Councilor Thomas stated well you didn't have the money when it was put in the Plan to begin with.

Lynn Dingler replied it seems to be what we do so often. You're right, we didn't have the money then and nothing has changed.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated there is a heavy traffic count of northbound traffic on 242<sup>nd</sup> coming from the south, from Gresham, on the Troutdale portion of 242<sup>nd</sup> and when it hits Glisan they hang a left and go down to 207<sup>th</sup>. Was Glisan and 207<sup>th</sup> designed to handle more traffic than they are handling now?

Ed Abrahamson replied yes. 242<sup>nd</sup> north to Glisan is designated as a principal arterial, which means we are trying to limit access to that road and increase capacity. Glisan Street itself has been widened and improved to meet major arterial standards. It has center turn lanes, bike lanes, sidewalks, and two travel lanes in each direction. It was built to accommodate a large volume of traffic in anticipation of industrial growth in E. Multnomah County. Glisan and 242<sup>nd</sup> Avenue south from Glisan were designated in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) as a freight route. One of the asterisks that was in the RTP also said that when 242<sup>nd</sup> Avenue connector, actually at that time it was the Mt. Hood Parkway, was completed that it would become the National Highway System freight route. Until that time the freight route remains I-84 down 181<sup>st</sup> to Burnside to US 26.

Mayor Thalhoffer asked the interchange at 207<sup>th</sup> and I-84 is a major interchange isn't it?

Ed Abrahamson replied every interchange should be.

Mayor Thalhoffer asked I understand there are going to be some improvements made on 238<sup>th</sup>, isn't that correct?

Ed Abrahamson replied yes, there will be some safety improvements made next spring to improve the sight distances and install some warning flashers to alert people when there is a red light at Arata Road. By investing a few million dollars and doing a few right-of-way enhancements it can probably accommodate a lot more traffic then it can currently.

Mayor Thalhoffer asked doesn't Mike McMenamin have plans to build a convention center on part of the land if the right-of-way were vacated?

Lynn Dingler replied I would hesitate to say what Mike is going to do. I have heard, but I am real hesitant on this, but he has talked about some convention activities and an amphitheater. I don't know where his plans are.

Doug Butler, Facility Director for Multnomah County stated in conversations with Mike he has said he is definitely considering plans for a convention center on the site. That is not the same as an absolute commitment but he is looking at purchasing the land to look at an expansion of his existing facilities and to enhance what he already has.

Mayor Thalhoffer asked part of the 242<sup>nd</sup> connector right-of-way would be included, isn't that correct?

Doug Butler replied absolutely. In our negotiations with the School District and McMenumins we have specifically tried to address what happens if that right-of-way is there and there interest is substantially less. The property value is substantially less and the potential development that you would see of that land would be substantially less.

Councilor Canfield stated I am troubled like Councilor Thomas with the difference of opinion between Metro and Multnomah County. There is one difference though, Metro is not trying to sell that piece of land. Could you give me a rough idea of the value of that piece of property?

Doug Butler replied the property on the south side is worth a little over \$11 million. The additional property that the Children's Center sits on that is also being included is another \$4.5 million. The right-of-way itself was valued by an appraiser and negotiations were based on an appraisal of \$1.7 million. It is a significant amount of money but what we are trying to do in selling the property is make a sell that is good for the community as well. One of the things that we looked at, and I talked to the state, County, and Metro and without exception they were all basically saying we don't have the funding for the connector and we don't see it on the horizon as to when we would have the funds. When you talk to Metro they say it wouldn't be our project anyways, that would be a County road. You talk to the County and they say we understand that is their view but we don't know where the money would come from. We have never said that we accept responsibility for it. I think it is important to maintain the corridors and to do what you can to plan for the future but you have to do a balancing act. When nobody can identify a potential source of funding anytime in the next twenty years and it will preclude a level of development, tax revenues, and activity that I think benefits you as well as the County and others, it seems to me that you are sacrificing a lot when there are a number of other alternatives that work. The Board has not taken action on the right-of-way vacation because they need to hear from you first, but what they have said is go ahead and sell the property. They have already heard the same thing and have said that we believe there are other alternatives.

Councilor Canfield asked are the proceeds of the sell going to be used for the Justice Center in Rockwood?

Doug Butler replied absolutely. It is dedicated to the construction of a Justice Center.

Councilor Canfield asked can 257<sup>th</sup> handle 10,000 more vehicles per day?

Ed Abrahamson replied I can't answer that tonight. I would have to take a look at what the current volumes are and what the projected volumes are.

Councilor Thomas stated currently there are 24,100 vehicles per day and that is expected to go to 32,975 by the year 2025.

Ed Abrahamson stated arterials can handle 45,000 vehicles per day. That is what 181<sup>st</sup> is handling.

Councilor Canfield asked could 207<sup>th</sup> handle a similar increase?

Ed Abrahamson replied a major arterial should be able to handle 40,000 to 45,000 vehicles per day as a rule of thumb.

Councilor Kyle asked when will the regional freight study be completed?

Ed Abrahamson replied it is about eighteen months out.

Councilor Gorsek stated you were talking about the studies that Multnomah County did to decide that the 242<sup>nd</sup> connector was not necessary. What year was that study done?

Ed Abrahamson replied I believe it was suspended in 2001.

Councilor Gorsek asked did it contemplate what is going on now with the new Metro reserve and the development in Gresham and Damascas?

Ed Abrahamson replied no. We did bring that up and said that perhaps this is the time to reopen the study and there was no response to say lets reopen it.

Councilor Gorsek stated that is fine if there was no response but the question is how valid is the study that you are presenting to us as support for your position? It really isn't that valid because it is not based on current data.

Ed Abrahamson stated but I don't think that the Springwater study showed a need for a 242<sup>nd</sup> connector either.

Councilor Gorsek stated all I can tell you is that we received testimony earlier from DKS saying that all four of these key corridors would be necessary, that you wouldn't just put all of your eggs in one basket so to speak.

Ed Abrahamson replied that is correct. What that study called for is that six travel lanes would be needed and that could be accommodated in a number of different combinations.

Councilor Gorsek stated and I heard your colleague indicate some preference for 257<sup>th</sup>. The interesting thing about 257<sup>th</sup> if we want to worry about livability in Troutdale, between 242<sup>nd</sup> and 257<sup>th</sup>, 257<sup>th</sup> runs right through our city. In my mind what happens on 257<sup>th</sup> is a heck of a lot more important from Troutdale's perspective than what happens on 242<sup>nd</sup>. I already can't get out onto 257<sup>th</sup> from 25<sup>th</sup> and we are being told that it's not a problem. How can your numbers be so far away from experience? I don't understand it. At rush hour 257<sup>th</sup> is a nightmare in our city so how can we be saying that it can handle 10,000 more cars, no big deal.

Ed Abrahamson stated I am not saying it's no big deal, I am saying that is the capacity of the road.

Councilor Gorsek asked is it true that 257<sup>th</sup> will become more and more attractive as the sections in Gresham get improved like the Powell to Division section? It will become more and more attractive as the connector between I-84 and US 26 won't it?

Ed Abrahamson replied I am sure it will, yes.

Councilor Gorsek stated so by taking away 242<sup>nd</sup> in essence we are helping to direct more traffic into our city on 257<sup>th</sup>.

Ed Abrahamson stated we did a traffic analysis for 242<sup>nd</sup> Avenue connector and the modeling just didn't show enough use.

Councilor Gorsek stated based on a 2001 study without taking in the Metro reserve. That is suspect data. The County has a vested interest because you want to sell the property. I am sorry you are all professionals and I am sure you all do your jobs very well, but I really suspect the data. I don't think that we should take that 2001 study at face value. Isn't it true, as Mr. Springer said, it may be premature to decide about this connector especially if we are a year out from completing the freight study that could tell us what we need. So isn't it premature to get rid of the connector until we know what the freight study says?

Ed Abrahamson replied maybe, maybe not. The freight study won't show us what routes. It just indicates what the origination and destinations will be. We can't get the specific data for the price we are paying.

Councilor Gorsek stated so we don't know if it will help or not, but it may help. According to Mr. Springer and other things I have heard, Gresham is reputedly trying to drop their freight designations off of streets in Gresham like 181<sup>st</sup>, Burnside and Division. They are actively trying to do that. That says to me even further that there is going to be more and more emphasis on 242<sup>nd</sup> or 257<sup>th</sup>. Lets face it, we are little tiny Troutdale, they are a big giant 90,000 Gresham. They are the big dog out here. I really fear when they start putting things like that into their plan that Troutdale isn't going to be able to say we don't want it on 257<sup>th</sup>. I think we are going to get run over by these guys.

Ed Abrahamson stated in response to freight traffic, in this case here we are talking about a NHS freight route. In order for a new route to be designated as an NHS route it takes a concurrence of all of the jurisdictions that the road runs through.

Councilor Gorsek stated so lets say that everyone agrees but us, what happens?

Ed Abrahamson stated it won't go through Troutdale. That is the Federal legislation.

Councilor Thomas asked but would it stop the traffic?

Ed Abrahamson stated that is another story. But when they put up signs routing traffic they will go by the NHS routing.

Councilor Gorsek asked Mr. Dingler indicated that essentially if we vacate the 242<sup>nd</sup> connector it is over. We aren't really going to be able to afford to go back, isn't that what you said?

Lynn Dingler replied yes I did say that. That is supposition on my part that if we look at major development that has to be removed for that right-of-way to go through then it is a bigger problem. I also said that by doing some modifications on 238<sup>th</sup> that would increase the safety and maybe help some.

Councilor Gorsek asked the modifications to 238<sup>th</sup> wouldn't change the grades or the shape of the road would it?

Ed Abrahamson replied the work that is going to be done in the spring will change one of the radiuses at the bottom going towards Arata Road. That also begs the question, if you put some additional funds into 238<sup>th</sup> are there more improvement that could be made to the grade and the radius. The answer to that is yes.

Councilor Gorsek stated there was some discussion about the justice center, can you tell us what the justice center will be designed to be.

Doug Butler replied we are looking at four court rooms to serve E. County with room for expansion to potentially six court rooms, a sheriff's office headquarters with a presence by the City of Gresham Police, a district attorneys office and other functions as well.

Councilor Gorsek asked so it would be designed to replace the Circuit Court facility that is in Gresham now and the Hansen Building on 122<sup>nd</sup>?

Doug Butler replied yes.

Councilor Thomas asked regarding the Buxton Road widening, is it in the Plan to widen Buxton the entire length from Stark Street to Columbia River Highway?

Rich Faith replied Figure 4-13, the Motor Vehicle Master Plan, shows Buxton/Troutdale Road from Sweetbriar all the way to Columbia River Highway as a future three lane road. It is listed under the Master Plan Project list as a future project. What I think is a little distorted perhaps is that there is no proposal, or immediate proposal, for this project. The project does not show up under what is called the Action Plan, which are the highest priority projects which there is anticipated to be money set aside or available within the next twenty years to perform that improvement. Buxton widening doesn't show up on that so basically the Plan is saying if you look out far enough into the future there very likely may be a demand or need for this, however, there is no plan to have any money to construct it for at least twenty years. Perhaps by that time other things will occur that the demand will never be there. So it is a project that may never happen, but it is simply forecasting the possibility that there could be a

need for this and if the demand presented itself in the future and if this is put on a priority list and funds are actually earmarked for it then the remedy I guess in order to meet that demand would be to widen it to three lanes.

Councilor Thomas asked is there enough right-of-way to do that as it currently exists today?

Rich Faith replied I can only speak to the information that Jim Galloway put in his memorandum to you that says there is currently 60' of right-of-way and depending on what the configuration is in terms of what they put in that right-of-way it is possible that it could be constructed within the current 60' right-of-way. However, if they wanted to go with all of the bells and whistles in terms of bike lanes and sidewalks, it may need additional right-of-way. Until it is designed and engineered and determined exactly how they want to construct it, it is really difficult to say if there would be a need for additional right-of-way.

Councilor Thomas stated I can see some need to widen the south end basically from Beaver Creek Bridge south to Stark Street makes sense and possibly adding a left turn lane at the north end at Columbia River Highway. In regards to the portion of Buxton Road, basically Cherry Park Road heading north, I don't see where there would be enough right-of-way to make it wide enough for a third lane without taking out some ones house and that is not acceptable.

Rich Faith stated Mr. Galloway stated in his memorandum that there is currently 60' of right-of-way. The pavement width however is only 38' or 39'.

Councilor Thomas stated if you take another 15' on both sides of the road you would basically have sidewalks sitting on front porches.

Rich Faith stated I think what I read in Mr. Galloway's memorandum is that there may be County right-of-way behind the current sidewalk that many of these people now use as their front lawn and may not even realize that it is not private property but instead part of the public right-of-way.

Councilor Thomas stated that may be possible but I have seen places where front porches border on the sidewalk and I am sorry that doesn't work.

Rich Faith stated I agree it is certainly not desirable.

Councilor Thomas asked in regards to Sunrise Park, what are the plans for the development of Sunrise Park? I know the road has been on the Plan for a long time but I have seen designs that talk about putting in a small parking lot with no connectivity between Hensley and 21<sup>st</sup>, is that part of the plans?

Rich Faith stated there was an attempt ten years ago when the Parks Master Plan was put together to answer that question. In fact it was difficult to do a Parks Master Plan for Sunrise Park until the issue of the Hensley Road extension could be answered and those things were running parallel. In a sense the final plan for Sunrise Park was deferred until the question of

the extension of Hensley Road could be answered. It was answered in some respects at that time when the Council decided to leave the road in as part of the TSP. On that basis, conceptually any kind of development for Sunrise Park has to assume that the road may in fact go through.

Councilor Thomas stated my understanding was at that time Hensley Road belonged to the County and it was their proposal. Since that time the road has been transferred to Troutdale, correct?

Rich Faith replied Hensley Road was a County road. I don't know that it is fair to say that it was their proposal or plan to put the road through. I think the City's TSP showed the desire for east/west connectivity to put the road through. The County had not committed any funds to do that but they were willing to acknowledge that in our Plan but I believe their position was that if that road is extended it would be a City road and a City project not a County project.

Councilor Thomas stated the road coming behind Flying J and Travel Centers of America, to me that doesn't make a lot of sense in that you are taking roughly one-third of Travel Centers of America's parking which I can't believe they wouldn't be responding to and roughly one-half or better of Flying J's parking. Have we made any attempts to actually talk to these business owners versus just sending them a letter?

Rich Faith replied no, other than the letter that was sent I have not personally contacted them.

Councilor Thomas asked I assume the letter did include a copy of what we were doing to them?

Rich Faith replied absolutely. It was very specific. It wasn't a general statement that we are going to have a hearing on a TSP that may impact your property. It actually stated that part of the proposal is this road which would come along the back part of the properties and would necessitate use of some of the property behind them. I was trying to be very clear that this will have a definite impact on them.

Mayor Thalhoffer called for a break at 9:30pm and reconvened the meeting at 9:40pm.

Rod Park, Metro Councilor stated my concern is regarding the vacation of 242<sup>nd</sup> Avenue. One of the things that was brought up by Multnomah County staff was that there wasn't a response from Metro. To Mr. Abrahamson's credit as a professional, he may not have been aware of two letters sent by Metro to the County Commission. The agreement if you look into it, the RTP, the agreement was that the right-of-way by Multnomah County would be preserved. We were assured at that time that it would be. Our letters, dated December 2004 and Spring of 2005, were to assure that. Two years as the Chair of the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) and currently the Vice-Chair I have been pretty well aware of the situation and we are trying to make sure that the agreements are lived up to, not just in Troutdale and Multnomah County but across the region. I am glad that it was picked up by Councilor Gorsek the fact that in 2001 the traffic study concluded at Stark at that



particular time and did not continue on beyond that. In 2002 Metro, as required by State law, brought in a very large amount of acreage, approximately 13,000 plus acres, on the east side that was not originally contemplated in any of those particular studies, certainly not with the type of change in demographics that we are seeing in the area. One of the issues raised was cost. I find it interesting from Multnomah County's standpoint that they want to not move ahead with something when we can't find the money. I find that very interesting because then they will have to take that into account when they are talking about the Ross Island Bridge, because no one has been able to find the money for that project yet we are still continuing to try to do something full speed ahead. The other part of it is our other experience that we have seen recently in Clackamas County, the Sunnyside Road extension from I-205 to 147<sup>th</sup>. Just to give you an idea of the cost of that short section that was improved to expand existing right-of-way, not to buy new right-of-way, the first \$20 million of that project \$10 million was spent for acquisition. When you are talking about dollars and you are talking about responsibility that is a lot of what we are dealing with here is the responsibility with our partners across the region. It is a regional transportation plan. When someone is driving they don't say now I am on Troutdale road, now I am on a Multnomah County road, etc. they just care that they are able to get there. Rex Burkholder, Metro Councilor, who is currently the JPACT Chair, is pushing very hard for and we are setting up together for a 2007 RTP update as required by the State. This will examine the entire region, not just Troutdale or Gresham. We are talking about the future of the Sunrise corridor, I-5/99 connector, we are talking about 217 and freight routes. We are looking at what is it going to require in order for us to have the type of economy we want with a transportation system that will match that and what are the dollars that are available. It seems to me that would be the appropriate time to take this particular piece up is under that entire study. Lastly, this comment is really for the next agenda item which I think is actually being covered now, is the fact that the even though the vacation may occur it still has to go through a local, regional and state process for it to actually come off of the RTP. I know this is a very difficult decision and there are a lot of dollars at stake and that is probably one of the best reasons why you should have this debate because there are a lot of dollars at stake not just today's dollars but future dollars and the fact that those are very scarce. It is part of our duty to preserve those resources for our generation and future generations.

Councilor Gorsek stated you made some very good points and I think it is really hard for small cities to think beyond themselves but I think it is imperative that we do that.

Councilor Thomas asked do you have any knowledge as to why the numbers from the traffic studies and counts from Metro and the County don't match?

Rod Park replied as discussed earlier the study that was looked at was a 2001 study without the expansion of the 13,000 acres in the Damascus area. The area has obviously changed and I think the question about freight still hasn't been decided because Springwater is looking at some freight component they just don't know what yet.

Mayor Thalhoffer asked Mr. Faith if we said to leave Buxton the way it is and put a light at the bottom of the hill on Buxton and if we allowed 2<sup>nd</sup> Street to be extended to 257<sup>th</sup> with a right-in and right-out, would that be helpful or not? Would that take some of the load off of Buxton?

Rich Faith replied there is certainly going to be traffic continuing to come down the hill on Buxton and once you get to Columbia River Highway we see quite a bit of backing up particularly in the early morning and rush hour. Extending 2<sup>nd</sup> Street to connect to 257<sup>th</sup> with a right-in and right-out I would have to believe it would take some of the pressure off of the intersection at Buxton and Columbia River Highway. I don't know that it has any long-term effect on the overall demand and use of Buxton. In other words the idea of improving Buxton and Troutdale Road to three lanes is in anticipation that in the future as development occurs to our south, by choice people are using that street if other streets are not to their liking or are congested so they choose Buxton/Troutdale Road and ultimately you will have a back-up particularly if someone wants to make a left turn. You can imagine if you have a constant stream of cars coming down the hill and one car needs to make a left turn onto 4<sup>th</sup> Street but needs to wait for all of those cars to pass, all of the vehicles behind that one vehicle have to wait until that left turn is made. In anticipation of that if you have a center turn lane it allows traffic to flow freely. We don't know exactly what the future has in store. Peoples driving habits will be dictated on their use of other roads and whether they feel that is slower and more congested than using Buxton. When it reaches a point where we see those kinds of traffic patterns and congestion problems occurring then obviously a solution would be to widen it to three lanes.

Mayor Thalhoffer asked are you talking about traffic on 2<sup>nd</sup> Street accessing Buxton trying to make a left turn, is that what you are saying?

Rich Faith replied I was speaking more in general about the Plan and its anticipation of widening Buxton.

Carl Springer stated we looked at the extension of 2<sup>nd</sup> Street. The extension of 2<sup>nd</sup> is a very localized solution for just a few blocks right in the downtown area. I have a few comments to make on the improvements on Buxton. I think Rich articulated this pretty well. I think what he is describing is our project on Buxton is really kind of a placeholder because it is in the Master Plan category, it is not something that is expected to happen anytime soon. It gives you the designation that will allow you to solve a problem in the future if the problem arises. We heard testimony tonight about speeding and the difficulty of crossing the street. As a traffic engineer I can tell you a couple of things, one is Buxton and Troutdale wouldn't have to be three lanes the whole stretch. When you got down to the point where you actually wanted to do something we could decide what segments of that road makes the most sense for three lanes. I can tell you as a traffic engineer that just adding another lane doesn't necessarily increase speeding. By widening the road and keeping within the standards that the City has already adopted doesn't mean people are automatically going to drive like they do on 257<sup>th</sup>. The other option that the center lane gives you is it makes it much easier to get in and out of driveways. It gives you an option to do pedestrian refuges so that you can have a barricade in the middle that lets people cross one lane at a time. It is actually an ideal opportunity to do that. Our research has shown that speeding doesn't really go up. Crashes go down when you add left turn lanes. I know there are concerns about property takings and removing houses. This is at the Master Plan level of analysis. There are many more steps that would have to happen before this was actually constructed. It would first have to be added to your

Capital Improvement Plan and that is the point where you would have the detailed public notice process. You would have a much better idea of what, if any, right-of-way acquisition was required. I guess I would encourage the support of the recommendation from a placeholder point of view. There is no construction recommended at any time within the next twenty years. It is an issue that could be revisited next time the Plan is updated in ten years.

Male stated in the Master Plan it talks about widening Buxton Road to three lanes and putting in a bike path or lane and sidewalks and enhancing pedestrian crossings. I am against leaving it in the Plan. Buxton is an historic part of Troutdale. There are some homes along there that are 100 years old. To leave it in the Plan is not good for Troutdale.

Mayor Thalsofer closed the public hearing at 10:02pm.

**MOTION:** Councilor Daoust moved to approve the Ordinance adopting an updated Transportation System Plan to replace the adopted 1995 Transportation System Plan and repealing Ordinance Nos. 636 and 686 with the following changes: 1) The Hensley Road extension through Sunrise Park be dropped off of the Plan; 2) The widening of Buxton/Troutdale Road be dropped off the Plan except for from Beaver Creek Bridge south (north of Beaver Creek Bridge would be dropped from the Plan) and in addition to that add a light (traffic signal) at the bottom of the hill on Buxton at Columbia River Highway; 3) 242<sup>nd</sup> connector be removed from the Plan but add a general statement recognizing the need for north/south improvements and north/south connectors. Seconded by Mayor Thalsofer.

Councilor Thomas asked Councilor Daoust if he would be willing to add the continuation of 2<sup>nd</sup> Street from Buxton to 257<sup>th</sup>?

Councilor Daoust agreed.

**AMENDMENT to the MOTION:** Councilor Daoust amended his motion to add the extension of 2<sup>nd</sup> Street from Buxton to 257<sup>th</sup>. Seconded by Mayor Thalsofer.

Councilor Daoust stated a lot of the roads that are in the Plan make sense. Obviously I am considering keeping the rest of them in the Plan. Public input is important to this Council. Regarding the Hensley Road extension through Sunrise Park, I was here ten years ago when we were considering it before and we heard the same testimony ten years ago that we are hearing now. It is pretty obvious, if we are going to consider public input, what the answer to that should be. What we are hearing from the public is to drop that and I am very comfortable with that. As far as widening Buxton, I to get concerned that even though there is no plan for the next twenty years that once it is writing it lingers. My motion takes into account some of the points brought up that there are some restricted points, mainly in the area of the

Beaver Creek Bridge and maybe even south of Stark Street that we may want to consider widening in the future. I also think a signal light at the bottom of Buxton would help. I've tried to enter the highway from Buxton and it is very difficult and a light would ease that congestion. I also think that the 2<sup>nd</sup> Street extension would also relieve some of the traffic that we don't want on Buxton. I think we need to keep it the way it is for the most part. I don't want to encourage more traffic on Buxton and I don't think the things that I am recommending will encourage any traffic, if anything it is going to relieve it. The 242<sup>nd</sup> connector, I struggled with that. I like to see myself as a regional player. I clearly see the need for some streamlining of the north/south connections. But, I think we can recognize the need which is what my motion included. As a Council we can recognize the need that we need to improve the north/south connectors. We don't need to spend money on the 242<sup>nd</sup> connection; we do need to spend money on improving the three or four connectors we currently have. I will remind the Council that we already have a 238<sup>th</sup> off-ramp off of I-84 and there is nothing that says we can't improve 238<sup>th</sup> up the hill rather than spending a lot of money on a brand new connection through the Multnomah County property. I really do not see the extra need for a different connector when we have one less than a quarter of a mile away. That doesn't make sense to me. In addition to that we are looking twenty years out anyways. I don't think anybody on the Council could argue that the needs for Reynolds School District are much more immediate and necessary in the short-term rather than the planning for a road more than twenty years from now. Development in that area that Multnomah County is going to sell would add to the livability in Troutdale. A connector would disrupt and detract from the livability in Troutdale. There are other options available. We are not stuck here with one option. I know that some Councilors are concerned that if we don't have the 242<sup>nd</sup> connector then that will leave all the heat on 257<sup>th</sup> or a good share of it. I think there are other improvements in other north/south connectors that could be made that could relieve some of the heat on 257<sup>th</sup>. I don't think that we need to assume that 257<sup>th</sup> is going to get all of the heat if we don't have that connector. I don't make that assumption. I would encourage the rest of the Council to consider my points and go along with supporting this motion. I think we have a good package here, one that we can live with. It may not be exactly what you want but I think if you sit back and think about it you could live with it. You can make the argument that we are going to revise the Plan ten years from now anyway, but for now these are the things that are important to Troutdale and these are the things that I want to be in the Plan right now and if in ten years from now things change dramatically, things start backing up dramatically on 257<sup>th</sup>, we will re-look at the Plan in ten years. That is what these plans are for. They are long-range plans and we can change them.

Mayor Thalhofer stated I think Buxton should be left alone. I think the light at the bottom of the hill should be installed and I think 2<sup>nd</sup> Street should extend through to 257<sup>th</sup> with a right-in and right-out to relieve some of the congestion in that area, especially if we build a City Hall in that area some day. People are going to want to get out on Buxton and they are going to have a hard time. I think 2<sup>nd</sup> will relieve some of the pressure on Buxton and the stacking up of traffic at the bottom of the hill. We need a light at the bottom of Buxton; it is a very dangerous intersection. Every time

you enter you take your life into your hands during rush hour. The Troutdale Road segment of it I agree with leaving it the way it is except for the Beaver Creek Bridge area. Sunrise Park is a great park. I do not want to see 21<sup>st</sup> go through to Troutdale Road. We have something new since we talked about this ten years ago, we have Author Academy School right there so it makes it even more hazardous if we had traffic going through there at a very high speed. I think we should abandon the 21<sup>st</sup> Extension from Hensley to Troutdale Road completely and get it off of the Plan. I also think we need to do some improving of Sunrise Park. I want to keep it a nature park, but you have to have a place to park when you visit the park. I think there is an area in Sunrise Park where they can do that. That would be at the northeast corner of the park. It wouldn't have to be a huge parking lot, it could be fairly small. With no street going through it shouldn't be a problem because I don't favor the street going through at all. The solution to the Frontage Road problem is, I think, probably as good as any. I haven't seen a better one. I think running the road behind as it is planned for is the way to go. Sure it is going to be disruptive to somebody. We need to get north and south Frontage Road cleaned up and rid of all the traffic that just stacks up. It is a mess and it is very dangerous for people. It backs up traffic sometimes clear onto I-84 which is very dangerous. So, moving around behind the truck stops I think is the way to go connecting on 257<sup>th</sup> at the intersection across from the Outlet Mall is probably a good plan. The Port of Portland, as you heard earlier, received \$1 million for a planning of a new interchange which we were promised many years ago. That interchange will be just as good, if not better, than the one at 207<sup>th</sup> which is underutilized, which brings me to 242<sup>nd</sup>. I agree with Councilor Daoust we should drop that from the Plan. The traffic from the south (Gresham) has a way to go to get onto I-84 and that is to go north to Glisan, hang a left, go south on Glisan which is a big wide road that was built to accommodate traffic, and then they can get to 207<sup>th</sup> and get on I-84. 207<sup>th</sup> is an underutilized interchange, it is time to utilize it. The road was built for heavy traffic. That is where your 242<sup>nd</sup> traffic can go. 238<sup>th</sup> can be improved as we have talked about. It is going to be improved by Multnomah County. If we could get some additional funds it could be improved even more. The 242<sup>nd</sup> right-of-way takes up a lot of Troutdale land. The 242<sup>nd</sup> connector as planned would cut through Troutdale land, which is just west of McMenamins Edgefield. Of course McMenamins is against it because they are trying to build a nice complex there including a convention center, which some of us have wanted for years, to bring tourists to Troutdale to help our business folks and create a better economy for Troutdale. The land they are interested in includes a portion of the right-of-way. The School District needs part of that right-of-way land which they testified to. I am looking at what is good for Troutdale and what enhances the livability of Troutdale.

Councilor Ripma stated I favor the motion. On the Hensley extension I remember that well. Last time we had neighbors in the 15<sup>th</sup> Street area coming in saying they wanted some relief from traffic. I have to admit that I was really impressed when Mr. Vandenberg talked about how there was trouble down his way and he didn't want to push it into the park and he is the only one here talking about possible relief of traffic in other parts of the city by having another through road. Even on that I was deflated

by the fact that Sunrise Park has developed into such a beautiful spot. I favor eliminating Hensley extension now and forever. Same with the widening of Buxton in the middle of our historic city, it is just a bad idea. I never want to see it and I think it is better not to have it on a plan. 242<sup>nd</sup>, I have been opposed to it for years but I am not that concerned about it on this Plan. I favor the motion but frankly it is never going to get built. Gresham has just got done renegeing on the south end of the 242<sup>nd</sup> connector. They will never let the traffic go down through on Halsey, just picture how it would get to Burnside. They want the County to hold it off of the market for some indeterminate period of time when it will clearly impact some very significant assets that would be built for the good of the City of Troutdale. I am not worried that it is ever going to get built. But I am worried that we would preserve that right-of-way in some way. If you notice it ends at Halsey it doesn't even go to the freeway. It is a road to nowhere and it is not connected at the south because Gresham won't do it and it is not connected at the north. I am not worried about it being on the TSP because it is a dotted line and I don't want to offend Metro or the State transportation planning folks because I don't think it is significant. The vote on the next agenda item will be. The 2<sup>nd</sup> Street extension, I don't know what to say. I don't mind having a dotted line on the map because that is all this will be; it doesn't come up with any funds for the project. I am not sure that it is really a good solution.

Councilor Thomas stated originally when the Hensley extension was talked about when I first moved here in 1992 I always thought it made sense. But 440 signatures have an impact. Also one of the other thoughts I had was maybe it would help alleviate some of the traffic concerns for people getting in and out of the school by having this second access in and out. However, after further consideration it really doesn't make sense to put a road through there. I think it does make sense to make some improvements to the park so that people have a place to park to use the park. I do agree with only widening Troutdale Road from Beaver Creek south. I think that makes sense partly because of the one comment regarding crossing the bridge on bike or foot. I don't see a need to modify Buxton Road. I think a future possibility might be putting a left turn lane at the bottom of Buxton at Columbia River Highway. I think I would rather see a three-way stop sign at Buxton versus the signal light. I think the three-way stop sign would move traffic better and faster. There have been studies in other cities where they have taken all of the stop lights out and put in nothing but four-way stops and the traffic actually moves through the city much faster and more efficient than it does with street lights. The two parts that I didn't care about were taking the 242<sup>nd</sup> right-of-way off; it is premature in that there is a need for more traffic north/south. Having been a member of a truck drivers family as a kid I know that the truckers, regardless of what the cities say, they will take the shortest route between two points. It is nice to say that we have alternate means of transportation to handle some of our needs. So far we have seen needs addressed with a blind eye saying we don't really care about you out here. The other part I don't really care for and we really didn't talk about is the new Frontage Road concept. I don't think that trying to move traffic in behind all of those businesses, some of which aren't real happy about that because they lose paying customers and taking away roughly one-third of Travel Centers of America's parking lot for their trucks

would nearly wipe out the parking and a good chunk of Flying J's property and it looks like it might even take out the new diner that they just put in. For that reason, I agree with everything else but I can't support the motion based the fact of the 242<sup>nd</sup> right-of-way and Frontage Road.

Councilor Canfield stated Hensley Road extension through Sunrise Park, 400 signatures, I know how hard that is to get. For me the park speaks for itself, it spoke more loudly than the 400 signatures which means a lot to me. I have a park in my neighborhood that is real nice but you go to Sunrise Park and that is a jewel of a park. It is probably the best park that Troutdale has. Last time we met the Mayor asked Carl Springer of DKS Associates what would happen if the Hensley extension did not occur. Mr. Springer replied that it wouldn't carry enough traffic to make much difference. Buxton, I can't see a need for that road to be three lanes. I respectfully disagree with the traffic expert. There is a good reason the middle lanes are called suicide lanes. I don't think having a third lane on Buxton will solve any of the safety issues. But I think the light at the bottom of the hill would be a great benefit and improve the traffic flow. In addition, making 2<sup>nd</sup> Street go through to 257<sup>th</sup> would get those folks that want to turn right onto 257<sup>th</sup> off of Buxton. I am conflicted with the solution on Frontage Road with having the road go behind the businesses. Conflicting needs versus cost but it is such a mess down there and it has been that way since they closed Exit 16B. The option that was suggested is the one that could do the most good. It does have some cost to the businesses down there. It is interesting to note that only one business expressed any interest in the subject at all. If they were concerned you think they would be here. However, I can't support the motion because I also believe that taking the 242<sup>nd</sup> connector off of the Plan is premature. With all due respect to the folks at Multnomah County I think they were not persuasive to me on their arguments. I think we need to keep all of our options open. Yes there are alternatives to additional traffic but as likely as not we are going to have more traffic coming from the south. We need to keep this option open for now.

Councilor Kyle stated I agree with dropping the Hensley extension. As to Buxton, I agree with the rest of the Council members on that except I would also question the bike path, that doesn't make any sense to me either at least on the steep area. Extending 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, I have some real mixed emotions about that because right about where 2<sup>nd</sup> would come out onto 257<sup>th</sup> I have seen so many wrecks and signs knocked down. That would make me really nervous but I know that we are just talking about a dot on a map and I know that we would have to jump through a lot of hoops before that would happen. As to Frontage Road on this Plan, I believe that we talked about the possibility of some elevations so that we did take up less space. I know that if that ever comes to fruition that we will look at some options there. Obviously I like a bypass, but I am thinking that it does bother me to take up property so I would like to look at some elevation options at that time. As far as 242<sup>nd</sup> goes, I can't support that being removed from the TSP. I don't feel like we have accurate information. Information as to the traffic flow from 2001 isn't adequate for me. I know that we talked about some freight studies coming up in the next 18 months. For this to be

removed off of the TSP is way too premature for me. Based on that, I can not support the motion.

Councilor Gorsek stated ditto about Buxton, Sunrise Park. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street we can visit but I do have that similar concern about accidents. The backdoor approach to Frontage Road I have some concerns as does Councilor Thomas and I think we need to look at that more. There are a couple of things that I think are really important. First off we have heard statements from some of the Council that McMenamins is dead set against 242<sup>nd</sup> but Mr. McMenamini is not here this evening. We have heard a lot of illusions that all of these people driving on these roads aren't from here. I don't know about the rest of you but I drive 257<sup>th</sup>, Glisan and 242<sup>nd</sup>. Lets face it commuters are us. This isn't just here for Gresham, this is here for all of us. The ease of being able to move north and south, I don't know about you but I can't do all of my shopping in Troutdale, I go to other places in the Metro east area and downtown. We have to see that we are part of a region, a part of the whole area, its not just us in the middle of northeast Oregon. We need to be plugged in. We were so angry when Gresham was going to get, and probably will get, the roads and that they will cut us out and not help us. In a sense that is what we are trying to do to our community to the south is the same sort of thing and that is not right. The other thing, it is eluded that it is a road to nowhere. If you have looked at the right-of-way on Halsey, the right-of-way is extremely wide. If you took the 242<sup>nd</sup> connector down to Halsey, improve the corridor right over to 238<sup>th</sup> you wouldn't need a second interchange, you simply tie into the one that is there. It would be very much like the Glisan Street approach to 207<sup>th</sup>. We need to realize these roads are for us and fright. By the way when I go to the store I hope that the fright truck has been there otherwise I am not going to be able to purchase what I want. In addition tourists come in and out of here, and we need that. Remember, as Councilor Kyle said, echoing the words of our own traffic analysis, Mr. Springer, it is premature to get rid of 242<sup>nd</sup>. It is just not right yet. I agree with the other changes but I can not support getting rid of 242<sup>nd</sup>. The 2001 data is not convincing.

**VOTE:** Councilor Ripma – Yes; Councilor Thomas – No; Mayor Thalhoffer – Yes; Councilor Canfield – No; Councilor Kyle – No; Councilor Daoust – Yes; Councilor Gorsek – No.

**Motion Failed 3 – 4.**

**MOTION:** Councilor Ripma moved to adopt the Transportation System Plan as set forth and repeal the 1995 Transportation System Plan with the following changes: 1) The Hensley Road extension through Sunrise Park be dropped off of the Plan; 2) The widening of Buxton/Troutdale Road be dropped off the Plan except for from Beaver Creek Bridge south (north of Beaver Creek Bridge would be dropped from the Plan) and in addition to that add a light (traffic signal) at the bottom of the hill on Buxton at Columbia River Highway; 3) add the extension of 2<sup>nd</sup> Street from Buxton to 257<sup>th</sup>. Seconded by Councilor Gorsek.



**VOTE: Councilor Ripma – Yes; Councilor Thomas – Yes; Mayor Thalhafer – Yes; Councilor Canfield – Yes; Councilor Kyle – Yes; Councilor Daoust – Yes; Councilor Gorsek – Yes.**

**Motion Passed Unanimously.**

John Anderson, City Administrator asked the Council to clarify that the motion included the recommended changes from DKS outlined in Exhibit A-3 in the adopted Transportation System Plan?

Council unanimously agreed that the changes recommended by DKS in Exhibit A-3 were included in the motion adopting the Plan.

Male stated we need more input. We would not have know about this meeting had someone not ran into our concrete wall. I came to City Hall to find out if I could get more signage for that corner and that is when I was informed about this meeting.

Mayor Thalhafer stated we need to take a look at the notice and make sure that people are getting the notice that they deserve to get and should get so they are aware of these meetings.

**6. RESOLUTION: A Resolution supporting the vacation of the 242<sup>nd</sup> Avenue connector right-of-way.**

Mayor Thalhafer read the resolution title.

Rich Faith stated this is a consideration of a request by Multnomah County to support their vacation of the 242<sup>nd</sup> connector right-of-way. The County Commissioners will be taking this up on September 8<sup>th</sup>. This right-of-way was created in 1995 and runs through the County Farm property in anticipation of a future corridor connecting I-84 on the north end and Highway 26 to the south. The County, after considerable study of that proposed road, decided several years ago to mothball or suspend the project until it could be shown to be cost effective. We have received letters commenting on this. Wood Village stated they would support the vacation of the right-of-way; they do not favor the 242<sup>nd</sup> connector. The City of Fairview is neutral on this vacation. The City of Gresham has not submitted a letter to us but has publicly stated that they would like the connector to remain in. Metro, by virtue of letter that we have received just recently, would like to leave the connector in. The County has indicated in order to finalize a vacation it does require support from the city in which the right-of-way is located and therefore they are requesting that the City approve a resolution in support of this right-of-way vacation.

Councilor Ripma asked when and how was this declared a road right-of-way?

Rich Faith replied I don't know exactly when it was declared a right-of-way.

Councilor Ripma asked are you sure that it is?

Rich Faith replied yes.

Ed Abrahamson stated I believe that this right-of-way was actually dedicated after the Mt. Hood Parkway study was suspended. That probably happened in the late 90's. That right-of-way only exists south of Halsey.

Councilor Ripma asked what action made it a right-of-way? I have been on the East County Transportation Committee for years and I don't remember the dedication that this is a road right-of-way, I just remember it being planned as a road. Is there a survey?

Lynn Dinger replied yes the road has been surveyed. It was dedicated in 1995 as a County road. The survey is in place in the deed.

Councilor Ripma asked then the vacation would go to the adjacent property, is that right?

Lynn Dinger replied correct.

Councilor Ripma asked is it entirely County property on both sides?

Lynn Dinger replied yes.

Councilor Ripma asked how about at the south end?

Lynn Dinger replied we did look at that and there was a stub on that end held away from the vacation process, so it is county property on all sides of the roadway.

Councilor Ripma asked do you have the deed?

Lynn Dinger replied not with me tonight but I do have them.

Mayor Thalhofer stated Mr. Dinger I think you were the one who stated that McMenamins had planned to build a small to medium size convention center and you gained that information talking to Mr. McMenamini.

Lynn Dinger replied that is correct.

Mayor Thalhofer asked isn't it fair to say that all of that 242<sup>nd</sup> connector right-of-way is taking up land in Troutdale?

Lynn Dinger replied that is correct.

Mayor Thalhofer asked if McMenamini built a small to medium size convention center, which is what some of us have wanted for years, as a private business they would pay taxes right?

Lynn Dinger replied that is my understanding.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated and the Reynolds School District probably would not pay taxes. Was this going to be an overhead right-of-way or elevated so that it would hit I-84?

Lynn Dinger stated the design stage is very rudimentary or early on, but given the width of the right-of-way it would be elevated to decrease the slope down hill. Yes, it would be elevated and there would be a slope easement associated with it.

Mayor Thalhoffer asked would that render useless the property underneath it as far as using it for a convention center or any kind of development like that?

Lynn Dinger replied yes.

Mayor Thalhoffer asked 238<sup>th</sup> Avenue is going to be improved right?

Ed Abrahamson replied yes. There is an improvement that is going to be constructed next spring. It will improve the radius at the north end, which is the lower end. The sight distance will also be improved to hopefully eliminate a lot of the rear end crashes that occur there.

Mayor Thalhoffer asked does this 242<sup>nd</sup> connector right-of-way have any impact on any other city besides Troutdale?

Ed Abrahamson replied the right-of-way itself is in Troutdale. If you are going to have a connection to I-84, right-of-way would be needed to go through Wood Village at that time, but it currently doesn't exist.

Mayor Thalhoffer asked if this 242<sup>nd</sup> connector were ever built, when would that happen? Do you have any idea when funding would be available?

Ed Abrahamson replied I believe the question that Commissioner Roberts asked ODOT and Metro is do you see any funding in the next twenty years and the response was no. The County doesn't have the wherewithal to fund it.

Mayor Thalhoffer asked so if this right-of-way is preserved then it is going to tie up valuable land in the City of Troutdale for the next twenty years approximately according to the information you have at this point, is that correct?

Ed Abrahamson replied at least twenty years, yes.

Councilor Daoust stated just looking at the map it looks like the distance between 238<sup>th</sup> and the right-of-way is about six blocks.

Ed Abrahamson replied it is a little bit more than that but it is close.

Councilor Daoust stated so more like eight blocks.

Ed Abrahamson replied yes.

Councilor Daoust stated so if that existed then the left hand turn would be eight blocks long. So if you travel the shortest distance then people might just use 238<sup>th</sup> anyway.

Ed Abrahamson stated we looked at several alternatives as part of the analysis of the 242<sup>nd</sup> connector. One of them was the 242<sup>nd</sup> Avenue coming into Halsey Street and that was one of the worse performing alternatives that we analyzed because as you are saying people just used 238<sup>th</sup>. They did that even when we had the direct connection to I-84. The reason we suspended it was because there were still so many people using 238<sup>th</sup> Avenue we couldn't justify the cost of the structure that would be required to connect with I-84.

Councilor Daoust stated if I had the option of going straight or turning left for eight blocks and then turning right, I would go straight.

Councilor Gorsek asked if 242<sup>nd</sup> is held in abeyance and not developed, is it possible that McMenamins could move across the street to the property for sale there, would there be any zoning that would prohibit that?

Rich Faith replied for a convention center?

Councilor Gorsek replied for what the Mayor described.

Rich Faith stated I don't believe the current zoning of Light Industrial would allow for that.

Councilor Gorsek asked but we have talked of this zoning as being a placeholder have we not? Couldn't we change it?

Rich Faith replied yes we could.

Councilor Gorsek stated talking about traffic, I would be more comfortable still having DKS present. No offense to the County but I still don't trust your assessments. Finally, turning left and going over to 238<sup>th</sup> and going to I-84 is not hard. You said a T intersection is a terrible thing. Why did we design 207<sup>th</sup> and Glisan that way? That is exactly what it is.

Ed Abrahamson stated we can speculate on a lot of things but one of the things that was also mentioned tonight is that there is not a lot of use of 207<sup>th</sup> Avenue, they are using other routes.

Councilor Gorsek asked is that based on a traffic study?

Ed Abrahamson stated we know that traffic is migrating there...

Councilor Gorsek interrupted and stated that was not my question. My question is, are you doing active traffic counts on 207<sup>th</sup> to make that statement?

Ed Abrahamson replied we have traffic counts, yes.

Councilor Gorsek asked so you have traffic counts for 207<sup>th</sup> that you can produce?

Ed Abrahamson replied yes.

Councilor Gorsek stated because it sounds like you are pulling this out of the air.

Ed Abrahamson replied no, we have counts.

Councilor Gorsek stated this whole hearsay issue, we can't take for granted what Mr. McMenamain told this gentleman from the County because McMenamain could change his mind. We need to put this to rest and I think we need to be done with this. We have already heard all of the statements.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated Mr. McMenamains has also told me that.

Councilor Ripma asked if we don't vote to approve the vacation can you still sale the property to interested buyers?

Lynn Dingler replied we will have an agreement and it will still be sold with no conditions attached to it. We will take a hit financially.

Councilor Ripma stated so it would be sold with the right-of-way across it and the parties that might be interested in buying I presume would pay less, but people might buy it with the right-of-way across it; that does happen all of the time. I think the road will never be built.

Doug Butler stated the agreement we have negotiated with Reynolds School District and McMenamains specifically says if the right-of-way is not vacated that the sale price is reduced by \$1.7 million, which is the appraised value of the right-of-way. Subsequent to that, then it will impact their development plans and we won't speculate on what that is but you can be sure it is less then if the right-of-way were to be vacated.

**MOTION: Councilor Thomas moved that we do not support the vacation of the 242<sup>nd</sup> Avenue connector right-of-way. Seconded by Councilor Gorsek.**

**Councilor Thomas stated I think that we are a little premature on this since we don't have all of the information that we need to either say that this is a good idea or a bad idea as far as the 242<sup>nd</sup> connector. From the beginning I have always thought that it was a good idea to help alleviate traffic. I am concerned, down the road, about the traffic impacts on 257<sup>th</sup> with the future addition of 10,000 vehicles on this road. I just think it makes sense to protect the livability of Troutdale as much as we can. Trying to get on and off of 257<sup>th</sup> today is a challenge especially during rush hour. For these reasons I don't think that it is a good idea to vacate the right-of-way.**

**Councilor Gorsek stated the only thing that I can say is we have this marvelous document that was prepared by DKS. They seem to know what they are doing as you read through this report. They know what they are doing enough that we have said we want to hire you to do this study. We must have some faith in them. They work for us and they have said themselves it is premature to vacate this right-of-way. I am going to rely on the scientific evidence of our own people and support Councilor Thomas's motion.**

**Councilor Ripma stated of course they knew what they were doing by widening Buxton and they knew what they were doing putting Hensley through. I have fought this Mt. Hood Parkway for years; it is what got me involved in government in the first place. It is a very bad idea for Troutdale. It has taken years and years to get us to this point with the County and I wish them well in selling the property. That road is not going to get built because Gresham has reneged at the south end every turn of the way but they want us, the County, to hold it. If there is a road to be built ODOT would be in making the bid and buying the land. It is disappointing. I have followed these traffic studies, even I was surprised when the 2001 study showed that the road wasn't needed, but it did. There is no funding and there isn't going to be any funding. I am not really worried about the road getting built, I am just disappointed that we are drawing this road block in. It is in the public interest to vacate it and the County found it to be in the public interest. I certainly support the vacation and I will have to vote no on the motion.**

**Mayor Thalsofer stated I don't support the motion. I have been elected Mayor for 12 years now and before that I was elected to the Council so I have served this city for 22 years now as an elected official and I served on the planning commission before that. So one would say that I probably have the pulse of this community pretty well in hand. I have campaigned hard and I have had opponents and I have beaten them. I beat them because of the quality of life issues. I fight for quality of life in this city so when I come to an issue like this it is pretty easy for me to decide whether we should tie up a good segment of Troutdale property by way of a right-of-way that is going to tie that up for over twenty years instead of having some of that land purchased by the Reynolds School District and some purchased by McMenamins for a convention center, which he told me himself. That would be good for this community to have a convention center, but no, we are going to tie it up with a right-of-way that is not even going to be funded for at least twenty years. We are going to let that tie up this piece of land in Troutdale. I live in Troutdale and I am an elected official in Troutdale, I don't represent anybody else. We have four different corridors to serve traffic from the south if we are really concerned about the south. We have 181<sup>st</sup>, which is the designated freight route. 207<sup>th</sup> which is serving very well, traffic hangs a left on Glisan and goes to 207<sup>th</sup> then goes to I-84. That very well serves those people that need to go west on I-84. We have 238<sup>th</sup> that Multnomah County is going to be improving. Hopefully we can find some more funding to improve it even more. That is a connector of sort, it is not a good one because it has some problems but it could be made better and it doesn't have to be a huge corridor that is going to tie up land that is in Troutdale. Nobody else is being impacted but Troutdale but we have some**

Councilors saying it is impacting Troutdale but we are in favor of that. The economic benefits of a convention center will benefit Troutdale. The taxes that would be paid by McMenamins will benefit Troutdale, but there are councilors here who apparently that is not a big item. Twenty-five years down the road they are going to maybe see the 242<sup>nd</sup> connector become a reality as a monstrosity of a connector. We have 257<sup>th</sup> that is serving a good portion of the people from the south. I am fighting for Troutdale people and I am fighting for issues that affect Troutdale and the economy of Troutdale and the actual livability of this city. That is what I am fighting for and so far I haven't been defeated in an election in Troutdale, I submit that to you at this time. I am voting no on this motion.

Councilor Canfield stated I am undefeated in Troutdale elections also Mayor. There are two points that I would like to raise. According to the staff report here this resolution is being presented as a request by Multnomah County. Now obviously Multnomah County has a great deal of interest in this issue. We have been talking about our TSP tonight and we have a tremendously detailed study from people who are on our team. I trust what they are doing. On the other hand an issue this important to Multnomah County and McMenamins, according to the Mayor and Multnomah County, where have the McMenamins brothers been for the last month? Have any of them testified? Has any representative from McMenamins testified to this issue? The answer is obviously no, so I wondering just how important this issue really is to them that they haven't even bothered to show up. It troubles me also that if this is such an important issue to Multnomah County that we couldn't get better information on this. If it is true what they are saying why not bring some numbers to us. I can't do anything with phantom traffic studies. I have to rely on what our consultants have told us and that is that it is premature to vacate this right-of-way. I favor the motion.

Councilor Kyle stated as I have heard several members of the Council say when the land is gone the land is gone. I am also concerned about Troutdale livability. I am not going to speculate about how the road is going to be built or what the design will be or how it will tie in. My concern is I don't want to remove that option tonight. The information that we have is outdated information and I prefer to wait. I am not going to say that I would not approve this, but I can't approve it tonight without some updated information. I will support the motion.

Councilor Daoust stated I am really disappointed in this Council. We tout livability, all of us do. I can not for the life of me figure out the benefit to Troutdale of this connector. I can't. You haven't given me any answer to that, but yet we all talk about livability. In my mind this road is not going to get built. So then you move to the next question. It is more of a question of keeping the right-of-way versus getting rid of it. That is really the question in front of us. Keeping a right-of-way for a road that is not going to get built. You are throwing a road block in front of, I don't care who it is, the County, McMenamins, or Reynolds School District. This is ridiculous. How can you say that there is a benefit to Troutdale by having that connector? None of you have said that yet but yet you want to keep it and throw a road block in front of the County,

School District and possibly McMenamins. I don't care as much about McMenamins as I do about the Reynolds School District. All I am hearing is that you want to keep it on the Plan. There have been no arguments about the benefit to Troutdale versus getting rid of the right-of-way and benefiting the School District immediately and the County and possibly McMenamins. That is such a clear trade off to me.

**VOTE: Councilor Ripma – No; Councilor Thomas – Yes; Mayor Thalhofer – No; Councilor Canfield – Yes; Councilor Kyle – Yes; Councilor Daoust – No; Councilor Gorsek – Yes.**

**Motion Passed 4 – 3.**

**7. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS**

None.

**8. COUNCIL COMMUNICATIONS**

None.

**9. ADJOURNMENT:**

**MOTION: Councilor Ripma moved to adjourn. Seconded by Councilor Gorsek. Motion Passed Unanimously.**

Meeting adjourned at 11:21pm.

**Paul Thalhofer, Mayor**

**Approved October 25, 2005**

**ATTEST:**

**Debbie Stickney, City Recorder**