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Sandy TSP Update  
Joint Citizen and Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #1

Date: December 11, 2008  
Meeting Time: 6:00 pm – 9:00 pm  
Meeting Location: Sandy City Hall, Council Chambers

| Topics |
|------------------|-----------------|
| **A** CAC Introductions/Sign In | 6:00 |
| **B** Transportation Planning 101 – John Bosket, DKS Associates  
- Transportation planning overview  
- Potential applications to project | 6:10 |
| **I** CAC/TAC Introductions/Sign In | 7:00 |
| **II** Committee Roles & Responsibilities – Liz French, City of Sandy | 7:10 |
| **III** Project Objectives & Schedule – Liz French, City of Sandy | 7:15 |
| **IV** Review of Plans, Goals & Policies | 7:20 |
| **V** Existing Transportation System Conditions – John Bosket | 7:30 |
| **VI** Future Transportation System Conditions – John Bosket | 8:00 |
| **VII** Measures of Effectiveness – John Bosket & Liz French | 8:30 |
| **VIII** Public Comments | 8:45 |
| **IX** Next Steps & Adjourn | 8:55 |
Sandy TSP Update  
Joint Citizen and Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #1

Date: December 11, 2008  
Time: 6:00 pm – 9:00 pm  
Location: Sandy City Hall, Council Chambers

Attending: 
CAC: Robert Watts, Don Allen (City Council, Transit Advisory Committee), Hollis Wenzel (Sandy Chamber), Lois Coleman (City Council), Jeremy Pietzold (City Council), Don Carlton (Planning Commission), Ron Lesowsk (Planning Commission, Tollgate Inn).

TAC: Tim Belanger (Oregon Trail School District), Avi Tayar (ODOT Region 1), Christine Heycke (CPH Planning), Dan Bacon (ODOT District 2C). Absent: Harold Skelton (Sandy Police Department), Gary McQueen (Sandy Fire Department)

PMT: Liz French (Project Manager), Mike Walker (Public Works Director), Tracy Brown (Planning Director), John Bosket (Project Consultant), Michael Tomasini (DKS Associates), Sonya Kazen (ODOT Region 1 Planning), Julie Stephens (Sandy Transit)

Transportation Planning 101 (6:00 – 7:00 pm)

A. CAC Introductions/Sign-in – Liz French, City of Sandy
Liz welcomed the group to the Sandy Transportation System Plan Update meeting and thanked them for taking time out of their day during the busy holiday season. Liz initiated introductions, and provided an overview of the Sandy Transportation System Plan Update.

B. Transportation Planning 101 – John Bosket, DKS Associates
John used a PowerPoint presentation to provide an orientation to the principles of transportation planning as a refresher for those who do not do transportation planning on a daily basis.

The presentation began with a discussion of why we are updating our Transportation System Plan (TSP):
- Required by the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) for cities with population greater than 10,000.
  - Although this does not apply to Sandy, most cities have adopted a Transportation System Plan for the reasons outlined below
- The TSP becomes the transportation element of the Comprehensive Plan
- Provides a long range view of needs and opportunities
- Ensures transportation systems are adequate
- Ensures the cost effective use of limited construction and maintenance funds
- Demonstrates project need & readiness (i.e. to apply for grants)
Items that the TSP must accomplish are:
- be consistent with state and regional TSPs
- provide an efficient network of streets, sidewalks, paths, bike lanes, etc.
- provide standards for streets, sidewalks, paths, bike lanes, etc.
- protect corridors and facilities for intended uses
- provide public transportation alternatives (this will be addressed in the concurrent Transit Master Plan)
- provide a network of bicycle and pedestrian amenities
- develop a list of projects that are reasonably likely to be funded
- develop implementing codes and ordinances

Items that the TSP should accomplish are:
- make decisions that are consistent with the community vision and expectations for the future
- support a variety of travel choices
- serve all the people in the community
- provide options for safe and secure travel
- support the local and state economy
- protect natural resources and the built economy

Through the project we will be developing goals and objectives, which will be used to develop evaluation criteria and then to select alternatives.

The steps to develop a TSP are:
1) Review state, regional & local regulations, policies & plans
2) Inventory of existing transportation conditions
3) Evaluate current deficiencies in the transportation system
4) Forecast growth (to year 2029)
5) Evaluate deficiencies in the future year transportation system
6) Forecast reasonable funds that will be available for transportation projects
7) Identify alternatives and match to available funding
8) Develop ordinances to support TSP
9) Adopt TSP
   a. Liz noted that the City will go through the adoption proceedings without DKS Associates

General Transportation Planning Principles:

Pedestrians
- Pedestrians use sidewalks and trails
- Prefer to avoid out of direction travel (generally willing to walk ¼ to ½ mile to get somewhere)
- Buffers should be provided in high speed corridors
- Direct access to businesses from street will encourage pedestrian traffic
- Facilities need to meet accessibility standards
- Access should be provided to transit, parks, schools, shopping
Bikes:  
- Use bike lanes (~5-6 ft wide), shoulder bikeways (~6 ft wide) or shared roadways (roads with speeds <25 mph and <3,000 vehicles per day).  
- Bike parking should be provided at destinations  
- Well-defined, clean routes are necessary

Transit:  
- Stops should be within ¼ mile of pedestrian origin or ½ mile of bicycle origin  
- Need to provide walking and bike routes to stops

Functional Classification  
A functional classification system is a method for categorizing roadways by the nature of service that they are intended to provide (mobility vs. access). Classifications in the current Sandy TSP are:  
- Major arterial (high volume street meant to move traffic)  
- Minor arterial (high volume street with limited access)  
- Collector (function is to connect arterials to local streets)  
- Local Streets (primary function is access to homes)

ODOT and Clackamas County also have classification systems.

There are two types of mobility standards. City uses Level of Service (LOS), which measures the delay (seconds) at intersections, and “grades” it from A, B, and C (free movement), D and E (longer delays), and F (very long delays). LOS E and F are considered failing. Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) uses a volume to capacity ratio (v/c ratio), which measures the actual volume using an intersection and compares it to the maximum volume that could be served. A v/c ratio greater than 1.0 indicates there is more demand for the intersection than it can adequate serve.

Safety investigates include crash history and sight distance analysis.

There are numerous strategies for mitigating congestion and other traffic problems.  
Transportation System Management looks at ways to improve the system:  
- signal timing  
- access management  
- traffic calming  
- increasing connectivity  
- appropriate assignment of functional classification

Transportation Demand Management looks at ways to change the way the system is used:  
- employee shift management (for example, having the large employers use a non-standard shift switch to reduce traffic during peak travel times)  
- encouraging telecommuting  
- transit  
- walking and biking programs
John concluded the review of Transportation Planning at 6:40, opened the floor to questions, and allowed a 20 minute break until the beginning of the technical part of the meeting.

I. Introductions/Sign In – Liz French, City of Sandy
Liz welcomed the group to the Sandy Transportation System Plan Update meeting and thanked them for taking time out of their day during the busy holiday season. Liz initiated introductions, and provided an overview of the Sandy Transportation System Plan Update.

II. Committee Roles and Responsibilities – Liz French, City of Sandy
Liz discussed the roles and responsibilities of the committees, which includes reviewing materials and providing recommendations to the Project Management Team (PMT – City Staff, DKS Associates, Christine Heyke from CPH Planning, and Sonya Kazen from ODOT). All comments, questions and recommendations will be fully listened to and considered, but not all will be incorporated into the plans. The PMT will provide the final review of all documents for the TSP Update. The final proposed TSP will be reviewed and adopted by the Planning Commission and City Council.

III. Project Objectives & Schedule – Liz French, City of Sandy
Liz stated that the purpose of this project is to update the existing Transportation System Plan, adopted in 1997, to reflect current conditions and needs. Many of the projects in the TSP have already been constructed, and others are infeasible or not likely to be built in the next 10 years. The City has also taken over transit operations from Tri-Met and operates fixed route and demand service, has annexed in several large areas in the City, and has updated development standards.

John Bosket provided copies of the schedule for all attendees, and Liz discussed the tight timeline, pointing out approximate dates for future meetings and milestones for the project. At this point, Liz turned the meeting over to John.

John began with a quick review of the relevant local, regional and state policies that the TSP is required to adhere to. Mike Walker stated that on page 3, the completed project should be removed from the list. Additionally, costs are based on 1994 dollars, not 2008 dollars.

On Page 24, Mike Walker clarified that the fleet replacement project listed under the 2008-2011 STIP from ODOT is for transit fleet replacement, and will not impact the Sandy transportation system.

V. Existing Transportation System Conditions - John Bosket, DKS Associates
John discussed the existing conditions of the Sandy transportation system and the methodology used to obtain the data. He noted that the existing conditions of the transit

- carpooling
system are being evaluated in a separate project, and will be incorporated into the final TSP.

Sonya Kazen noted that a map of the environmental resources and setbacks would be useful.

Pedestrian conditions:
Locations with sidewalk obstructions, crosswalks that don’t meet ADA standards, intersections without crosswalks, and areas without sidewalks were recorded. It was noted that one of the goals should be to facilitate crossings, especially near transit stops, and to improve connectivity throughout the City. The City’s development code currently requires 400 foot block spacing.

Don Allen mentioned that there is not a crosswalk at the new transit shelter on the east side of Industrial Way. Lois Coleman wondered why pedestrian counts were not done at the McCormick/Langensand intersection, since this is one of the main transit stops, and everyone walks to this stop.

John cautioned that having only a few pedestrians recorded at a location during a survey is just as significant as many vehicles recorded at the same intersection.

It was also noted that the City has received a grant from the ODOT Bike/Ped division for a pedestrian refuge (short, landscaped median with a gap in the middle to provide pedestrians some safety while trying to cross Hwy 26 at University Ave).

Other gaps in the sidewalk network that were mentioned are along the north side of Hwy 26 from the Sandy Vista Apartments to downtown Sandy, the south side of Hwy 26 between University Ave and Ruben Ln, and along Vista Loop. Lois Coleman mentioned that since Vista Loop currently gets a low amount of traffic, pedestrians walk in the middle of the road.

Bicycle Conditions:
John mentioned that bike facilities vary depending on roadway classification, and include shared roadways on local streets, bike lanes, bike shoulders, and separate bike paths. Gaps in the bicycle facilities were noted. Scott Lazenby mentioned that the vertical grade differences in Sandy can make a big difference, and are present on most North-South streets. Some bicyclists may prefer a slightly longer route that avoids the steeper hills. It was suggested to include a topographic map with the proposed alternatives.

Don Allen noted that the Sandy River Airport has an approach over the City, restricting building heights in some areas. Mike Walker asked Dan Bacon if bridge weight/size restrictions on I-84 were still in effect, and if this had skewed the freight numbers for the survey. Dan Bacon stated that very few trucks were diverted through Sandy, and would not make a difference in the survey. John Bosket mentioned that one reason for including the pavement condition information in the report is to maximize funds spent by focusing reconstruction efforts on streets already in poor condition.
VI. Future Transportation System Conditions – John Bosket

John discussed the methods used to forecast future housing and employment in the City and associated growth in transportation. Scott Lazenby wondered whether the fact that we were required to use “Safe Harbor” population growth estimates, which are lower than our historical growth rates, will be a problem for forecasting future transportation demands. How will this affect the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)? Tracy Brown stated that since the TSP is only looking at arterial and collector streets, the lower projections shouldn’t be a problem. Additionally, the only change would be to move up the timeline in the TSP and cause projects to be necessary sooner than expected. Sonya wondered if we should be using the location of vacant land to prioritize project locations.

Jeremy Pietzold wondered why we did not show the location of future streets from the current TSP. He stated that having a map of those would be helpful. John Bosket replied that we will re-evaluate all of the projects from the previous TSP and see if others are needed to meet the future demands. However, the City decided to examine future conditions based on the transportation system as it exists today since it is not possible to predict when projects might be built.

Jeremy reminded us that changes to how the Bluff Rd/Hwy 26 intersection function will occur when the new school opens off of Bell Street, and the northern leg of 362nd and connection to Bell St are constructed. CAC members stated that Dubarko Rd users are primarily locals trying to avoid getting onto Hwy 26.

VII. Measures of Effectiveness – John Bosket & Liz French

Due to time constraints, this item was not discussed in detail. Examples of potential goals and visions for the TSP are located on pages 2 and 3 of Tech Memo #1, taken from the current TSP. Liz assigned the committee members the task of reviewing these goals and visions, determining if any need to be changed or eliminated, and developing new ones.

VIII. Public Comments

No members of the public were present at the meeting.

IX. Next Steps & Adjourn

At 9 PM, Liz closed the meeting and thanked everyone again for their time. She requested that any comments or questions be submitted in 1 week (Thursday, December 18 amended to Monday, December 29th) and that the committee members review the goals from the current TSP and determine changes that need to be made.

Liz reminded the committee members that there will be a Community Workshop in January (date and location to be announced) to review the same material and get feedback on the goals and visions for the TSP.
After the meeting, Ron Lesowski expressed concern whether the survey of through traffic on Hwy 26 accurately captured the number of people not stopping in Sandy. John explained the methodology, and expressed confidence in the numbers.
Sandy TSP Update
Joint Citizen and Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #2

Date: June 24, 2009
Meeting Time: 6:30 pm – 8:30 pm
Meeting Location: Sandy City Hall, Council Chambers

Topics

I  Introductions/Sign In – Liz French, City of Sandy  6:30
II Project Status, Next Steps – John Bosket, DKS Associates  6:40
III Highlights of Technical Memo #3 – John Bosket  6:55
IV Proposed Projects – John Bosket  7:15
V Other Comments/Questions (if time)  7:45
VI Public Comments  8:15
VII Next Steps & Adjourn  8:30
I. Introductions/Sign In – Liz French, City of Sandy
Liz welcomed the group to the Sandy Transportation System Plan Update meeting and thanked them for taking time out of their day during the busy holiday season. Liz initiated introductions, and provided an overview of the Sandy Transportation System Plan Update.

II. Project Status & Next Steps – John Bosket, DKS Associates
John Bosket provided copies of the schedule for all attendees and discussed where we currently are in the project and steps still required before the final project. John mentioned the Community Workshop that will occur the following day (Thursday, June 25th), and then third Joint TAC/CAC meeting prior to the final presentation to the Joint Planning Commission/City Council. The next step is preparing the Implementation Element, and then all the individual elements will be combined to create the draft TSP.

John stated that the purpose of tonight’s meeting is to review the proposed projects and determine priorities. Additionally, he mentioned that not much new is being added to the TSP Update. Most items are either from the current TSP or current Development Code; in general, the only new items are code-based, and are required to meet the new Transportation Planning Rule (TPR).

III. Highlights of Technical Memorandum #3 – John Bosket & Michael Tomasini, DKS Associates
John provided a review of the main topics of Technical Memorandum #3 – Alternatives Analysis:
- Transportation System Management (TSM) is a way to get more out of the existing facilities. Some of the elements include Access Management, Neighborhood Traffic Management, Adaptive Signal Systems, Local Street connectivity, Functional Classification, and Typical Roadway Sections. In terms of Access Management, the only
area where there is any change from the current TSP and existing code is the proposal to increase spacing on Minor Arterials to 300 feet between private drives and public streets. The City has an existing Neighborhood Traffic Management Program which helps manage traffic concerns (volume and speed) on local streets, and provides a method for citizens to fairly get assistance in managing perceived problems. Information in the TSP was taken from the City’s program.

Adaptive Signal Systems are proposed as a method to better manage traffic on US 26. Our current signal system uses time of day plans, which change signal length based on average conditions during different times of day. While these work adequately in some areas, in areas where traffic volumes fluctuate significantly between different days and based on different conditions (such as Sandy), time of day plans may not adequately respond to conditions. Adaptive signal timing continuously measures congestion levels on every traffic lane at every intersection to adjust signal timing to minimize delay for all users while maintaining the progression of vehicles on the major route. While this system would not change capacity at peak hour, it would provide for better circulation during the rest of the time. An example is located on Burnside between Eastman & Powell.

The principles of local street connectivity are already reflected in City code, and most of the information regarding functional classification comes from either the existing TSP or current City code. Typical roadway sections were also taken from City code and the existing TSP for city streets, and from the draft Sandy Gateway Plan for US 26 (note that this was the only thing taken from the Gateway Plan – all else from the Gateway Plan is deferred until that plan is brought for adoption). The section for OR 211 from Bornstedt to Dubarko Rd was taken from the adopted Bornstedt Village Plan, and a cross-section for OR 211 from Dubarko Rd to US 26 was presented. John noted that existing streets do not need to change to meet the standards unless there is development on the street that requires street improvements.

- Transportation Demand Management (TDM) is term used to describe any action that removes single occupant vehicle trips from the roadway network. This includes a variety of policies including telecommuting, compressed work week, subsidized transit and a large number of other programs. Mike Walker noted that the DEQ administrative rule cited in the memo does not apply to Sandy, nor do we have many companies large enough to meet the threshold under the DEQ program.

- Freight Mobility: US 26 is a designated freight route, and as such, freight mobility must be considered with any changes proposed on the highway. Management of congestion on US 26 will improve freight movement through the City. “Truck friendly” improvements to City streets are proposed on streets in the Industrial area.

- John briefly mentioned Goal 5 resources, the draft cost estimates and the revenue forecast.
IV. Proposed Projects – John Bosket and Michael Tomasini, DKS Associates

Michael discussed the proposed pedestrian and bicycle projects, and touched on some of the potential priority areas. For pedestrian improvements, the proposed projects include:
- Sidewalk infill along Bluff Rd – for school access and access to the Sandy Bluff neighborhood.
- Pedestrian bridge over OR 211 at Sandy Heights – this would work well with the existing grades, and allow for easy pedestrian access to Meinig Park.
- Sidewalks along OR 211 from Bornstedt Village to US 26 – currently no sidewalks
- Sidewalks along US 26 east of downtown

For bicycle improvements, the proposed projects consist of bike lanes, which are useful to get people out of travel lanes, and include bike lanes on US 26 east of Sandy and infill on sections of Dubarko. Michael noted that one problem with adding bike lanes to Dubarko is that in order to accomplish that without widening the paved area, on-street parking would need to be removed.

Hollis wondered what provisions we are making for connection to the Springwater trail. While the actual Springwater extension will be completely located outside of the City, within the City we have a good network of multi-use trails that will be able to connect with the Springwater.

Don Allen asked how we would be able to get ODOT to approve the pedestrian bridge over OR 211. John Bosket answered that since it won’t touch the road, as long as we can get the necessary height, ODOT shouldn’t have any problems with it. Dan Bacon followed up by saying that the required height is 17 feet. The current grade difference is approximately 15 feet. He noted that one problem that has been seen in Portland with other pedestrian bridges is that they are used by the criminal element to avoid capture. For example, a robbery takes place on one side, and the police show up to that side. Unfortunately, the robber has taken off on foot to the other side, while the police need to drive around. Mike Walker noted that we have approximately 20 feet of right of way on the east side of OR 211 that could be used for the pedestrian bridge.

Ron Lesowski stated that he would like to hear our (i.e. City staff) priorities for the projects. Liz stated that she hasn’t yet reviewed them. Mike stated that in general for pedestrian projects our priorities are to provide sidewalks where there is not contiguous sidewalk on either side of the street. Otherwise, we generally try to maintain near-term list and long term sets of projects, although these can change if the opportunity arises. However, we don’t want to get locked into a ranked list, as many of our projects are done when funding and the opportunity arises.

Julie Stephens stated that she will review the pedestrian improvements with an eye towards providing access to transit facilities.

Michael then reviewed the proposed motor vehicle improvements. He noted that the City intersections that fail to meet standards will be 362nd Avenue at Dubarko Road and
Industrial Way at 362nd Avenue. On the state system, nearly all of the intersections on US 26 and OR 211 will fail to meet standards by the year 2029.

To mitigate some of the problems at the intersections, improvements are proposed at nearly all of the intersections:
- 362nd at Dubarko: construct a roundabout (see Stafford Rd near I-205 for an example)
- Industrial Way West at 362nd Ave: add an eastbound left turn lane and remove the stop signs on 362nd Ave.
  Julie Stephens expressed concern about bus and truck traffic being accommodated through the roundabout. John assured her that the roundabouts are different from the traffic circle on Dubarko Rd, and are designed to accommodate buses and trucks.
- 362/US 26: add a second northbound left turn lane. Mike Walker remarked that the extra required Right of Way was dedicated as part of the Fred Meyer project.
- Industrial Way/US 26: Construct a northbound left turn lane and change the southbound approach to dual left turn lanes and a share through/right turn lane. This would enable getting rid of the split green signals, allowing for longer green on US 26.
  The question was asked whether the northern extension shown would go through the shopping center. The answer is that yes, but not until the site redevelops. This is as prime example of an opportunity-driven project.
- Ruben Lane/US 26: change southbound approach to dual left turn lanes and a shared right/through lane and change northbound approach to left turn lane with a shared through/right lane. The north approach may require further modification to align north and south approach lanes.
- OR 211/Proctor: construct a left turn lane. Ron Lesowski noted that this would need to have staggered stop bars to accommodate vehicles turning left from Proctor onto OR 211.
- Ten Eyck-Wolf Dr/US 26: construct north and southbound left turn lanes
- OR 211/Dubarko Rd: The right of way and topography eliminate the ability to put a roundabout in this location. Instead, the following lanes are recommended along with a traffic signal when signal warrants are met: northbound left and right turn lanes & southbound left turn lane.
- Bornstedt Rd/OR 211: It was noted that the No-Build condition does not show this intersection failing. However, when the new proposed roads are shown, more traffic is diverted to OR 211, which then causes the intersection to fail. The initial plan showed left turns out of Bornstedt being prohibited. Other options, such as a roundabout, are being looked at instead.
  Julie Stephens asked whether the Bornstedt Village Plan showed a signal on OR 211. The answer is yes, at Village Blvd.
  Jeremy asked why the Bluff Rd extension south to OR 211 from the original TSP wasn’t shown. The answer is that there are too many topographic and Goal 5 resource issues to construct the road in this location.
- OR 211/Arletha: realign to create a regular 4-way intersection once Gunderson is constructed. In the short term, a vegetation easement should be acquired to allow for adequate sight distance.

Jeremy asked about the proposed Vista Loop realignments as discussed in the Gateway Plan and during the Timber Valley subdivision hearings. John stated that the traffic volumes are too low at these intersections to warrant major improvements. Sonya stated that the realignment should be included in the TSP, as it will be required by ODOT for future development for safety issues.

After reviewing the proposed intersection improvements and the 11 roadway improvements, the three alternatives were discussed. Alternative 1 only includes the intersection improvements and 11 roadway improvements. This provides some benefit to the highway, as well as improving local connectivity. Alternative 2 includes everything in Alternative 1 as well as widening US 26 to 7 lanes outside of the downtown couplet. This would likely involve a median barrier the length of the City, and would also create a bigger bottleneck at the couplet. Alternative 3 includes everything in Alternative 1 and a bypass south of the City from somewhere west of Orient Dr all the way to Shorty’s corner with 1 interchange for OR 211.

It was mentioned that a discussion of the recommended roadway improvements needs to be included in the report.

Don Allen asked about the purpose of the proposed Meadow Ave extension since it doesn’t take much traffic off the highway, and appears to be too close to the Vista Loop West intersection. John Bosket stated that the purpose is for local connectivity and access to future developed land. John also said that the two Vista Loop intersections are plenty far apart. Mike Walker said that this project should be called “unnamed” instead of Meadow Ave.

It was noted that several of the projects are primarily located outside of the UGB, such as Gunderson and “Meadow Ave”. It was noted that we probably would not be able to fund these projects with SDC’s and that they could not be part of our CIP. Some more research needs to be done on this to figure out the technicalities. Sandy is unusual in that we have an agreement with the County allowing us to plan for city growth in our Urban Reserve. Mike Walker also stated that it is unlikely that we would fund a street that primarily benefits US 26.

Sonya asked whether signal warrants would be met at some intersections where they aren’t met in the built-out scenario if only some of the projects were built. John said that it is possible, but it is not something that we can plan for at this stage due to the complication of determining which projects will actually be built, when.

Hollis stated that people tend to have strong reactions, either positive or negative, about the idea of the bypass. The initial Main Street studies have shown that locals don’t use the downtown businesses partly because of the congestion. If we would get rid of that, it
would have a benefit for our businesses. She wondered whether the idea of a bypass is even feasible, and if so, why is it so far out. John stated that we have only done the 2nd step in a long, complicated process. The current TSP includes the conceptual idea of a bypass. The analysis for the update shows that a bypass would improve conditions on US 26 and in the City. There are still a lot of land use, environmental, and funding issues to tackle, but it’s not impossible, as the recent funds dedicated to the Newberg bypass show. The bypass would end up being the freight route, and it’s likely that US 26 would be dedicated back to the City once the bypass was operational.

VI. Public Comments
No members of the public were present at the meeting.

VII. Next Steps & Adjourn
At 8:45 PM, Liz closed the meeting and thanked everyone again for their time. She requested that any comments or questions be submitted in 1 week (Wednesday, July 1st) and that the committee members review the proposed projects and submit their project priorities along with projects they feel should or should not be included.

Liz reminded the committee members that there will be a Community Workshop the following day (Thursday, June 25th) to review the same material and get feedback on the priorities for projects.
What Is It All About? The City of Sandy is holding two community workshops to gather public input on findings and recommendations coming out of its Transportation System Plan (TSP) update project. The TSP is the transportation element of the City’s Comprehensive Plan that establishes a system of facilities and services to meet local transportation needs. With the current Sandy TSP being over ten years old (1997), this update will use the most recent growth projections to address current transportation system needs and plans for facilities that will be required to serve growth over the next 20 years. All modes of transportation (including pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and motor vehicle) are included in the plan, with the transit element being addressed through a separate, but coordinated, Transit Master Planning effort.

What has changed since the adoption of the 1997 TSP? Many of the projects shown in the 1997 TSP have already been constructed, and others have been determined to be infeasible due to existing and surrounding land uses and topographic and environmental constraints. Since the preparation of the 1997 TSP, the City has added approximately 73 acres into the Urban Growth Boundary and prepared the Bornstedt Village Specific Area Plan to address conceptual roadway locations and cross-sections for the added area. Additionally, the City has adopted new local street standards including "green street" options.

Furthermore, since the current TSP was completed, new projections for housing and employment in the area have been made and there have been recent updates to the Transportation Planning Rule (OAR 660-12), which include additional planning and code implementation requirements for the City. This growth has changed the baseline (i.e., existing and projected future deficiencies) that is used for planning the transportation system.

How can citizens help? Your input and participation plays a key role in shaping the future of the Sandy transportation system. Following a brief presentation, you will have the opportunity to circulate about the room to view maps displaying the existing transportation facilities in the city; highlighting the deficiencies found for all modes of travel including walking, biking, transit (see the Transit Master Plan materials), and motor vehicles. You will have an opportunity to provide your opinions and suggestions on any of the issues raised and are encouraged to add any others that you feel aren’t being addressed.

City and consultant staff will be stationed around the room and will be available for answering questions about the TSP update. Your comments will be taken directly and written on posters around the room. Alternatively, comment forms are attached that provide space for input on each transportation mode. Your input is very important to us and will help us form a plan that represents the interests of the community as a whole.

What will be the outcome of the TSP Update? The recommendations collected at the community workshops will be combined with input from the Citizen Advisory Committee and the Technical Advisory Committee to finalize an updated TSP for Sandy. This TSP will go through a public adoption process with City Council sometime next winter. When adopted, the TSP will include action plans for implementing improvement projects, recommendations for funding improvements, and goal/policy changes that will be used to update City of Sandy codes and standards.
# Comments

## Pedestrian Facilities

- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]

## Bicycle Facilities

- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]

## Transit Facilities

*Please provide these comments directly to the Transit Master Plan team.*

## Local Street Connectivity

- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
Proposed Functional Classification

Needed Roadway Improvements Projects

Truck Routes or other Modes of Travel
General Comments
Goals and Objectives for the Sandy TSP Update

Establishing a clear vision and a set of guiding objectives for transportation needs that reflect the interests of the community plays a critical role in the TSP Update process - helping us to develop the right projects and prioritize them for funding in a way that gets the most important projects completed first.

Please take a moment to provide some comments and let us know what issues are most important to you and what would make the TSP Update successful.

Please give us your name and address (both mailing and email, if available) so we can include you on future mailings.

Name:

Mailing Address:

Email Address:

If you choose to fill out this form at a later time, please return to:

Liz French
City of Sandy
39250 Pioneer Blvd.
Sandy, OR 97055
lfrench@cityofsandy.com
Sixteen people attended the First Community Workshop for the Sandy Transportation System Plan Update and the Transit Master Plan in addition to the Project Team members listed above. Citizens in attendance included local business and property owners, Planning Commissioners, members of the Sandy Chamber of Commerce, an Oregon Trail School District representative, and other citizens. A representative from Clackamas County Social Services and the Wheels manager were in attendance primarily for the Transit Master Plan.

The workshop began with a brief introduction by Liz French, City of Sandy Project Manager, describing the project goals, process, and introducing John Bosket with DKS Associates. Julie Stephens, Sandy Transit Manager, provided an introduction to the Transit Master Plan project.

John Bosket began by reviewing the project schedule, including where we are in the process, and when other opportunities for public input will occur. The time frames for the Joint Citizen and Technical Advisory Committee meetings were mentioned, as well as the 2nd Community Meeting and the Joint Planning Commission and City Council workshop. Liz interjected that after the project is completed, the TSP will still need to go through a full public process before the Planning Commission and City Council for adoption.

John discussed that the purpose of this Community Workshop was to review the existing and future conditions, examine where deficiencies are present in the system, and begin the process of proposing solutions. John provided a handout with a summary of deficiencies from the technical memos, and the following posters:
- Existing Roadway Functional Classifications
- Existing Bicycle Facilities
- Existing Pedestrian Facilities
- System Deficiencies (2008-2029)
- Streets Proposed in Current (1997) TSP

John also mentioned that we will be using a set of “goals and objectives” to rank the projects and that we are requesting input into the list. The goals and objectives from the current TSP were posted for comment. Beyond using the goals and objectives, John stated that the projects selected for the final TSP must be financially constrained – that is,
selected based on their likelihood of being constructed. While we will likely have a long list of potential projects, the financially constrained list will be much shorter.

Christine Heycke introduced the Transit Master Plan (TMP) and the schedule for that project. She discussed that although the TMP is a separate project from the TSP, it will be incorporated into the TSP as the Transit Section.

After the introduction from Christine, the floor was opened for review of the posters, comments and discussion.

Comments received at the workshop are summarized below; no surveys have been returned yet:

**Pedestrian Network**
- Need more pedestrian crosswalks on Proctor Blvd.
- Extend Tickle Creek Trail east to City Limits.
- Connect east end of town with a trail to Sandy River Park
- Connect Sandy River Park trails to Fish Hatchery
- Extend the Tickle Creek Trail to Springwater Corridor
- Get easements for Tickle Creek Trail over private property & reroute off sidewalk
- Narrow sidewalks currently on Bluff Rd. Need contiguous sidewalks on at least 1 side.
- Connect Sandy Bluff Park trails to 362nd Ave
- Negotiate with School District for a common corridor easement for bikes & dogs on leash on central road through nature trail & connect behind athletic club & BiMart shopping center.
- Need more trails throughout the City.
- Need a sidewalk on US 26 from Ruben to University
- Need better/protected pedestrian crossings downtown on US 26 (between Strauss & Shelley) and on Proctor near library – preference for signals with pedestrian push-buttons.
- People don’t just need to get downtown on foot, but need to be able to walk to individual destinations within it as well (better crossing of US 26)

**Natural Resources**
- Protect existing parks & green space from arterials & collectors. Keep traffic on Bell, Jewelberry & 362nd, and consider Green Mountain or Agnes as alternate to extending Bell St.

**Future Streets**
- “With the passage of the high school bond, does the need for completion of Bell Street to the west become more pressing? I would think so.”
- The future Meeker St/Ruben Ln alignment from the 1997 TSP does not appear practical or useful. The street appears to go through the Safeway shopping center and run along the High School trail.
SUMMARY

- Need to look at a public street between Orient & 362nd to relieve traffic pressure at 362nd Ave intersection.
- Look at a frontage road alignment for Industrial to Jarl Rd.
- Tunnel under the City as a US 26 bypass.

Traffic
- People drive too fast on Ruben Lane.

Other
- Move Expressway Designation on US 26 back to light at Orient/Jarl Rd since this section of highway doesn’t meet conditions for a typical expressway.

Other discussions not documented included whether there was truly a need for a bypass, and if so, where should it be located. One comment that was received was that we should move forward with plans for a bypass and/or truck route to limit trucks from going through downtown.

Several people were surprised with the through-traffic counts and how low the numbers seemed; there was a general feeling that through traffic makes up a much larger amount of the traffic on US 26 than was shown in the vehicle counts. However, one business owner who had earlier expressed surprise at the low amount of through-traffic on US 26 spent some time watching cars on the highway and noticed that there were a large number of cars turning on and off the highway as compared to through-traffic.

Roundabouts were mentioned as an idea for intersections that currently fail to meet mobility standards to one business owner who liked the idea and stated that he is a fan of roundabouts in general.

Transit
The Transit Master Plan outreach included a dot exercise. Participants were each given four dots that they could use to identify their top priorities on a wall poster. Participants were able to write their own priorities or use ones already listed. The listed priorities were ones that had been identified by current bus riders and the general public in earlier surveys. The intent of the dot exercise was to refine the information collected in the surveys. For instance, the surveys indicated a demand for Sunday service, but not specific to one route.

The following priorities are listed in the order of most dots received:
- Service on Sundays – SAM Gresham – 7
- Add service to Government Camp – 5
- Later service weekdays on SAM-Gresham – 3
- Later service Saturdays on SAM Gresham – 3
- Earlier service on Saturdays on SAM Gresham – 2
- Transit to Ski Bowl & Timberline to reduce congestion and skier traffic – 2

There were also a number of priorities that received one dot, including:
Later service on Saturdays on STAR, earlier service on Saturdays on STAR, Sunday service on STAR, Later weekday service on STAR, later service on Mtn. Express, more frequent service on SAM-Gresham, and additional bus stops.

Three written comments were received:

1. I would like to make a comment on fares. I would like to see an affordable and reasonable fare for the Sam busses. I would hope this would help offset the rising costs but in addition aid in keeping the current services to their existing standards. As a driver I believe it would cut down on Gresham passengers commuting only in Gresham for the free ride. Some schedules are very tight and stopping for people to go 10-15 blocks really adds on time. We also seem to end up transporting some of the more undesirable troublemakers. Feedback from passengers for me has gone both ways.

2. Comments: I like the Mountain Express. I X-country ski at Lolo Pass, so I go to ZigZag, then bike 4 miles on Lolo Pass Road. Suggestions: If you can get a route to Gov’t Camp for the skiers, that would be awesome.

3. Cookies are good. Yum
What Is It All About? The City of Sandy is having its second community workshop to gather public input on findings and recommendations coming out of its Transportation System Plan (TSP) update project. The TSP is the transportation element of the City’s Comprehensive Plan that establishes a system of facilities and services to meet local transportation needs. With the current Sandy TSP being over ten years old (1997), this update will use the most recent growth projections to address current transportation system needs and plans for facilities that will be required to serve growth over the next 20 years. All modes of transportation (including pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and motor vehicle) are included in the plan, with the transit element being addressed through a separate, but coordinated, Transit Master Planning effort.

What has changed since the adoption of the 1997 TSP? Many of the projects shown in the 1997 TSP have already been constructed, and others have been determined to be infeasible due to existing and surrounding land uses and topographic and environmental constraints. Since the preparation of the 1997 TSP, the City has added approximately 73 acres into the Urban Growth Boundary and prepared the Bornstedt Village Specific Area Plan to address conceptual roadway locations and cross-sections for the added area. Additionally, the City has adopted new local street standards including "green street" options.

Furthermore, since the current TSP was completed, new projections for housing and employment in the area have been made and there have been recent updates to the Transportation Planning Rule (OAR 660-12), which include additional planning and code implementation requirements for the City. This growth has changed the baseline (i.e., existing and projected future deficiencies) that is used for planning the transportation system.

How can citizens help? Your input and participation plays a key role in shaping the future of the Sandy transportation system. Following a brief presentation, you will have the opportunity to circulate about the room to view maps displaying the proposed projects for all modes of travel including walking, biking, and motor vehicles. You will have an opportunity to provide your opinions and suggestions on any of the issues raised and are encouraged to add any others that you feel aren’t being addressed.

City and consultant staff will be stationed around the room and will be available for answering questions about the TSP update. Your comments will be taken directly and written on posters around the room. Alternatively, comment forms are attached that provide space for input on each transportation mode. Your input is very important to us and will help us form a plan that represents the interests of the community as a whole.

What will be the outcome of the TSP Update? The recommendations collected at the community workshops will be combined with input from the Citizen Advisory Committee and the Technical Advisory Committee to finalize an updated TSP for Sandy. This TSP will go through a public adoption process with City Council sometime this winter. When adopted, the TSP will include action plans for implementing improvement projects, recommendations for funding improvements, and goal/policy changes that will be used to update City of Sandy codes and standards.
**Comments**

**Pedestrian Facilities:** Please give us your feedback on the proposed pedestrian projects
(Also, please list your top 5 preferred projects)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bicycle Facilities:** Please give us your feedback on the proposed bicycle projects
(Also, please list your top 5 preferred projects)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Needed Roadway Improvements Projects:** Please give us your feedback on the proposed roadway projects
(Also, please list your top 5 preferred projects)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How would you feel about widening US 26 to 3 lanes in each direction? (east and west of downtown only)

How would you feel about a bypass of US 26 around the south end of Sandy?
Please give us your name and address (both mailing and email, if available) so we can include you on future mailings.

Name:

Mailing Address:

Email Address:

If you choose to fill out this form at a later time, please return by July 2, 2009 to:

Liz French  
City of Sandy  
39250 Pioneer Blvd.  
Sandy, OR  97055  
lfrench@cityofsandy.com
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Sandy Facility Pedestrian Improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>362&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Dr.</td>
<td>Chinook Dr. to Industrial Way</td>
<td>Infill sidewalk gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell St.</td>
<td>Jewelberry Rd. to Bluff Rd.</td>
<td>Infill sidewalk gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluff Rd.</td>
<td>Hood St. to Green Mountain St.</td>
<td>Infill sidewalk gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluff Rd.</td>
<td>Strawbridge Parkway to Nettie Connett Dr.</td>
<td>Infill sidewalk gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluff Rd.</td>
<td>Green Mountain Rd. to Northern UGB</td>
<td>Infill sidewalk gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bornstedt Rd.</td>
<td>Cascade Village Dr to UGB</td>
<td>Infill sidewalk gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubarko Rd.</td>
<td>East of Melissa Rd. to East of OR 211</td>
<td>Infill sidewalk gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubarko Rd.</td>
<td>Langensand Rd. to Antler Ave.</td>
<td>Infill sidewalk gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Way</td>
<td>362&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Dr. to US 26</td>
<td>Infill sidewalk gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacoby Rd.</td>
<td>Dubarko Rd. to Cascade Village Dr.</td>
<td>Infill sidewalk gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewelberry Rd.</td>
<td>Penny Ave. to Kelso Rd.</td>
<td>Infill sidewalk gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langensand Rd.</td>
<td>Dubarko Rd. to US 26</td>
<td>Infill sidewalk gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meinig Ave.</td>
<td>Scenic St. to US 26</td>
<td>Infill sidewalk gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Ave.</td>
<td>Beers Ave. to Revenue Ave.</td>
<td>Infill sidewalk gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruben Rd.</td>
<td>US 26 to Dubarko Rd.</td>
<td>Infill sidewalk gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Heights St.</td>
<td>Bluff Rd. to End</td>
<td>Infill sidewalk gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Core Pedestrian</td>
<td>Side streets perpendicular to US 26</td>
<td>Infill sidewalk gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Ave.</td>
<td>Sunset St. to US 26</td>
<td>Construct sidewalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Accessway / Trail</td>
<td>Extension of Tickle Creek Trail to Dubarko Rd.</td>
<td>Accessway / Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Accessway / Trail</td>
<td>Yocum Loop to Ruben Ln.</td>
<td>Accessway / Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Accessway / Trail</td>
<td>Bell St. Fields to Kate Schmitz Ave.</td>
<td>Accessway / Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Accessway / Trail</td>
<td>North of Kate Schmitz Ave. to Orient Dr</td>
<td>Accessway / Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Accessway / Trail</td>
<td>Industrial Way to Eastern UGB</td>
<td>Accessway / Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Accessway / Trail</td>
<td>Marcy to Middle School Fields</td>
<td>Accessway / Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Accessway / Trail</td>
<td>Marcy to Sandy River</td>
<td>Accessway / Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Accessway / Trail</td>
<td>OR 211 to Jacoby</td>
<td>Accessway / Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Accessway / Trail</td>
<td>Meinig Memorial Park Demand Trails</td>
<td>Accessway / Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Accessway / Trail</td>
<td>Meinig Memorial Park Demand Trail to SW Corner</td>
<td>Accessway / Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ODOT Facility Pedestrian Improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR 211</td>
<td>South UGB to US 26</td>
<td>Construct sidewalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR 211</td>
<td>Sandy Heights St. to Meinig Ave.</td>
<td>Pedestrian Overcrossing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 26</td>
<td>Royal Lane to 362&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Dr.</td>
<td>Infill sidewalk gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 26</td>
<td>362&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Dr. to East UGB</td>
<td>Infill sidewalk gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 26</td>
<td>Reuben Ln. to University Ave.</td>
<td>Infill sidewalk gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 26</td>
<td>Ten Eyck Rd. to Vista Loop Dr. West</td>
<td>Infill sidewalk gaps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 - Bicycle System Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Sandy Facility Bicycle Improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>362nd Dr.</td>
<td>Dubarko Rd to UGB</td>
<td>Widen shoulder to 6'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluff Rd.</td>
<td>US 26 to Miller Rd.</td>
<td>Re-stripe/widen Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bornstedt Rd.</td>
<td>OR 211 to UGB</td>
<td>Widen shoulder to 6'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubarko Rd.</td>
<td>362nd Dr. to Eldridge Dr.</td>
<td>Re-stripe/widen Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubarko Rd.</td>
<td>Sandy Heights St. to Melissa Ave.</td>
<td>Re-stripe/widen Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langensand Rd.</td>
<td>US 26 to UGB</td>
<td>Widen shoulder to 6'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meinig Ave</td>
<td>Scenic St. to US 26</td>
<td>Re-stripe/widen Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meinig Ave</td>
<td>Barker Ct. to Dubarko Rd.</td>
<td>Re-stripe/widen Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Heights</td>
<td>Dubarko to Nettie Connett</td>
<td>Re-stripe/widen Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Heights</td>
<td>Bluff To Tupper</td>
<td>Re-stripe/widen Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tupper Rd.</td>
<td>Dubarko Rd to OR 211</td>
<td>Re-stripe/widen Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ODOT Facility Bicycle Improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR 211</td>
<td>UGB to US 26</td>
<td>Widen shoulder to 6'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 26</td>
<td>Ten Eyck Rd. to UGB</td>
<td>Widen shoulder to 6'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>362nd Dr.</td>
<td>Dubarko Rd to UGB</td>
<td>Widen shoulder to 6'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3 - Recommended New Roadway Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Roadways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local System Enhancements</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Way extension to Jarl Rd./ US 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubarko Rd. connection to Champion Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend Bell St. to Orient Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend 362nd Dr. to Kelso Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend Kate Schmidt St. from US 26 to the proposed Bell St. extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend Industrial Way north to Bell Street extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend Olson Rd. from 362nd Dr. to Jewelberry Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend Agnes St. to Jewelberry Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend Dubarko Rd. to US 26 opposite Vista Loop Dr. (West)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunderson Rd., 370th Ave., Cascade Village Drive, Cascade Village Boulevard, New Collector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadow Ave. extension to US 26 opposite Vista Loop Dr. (East)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Improvements to the US 26 Corridor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-lane US 26: Orient Dr. to Bluff Rd. and Ten Eyck Rd. to Vista Loop Dr. East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 26 Bypass (west of Orient Dr. to Shorty's Corner – south of the City)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4 - Recommended Intersection Improvement Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Improvement(s) Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Sandy Intersection Improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>362nd Dr./ Industrial Way (West)</td>
<td>Construct an eastbound left turn lane with 50 feet of storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>362nd Dr./ Dubarko Rd.</td>
<td>Construct a single-lane roundabout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ODOT Intersection Improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 26/ 362nd Dr.</td>
<td>Construct a second westbound left turn lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct an acceptance lane for second westbound left turn lane to drop at southern access to Fred Meyer property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct a northbound through lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct southbound through, right turn and left turn lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 26/ Industrial Way</td>
<td>Change southbound approach to dual left turn lanes and a shared through/right lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct a northbound left turn lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 26/ Ruben Lane</td>
<td>Change southbound approach to dual left turn lanes and a shared through/right lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change northbound approach to left turn lane, and shared through/right lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR 211/Proctor Boulevard (US 26)</td>
<td>Construct a northbound left turn lane (restriping only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 26/ Ten Eyck Rd. – Wolf Drive</td>
<td>Construct a northbound left turn lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct a southbound left turn lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR 211/ Dubarko Rd.</td>
<td>Construct a northbound right turn lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct a southbound left turn lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct a northbound left turn lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct a traffic signal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR 211/ Bornsted Rd.</td>
<td>Prohibit left turns out of Bornsted Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR 211/ Arletha Court</td>
<td>Realign Arletha Court approach from the south</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sandy TSP Update
Community Workshop #2

Meeting Date: Thursday, June 25, 2009
Meeting Time: 6:30 pm – 8:00 pm
Meeting Location: Sandy Public Works and Transit Operations Center
Project Team: Suzanne Hicks - Sandy Associate Planner, Liz French - Sandy Project Manager, Mike Walker - Sandy Public Works Director, John Bosket – DKS Associates, Michael Tomasini – DKS Associates.

Three people attended the Second Community Workshop for the Sandy Transportation System Plan Update in addition to the Project Team members listed above. Citizens in attendance included a local property owner, a land use lawyer, and a City Councilor.

The workshop began with a brief introduction by Liz French, City of Sandy Project Manager, describing the project goals, process, and introducing John Bosket with DKS Associates.

John Bosket began by reviewing the project schedule, including where we are in the process, and when other opportunities for public input will occur. The time frame for the last Joint Citizen and Technical Advisory Committee meeting and the Joint Planning Commission and City Council workshop was mentioned. Liz interjected that after the project is completed, the TSP will still need to go through a full public process before the Planning Commission and City Council for adoption.

John discussed that the purpose of this Community Workshop was to review the proposed projects and develop a list of priorities to help select the projects that will be on the financially constrained project list in the TSP (while we will have a long list of potential projects, we will have a much shorter “action plan” of projects that we reasonably expect can be built in the next 20 years. These projects will be programmed into the Capital Improvement Plan).

John and Michael presented the various projects under consideration in the Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Vehicle transportation system. Proposed Pedestrian and Bicycle projects are relatively straight-forward and generally include eliminating gaps in the City’s current systems. Three alternative sets of projects were proposed for the Vehicular transportation system. In all three sets of projects, geometric improvements at failing intersections on US 26 and on the City transportation system would occur. Additionally, local collector and arterial connections (listed as projects 1-11) would occur. The first alternative only includes the geometric improvements and arterial and collector roadway connections. This alternative improved conditions on US 26 approximately 20% over the No-Build conditions, although most state intersections continue to fail to meet mobility standards.

Alternative 2 includes the above improvements with the addition of expanding US 26 to 7 lanes (3 in each direction with a median/turn lane). Conditions on state facilities improved approximately 26% over the No-Build condition; conditions on City facilities...
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were not significantly impacted by adding capacity to US 26, although some traffic was shown to return to US 26 and leave the local streets. No additional intersections on state facilities (beyond those in Alternative 1) met mobility standards.

The third alternative included all of the projects in Alternative 1, but added a bypass around the south side of Sandy from a point west of Orient Drive to approximately Shorty’s Corner. In this scenario, conditions on US 26 improve greatly, and 5 intersections meet ODOT mobility standards. If, after construction of a bypass, US 26 were transferred to City jurisdiction, all intersections would meet City standards.

It was mentioned that the discussion of a bypass in the TSP Update is only the first step in a long, difficult process. The TSP shows the need for a bypass, but does not do any of the required analysis for location, environmental impacts, and land use planning.

Comments received at the workshop and from the public are summarized below:

**Funding for Proposed Projects**
- There was concern about how these improvements will be paid for. Liz noted that as is true with the current TSP, they will be paid for through SDCs and by the property owners. There was the reminder that the amount paid by the property owners must pass the Dolan rough proportionality test.
- It was also mentioned that projects #10 and 11 are outside of the City’s UGB, so funding for those should be dealt with differently. John Bosket agreed, and stated that the City has an unusual agreement with the County allowing for City planning to occur outside of the UGB.

**Bypass**
- One person is excited about the potential for the bypass.
- Another stated that in his experience the bypass is almost impossible to get approved, and is unlikely to happen. John remarked that while that is often true, the example of Newberg, who just got $200 million for their bypass, shows that it is possible.
- A local property owner who was not at the meeting stated that he doesn’t feel that a bypass is feasible

**7-lane US 26**
- A local property owner who was not at the meeting stated that he has had car dealerships on 7-lane highways that worked quite well. The highways used a grass-median and allowed left turns into properties, but restricted turns out to right only, with U-turns allowed at the signalized intersections. He is in favor of 7-laning the highway, but is concerned that widening the streets in the couplet would require removal of on-street parking which would not be politically feasible.

**Other**
- Remove the Urban Expressway designation from US 26 within the city limits
is within the city limits and 362nd Ave. It should provide for a more cohesive long term circulation.

- The City should move quickly and aggressively to construct Industrial Way to Orient Drive.
- See the attached pdf file for additional comments submitted by fax.