



Department of  
Land Use & Transportation

# Minor Betterment Program Comments

on candidates for construction  
in 2014-2015

## Top Candidates (quick link to comments):

<a href="#">274 - 119th Av</a>	<a href="#">321 - Cornell Rd</a>	<a href="#">326 - Scholls Ferry Rd</a>
<a href="#">007 - 158th Av</a>	<a href="#">212 - Fairfield St</a>	<a href="#">282 - Thompson Rd</a>
<a href="#">317 - 209th Av</a>	<a href="#">206 - Huntington Av</a>	<a href="#">233 - Verboort Rd</a>
<a href="#">319 - Alexander St</a>	<a href="#">296 - Jenkins Rd</a>	<a href="#">298 - Walker Rd</a>
<a href="#">146 - Barnes Rd</a>	<a href="#">179 - Rock Rd</a>	<a href="#">329 - Walker Rd</a>
<a href="#">263 - Barnes Rd</a>	<a href="#">066 - Scholls Ferry Rd</a>	<a href="#">331 - Walker Rd</a>
<a href="#">175 - Cornell Rd</a>	<a href="#">083 - Scholls Ferry Rd</a>	

Candidate (link to candidate packet)	Comment
<a href="#">274 - 119th Av</a>	<p>See attached letters of support from Lynn Santelmann dated 6/10/11, from Mark Swan dated 6/13/11, from Barbara Dusicka dated 6/30/11.</p> <p>Supported by county Safe Routes to School coordinator in 2012-2013 candidate selection.</p> <p>Sidewalks are NOT a good idea for 119th; it would be more pedestrian-friendly to funnel foot traffic up 124th (need walkways on both sides of 123/124) towards Walker--where you are planning on major roadway &amp; walkway &amp; bike path improvements.</p> <p>Opposed to project 274 &amp; project 212. I walk daily with little traffic, almost no pedestrians, and zero safety concerns. However, I would comment that it would be ridiculous to approve either project #212 or #274 without approving both.</p> <p>THPRD supports MB Candidate #274. A pedestrian path on the east side of 119th Avenue between Walker Road and Fairfield Avenue would provide a safe and convenient route to THPRD's Cedar Hills Park. This park, located adjacent to William Walker Elementary, is slated for a \$6 million redevelopment effort that will feature a multipurpose synthetic athletic field, new play equipment, picnic areas and pathways, improved parking and lighting, a splash park and a community garden. [see attached letter of support from THPRD]</p> <p>TriMet notes this is close to Route 20.</p>
<a href="#">007 - 158th Av</a>	<p>I think this short section of 158th should be widened to two Southbound lanes instead of the current one. Please consider that in addition to the pedestrian pathway.</p> <p>The volume of foot traffic can anticipate growing as this area develops. Pedestrian safety is key to a positive neighborhood and business environment.</p> <p>Supported by TriMet, on Route 67.</p>

<p><u>317 - 209th Av</u></p>	<p>I think this is a great idea. There is a lot of pedestrian traffic in this area. My only concern is that improvements done today might have to be removed when/if vehicle part of this intersection is improved in the future.</p> <p>209th is due for upgrades when South Hillsboro is developed. The road may even need to be realigned with Cornelius Pass. Maybe the money for minor betterments should be spent where it will have a longer use.</p> <p>A path will provide some safety and help separate pedestrians from motorized traffic moving at 45 mph along this two-lane country road, used by hundreds of dump trucks and trailers daily.</p> <p>I think it's a great idea, but I'm also concerned with longterm changes that would need to be done if this area develops any more.</p> <p>This is a terribly congested section, just before the intersection with TV Hwy. Peds don't have a chance, even in daylight. How quickly will these improvements be undone when 209th gets widened with the coming of South Hillsboro?</p> <p>Supported by TriMet, connects to Route 57 on TV Hwy, supports <a href="#">Frequent Service</a>.</p>
<p><u>319 - Alexander St</u></p>	<p>This area is very busy with cars trying to avoid heavy traffic on TV Highwa. It is an older neighborhood with no safe pedestrian walkway. It is a good place to improve.</p> <p>I would not support this Pedestrian Path. I live on Alexander and there is really not a need to screw up everyone's front yard for this. TV Hwy ia one block south. Foot traffic can use the side walks that are already present. Alexander Street has already become a second highway since the traffic light was put in at 170th and Alexander. All these less than intelligent ideas keep pushing car (and now foot) traffic onto a residential street. This is a bad idea. Hwere and when is the public meeting going to be heald? I would like to attend this one for sure.</p> <p>A pedestrian path on the north side of the street would provide a wider shoulder and extend existing sidewalk. This would be an improvement. Often, pedestrians walk in the steet in this area in order to be seen by drivers.</p> <p>If vehicle traffic increasingly uses Alexander as a by-pass for TV Hwy, pedestrians and neighborhood children face increasing dangers we would all like to avoid for them.</p> <p>Supported by TriMet, parallel to Route 57 on TV Hwy, supports <a href="#">Frequent Service</a>.</p>
<p><u>146 - Barnes Rd</u></p>	<p>Responding to the two ped projects, one on Leahy and one on Barnes west of Cedar Hills Blvd, I'd advise spending the money on Leahy - it is loaded with people coming and going from the schools. Barnes will be taken care of with future development, but Leahy won't. High priority segment. Bike facilities are marginal and ped facilities non-existent. Barnes is important connector here for bikes.</p> <p>Another "step" in the right direction!</p> <p>I understand that you are waiting until someone develops the open field so they have to pay for the sidewalk, but this is a critical pathway for people trying to get from the apartments below up to the shopping center or max station. Every day I drive on Barnes road and see pedestrians trying to walk in the field next to Barnes because there is no</p>

	<p>sidewalk. The field is muddy and slippery. I saw an individual literally slip in the mud into the turn lane when trying to come down the slope off the field.</p> <p>Peterkort &amp; Choban should pay for this</p> <p>seems like this should come with development of the corner lot, paid for by the developer.</p> <p>I agree, Petercourt should pay for this, not the taxpayers.</p> <p>My neighborhood would benefit from the improvements of #146/Barnes and #238 Cornell Rd. Both of these projects would improve the ability of people to access grocery stores, libraries, banks and other services in the Cedar Mill area.</p> <p>A sidewalk here is a definite necessity. There already is a dirt path and pedestrians often walk along the shoulder of the road or in the bike lane.</p> <p>Needed improvement. Landowner (assume Peterkorts) should complete "temporary" pedestrian paths along all their Barnes Rd frontage, as well as Cedar Hills. Then credit them the cost of this when they finally develop and put in a real sidewalk.</p> <p>This area is desperately in need of pedestrian support. Peds shouldn't have to 'wade through the wilderness' just to stay out of the way of auto traffic.</p> <p>This is needed. There is no good walkway here on either side of the road.</p> <p>Often see pedestrians try and navigate this dangerous stretch of road. A sidewalk is urgently needed for safety along the route many walk from Sunset TC towards the neighborhoods off Barnes Rd towards Cornell Rd.</p> <p>Supported by TriMet, on Route 62.</p>
<p><u>263 - Barnes Rd</u></p>	<p>Hello! My family and I are residents in Washington County, Cedar Hills to be exact, and we are concerned about a small stretch of road that passes along our condo complex. The address is 12642 NW Barnes Rd. Just across the entrance to our condo complex, there is a trimet stop (#228), so there is considerable pedestrian traffic day and night. The problem is two-fold: 1) there is NO sidewalk on the west side of our entrance and 2) the bend in the road for oncoming traffic along with cars entering and exiting our complex present an even greater danger for those walking, essentially, in the street. Our condo complex recently cut back several juniper bushes to increase visibility from our entrance/exit; however, having no sidewalk is still a problem...I should mention that the vast majority of the foot traffic we see are people who do NOT live in our complex but who are either riding trimet and/or simply out taking a stroll, i.e. families.</p> <p>This location would not serve nearly as many people as a sidewalk between Saltzman and Murray on Filbert.</p> <p>I almost ran over a silly kid and his skateboard here. He was riding down the sidewalk and had no place to go but into the road.</p> <p>A great idea! Lots of people go back and forth along this stretch from the apartments to the grocery store, etc. Filbert sidewalk or path would also make sense.</p> <p>So much ped traffic thru' here to and from the grocery, etc. and no safe way to maneuver</p>

	<p>where the sidewalk comes to an end. Its not like people can choose to NOT buy food and they should be able to do that safely.</p> <p>TriMet notes it connects to Route 62 on Saltzman.</p>
<p><u>175 - Cornell Rd</u></p>	<p>Cornell Rd is one of the main arterials that provides a moderate to good link to points east and west along it. These improvements, no matter how minor will help a lot.</p> <p>Wasn't this already scheduled to be done? I thought we talked about it last year. It's cheap and easy - improved visibility is a great thing. Just do it!</p> <p>I drive this part of Cornell several times a month and believe the real problem here is the hill in the road east of 206th. Lowering the grade of Cornell Road by several feet would be a better long-term solution.</p> <p>This doesn't seem important. Why is sight distance that important at a signalized intersection? Movements are governed more by the signal than by the presence, therefore, the ability to see traffic. Is it feasible to simply replace existing tall plantings with short, ground cover? It would be cheaper.</p> <p>Easy solution providing improved safety - make it happen!</p> <p>I am absolutely against this. The trees are not blocking anything. If you don't like trees, they have room in Arizona, the houses are cheap too.</p> <p>I looked at the photo's and have driven that section of road. I do not see how the trees are causing a safety hazard. Please keep the trees. Has there been a lot of accidents there due to the trees?</p> <p>I'm not sure how these trees are causing safety issues. If there are safety issues, is there another way to deal with them without chopping down more trees? Trees and other natural aspects are part of what makes living in an urban area bearable.</p> <p>I also don't agree with removing trees. If anything needs to be done, perhaps limbing lower branches. It's the driver's responsibility to be aware as they drive, no matter the road.</p>
<p><u>321 - Cornell Rd</u></p>	<p>Would improve pedestrian access to Cedar Mill school from new developments along Cornell. And how about some improvemnts on north side of Cornell to the west of the school?</p> <p>Pedestrian safety in school areas ought to be very high priority, in the name of keeping kids safe. Of course they need taught self reliance and responsibility but lets give them the tools for success.</p> <p>I received your card about putting in a path on the north side of Cornell Rd. to Cedar Mill Grade School. I assume this is for the new house development beside me. We bought our home here on the north side of Cornell Rd. in June 1957 so I've lived here a long time. I am very concerned about a path where you mention. Cornell Rd. is two lanes, few shoulders &amp; high traffic. Cedar Mill is Grade School &amp; some of these little kids as young as 5 &amp; 6 years go there. I do not think any parent would even consider letting a child on it &amp; it would be school time when the traffic would be heavy. Jr. High &amp; High School kids would not have any reason to use this path. This development has one way out to Cornell R. &amp; that is the upper south east corner. It would be a pretty long walk &amp; steep in places for these little kids</p>

	<p>to walk in the rain &amp; cold in the winter to even get to this path. Even the path put in years ago on the south side of Cornell Rd is used very little by adults &amp; I never see children on it. Some mention the high cost of moving &amp; the high cost of moving the utility posts &amp; fire hydrants but that isn't important to me as one of these little kids life.</p> <p>TriMet notes this has no direct connection to transit, but could help people reach Route 50 service, possibly Route 48.</p>
<p><u>212 - Fairfield St</u></p>	<p>See attached letters of support from Lynn Santelmann dated 6/10/11, from Mark Swan dated 6/13/11, from Barbara Dusicka dated 6/30/11.</p> <p>If Walker Road is upgraded for walking this feeds right into it and would help William Walker Elementary school walkers. (priority from county Safe Routes to School coordinator)</p> <p>I am writing to express my strong support for the minor betterment projects providing sidewalks along SW 124th (project 0180) and SW Fairfield (project 0212). While our house is being renovated, we have been staying at an apartment on Center Street and I have been amazed at the volume of pedestrian traffic, particularly walking along SW 124th between Center Street and Fairfield and also also walking along Fairfield between Cedar Hills Blvd and 124th. This is a busy pedestrian thoroughfare and especially now with it getting darker earlier I worry about the safety of those pedestrians - who are often laden with groceries and walking with young children. Even if the full projects extending to Walker Rd cannot be completed with the budget available, I would strongly encourage the committee to prioritize sidewalks on the two sections mentioned above.</p> <p>SW Fairfield is the east-west connector that ties these two streets [123rd-124th] to the Cedar Hills shopping complex and shops along Cedar Hills Blvd.</p> <p>This is a residential street. Why does it need a pedestrian path? If they want a sidewalk, they should pay for one.</p> <p>[phone call] Resident who lives near 119th and Fairfield does not support this project, does not want more foot traffic and does not want to encourage more people and more garbage along her street. Also felt that the public comment period was not long enough.</p> <p>I live on Fairfield near 119th, and I have a seven year old daughter. We are very concerned about her safety on the street, given that there are no sidewalks, and we would really appreciate sidewalks.</p> <p>I live on Fairfield between 119th and 121st. With two young children a sidewalk would really improve safety and walk-ability!</p> <p>This is a very good idea and long overdue. However, BY FAR the most dire need is on Fairfield between Cedar Hills Blvd and 124th St. 90% of Fairfield pedestrian and automobile traffic is between Cedar Hills and 124th.</p> <p>Yes! Please do this!! Let us know if there is something we can do to help. We are willing to move some of our plants and other such things.</p> <p>I have lived on Fairfield Street for about 15 years. I think the Fairfield Street pedestrian betterment is a very good idea and long overdue. However, the most dire need is on Fairfield between Cedar Hills Blvd and 124<sup>th</sup> St. 90% of Fairfield pedestrian and automobile</p>

traffic is between Cedar Hills and 124<sup>th</sup>. Is that not in Washington County jurisdiction? If not, does the city of Beaverton have plans to improve Fairfield between Cedar Hills Blvd and 124<sup>th</sup> St? Please let me know if you want more information from a long time resident!

I would not support it, it should end at 124th, Walker is not a pedestrian friendly street so does not draw foot traffic. Use the money to make all the intersections 4 way stops.  
(Fairfield resident)

(from Homes Association of Cedar Hills) The consensus of the Board regarding MB#212 is unsure why Washington County feels its necessary as the pedestrian traffic on Fairfield from 123rd/124 east to 119 is minimal.

I oppose the sidewalk on this stretch of Fairfield St. We do not have a high volume of pedestrian traffic here. 124th to Cedar Hills Blvd and Center street on 124 to Fairfield st. We already have drainage issues and with a sidewalk it may be worse along with the liability the homeowners will have with the sidewalks. When the sidewalks degrade will maintain them? We need more stop signs and speed bumps before sidewalks here. Also it is only the south side residents that will be losing yard space and accepting liability. Please do not put sidewalks on this part of Fairfield

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Betterment Project #212. We have been homeowners on SW Fairfield Street for almost 12 years. We have walked, biked and driven here and have actively sought to improve neighborhood safety.

While we are in favor of the efforts of pedestrian safety and the LUT Betterment program, we are AGAINST project #212 in its current form. This would only add a sidewalk on the south side of Fairfield Street from 124th-119th Avenues. This project does not appear to take into consideration the lack of actual pedestrian traffic on that particular section of Fairfield, nor does it address the surface water and overall drainage issues experienced by a number of households in that area. Thus, this project will actually serve to increase problems for affected homeowners.

It would be best to see sidewalks throughout the entire Cedar Hills neighborhood—all streets, all sides. That would benefit all people living in and walking through the neighborhood. However, if there are insufficient funds for such an extensive capital improvement, then please focus monies on the high pedestrian traffic areas; routes most used by residents who depend upon public transportation and walking; and school bus stops.

The scope of #212 is not a good use of limited funds. The money would be better spent by addressing several smaller traffic and safety issues throughout the neighborhood:

- a) Installing stop signs and/or traffic calming devices throughout the neighborhood, especially where there are school bus stops and busy intersections.
- b) Pedestrian west-side access to/from Center Street Park via Denfield would benefit from clearly marked crossings, and "No Parking" sections right around that access point. Large numbers of people now utilize that park and that access, especially during the summer. A fair number of these people come from the apartments on the south side of the park as well as the Lynnfield neighborhood and are trying to get access to bus lines and grocery shopping.
- c) The much greater vehicular and pedestrian traffic on 123rd/124th would benefit from sidewalks on BOTH sides of that street—not just one side of the street—and they should run all the way up to Walker Road.
- d) Improve intersection visibility and provide refuge areas for pedestrians along all north/south streets that intersect with Walker Road.

If the LUT committee eventually opts to install sidewalks along Fairfield from 124th-119th, additional factors should be included in the project:

- a) Sidewalks should be on both sides of the street.
- b) Utilize better existing technology (i.e., improved gutters and permeable pavers) to help mitigate water issues.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to comment on this project.

I live on Fairfield. This project is not the best use of funds & would benefit only a few. Money is better spent on several other traffic & safety issues (stop signs, speed bumps, intersection visibility) that would benefit areas with more pedestrians.

I question the decision to place sidewalks on one side of Fairfield St. The most dangerous streets are 121st (in front of the park) and 123/124th from Walker to Center streets. These also have the most foot traffic. Please reconsider.

This is unnecessary. Why not do this from CHB east to 124 then south to Center? There isn't enough foot traffic from 119th to 124 to justify this. Who pays for it? And who pays for future maintenance?

Putting a sidewalk from SW 119th/SW Fairfield to SW SW 121st is ridiculous. Putting a sidewalk in front of my house and taking half of my front yard isn't an option!! Will it lower my property taxes? How about property value?

I'm responding to a postcard I recently received from the Department of Land Use & Transportation Operations and Maintenance concerning a proposed pedestrian path for Sw Fairfield St. from 119th Ave to 124th Ave.

I strongly disagree with spending our limited resources on the portion of SW Fairfield St between 119th Ave and 124th Ave for a sidewalk because there is very little pedestrian traffic on this portion of SW Fairfield. I have lived at 12060 SW Fairfield St for 35 years and have not see much increase in people walking in this area of SW Fairfield St.

I do think there is a need for a pedestrian path west from Sw Fairfield St to Cedar Hills Ave and from Center Street to SW Fairfield Ave. Since the traffic signal was installed on Cedar Hills Blvd. and Fairfield Ave there has been a tremendous increase in both foot and automobile traffic when people cut through our neighborhood to get from Cedar Hills Blvd. to Center Street and vice versa.

I would like to comment on the proposed pedestrian path on Fairfield from 119th to 123/124th. There are only a small number of people that walk down this part of Fairfield. It starts and stops inside the neighborhood. No real start/stop destination. The vast majority of the foot traffic is from Cedar Hills Blvd east on Fairfield to 124th and then south on 124th to Center Street and the other way around. These are people cutting through the neighborhood, not primarily people that live in the neighborhood. They are mostly people that live in the apartments along Center street.

I want to vote against candidate 0212 and only see this as an intrusion into a neighborhood that already has too many people using the neighborhood as a pass through and leaving their trash along the side of the road as they pass by. What little money the county has can be better spent somewhere else.

If you must make changes in our neighborhood, the route from Cedar Hills Blvd east on Fairfield to 124th and then south on 124th to Center Street would serve far more pedestrians. Again, these are mostly people cutting through the neighborhood not the people that live in the neighborhood.

Thanks for your consideration,

I'm for sidewalks on arteries, but they should be the homeowners responsibility on residential streets. If they want them, they can add them. If the county adds them, who

maintains them? Do the homeowners have to maintain a sidewalk they didn't want?

See attached petition from residents received 5/1/13.

i am against this "improvement". This will create a liability that I personally do not want to assume. I do not care to be responsible for something that I deem unnecessary in the first place.

Also, we should be concerned about water runoff, this would create more & increase the chance of overloading an already insufficient/out of date storm drain system.

This neighborhood has existed for over 60 years without sidewalks, why the sudden need? Justifying the budget?

No sidewalk preferred. If you must, then curb-facing walk with NO planting strip. You want select lower-income residents to plant, water and maintain a space that you deem an esthetic necessity. And accept more insurance liability. Wow. Democracy.

Opposed to project 274 & project 212. I walk daily with little traffic, almost no pedestrians, and zero safety concerns. However, I would comment that it would be ridiculous to approve either project #212 or #274 without approving both.

I am opposed to the side walk being added between 119th and 124th. I do live on this section of Fairfield so it directly affects me. It is a waste of tax payer money. There are few people that walk on this section of road. How can you call a paved sidewalk a "path". It will force more cars to park in the street because driveways will be shorter. I don't want my taxes to increase because we have a sidewalk and they will. I don't want to be liable for maintenance of the sidewalk in the future. This project will disrupt access to my property for months all for something I don't want anyway. I personally collected signatures on a petition with the vast majority saying they don't want a sidewalk. What is the point of getting public input when the people living on the street don't want it and you keep pressing the point to move ahead. If you don't live on the street, you shouldn't have a say. Your own web site talks about new taxes to fund the county and you talk like this sidewalk is "free". In looking at the sidewalk added between Cedar Hills Blvd. and 124th street along Fairfield, the driveway entrance in some cases look so abrupt I'm not sure my car could get in the drive way without scraping the bottom of the car. They also don't have any angled entrance to allow for normal turning radius entering the driveway. You will have to pull over into oncoming traffic to get in the driveway to avoid having the back wheel hit the curb. If there is money to be spent on improvements, many that signed the petition talked about fixing the drainage problems in the neighborhood. I have lived here for about 43 years and in heavy rains, storm drains in the street backup and run water down my driveway in then flood my crawl space. Fixing these kinds of problems are more important to me than a sidewalk.

I am against this improvement, there is no need to put a sidewalk on Fairfield, there is no purpose for a sidewalk. There is very little pedestrian traffic, with the exception of neighborhood residents.

I have spent thousands of dollars to attempt to divert water from entering my garage and crawl space. I have done landscaping improvements to draw some water before it gets to the storm water drain, because the storm water drain cannot handle it.

Putting in sidewalks would only funnel the water to the storm water drains, that cannot currently handle the water they receive, and that is with yards providing some relief to the drains.

	<p>This is in addition to the THPRD funneling water into our back yards from the Center street park. You are now going to give us water problems in both the front and back. Who is going to pay for us to fight all of this water you are creating for an unneeded purpose when it floods our residences. By the way, how are we supposed to make well thought out comments in 250 words or less.</p> <p>If this goes through, you are trying to ram something down our throats with no consideration of what we want, we live here, not you. Cancel this project.</p> <p>After reviewing other information on the website, I found that the Cedar Hills Homes Association provided a letter indicating they supported these projects.</p> <p>I personally attended a meeting where indicated our disapproval of these project to the Board. Please disregard their letter, it does not represent what the residents want, at least for the Fairfield portion.</p> <p>TriMet notes this is close to Route 20.</p>
<p><u>206 - Huntington Av</u></p>	<p>See attached letters of support from Lynn Santelmann dated 6/10/11, from Mark Swan dated 6/13/11, from Barbara Dusicka dated 6/30/11.</p> <p>SW Huntington is immediately opposite the entrance to Cedar Hills park and is used as overflow parking when the park gets busy for events (which I imagine it would do more so when the \$6,025,000 redevelopment project that THPRD is planning is complete). Not only is Huntington used for access to the park, it is also a major access point for the neighborhood for people walking to the nearby Cedar Hills shopping complex and is a convenient walking path towards the local grade school (William Walker) which can be accessed through Cedar Hills Park. Because of its convenience as a major access point, Huntington has lots of vehicle traffic as well as pedestrians and because the road is so wide, most vehicles tend to exceed the speed limit. Adding a sidewalk to this section of SW Huntington would benefit the community by providing a safer walking path beside this busy street and would encourage more people to walk rather than drive to the nearby mall.</p> <p>Property owner on Huntington Avenue is not opposed as long as improvement is on south side of street. Is opposed if improvement is on north side because it would impact their property frontage, established landscaping, concern about long-term maintenance responsibility of sidewalk if sidewalk installed. They already get walkers in front of their house who drop trash; don't want more. Okay if on south side; not okay if along their property. (from phone call)</p> <p>TriMet supports, direct lead to Route 20 service.</p>
<p><u>296 - Jenkins Rd</u></p>	<p>One full bus of children living at La Chateau Apt. would be able to safely walk the three blocks to school. Currently bussed due to SW Ecole Road having no sidewalks, deep ditches and high volume cut through speeding issues. (submitted by county Safe Routes to School coordinator, with note that proposal is supported by Beaverton School District)</p> <p>This would be a good value add. There are a lot of apartments along this route and would also connect the new 48 central area to the Cedar Hills crossing (North) area.</p> <p>TriMet supports, on Route 62.</p>
<p><u>179 - Rock Rd</u></p>	<p>For such a residential area, I think that the pedestrian path is a great idea.</p>
<p><u>066 - Scholls Ferry Rd</u></p>	<p>If this compliments project 366 for the north side ped path than this is an important connection. If it is in lieu of, then project 366 (pedestrian path) must take higher priority.</p>

	<p>I am responding to the notice that was communicated on the 20th of this month regarding Washington Co. intent to respond to a list of multiple projects that for reasons of either safety or improved / enhanced utility of existing corridors are currently being considered. Specifically projects 066 and 326 are here alluded to. [see complete comment posted under candidate 326]</p> <p>TriMet supports, on Route 56.</p>
<p><u>083 - Scholls Ferry Rd</u></p>	<p>This is an important pedestrian connection as it is adjacent to a public middle school and provides access to a public park. Additionally, it provides pedestrian access to retail services at Scholls/Hall.</p> <p>SW Scholls Ferry Road needs a wider shoulder by McKay school exactly like that one candidate was shown. Candidate 326 is not needed. It would cost too much and remove parking and vegetation. However, the part of SW Scholls Ferry Road by McKay school does need more safety by the shoulder.</p> <p>TriMet supports, on Route 56.</p>
<p><u>326 - Scholls Ferry Rd</u></p>	<p>This is an important connection that leads to Raleigh Hills K-8 school. It would also complete the pedestrian connection between multi-family housing and services within 1/2 mile or less, such as Fred Meyer, banks and other retail.</p> <p>Candidate 326 is not needed. It would cost too much and remove parking and vegetation.</p> <p>I am responding to the notice that was communicated on the 20th of this month regarding Washington Co. intent to respond to a list of multiple projects that for reasons of either safety or improved / enhanced utility of existing corridors are currently being considered. Specifically projects 066 and 326 are here alluded to.</p> <p>The latter project 326 poses a significant impact to the property known as 5419 SW Scholls Ferry RD. The potential of dramatically changing both the Ambience and buffer that both trees and extensive hedges provide is significant. Those essential have long defined and embellished this Home site as worthy of designation as a historic site registered as such with Washington County.</p> <p>We as the current owners have felt a unique responsibility to maintain the integrity of this home site known as the Watkins House circa 1913. We have spent close to three hundred thousand dollars over the last seven years to restore both structure maintain grounds. It is distinctly plausible that the construction and extension of a sidewalk from the Raleigh Elementary School along the N. side of Scholls Road could threaten the very nature and unique contribution that this property provides our neighborhood.</p> <p>We are extremely aware and easily reminded of the tragic death of the youth across the street from our house on Lauralwood. Safety is of paramount interest and concern from my perspective as an Emergency Department Physician. The Property identified above exist along both a busy corridor for vehicles but also exists adjacent to streets leading to several schools in the area. When considering the project 326 safety would seem to trump all other concerns. Safety, however, might be served without radically altering the benefits that trees and hedges provide to the existing home site at 5419 SW Scholls Ferry Rd.</p> <p>In Regards to any extension of the sidewalks on Lauralwood at first blush I see no major conflict as it would seem that the hedges as located would not seem to cause a major problem.</p> <p>TriMet supports, on Route 56.</p>

<p><u>282 - Thompson Rd</u></p>	<p>Pedestrian pathway needed on one side or the other of NW Thompson Road. Will provide safe access to transit, shopping, school and park. (submitted by CPO 7)</p> <p>As Bethany grows, the traffic from the new fire station will make this even more important to keep the pedestrians in a safe place.</p> <p>A significant section of this is along the portion of Thompson Road that is supposed to be realigned through the old Lehman property. Any pedestrian path installed now would have to be reworked when the road is realigned.</p> <p>If children use this route to get to school at Findley it should definitely be improved. When planning bear in mind the planned changes to the roads to incorporate as much of the sidewalk as possible.</p> <p>TriMet notes this is near Routes 50, 47 and 67.</p>
<p><u>233 - Verboort Rd</u></p>	<p>Proposed by county Safe Routes to School coordinator, benefits local school.</p> <p>This is an important project due to the proximity of the school and church, combined with the relatively high speeds of the road (regardless of the 20mph school zone).</p> <p>Much truck traffic uses Electric Co. on N Verboort Rd. driving over the sidewalk constantly, often hi speed, a safety issue for peds. Also, trucks that park parallel to the road (a frequent event for deliveries), can't see peds behind them.</p> <p>I support the Committee's efforts to make the safety of Verboort residents a priority. I have a few suggestions regarding how the plan might be most effective as I am a resident who lives on the South side of Verboort Rd, directly across the street from the Sundown Electric Company. We have lived here 17 years and sent our children to the School on Visitation Road which required a daily crossing of the busy Verboort Rd. I have several concerns about the plan of having the pedestrian path on the North as described. First, is the obvious safety issue of students walking in front of the Electric Company which I will describe. The "parking lot", or more accurately "truck yard" at the electric company (which is a highway electric installation and maintenance company) as an integral part of their daily operations, has a large volume of truck traffic, and often extremely large trucks, semis, fork lifts, delivery trucks, highway maint trucks, etc which often exit Verboort Rd, and park parallel to the road. There is no room for this business area to be moved back as the buildings are in the way. Children essentially would be walking on a path that would be crossed by these large trucks, and in addition they would be walking behind very large parked trucks that may have difficulty seeing them as they prepare to leave. Another concern about having the ped path on the North is that if the students were to be using the ped path, (which is the goal of the project), from Porter Road, they would have to cross at the intersection of Porter and Verboort Rd, which is a very dangerous intersection. There are many accidents at that intersection. I can personally remember probably ten since I have lived here, ask the Meeuwsens who live at that corner, some have involved life threatening injuries. The reason it is so dangerous is that visibility is limited by the closeness of the corner homes on the southeast and southwest sides of Porter, also the angle that Porter/Heesacker creates isn't a 90 degree, and also there is a downward dip on Verboort Rd. to the west of that intersection. My suggestion is to have the crossing point instead focused at Visitation and Verboort Roads. Visibility is much better, the road is straighter, there is only a "T" intersection to deal with, not two through roads crossing, as there is at Porter/Heesacker and Verboort Roads. Also the intersection is more prominent</p>

	<p>and there is already a flashing yellow on the corner of Visitation and Verboort Rd. Would it make more sense to have the ped path on the South side and have the children cross there? However, I see the value of east of there of doing the ped path on the NORTH side of Verboort Rd as proposed, (east from the Visitation Verboort intersection where right now there is a very dangerous path that students use and would be great to improve). Would it work to do that part, but change the plan going west by doing the ped path on the SOUTH side of Verboort Rd, ( to the Porter/Heesacker and Verboort Rd. intersection)? I think avoiding a crossing at Porter/Heesacker and Verboort Rd is very important as it is a very scary and dangerous place to cross. A “home plate” type intersection at Visitation and Verboort Road makes much more sense. If this crossing pattern I am about to describe were established at this time, ultimately, although it may not be in the cards now, I believe it would be to the benefit of all if push button cross walk lights could be installed on the “T” of Visitation and Verboort Rd., (“ my proposed home plate”). The location of “home plate” would be the South side of Verboort crossing to the Northeast corner of the intersection, an area where right now there is a huge gaping ditch presenting a hazard to peds, cyclists, and even cars that turn too sharp! This improved “landing pad” where the ditch was, would provide a safe crossing from the Northeast corner of the intersection to cross Visitation road, especially if a push light was installed there. This described route would allow for both South and North children to get to School more safely. From the standpoint of bike safety, (my husband is an avid cyclist) having the road improvement on the South side of Verboort Road should improve the safety of cyclists using the scenic bike route going North on Porter, where it turns onto Verboort Rd for the space of one block, and at which point it crosses Verboort Road at my described “home plate” intersection, going North on Visitation Rd. Thanks for considering using Betterment funds for improving the safety of our citizens.</p>
<p><u>328 - Walker Rd</u></p>	<p>Connect the sidewalks via a paved path and a bridge on the North side of the road just west of 173rd. The south side was done a couple of years ago and has made pedestrian and bicycle traffic easier and safer through the narrowing "dip" in Walker Road. Will provide much safer walking and bicycling west on Walker Road west of 173rd. No requirement to walk or bicycle through the narrow dip in Walker Road. This will dovetail nicely with the scheduled improvements on Walker between Murray and 173rd.</p> <p>I recommend funds be used for 2 of the Walker Rd. projects: 298 and 331. There are many citizens walking in this area. The current access for pedestrians makes for dangerous situations. Improvements are definitely needed.</p> <p>This section needs to be redone to four lanes of traffic with a new, higher creek crossing. Ideally, a pedestrian pathway project would be done as part of an MSTIP project for the road.</p> <p>THPRD supports MB Candidate #298. A pedestrian path along the north side of Walker Road between 173rd and 178th Avenues would improve safe access along a major roadway utilized by THPRD patrons to reach parks and trails north and south of Walker Road. The segment of Walker Road proposed for improvement intersects with THPRD’s planned Willow Creek Trail, a corridor intended to link the Westside and Waterhouse Trails with the Willow Creek MAX light rail station. [see attached letter of support from THPRD]</p> <p>TriMet supports, is on Route 59.</p>
<p><u>329 - Walker Rd</u></p>	<p>This short section of Walker is ready for a major street upgrade -- to four lanes and a new, higher creek crossing. Ideally, the fixes to the pedestrian pathways would be done at the same time.</p>

	TriMet supports, is on Route 59.
<u>331 - Walker Rd</u>	<p>This will connect the Amberglen business park and apartments to businesses and transit on 185th, though an area that can be treacherous for walkers. GREAT project!</p> <p>I recommend funds be used for 2 of the Walker Rd. projects: 298 and 331. There are many citizens walking in this area. The current access for pedestrians makes for dangerous situations. Improvements are definitely needed.</p> <p>This is a great idea and probably should have been done years ago.</p> <p>Seems like a good idea as this area is very narrow. I would assume that the whole road section/bridge would be replaced soon via MSTIP funds. Ideally, this would all be done at once as one project.</p> <p>Pedestrian access is always great in my mind.</p> <p>TriMet supports, is on Route 59 when <a href="#">Westside Service Enhancement Plan (WSEP)</a> implemented. Near Route 52, but not directly.</p>