



SW DENNEY ROAD SCHOLLS FERRY ROAD TO HIGHWAY 217

Open House Summary April 6, 2023

Washington County and the City of Beaverton held a project open house for the SW Denney Road improvement project on Thursday, April 6, 2023, from 5 to 7 pm at the Beaverton Operations Center (9600 SW Allen Blvd, Beaverton). No formal presentation was held. This was the second open house for the upcoming SW Denney Road improvement project. Members of the public were invited to stop in at any time during the event to review the three proposed design alternatives, identify what they did and did not like in each of the alternatives and express any concerns or issues they may have with them or the project in general.

To inform the public and interested parties of the event, Washington County sent out approximately 850 postcards to adjacent business and property owners and the surrounding neighborhoods, which included areas of CPO 3 and Denney Whitford/Raleigh West Neighborhood NAC. Open house signs were installed underneath larger project signs located at each end of the project limits. County staff sent a media release to its standard list of local and regional news media outlets (print, television and radio). An e-newsletter was sent out to project subscribers. The project website included an announcement of the open house and other County web pages and newsletters advertised the event, including Washington County Roads (www.wc-roads.com) and the *LUT Weekly Update* e-newsletter.

The purpose of this open house was to present several design alternatives for the proposed MSTIP road improvement project and to solicit feedback from the community as to which alternative they liked better than the others and their reason behind the decision; potential design refinements they would like to see be incorporated; and to identify other areas of issues or concerns that they may have. Some of the main issues and concerns heard were:

- Loss of property, mature trees (particularly the White Oaks) and vegetation
- Safe mid-block crossing (like the RRFB but would like another one)
- Want separation between vehicle lanes and bike lanes
- Don't want multi-use path as it creates conflict between cyclists and pedestrians
- Cut-through traffic using neighborhood streets to avoid current construction in area and during this project
- Traffic noise

An informal open house format was used at the meeting, allowing the public to discuss their issues and concerns directly with county and city staff as well as members of the consultant design team. Attendees were encouraged to meet the design team members, ask questions, and to record their comments on the open house comment form. Approximately 40 members of the public attended the open house, which included some that chose not to sign in.

The following exhibits were available for review at the meeting:

- SW Denney Road - Alternative No. 1: City of Beaverton Standard 3-lane
- SW Denney Road - Alternative No. 2: 2 and 3 lane combination
- SW Denney Road - Alternative No. 3: 2 and 3 lane combination with multi-use path along north side (in lieu of westbound bike lane)
- SW Denney Road - Alternative Matrix
- SW Denney Road - Cross Section for each alternative
- SW Denney Road - Existing and future traffic volumes (2022 and 2045, respectively)
- SW Denney Road - Project Schedule
- SW Denney Road - Fast Fact sheet handout

Comment forms were available for those attending the open house asking several questions: which alternative they preferred and why; what they disliked about the preferred alternative; and what were the issues with the other alternatives that they did not prefer.

Eighteen comments forms were submitted at the open house and the several other came in the week after. The following is a summary of those comments received and staff's response to these comments. Please note that staff responses are based on the comment received and the response could change based on the design that is selected:

Comment(s)
What design alternative do you prefer? What specifically do you like about the alternative you chose?
Alternative 3: Least amount of invasion
Alternative 3: Is the only design option that physically separates people riding bikes from vehicle traffic
Alternative 2: bike lanes in both directions. North side more direct/quicker than the Fanno Creek Trail
Alternative 3: 2 lanes is fine. I live right on that corner (at Scholls?), and there is <u>no</u> need for a left turn!
Alternative 1: the turn lane all the way from 217 to Scholls, the specific bike lane on both side and the sidewalks on both sides
Alternative 1: buses have 12 ft distance between mirrors. Having a center turn lane allows bus to move over to safely pass bikes, and it keeps bikes and peds separate. Love the lit crosswalk (RRFB), it's on the right street!
Alternative 2: I like that Denney narrows near Rollingwood. I believe that no matter which alternative is chosen, there should be at least one more cross walk for pedestrians
Alternative 1: less invasive – protect the oak trees
Alternative 2 or 3: Options 1 and 2 seem to have a lesser impact while still providing good bike/ped (which are a priority for me!). I also like that fewer significant trees are harmed
Alternative 2 (reluctantly chose): I have lived on Rollingwood Dr for 49 years. Turn lanes are not needed! A crosswalk down by the “pot” shop would be okay as you could cross to the park.
Alternative 2: It does not have as much as a pointless turn lane as option 1
Alternative 3: separated active transit

Don't have a preference. I know people will fight for the large trees but aren't they near the end and a danger of coming down or limbs dropping during storms? Happy there will be sidewalks
Alternative 2: 1) preserves more trees 2) keeps wheels on street (foresee conflict b/w pedestrians and dog walkers and kids on skateboards/scooter and bikers who are not safe – most bikers are ok) 3) less loss of ROW
Alternative 2: still don't like the left turn lane. Impacts access/egress for the 3 properties.
Alternative 1: Bike lane shorter – keep big oak trees across road
Alternative 1: narrower sidewalks, save oak trees please - move
Alternative 3: less impact on south side single family homes east of Rollingwood intersection.
Alternatives 2 and 3: something now that I just noticed, in Alt. 3 it says the North side to share the use of the path. Is that why you say the North side will only lose 10 ft. and my side or the South side will lose 12 ft....., why is that?
Alternative 2: Disruption of trees, vegetation, and private property should be minimized, other than at 217 and at Scholls are turn lanes necessary. If the on/off ramps are removed then maybe bot even at 217.
What specifically do you dislike about the alternative you chose?
Properties will reduced for an unnecessary turn lane
Alternative 3 only separates people on bikes on the north side of the street, not the south side
3 lanes at beginning: 3 lanes = higher traffic speeds regardless of posted speed limits. 3 lanes at the Scholls Ferry intersection: maybe keep it two lanes, keep eastbound bike lane and add a bike box at front of turn lane.
That you might do 3 lanes
Lack of safe bike lanes at SE road section and less green. But happy to have less green for <u>safe</u> shared roadways
Any of these projects will be disruptive, which is a little challenging to contemplate given how much construction is going on in this area now.
Turn lanes aren't needed. Due to the fact that Fanno Creek will forever prohibit traffic from getting to Allen, the entire subdivision is land locked. There won't be huge subdivisions – this is unnecessary.
Zero additional room is need for a turn lane. Zero
Wider vehicle travel lanes don't promote appropriate speed limit. No coordination with ODOT
Very happy to see the flashing light for pedestrians at 103 rd . I use 105 th and 103 rd mainly coming off 217/Denney to get to Heather
Utilities under the curb/green strip would be hard to access. Would this lengthen maintenance/construction or cause more disruption during process?
Left turn lane, possibility of losing oak trees; loss of privacy
Loss of privacy and less driveway. Need pull through driveway for safety and 40' mobile home access
Only one driveway access – loss of neighbor big oak trees across the road
On all three alternatives, the potential loss of the Doug firs on the corner of 103 rd and Denney which is the marker of the NW corner of my 10220 SW Denney Road lot. It is also the NW corner of the McKay land donations around 1841. The property includes 7 first growth very large and old Doug firs. I keep these trees trimmed to sails so string winds blow through these trees and they all swing together. I have videos from this last winter. Sail is to raise the canopy of all the tree 40' or more which I have had General Service has maintained ever since I purchased the home in 2010. These trees and the landscaping in the grove are natural with the many rhododendrons for a beautiful setting. O do not want to lose any of these Doug firs.
It looks like the North side benefits over the South side of Denney by 2 ft. and somebody mentioned it's because of a Tree on the North side. Now that angers me, because I paid good money for my Poly Rock Simulated Fence, plus new water lines from the Meter.

Islands and turn lanes the length of Denney from 217 to Scholls are not necessary.

What do you see as issues with the alternatives you did not choose?

None are necessary for normal traffic after detour and construction is complete. 217 and Willamette Water projects have increase traffic and delays

No physical separation of cyclists from vehicular traffic in alternatives 1 and 2

3 lanes = higher traffic speeds

Takes away trees, parking, etc.

When there are no turn lanes I worry about buses going into the bike lane. I don't like bikes sharing the sidewalk with pedestrians

Narrow passage and safe shared roads

Significant more ROW needed = more neighborhood disruption and we don't gain much in return.

Wider sidewalks – don't like. Really don't like the whole project but #2 is the best of them. Least impact on my property

Less privacy and neighborhood parking and using driveway for emergencies and deliveries and bus access

Need better emergency for access for 9780 care taking home

I would like just one 6 ft. shared path on the South side of Denney, so you don't have to dig up my parking area in front, and Poly Fence that was installed by Rick's Fence in town.

A dedicated turn lane the length of Denney is unnecessary. As a regular user I never have to wait for turning cars. The traffic along Denney should decrease with the elimination of 217 on/off ramps. It is only a neighborhood street that dead ends at Scholls and Hall. Disruption to trees and property should be minimized.

Are we missing anything that you hoped to see in any of the alternatives?

A traffic light at the end of eastbound Denney Road at Scholls Ferry Rd with left and right green arrows. Make Merry Lane a one way street – exit only at Denney Rd. No eastbound Denney traffic will be stopped for a few Merry Lane cars going west on Denney. No need for a turn lane

Protected curbs at marked crosswalks

SW 100th Terrace could use a striped crosswalk near it

No, it's stupid to spend money on these unnecessary "improvements".

I really wish the powerlines would go underground. These take a beating during storms. I'd pay more on my bond tax to get them underground 😊

Crosswalk at 100th by the bus stop

As long as the final design has sidewalks, I will be satisfied 😊

Need pull through driveway – worried about water runoff

Want a second driveway access for loop through like currently there. I use pull through for RV and trailers. Backing out onto Denney is dangerous currently

Yeah I'd prefer you just put in one path on my South side, so you don't have to move or even remove my fence.

The main issue with Denney is the intersection at Scholls. The turn for larger vehicles is very difficult and should be the main concern if you want to make changes.

Do you have any other comments about the proposed alternatives?

At Dec. 8, 2022 open house there were handouts for the Washington County Dept of Land use relocation assistance program. I hope this does not come to this (see image)
Buffered bike lanes would be great. Physical curb would be even better! Especially for eastbound bicyclists
No one living on Denney Rd has requested or desired any of this
Good work. Thanks for listening to me opinionate
Keep it simple – no need for the turn lanes. Keep the traffic on Allen – don't encourage it to Denney. Thanks 😊
Nice work!
Runoff in front of street has always had pool accumulate there. Needs better street drain.
I'm curious as to the Intersection of Denney & Scholls Ferry Rd. How much of the Apartment Complex property you are going to take out because of the 3rd turning lane and the paths ?
Making the area more car friendly allowing higher speeds is not beneficial. With the new frontage road and changes to 217, traffic should greatly increase in the area on Denney
END OF COMMENTS