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TRANSPORTATION SOLUTIONS

Chapter 1
Summary

## INTRODUCTION

The current transportation system plan (TSP) for the City of Hillsboro was developed from 1996 through 1998 and adopted in 1999. Since that time, the intensity of development within the City has continued to change in response to the adopted Metro 2040 Urban Growth Management Concept Plan and the Tri-Met Westside Light Rail extension. The City of Hillsboro's population has grown to approximately 74,840 with a population density of 3,400 people per square-mile. ${ }^{1}$

The TSP provides specific information regarding transportation needs to guide future transportation investment in the City and to determine how land use and transportation decisions can be coordinated beneficially for the City. Extensive research and plan analysis was conducted through 1999 to 2003.
An update to the current Hillsboro TSP was undertaken to incorporate a modified study area to include additional key intersections, recently annexed land and neighborhoods within the Hillsboro School District boundaries and to incorporate recently completed transportation projects for the City based on a 2020 planning horizon. The revised TSP study area is shown in Figure 1-1.

The TSP planning objective is to achieve optimal efficiency for each travel mode (motor vehicle, pedestrian, bicycle, transit) within Hillsboro. The following sections summarize the findings of the Transportation System Plan technical studies. Specific chapters of this report address:

- Summary report including Modal plans (Chapter 1)
- TSP Goals and Policies (Chapter 2)
- Existing Conditions (Chapter 3)
- Future Demand and Land Use (Chapter 4)

[^0]

Figure 1-1 STUDY AREA
Study Area Boundary
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## Regional Process

Concurrent planning efforts were being undertaken both regionally and locally during the development of the Hillsboro TSP update that influences the city transportation system. The Urban and Rural Washington County Transportation Plans were developed from 2000 to 2001, adopted in October 2002 and became effective in November 2002. The adjacent City of Beaverton TSP was updated in 2001and 2002 and formally adopted June 2003.

Additionally, Metro annexed 308 acres of exception land located south of Hillsboro into the Urban Growth Boundary. This section of land, referred to as Site 55 , is included within the study area for this Plan update. In 2002, the City began a community planning process ${ }^{2}$ for this area called Witch Hazel Village.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Transportation master plans have been developed for each travel mode in Hillsboro, including pedestrians, bicycles, public transit motor vehicles, trucks and other modes. The master plans in the adopted TSP have been updated to include the modified study area and recommendations based on the 2020 planning horizon. The proposed master plan updates are summarized in the following sections.

## PEDESTRIANS

Sidewalks are provided on many of the arterial and collector roadways and are required on all newly constructed streets and roadways including local streets in the City of Hillsboro. The most important existing pedestrian needs in Hillsboro are connectivity of a system of walkways with a quarter mile grid that provides access to key activity centers such as parks, schools, retail, and transit. A pedestrian system should include safe, convenient crossings of arterial streets which typically act as barriers to pedestrian movement. In the future, pedestrian needs will be similar, but there will be additional activity centers that will need to be considered and connected to the pedestrian system.

Pedestrian projects were identified and prioritized by the Hillsboro Bicycle and Pedestrian Task Force using seven criteria that were designed to provide pedestrians with system-wide connectivity to key destinations in a safe, convenient manner (see Chapter 4 for more detail). Projects on streets that were more likely to have high potential usage scored well. Additional emphasis was also placed on identifying streets which if improved, would provide safe routes to school.

The Pedestrian Master Plan project list is provided in Table 1-1. Cost estimates are based on additional sidewalk, curb and gutter, drainage, driveway adjustments and landscaping as required. Right-of-way costs and additional roadway pavement costs, if known, are included in the estimates. The cost estimates are conceptual and subject to refinement upon further study. The Pedestrian Master Plan is shown in Figure 1-2.

[^1]Table 1-1
Pedestrian Master Plan Priority Projects

| Project | From | To | Stand-alone Project | Roadway Improvement Project | Lead Agency | Cost* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N $1^{\text {st }}$ Ave | $603 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{1}^{\text {st }}$ Ave | 1283 N 1 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ Ave |  | $\checkmark$ | Washington County | Check with Wash. Co. |
| NE $6^{\text {h }}$ Ave | NE Jackson St | NE Grant St | $\checkmark$ |  | Hillsboro | \$126,000 |
| NE 15 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave | $2955 \mathrm{NE} 15^{\text {th }} \text { Ave }$ <br> (just north of) | NW Evergreen Rd |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$1,210,000 |
| NE $17{ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave | NE Barberry Dr (mostly west-side, with east-side gaps) | NE Sunrise Ln |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | TBD |
| NE $18{ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave | E Main St | NE Grant St | $\checkmark$ |  | Hillsboro | \$295,000 |
| SE $18^{\text {th }}$ Ave | SE Maple St | SE Oak St |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | TBD |
| SW $205{ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave | SW Marsuda Way (east-side) 46 SW $206^{\text {th }}$ Ave (west-side) | NW Anzalone Dr (crosses Beaverton Creek) |  | $\checkmark$ | Washington County | \$462,000 |
| NW 206 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave | Light rail tracks | NW Wilkins St |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | TBD |
| SE 21 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ Ave | SE Cypress St | SE Maple St |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$543,000 |
| NW 231 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ Ave | 6501 NE Deer Run St (east-side only) | NW Alder St |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$939,000 |
| NW 231 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ Ave | NW Alder St | NW Cornell Rd |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$1,175,000 |
| SW 231 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ Ave/ SW Century Blvd | SW Lois St | W Baseline Rd |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$19,300,000 |
| SW $239^{\text {th }}$ Ave | Tualatin Valley Hwy | SE Blossom St |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$1,549,000 for |
| SW $23{ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave | SW Frances St (east-side, County island) | 1330 SW 239 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | total project cost |
| SE 24 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave | SE Maple St | SE Washington Ct |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$4,885,000 |
| SE 24 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave | 1233 SE 24 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave | SE Maple St | $\checkmark$ |  | Hillsboro | \$228,000 |
| NE 28 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave | E Main St | NE Grant St |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$1,100,000 |
| SE 39 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave | SE Walnut St | E Main St | $\checkmark$ |  | Hillsboro | \$87,000 |
| NE Airport Rd | NE Brookwood Pkwy | Just east of 4882 NE Airport Rd (south-side); Just past TriQuint (north-side) |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$3,245,000 |


| Project | From | To | Stand-alone Project | Roadway Improvement Project | Lead Agency | Cost* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NW Aloclek Dr | NW Cornelius Pass Rd (northside); From end of existing sidewalks at road end (south-side) | NW Amberwood Dr |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$2,300,000 |
| NW Amberwood Dr | NW Cornelius Pass Rd | 21480 NW Amberwood Dr (south-side); Just past 21480 (north-side) |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$603,000 |
| NW Amberwood Dr | 21180 NW Amberwood Dr | 21000 NW Amberwood Dr (south-side only) |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$338,000 |
| NW Amberwood Dr | 20600 NW Amberwood Dr | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NW 206 }{ }^{\text {th }} \text { Ave } \\ & \text { (north-side only) } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$186,000 |
| NE Arrington Rd | NE Jackson School Rd | NE Cornell Rd | $\checkmark$ |  | Hillsboro | \$554,550 |
| SE Bentley St | SE 32 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ Ave | SW Brookwood Ave |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$1,286,000 |
| NE Brogden St | NE 28 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave | NE 43 ${ }^{\text {rd }}$ Ave |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$1,135,000 |
| SE Brookwood Ave | SE Alexander St | Tualatin Valley Hwy |  | $\checkmark$ | Washington County/ Hillsboro | \$10,000,000 |
| SW Brookwood Ave | Tualatin Valley Hwy | W Baseline Rd |  | $\checkmark$ | Washington County | \$12,500,000 |
| SE Cedar St | SE 32 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ Ave | SW Brookwood Ave |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$1,000,000 |
| NW Century Blvd | NW Bennett St | NW Wagon Way |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | Part of a cost estimate for extending Century Blvd to West Union Rd (\$9,500,000) |
| NW Connell Ave | NW Garibaldi St | NW Cory St |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$1,260,000 |
| ```SW Cornelius Pass Rd``` | SW Lois St | South of NW Aloclek Dr |  | $\checkmark$ | Washington County | TBD |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { SW Cornelius Pass } \\ & \text { Rd } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | SW Augusta Ln | SW Frances St |  | $\checkmark$ | Washington County | \$6,150,000 |
| SW Davis Rd | SW River Rd | SW 229 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | Cost estimate to be determined with development of Witch Hazel Village |
| NE Delsey Rd | NE Grant St | NE Arrington Rd | $\checkmark$ |  | Hillsboro | \$296,000 |
| NW Dennis Ave | NW Jackson St | NW Garibaldi St (east-side only) | $\checkmark$ |  | Hillsboro | \$182,000 |


| Project | From | To | Stand-alone <br> Project | Roadway Improvement Project | Lead Agency | Cost* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NW Ebberts Ave | NW Jackson St | NW Garibaldi St (west-side only) |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$296,000 |
| NE Edison St | NE 5 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave | NE $6^{\text {th }}$ Ave | $\checkmark$ |  | Hillsboro | \$26,000 |
| NW Forest St | NW Freeman Ave (includes intersection correction) | NW Connell Ave |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$458,000 |
| SW Frances St | $239^{\text {th }}$ Ave | 23615 SW Frances St |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$258,000 |
| SW Frances St | SE 71 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ Ave | 22135 SW Frances St |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$308,000 |
| NW Garibaldi St | NW Ebberts Ave | NW Connell Ave |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$265,000 |
| NW Garibaldi St | NW Adams Ave | NW Connell Ave (south-side only) |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$228,000 |
| NW Glencoe Rd | 1283 N 1 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ Ave | NE Milne Rd (mostly west-side) |  | $\checkmark$ | Washington County | TBD |
| SE Golden Rd | SW Brookwood Ave | 5580 SE Golden St |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$956,000 |
| NE Grant St | NE $17^{\text {th }}$ Ave (just west of) | NE $24^{\text {th }}$ Ave (just east of) | $\checkmark$ |  | Hillsboro | \$301,000 |
| NE Grant St Extension | NE 28 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave | NE Brookwood Pkwy |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$8,100,000 |
| NE Jackson School Rd/NE $5^{\text {th }}$ Ave | NE Grant St | NW Evergreen Rd |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$2,800,000 |
| NE Jackson School Rd/NE $5^{\text {th }}$ Ave | NE Grant St | NE Kathryn St |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | (one section of improvement) |
| NE Jackson School Rd | NE Josephine St | NE Estate Dr |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | (one section of improvement) |
| NE Jackson School Rd | NE Roghan St | NW Evergreen Rd |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | (one section of improvement) |
| SW Johnson St | SW $239^{\text {th }}$ Ave | SW Cornelius Pass Rd |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$2,001,000 |
| NE Lincoln St | NE $18{ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave | 2100 NE Lincoln St | $\checkmark$ |  | Hillsboro | \$33,000 |
| W Main St | SW Baseline St | NW Dennis Ave (north-side only) |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$427,000 |
| W Main St. | SW Baseline St. | $\mathrm{N} 1^{\text {st }}$ Ave. |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$1,600,000 |
| SE Maple St | SE $18^{\text {th }}$ Ave | SE $24{ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$422,000 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { SE Minter Bridge } \\ & \text { Rd } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | SE Morgan Rd | SE Meadowlark Dr |  | $\checkmark$ | Washington County/ Hillsboro | \$1,500,000 |
| SE Minter Bridge $\mathrm{Rd}$ | SE Anthony St | SE Meadowlark Dr (east-side only) |  | $\checkmark$ | Washington County/ Hillsboro | \$391,061 |
| SE Oak St | SE $12^{\text {th }}$ Ave | SE $18{ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$488,000 |


| Project | From | To | Stand-alone <br> Project | Roadway Improvement Project | Lead Agency | Cost* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SE Rood Bridge Rd | SE River Rd | SE Rood Bridge Dr |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$399,000 |
| SE Rood Bridge Rd | SE Rood Bridge Dr | South City Limits |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$1,000,000 |
| NE Shute Rd | About 600' north of NE Butler Rd | 3100 NE Shute Rd, second driveway (eastside only) | $\checkmark$ |  | Hillsboro | \$588,000 |
| NW Shute Rd | NW Evergreen Rd | US 26/Sunset Hwy | $\checkmark$ |  | Washington County | TBD |
| SE Spruce St | SE 21 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ Ave | SE 28 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave | $\checkmark$ |  | Hillsboro | \$257,000 |
| NE Sunrise Ln | NE Jackson School Rd | NE $17{ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$1,876,000 |
| NW Walker Rd | NW Von Neumann Dr | 1725 NW Walker Rd |  | $\checkmark$ | Washington County | \$8,600,000 |
| SE Witch Hazel Rd | SE River Rd | Tualatin Valley Hwy |  | $\checkmark$ | Washington County | TBD |

Project cost estimates represent 2003 dollars. All cost estimates are conceptual. For roadway improvement projects, the cost estimate represents the whole street improvement necessary for a multi-modal street including sidewalks. For stand-alone projects, the cost estimate represents the cost for retrofitting the existing street cross section to add sidewalks and landscape strips and associated costs.


Figure 1-2
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## BICYCLES

Bikeways are currently provided on several arterials and collectors within the City, forming a basic bikeway network. Bikeways generally consist of designated bike lanes and roadway segments where specific accommodations (additional lane widths) have been made. However, there are many gaps in the bikeway network where bikeways do not exist along arterial and collector roadways, causing significant problems for bicyclists. Bikeway connectivity throughout the City is needed.

To address these gaps in the bikeway network, the Hillsboro Bicycle and Pedestrian Task Force used guidelines developed by the City of Portland for determining under which circumstances bike lanes are appropriate for all new or reconstructed streets (see Chapter 4 for more detail). As a result of application of these guidelines, many collector streets not previously designated for bike lanes were designated as appropriate for bike lanes.

The Task Force also added a new type of bikeway treatment to the bikeway network -- a bicycle boulevard (see Chapter 4 for more detail). There are three bicycle boulevard streets in Hillsboro (see Figure 1-3). They include Connell Avenue from W. Main Street to NW Cory Street, Grant Street from N. $1^{\text {st }}$ Avenue to NE $28^{\text {th }}$ Avenue and Walnut Street from S. $1^{\text {st }}$ Avenue to SE $18^{\text {th }}$ Avenue.

Bicycle projects were identified and prioritized by the Hillsboro Bicycle and Pedestrian Task Force using the same seven criteria used to identify and prioritize pedestrian projects. All multi-use trail projects which consist of off-street facilities were also included on the Bicycle Master Plan project list as they supplement the bikeway network by providing additional connectivity to key destinations and recreational opportunities.

The Bicycle Master Plan project list is provided in Table 1-2. Cost estimates are based on additional pavement, curb and gutter, drainage, driveway adjustments and landscaping as required. Right-of-way costs and additional pavement costs, if known are included in the estimates. The cost estimates are conceptual and subject to refinement upon further study. The Bicycle Master Plan is shown in Figure 1-3.
Bicycle Master Plan Priority Projects

| Project | From | To | Stand-alone Project | Roadway Improvement Project | Lead Agency | Cost* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SE $10^{\text {th }}$ Ave | SE Baseline St | E Main St |  | $\checkmark$ | ODOT/ Hillsboro | \$1,600,000 |
| SE $10{ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave | SE Walnut St | SE Baseline St | $\checkmark$ |  | ODOT | \$157,000 |
| NE 15 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave | NE Kathryn St | NW Evergreen Rd |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$1,210,000 |
| SW 205 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave | SW Baseline Rd | NW Quatama Rd |  | $\checkmark$ | Washington County | \$6,800,000 |
| NW 206 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave | Light rail tracks | NW Wilkins St | $\checkmark$ |  | Hillsboro | \$276,000 |
| NW 206 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave | NW Wilkins St | NW Amberwood Dr | $\checkmark$ |  | Hillsboro | \$322,000 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { NW } 2066^{\text {th }} \text { Ave/ } \\ & \text { NW John Olsen Ave } \end{aligned}$ | NW Amberwood Dr | NW Evergreen Pkwy | $\checkmark$ |  | Hillsboro | \$288,000 |
| SE 21 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ Ave | SE Cypress St | SE Maple St |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$543,000 |
| NW 231 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ Ave | W Baseline Rd | NW Alder St |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$706,000 |
| NW 231 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ Ave | NW Alder St | NW Cornell Rd |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$1,175,000 |
| SW 231 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ Ave/ SW Century Blvd | SW Lois St | W Baseline Rd |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$19,300,000 |
| SW 234 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave/ SW Century Blvd | Tualatin Valley Hwy | SW Davis Rd |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | Design/cost estimates to be determined with development of Witch Hazel Village |
| SW $239^{\text {th }}$ Ave | Tualatin Valley Hwy | SW Lois St |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$1,549,000 |
| SE $24{ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave | SE Maple St | E Main St |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$4,885,000 |
| NE 25 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave | NW Intel driveway | Old Evergreen Rd |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | TBD |
| NE 28 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave | E Main St | NE Grant St |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$1,100,000 |
| SE 32 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ Ave/ SE Cypress St | SE 21 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ Ave | E Main St | $\checkmark$ |  | Hillsboro | \$210,000 |
| NE Airport Rd | NE Brookwood Pkwy | NE 51 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ Ave |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$3,245,000 |
| NW Aloclek Dr | NW Cornelius Pass Rd | NW Amberwood Dr |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$2,300,000 |
| NW Amberwood Dr | NW Cornelius Pass Rd | 21480 NW Amberwood Dr |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$603,000 |
| NW Amberwood Dr | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 21180 \mathrm{NW} \\ & \text { Amberwood Dr } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 21000 NW Amberwood Dr |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$338,000 |
| NW Amberwood Dr | $\begin{aligned} & 20600 \text { NW } \\ & \text { Amberwood Dr } \end{aligned}$ | NW 206 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$186,000 |


| Project | From | To | Stand-alone Project | Roadway Improvement Project | Lead Agency | Cost* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SE Bentley St | SE 32 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ Ave | SW Brookwood Ave |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$1,286,000 |
| SW Brookwood Ave | Tualatin Valley Hwy | W Baseline Rd |  | $\checkmark$ | Washington County | \$12,500,000 |
| SE Brookwood Ave | SE Alexander St | Tualatin Valley Hwy |  | $\checkmark$ | Washington County/ Hillsboro | \$10,000,000 |
| NW Century Blvd | NW Bennett St | NW Wagon Way |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$9,500,000 |
| NW Century Blvd | NW Jacobson Rd | North to existing bike lanes |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | (Both pieces are within cost estimates for $229^{\text {th }}$ Ave to West Union Rd) |
| NW Connell Ave (bike boulevard) | W Main St | NW Cory St | $\checkmark$ |  | Hillsboro | N/A |
| NW Connell Ave | NW Garibaldi St | NW Cory St |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$1,260,000 |
| SW Cornelius Pass Rd | SW Johnson St | SW Francis St |  | $\checkmark$ | Washington County | \$6,150,000 |
| SW Cornelius Pass $\mathrm{Rd}$ | NE Shaleen St | South of NW Aloclek Dr |  | $\checkmark$ | Washington County | TBD |
| NE Cornell Rd | West of NE Elam Young Pkwy (W) | East of NE Ray Circle | $\checkmark$ |  | Hillsboro | \$565,000 |
| SE Cypress St | Tualatin Valley Hwy | SE 21 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ Ave | $\checkmark$ |  | Hillsboro | \$97,000 |
| SW Davis Rd | SW River Rd | SW $229^{\text {th }}$ Ave |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | Cost estimate to be determined with development of Witch Hazel Village |
| SW Frances St | SW $239^{\text {th }}$ Ave | SE 71 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ Ave |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$156,000 |
| SW Frances St | SE 71 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ Ave | 22135 SW Frances St |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$308,000 |
| NW Glencoe Rd | NE Jackson St | NW Evergreen Rd |  | $\checkmark$ | Washington County | \$14,800,000 |
| SE Golden Rd | SW Brookwood Ave | SW $239^{\text {th }}$ Ave |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$955,000 |
| NE Grant St (bike boulevard) | N 1 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ Ave | NE $28{ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave | $\checkmark$ |  | Hillsboro | N/A |
| NE Grant St | NE Cornell Rd | NE 28 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave | $\checkmark$ |  | Hillsboro | \$7,200 |
| NE Grant St Extension | NE 28 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave | NE Brookwood Pkwy |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$8,100,000 |
| NE Griffin Oaks St | NE 15 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave | NE 25 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave | $\checkmark$ |  | Hillsboro | \$33,000 |


| Project | From | To | Stand-alone Project | Roadway <br> Improvement <br> Project | Lead Agency | Cost* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NW Imbrie Dr | NW Evergreen Pkwy | NW Cornelius Pass Rd | $\checkmark$ |  | Hillsboro | \$284,000 |
| NE Jackson School Rd | NE Grant St | NE Evergreen Rd |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$2,800,000 |
| SW Johnson St | SW $239^{\text {th }}$ Ave | SW Cornelius Pass Rd |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$2,001,000 |
| W Main St | SW Baseline St | NW Dennis St |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$270,000 |
| W Main St | SW Baseline St | N $1^{\text {st }}$ Ave |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$1,600,000 |
| SE Maple St | SE 13 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave | SE $18^{\text {th }}$ Ave | $\checkmark$ |  | Hillsboro | \$3,500 |
| SE Maple St | SE $18^{\text {th }}$ Ave | SE $24{ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$435,000 |
| SE Minter Bridge Rd | SE Morgan Rd | Tualatin Valley Hwy |  | $\checkmark$ | Washington County/ Hillsboro | \$1,500,000 |
| SE Minter Bridge Rd | SE Anthony St | SE Meadowlark Dr |  | $\checkmark$ | Washington County/ Hillsboro | \$391,000 |
| NW Quatama Rd | NW 227 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave | NW 206 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave |  | $\checkmark$ | Washington County | \$4,368,000 |
| SE River Rd | Tualatin Valley Hwy | SE Witch Hazel Rd |  | $\checkmark$ | Washington County | Check with Wash. County |
| SE Rood Bridge Rd | SE River Rd | SE Rood Bridge Dr |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$399,000 |
| SE Rood Bridge Rd | SE River Rd | South City Limits |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$1,000,000 |
| NW Shute Rd | NW Evergreen Rd | US 26/Sunset Hwy | $\checkmark$ |  | Washington County | \$888,000 |
| NW Walker Rd | NW Amberglen Pkwy | NW $185^{\text {th }}$ Ave |  | $\checkmark$ | Washington County | \$8,600,000 |
| SE Walnut St (bike boulevard) | S $1^{\text {st }}$ Ave | SE $18^{\text {th }}$ Ave | $\checkmark$ |  | Hillsboro | N/A |
| Multi-Use Trails |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beaverton Creek Trail | NW Cornelius Pass Rd | SW 206 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave | $\checkmark$ |  | Hillsboro | \$370,600 |
| Beaverton Crk Trail <br> Under-crossing | SW 206 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave | SW $206{ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave | $\checkmark$ |  | Hillsboro | \$39,000 |
| Bethany Pond Trail | NW Cornelius Pass Rd | NW Rock Creek Blvd | $\checkmark$ |  | Hillsboro | \$58,000 |
| Bronson Creek Trail | NW 206 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave | NW Walker Rd | $\checkmark$ |  | Hillsboro | \$172,000 |
| Bronson Creek Trail <br> Under-crossing | NW Walker Rd | NW Walker Rd | $\checkmark$ |  | Hillsboro | \$39,000 |
| Bronson Creek Trail | NW Walker Rd | NW Eider Ct | $\checkmark$ |  | Hillsboro | \$35,000 |
| Rock Creek Trail | Rood Bridge Park | SE River Rd | $\checkmark$ |  | Hillsboro | \$29,000 |

DKS Associates
transportation solutions

| Project | From | To | Stand-alone Project | Roadway <br> Improvement <br> Project | Lead Agency | Cost* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rock Creek Trail includes pedestrian crossing of River Rd | SE River Rd | Tualatin Valley Hwy | $\checkmark$ |  | Hillsboro | \$211,000 |
| Rock Creek Trail incl. ped. crossing of TV Hwy | Tualatin Valley Hwy | SW Brookwood Ave | $\checkmark$ |  | Hillsboro | \$765,000 |
| Rock Creek Trail incl. ped. crossing of Brookwood Ave | SW Brookwood Ave | W Baseline Rd | $\checkmark$ |  | Hillsboro | \$784,000 |
| Rock Creek Trail Under-crossing of Baseline Rd | East of SW 231 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ Ave/W Baseline Rd | W Baseline Rd | $\checkmark$ |  | Hillsboro | \$39,000 |
| Rock Creek Trail incl. a ped. crossing at NW $227^{\text {th }}$ Ave | NW 227 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave/ NW Quatama Rd | NW Cornelius Pass Rd |  | $\checkmark$ | Hillsboro | \$1,110,000 |
| Rock Creek Trail includes undercrossing of Cornelius Pass Rd | NW Cornelius Pass Rd/NW Wilkins St | Orchard Park | $\checkmark$ |  | Hillsboro | \$581,000 |
| Rock Creek Trail crossing at NW Cornell Rd | Mid-block crossing east of NW Aloclek Pl | West of NW John Olsen Ave | $\checkmark$ |  | Hillsboro/ <br> Washington County | \$285,000 |
| Rock Creek Trail crossing at NW Evergreen Pkwy | Mid-block crossing east of NW Aloclek Pl | West of NW John Olsen Ave | $\checkmark$ |  | Hillsboro/ <br> Washington County | \$255,000 |
| Witch Hazel Creek Trail | Rood Bridge Park/ <br> Rock Creek <br> Confluence | SE River Rd | $\checkmark$ |  | Hillsboro | \$59,000 |
| Witch Hazel Creek Trail | SE River Rd | SW 247 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave/ SW Brookwood Ave | $\checkmark$ |  | Hillsboro | Design/cost estimates to be determined with development of Witch Hazel Village |

* Project cost estimates represent 2003 dollars. All cost estimates are conceptual. For roadway improvement projects, the cost estimate represents the whole street improvement necessary for a multi-modal street including bicycle lanes. For stand-alone projects, the cost estimate represents the cost for retrofitting the existing
transporatation soution
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## TRANSIT

Tri-Met provides transit service along many arterial and a few collector roadways in the City of Hillsboro. The most important existing transit need in Hillsboro is to increase transit coverage. In the future, transit needs will be similar, but there will be additional residential and employment developments that will need to be considered and connected based on ridership demand. The Transit Master Plan is shown in Figure 1-4.

In addition to light rail transit, Metro's RTP includes bus transit route designations along corridors defined as follows ${ }^{3}$ :

- Frequent Bus - Frequent Bus service provides more recurrent service than rapid bus along selected transit corridors. This service runs at least every 10 minutes and includes transit preferential treatments such as reserved bus lanes and signal preemption.
- Regional Bus - Regional bus service is provided on Hillsboro's primary urban streets, including Cornell Road, $185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue, $229^{\text {th }} / 231^{\text {st }}$ Avenue, and Evergreen Parkway (eastern half). This type of service operates with varied frequencies and provides conventional stop spacing along the route. Transit preferential treatments and passenger amenities such as covered bus shelters, special lighting, signal preemption and curb extensions are appropriate at high ridership locations.
- Community Bus - Community bus lines provide coverage and access to primary and secondary land use components. This type of service runs as often as every 30 minutes on weekdays. Weekend service is provided as demand warrants.

The RTP has identified several roadways within Hillsboro for regional bus service including $185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue, Cornell Road, Evergreen Parkway, $229^{\text {th }} / 231^{\text {st }} / 234^{\text {th }}$ Avenue and Baseline Road. High quality regional transit service on corridors can link many high employment, regional center, and town center areas.

There is a future need to improve local transit service coverage, especially within the areas south of Tualatin Valley Highway, between Baseline Road and Tualatin Valley Highway and north of US 26. The RTP has designated Community Bus service on several roadways in Hillsboro including West Union, Rock Creek, Cornelius Pass, River Road and Brookwood. The community bus designations are shown in the Transit Master Plan.

[^2]
## City of Hillsboro Transportation System Plan



Figure 1-4 TRANSIT MASTER PLAN
RTP Designations
Frequent Bus
$\because \quad$ Community Bus

## DKS Associates

## MOTOR VEHICLES

Motor vehicle needs were analyzed in terms of existing conditions and future 2020 forecasts. Based upon the evaluation of intersection level of service, 38 of the study intersections operate at or worse than Level of Service E in the 2020 evening peak hour with no improvements. This compares with seven intersections operating at these levels today. The impact of future growth (caused by nearly 47,000 additional trips in the evening peak hour in 2020 as compared to today) would be severe without significant investment in transportation improvements. Poor performance on freeways and arterials would result in substantial impacts (added through traffic) to neighborhood and collector routes.

Figure 1-5 outlines the locations where major improvements are identified. Figure 1-6 summarizes the Hillsboro streets anticipated within the TSP planning horizon to require right-of-way for more than two lanes. Figure 1-7 identifies substandard study intersection locations based on 2020 conditions. A summary list of roadway improvement projects is provided in Table 1-3. A summary list of intersection improvement projects is provided in Table 1-4.

Predictably, increased traffic volumes necessitate the need for additional traffic control devices. The Hillsboro Traffic Signal Master Plan, displayed in Figure 1-8, proposes 25 new traffic signals located throughout the TSP study area.

## Motor Vehicle Project List

| Location | Description | Planning Status* | Lead Agency | Cost** |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Highest Priority Projects |  |  |  |  |
| Baseline Road: Lisa to Brookwood | Widen to 5 Lanes | RTP 3103 | Wash. County | \$6,800,000 |
| Baseline Road: Brookwood to 231 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ | Widen to 3 Lanes | RTP 3102 | Wash. County | \$22,700,000 |
| Brookwood Pkwy: Baseline Rd. to TV Hwy | Widen to 3 Lanes | RTP 3137 | Wash. County | \$8,700,000 |
| Cornelius Pass Road: Aloclek to Baseline | Widen to 5 Lanes | RTP 3135 | Wash. County | \$17,000,000 |
| Cornelius Pass Road: Baseline to TV Hwy | Widen to 5 Lanes | RTP 3134/3126 | Wash. County | \$16,170,000 |
| Evergreen: 25th to 253 ${ }^{\text {rd }}$ | Widen to 5 Lanes | RTP 3131 | Wash. County | \$4,680,000 |
| 185th: TV Highway to Bany | Widen to 3 Lanes | Planned | Wash. County | \$4,100,000 |
| Cornell: $185^{\text {th }}$ to $25^{\text {th }}$ | Interconnect Traffic Signals | RTP 3150 | Wash. County | \$1,000,000 |
| TV Highway: $209{ }^{\text {th }}$ to $10^{\text {th }}$ | Interconnect Traffic Signals | RTP 3124 | ODOT | \$1,730,000 |
| TV Highway Boulevard | Complete Boulevard Improvements | RTP 3119 | ODOT | \$2,300,000 |
| Aloclek: Amberwood to Cornelius Pass | Extend 3 lane road | RTP 3104 | Hillsboro | \$2,950,000 |
| 231st Avenue Extension | Extend south of Baseline to Lois Street 3 Lane roadway | RTP 3106 | Wash. County | \$19,300,000 |
| $231^{\text {st }} / 234^{\text {th }}$ Avenue: Dogwood to Baseline | Widen to 3 Lanes | RTP 3106 | Wash. County | \$5,000,000 |
| Brookwood Extension s/o TV Hwy | Extend 3 Lanes, realign Witch Hazel | RTP 3118 | Wash. County | \$10,000,000 |
| River Rd/Davis Rd | Construct Roundabout | Not in Plans | Wash. County | \$402,700 |
| Alexander Rd | Extend west of $247^{\text {th }}$ Ave to Davis Rd | Not in Plans | Wash. County | \$2,084,000 |
| Davis Rd | Extend to River Rd | Not in Plans | Wash. County | \$640,600 |
| Witch Hazel Village | Construct three roundabouts (two on Davis Rd, one at Alexander $/ 247^{\text {th }}$ Ave) | Not in Plans | Wash. County | \$922,300 |
| Huffman Road | Extend west of Shute Rd to $253{ }^{\text {rd }}$ Ave | Not in Plans | Wash. County | \$1,200,000 |
| $253{ }^{\text {rd }}$ Avenue | Improvements north of Evergreen Road; add southbound right turn lane | Not in Plans | Wash. County | \$690,000 |
| Dawson Creek Drive | Realign to connect with $253{ }^{\text {rd }}$ Ave | Not in Plans | Hillsboro | \$1,000,000 |
| Subtotal |  |  |  | \$129,369,600 |

## Description

## *snieqs 6u!̣uueld

| Second Highest Priority Projects |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Amberwood: 206th to Cornelius Pass | Widen to 3 Lanes | Not in Plans | Hillsboro | \$1,700,000 |
| Butler Road: 63rd to Brookwood/Airport | Widen and extend to 3 lane road | Not in Plans | Hillsboro | \$1,400,000 |
| Cornell: Arrington to Main | Widen to 5 Lanes | RTP 3128 | Wash. County | \$6,800,000 |
| Glencoe: Lincoln to Evergreen | Widen to 3 Lanes | RTP 3099 | Wash. County | \$4,467,000 |
| Amberglen Parkway: Walker to 206 ${ }^{\text {th }} * * *$ | Extend 3 Lane roadway | Not in Plans | Hillsboro | \$2,400,000 |
| Jackson School Road: Evergreen to Grant | Widen to 3 Lanes | RTP 3101 | Hillsboro | \$5,162,850 |
| Jacobson Road at Helvetia | Realign intersection north of US 26 | Not in Plans | Hillsboro | \$1,900,000 |
| Quatama Street: LRT to Cornelius Pass | Widen/improve 2/3 lane road | RTP 3091 | Hillsboro | \$2,400,000 |
| Salix Extension: LRT to Walker *** | Extend 2/3 Lane roadway | Not in Plans | Hillsboro | \$4,900,000 |
| Walker Road: Amberglen to $185{ }^{\text {th }}$ | Widen to 5 Lanes | RTP 3144 | Wash. County | \$3,850,000 |
| $10^{\text {th }}$ Avenue: Walnut to Washington | Widening and turn lanes | RTP 3113/3114/3115 | ODOT/Wash. County | \$5,700,000 |
| $2^{\text {nd }} / 3^{\text {rd }} / 4^{\text {th }} / 5^{\text {th }}$ Avenues downtown | Convert to two-way operation | Not in Plans | Hillsboro | \$2,000,000 |
| East-West Collector: Cornelius Pass to Salix *** | Extend 2/3 lane road | RTP 3105 | Hillsboro | \$4,400,000 |
| Johnson: $185{ }^{\text {th }}$ to $234{ }^{\text {th }}$ | Widen to 3 lanes | WACO 122 | Wash. County | \$13,500,000 |
| 185th Avenue: Westview to Springville | Widen to 5 Lanes | RTP 3067 | Wash. County | \$5,700,000 |
| 206th Avenue: Amberwood to LRT | Widen to 3 Lanes | Not in Plans | Hillsboro | \$3,500,000 |
| Other Collector Reconstruction | Multiple Locations | Not in Plans | Wash. County/ Hillsboro | \$43,300,000 |
| Intersection Improvements | Multiple Locations (see Table 1-5) | Not in Plans | ODOT/Wash. County/ Hillsboro | \$31,800,000 |
| Other Traffic Signals (16) | City/County operational enhancement | Not in Plans | Wash. County/ Hillsboro | \$4,500,000 |
| US 26/Cornelius Pass Road | Build new diagonal ramps in NE \& SE quadrants. Add ramp meter storage. | RTP 3133 OTIA | ODOT/Wash. County | \$5,700,000 |
| US 26/Shute Road | New loop ramp and interchange modifications | RTP 3149 | ODOT/Wash. County | \$6,400,000 |
| US 26/229th Overcrossing | Extend 229th from Evergreen to West Union as 3 Lane roadway | RTP 3139/3140 | Hillsboro | \$9,500,000 |


| Location | Description | Planning Status* | Lead Agency | Cost** |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| $197^{\text {th }} / 198^{\text {th }}$ : Baseline to TV Highway | Widen to 3 lanes | WACO 123 | Wash. County | \$13,900,000 |
| US 26/Jackson School Road | Construct new interchange | RTP 3003 | ODOT | \$18,480,000 |
| 209 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ : TV Highway to Rosedale | Realign and widen to 3 lanes | WACO 12 | Wash. County | \$21,000,000 |
| Subtotal |  |  |  | \$224,359,850 |
| Third Highest Priority Projects |  |  |  |  |
| Airport Road: Evergreen to Brookwood | Realign and widen to $2 / 3$ lanes | Not in Plans | Hillsboro | \$3,200,000 |
| Baseline Road/185th Intersection | Upgrade Capacity/Grade Separation | Not in Plans | Wash. County | \$17,000,000 |
| Cornelius Pass Road Extension | Extend 3 lane road south of TV Hwy to $209^{\text {th }}$ with grade separation over/under TV Hwy | Not in Plans | Wash. County | \$15,900,000 |
| Heritage: 185th to Salix | Extend 2 lane road | Not in Plans | Wash. County | \$2,200,000 |
| Parr: $185^{\text {th }}$ to Salix | Connect 3 lane road | Not in Plans | Wash. County | \$2,200,000 |
| Quatama Street: Cornelius Pass to $227^{\text {th }}$ | Widen/improve $2 / 3$ lane road | RTP 3091 | Hillsboro | \$3,800,000 |
| Quatama Street: 227th to Baseline | Extend $2 / 3$ lane road | RTP 3091 | Hillsboro | \$3,200,000 |
| TV Highway: Access Control | Driveway/Turn Lane modifications | RTP 3060 | ODOT/Wash. County | \$17,300,000 |
| East-West Collector: Brookwood to $28{ }^{\text {th }}$ | Extend Grant Street with a new 3 lane road n/o LRT | RTP 3117 | Hillsboro | \$9,000,000 |
| East-West Collector: River to 209 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ | Extend and widen to 3 lane road | Not in Plans | Wash. County | \$20,700,000 |
| 28th Avenue: Cornell to Baseline | Widen to 3 lanes | RTP 3114 | Hillsboro | \$3,200,000 |
| 185th Avenue: Cornell to Walker | Widen to 7 Lanes | Not in Plans | Wash. County | \$3,600,000 |
| Alexander: $185^{\text {th }}$ to $209{ }^{\text {th }}$ | Widen to 3 lanes | WACO 121 | Wash. County | \$10,900,000 |
| Kinnaman: $209^{\text {th }}$ to $198{ }^{\text {th }}$ | Widen to 3 lanes | WACO 200 | Wash. County | \$4,600,000 |
| 188th Extension: Cornell to Walker | Extend 3 lane road | Not in Plans | Hillsboro | \$ 2,700,000 |
| 205th Avenue: LRT to Baseline | Widen to 5 Lanes | RTP 3107 | Wash. County/ Hillsboro | \$7,100,000 |
| US 26 Auxiliary Lanes: Shute to $185{ }^{\text {th }}$ | Add Auxiliary Lanes | Not in Plans | ODOT | \$22,700,000 |
| US 26/Glencoe Road | Interchange improvement/modernization | STIP safety projects | ODOT | \$13,600,000 |
| Evergreen: Glencoe to $25^{\text {th }}$ | Widen to 5 Lanes | Not in Plans | Wash. County | \$4,000,000 |

Third Highest Priority Projects
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DKS Associates
transpopatation soutions

| Location | Description | Planning Status* | Lead Agency | Cost** |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TV Highway: $185^{\text {th }}$ to Cornelius Pass | Widen to 7 lanes ${ }^{4}$ | Not in Plans | ODOT/Wash. County | \$50,000,000 |
| Evergreen extension: Glencoe to Hornecker | New 3 lane roadway | Not in Plans | Wash. County | \$9,200,000 |
| Springville extension: West Union to $185^{\text {th }}$ | New 3 lane roadway | Not in Plans | Wash. County | \$5,900,000 |
| West Union: Springville extension to $185^{\text {th }}$ | Widen to 3 lanes | WACO 93 | Wash. County | \$1,000,000 |
| West Union: Springville extension to Cornelius Pass | Widen to 5 lanes | WACO 104 | Wash. County | \$12,400,000 |
| Subtotal |  |  |  | \$245,400,000 |
| MOTOR VEHICLE STREET IMPROVEMENT TOTAL |  |  |  | \$599,129,450 |

[^3]${ }^{4}$ Due to potential encroachment on the railroad right-of-way to the south of TV Highway, future widening will likely be concentrated mostly on the north side of the
highway corridor.
Hillsboro Transportation System Plan Update
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Figure 1-6

Table 1-4

## Study Intersection Project List

| No. | Study Intersection | Proposed Improvements |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ Avenue/Main Street | Add WB right turn lane |
| 2 | Shute Road/US 26 WB ramps | Add SB through lane, construct interchange improvements |
| 3 | Shute Road/US 26 EB ramps | Install traffic signal, construct interchange improvements |
| 4 | Cornelius Pass/US 26 WB ramps | Construct WB off ramp |
| 5 | Cornelius Pass/US 26 EB ramps | Construct NB to SB diamond ramp as a free movement |
| 6 | Evergreen Parkway/229 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | Add NB/SB right turn lanes, protected-permitted N/S signal, protected $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{W}$ signal |
| 7 | Evergreen Road/Cornelius Pass | Add $2^{\text {nd }}$ left turn lane on NB/SB/EB approaches, EB and WB right turn lanes, protected $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{W}$ signal |
| 8 | $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ Avenue/Grant Street/Glencoe | Install traffic signal: Glencoe 3 lanes (add turn lanes on Grant) |
| 9 | Cornell Road/Brookwood Parkway | Add SB right turn lane |
| 10 | Cornell Road/229 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ - $231^{\text {st }}$ Avenue | Add EB and SB right turn lanes, add WB $2^{\text {nd }}$ left turn lane |
| 11 | Cornell Road/Cornelius Pass * | Add WB and SB right turn lanes, $2^{\text {nd }}$ EB left turn lane, protected E/W signal |
| 12 | $185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/Walker Road * | Add $2^{\text {nd }}$ SB and EB left turn lanes, WB right turn lane: $185{ }^{\text {th }}$ |
| 13 | Baseline Road/185 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue * | Add $2^{\text {nd }}$ SB left turn lane |
| 14 | $10^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/Baseline Road | Add SB right turn lane, NB $2^{\text {nd }}$ left turn lane, restripe for 2 ${ }^{\text {nd }} \mathrm{WB}$ lane |
| 15 | $13^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/River Road/TV Hwy | Add EB right turn lane and NB left turn lane |
| 16 | Brookwood Parkway/TV Hwy | Extend Brookwood south, $2^{\text {nd }}$ SB left turn lane |
| 17 | $239^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/TV Hwy | Traffic signal |
| 18 | Cornelius Pass/TV Hwy * | Add $2^{\text {nd }} \mathrm{NB} / \mathrm{SB} / \mathrm{EB}$ left turn lanes |
| 19 | Bentley Street/Brookwood Avenue | EB left turn lane |
| 20 | Harewood Street/Jackson School | Add EB right turn lane |
| 21 | $185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/TV Hwy * | Add EB right turn lane |
| 22 | Cornell Road/Stucki Avenue | Add EB right turn lane |
| 23 | Shute Road/Evergreen Road | Add ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ EB left turn lane, EB and WB right turn lanes |
| 24 | Witch Hazel Road/River Road | Traffic signal |
| 25 | Minter Bridge Road/TV Hwy | Convert NB through-left lane to a separate left turn lane and change $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{S}$ signal phasing to protected |
| 26 | $10^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/Oak Street | Third NB through lane |
| 27 | Grant Street $/ 25^{\text {th }}-288^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | Add EB left turn lane |
| 28 | Evergreen Road/ $185{ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue * | Add SB right turn lane, NB $2^{\text {nd }}$ left turn lane |
| 29 | Cornell Road/Grant Street | EB/WB left turn lane |
| 30 | Cornell Road/ $10^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/Main | Add through NB and SB lanes |


| No. | Study Intersection | Proposed Improvements |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 31 | Cornell Road/185 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue * | Add NB and SB double left turn lanes, add NB right turn lane: $185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue 7 lanes |
| 32 | Baseline Road/Cornelius Pass | Add NB and SB right turn lanes: Baseline 5 lanes, Cornelius Pass 5 lanes |
| 33 | $229{ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/Alexander Street | Install traffic signal |
| 34 | $234{ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/Alexander Street | Install traffic signal |
| 35 | River Road/Rood Bridge Road | Add an eastbound right-turn lane |
| 36 | $229^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/TV Hwy | Add a northbound right-turn lane |
| 37 | 209 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/TV Hwy | Add northbound and southbound right turn lanes |
| 38 | $253{ }^{\text {rd }}$ Avenue/Evergreen Road | Install traffic signal |

* Potential grade separation candidate Washington County 2020 Transportation Plan

Figure 1-8

A East-West Connector Study Area

## DKS Associates

## Functional Classification

The current functional classification of streets in Hillsboro was updated to reflect regional planning and the local needs of Hillsboro. Classifications of principal arterial, arterial, collector, neighborhood routes and local streets have been developed based upon connectivity, which is the best indicator of function. Figure 1-9 summarizes the functional classification recommendations.

## Connectivity/Local Street Plan

The current connectivity plans for Hillsboro were updated to reflect recent changes land use, the expanded study area and recently constructed projects since the 1999 TSP. Recommended local connections for vehicles and pedestrians/bicycles are shown on Figures 1-10 to 1-17 (representing the City of Hillsboro neighborhood districts). The arrows represent potential connections and the general direction for the placement of the connection. In each case, the specific alignments and design will be better determined upon development review. The criteria used for providing connections are as follows:

- 300 to 500 foot grid for pedestrians and bicycles
- 530 foot grid for automobiles

To protect existing neighborhoods from potential traffic impacts of extending stub end streets, it may be appropriate to incorporate neighborhood traffic management into their design and construction of connector roadways. The arrows shown on the local connectivity figures indicate priority connections only. Other stub end streets in the City's road network may become cul-de-sacs, extended cul-de-sacs or provide local connections. Connections from these stub end streets could be deemed appropriate and beneficial to the public, as future development occurs. The goal is to continually improve city connectivity for all modes of transportation.

## Freeway

Principal Arterial
Arterial

-     - Planned Arterial

Collector

-     - Planned Collector
— Neighborhood Route
-     -         - Planned Neighborhood Route Local Street

Study Area Boundary
Special Study Area Boundary
East-West Connector Study Area
Alignment subject to UGB expansion and/or future refinement or study in these areas.
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Figure 1-16
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$\boldsymbol{v}$ School
$\geqslant$ Planned Local Street ConnectionStudy Boundary
*
The OHSU West Campus Master Plan includes an east-west connection. However, final determination of this connector and alignment(s) will require further study.
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## TRUCKS/FREIGHT MOVEMENT

Efficient truck and freight transport plays a vital role in the economy via the movement of raw materials and finished products. The establishment of through truck routes provides for this movement while at the same time maintaining neighborhood livability, public safety and minimizing maintenance costs of the roadway system. To accomplish this, a map of through truck routes in Hillsboro has been developed (Figure 1-18). This is intended to address the movement of trucks through the study area with regional destinations, not local deliveries. The objective of this route designation is to allow these routes to focus on design criteria that is "truck friendly", i.e. 12 foot travel lanes, greater access spacing, 35 foot (or larger) curb returns and pavement design that accommodates a larger share of trucks. The truck master plan is shown in Figure 1-18.


## DKS Associates

## Chapter 2 Goals and Policies

The 1999 Hillsboro TSP established goals and policies to guide the City's 20 year vision of transportation system needs. The 1999 TSP consists of seven goals with related policies organized under each goal. The goals are simple, brief guiding statements, which describe a desired result. The policies focus on how goals will be met by describing the types of actions that will contribute to achieving the goal. Many of these goals and policies pertain specifically to motor vehicles. These goals and policies represent the criteria that all motor vehicle improvements or changes in Hillsboro should be measured against to determine if they conform to the intended direction of the City.

No changes to the overall goals are recommended with this TSP update. Goal statements have been modified in order to better articulate their purpose. Several policies discussed in the 1999 TSP have been updated to reflect current regional and local needs. The proposed goals and policies are summarized below.

## GOALS AND POLICIES

Goal 1: Promote Safety. Develop and Maintain a Safe Transportation System that Conforms to the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) and American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Guidelines.
Key Elements: Accident Reduction, Maintenance, Access Management
Policy 1. Build and maintain a well-defined and safe transportation system within the City for pedestrian, bicycle, transit, motor vehicles, air and rail travel.
Policy 2. Establish a City monitoring system that regularly evaluates, prioritizes and mitigates high accident locations within the City.
Policy 3. Promote transportation system safety through education and law enforcement.
Policy 4. Implement access management standards for arterial and collector roadways consistent with City, County and State requirements.
(i) The City of Hillsboro shall coordinate with ODOT in the evaluation of any action (such as a comprehensive plan amendment) that would affect the function of the Cornelius Pass Road interchange. (ii) The function of the Cornelius Pass Road interchange is to provide safe and efficient access for long-distance, regional trips (e.g. between Hillsboro and the Portland metropolitan area) as well as for local traffic that originates and terminates within Hillsboro. The interchange has been designed to provide capacity and
safe operations to accommodate this function over the 15-year planning period.
Policy 5. Provide adequate access to properties for emergency services vehicles throughout the City through the City land use planning and development review procedures.

Policy 6. Do not permit land uses within airport noise corridors that are not noise compatible, and avoid the establishment of uses that are physical hazards to air traffic at the Hillsboro Airport.

Policy 7. Coordinate, when applicable and appropriate, federal, state and local safety and compliance standards in the operation, construction and maintenance of the rail and pipeline systems in Hillsboro.

Policy 8. Encourage grade separations or gate controls at primary railroad crossings of streets.

Goal 2: Support Multi-modal Travel. Provide a Balanced Transportation System that Serves the Many Modes of Travel.
Key Elements: Pedestrians, Bicycles, Motor Vehicles, Transit, Other modes
Policy 1. Design transportation facilities within Hillsboro that accommodate multiple modes of travel within transportation corridors, where appropriate, and encourage their use to move people, goods and services within these corridors. Encourage and coordinate efforts to provide convenient linkages between various modes of travel.
Policy 2. Construct bikeways and pedestrians facilities on major, new or reconstructed arterial and collector streets within Hillsboro (with roadway construction or reconstruction projects.) Coordinate (or require where appropriate) convenient access to existing or planned bike and pedestrian facilities from nearby schools, parks, transit, public facilities and retail areas.

Policy 3. Connect gaps in the sidewalk system according to the Hillsboro Pedestrian System Plan.
Policy 4. Link the regional trails network to Hillsboro's bicycle and pedestrian systems.
Policy 5. Encourage and work with Tri-Met to improve local bus transit service.

Goal 3: Support Trip Reduction. Develop a Transportation System that Reduces the Rate of Increase of Motor Vehicle Trips and Contributes to Regional Goals to Reduce Per Capita Vehicle Miles of Travel.

Key Elements: Land Use/ Development Code, Transportation Demand Management, Parking
Policy 1. Participate in trip reduction strategies developed locally and regionally, including employment, tourist and recreational trip programs.

Policy 2. Ensure that nearby commercial, community service and high employment industrial land uses are developed in a manner that provides convenient access to pedestrians, bicyclists and transit riders. Support compact, mixed-use development including infill and redevelopment in appropriate areas of the City.

Policy 3. Implement City Light Rail Station Community Planning Areas in ways that encourage the location of the highest land use densities and mixed uses near the best transit services.

Policy 4. Limit the provision of parking to meet regional and state standards.

Goal 4: Performance. Fund Projects that Promote an Efficient, Economic Transportation System That Maximizes the Movement of Vehicles, Pedestrians, Cyclists, Etc.

Key Elements: Level of service (LOS) standards, Transportation System Management
Policy 1. Maintain a level of service consistent with regional goals and reduce traffic congestion.
The current Regional Transportation Plan ${ }^{1}$ and Washington County Transportation System Plan ${ }^{2}$ provide motor vehicle performance measures. The RTP defines deficiency thresholds and operating standards for Town Centers, Main Streets, Regional Centers and Station Communities. The Washington County TSP expands the motor vehicle performance measures to apply to county roadways. ODOT's Oregon Highway Plan ${ }^{3}$ expands the performance thresholds to apply to state facilites including Highway 219 ( $1^{\text {st }}$ Avenue), Highway 8 (TV Highway) and US 26 in Hillsboro. These motor vehicle performance measures should be considered for performance thresholds.
Policy 2. Work with Washington County, Beaverton, Metro and ODOT to develop, operate and maintain intelligent transportation systems including coordination of traffic signals.
Policy 3. Provide a cost-effective transportation system where the public, land use development and users pay their respective share of the system's costs proportional to their respective demands placed upon the multi-modal system.

## Goal 5: Goods Movement. Provide for Timely and Efficient Movement of Goods and Services.

Key Elements: Freight, Rail, Air Freight, Hazardous Materials, Other Goods and Services
Policy 1. Design arterial routes, highway access and adjacent land uses in ways that facilitate the efficient movement of goods and services.

Policy 2. Coordinate with the Port of Portland in planning for the Hillsboro Airport.
Policy 3. Encourage continued use and development of rail and air transportation facilities.
Policy 4. Require safe routing of hazardous materials consistent with federal and state guidelines.

## Goal 6: Livability. Transportation Facilities shall be Designed and Constructed in a Manner Which Enhances the Livability of Hillsboro.

Key Elements: Aesthetics/Neighborhood Traffic Management, Regional Facilities, Environment, Managing Growth

Policy 1. Design and build local and neighborhood streets to minimize speeding.
Policy 2. Relate the design of street capacity and improvements to their intended use.
Policy 3. Construct transportation facilities to comply with applicable City landscape and design standards.

Policy 4. Avoid potential adverse environmental impacts associated with traffic and transportation system development through facility design and system management.

[^4]Policy 5. New or improved transportation facilities shall be subject to City land use type approval procedures including identification of potential impacts.

## Goal 7: Accessibility. Develop Transportation Facilities which are Accessible to All Members of the Community and Minimizes out of Direction Travel.

Key Elements: American Disabilities Act (ADA), Connectivity
Policy 1. Construct transportation facilities which conform to the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Policy 2. Locate transit dependent land uses close to transit stations.
Policy 3. Design the local street network to facilitate street connectivity and limit out-of-direction travel. Provide connectivity to and from activity centers and destinations, giving priority to pedestrian and bicycle connections.
Policy 4. Develop an efficient arterial grid system that provides access within the City, and serves through City traffic.

## OTHER PLANS

The relationship of the TSP to other regional planning documents can be puzzle of acronyms, activities and plans. Many of the most common planning initiatives and terms are summarized below:

TPR - Transportation Planning Rule, Statewide Planning Goal 12 developed by Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) to guide transportation planning in Oregon.

OTP - Oregon Transportation Plan, a federally mandated plan developed by Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) to guide statewide transportation development.

RTP - Regional Transportation Plan, developed by metropolitan planning organizations (MPO) to guide regional transportation investment, required to secure federal funding. In Portland this task is performed by Metro (Metropolitan Service District).

TSP - Transportation System Plan, a TPR required document developed by cities and counties in Oregon to guide local transportation decisions and investments.

Corridor Plan - ODOT transportation plans which focus on state transportation corridors to specifically outline needs, modes, strategies and effective investment.

Access Management - Methods to address improved safety and performance of state highways through control of access commensurate with facility needs.

ITS - Intelligent Transportation Systems. Use of advancing technology to improve movement of people and goods safely.

TDM - Transportation Demand Management. A series of actions to reduce transportation demand during peak periods.

## DKS Associates

ECO - Employee Commute Options. An urban area TDM program required by Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) of employers of 50 or more persons to reduce vehicle trips.

LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT (LRT) - Light Rail Transit. Planned by Metro, designed and operated by Tri-Met, providing a high capacity transit option linking key centers in the region.

Functional Plan -Metro's recently adopted plan which outlines mandatory criteria for evaluating transportation systems and land use, translating state and regional policy to local requirements necessary to implement the 2040 planning effort.

2040 - A long range effort directed by Metro to explore the choices for growth in the next 50 years and defining performance standards for local government to implement the regional growth concept. It defines several development types which will create higher density population and employment centers in the region. They are as follows:

- Regional Center: Compact centers of employment and housing served by high quality transit. They will become the focus of transit and highway improvements.
- Town Center: Provides for localized services within a 2-3 mile radius, with a community identity.
- Station Areas: Development centered on light rail transit (LRT) or high capacity transit, accessible by all modes.
- Main Street: Similar to town centers, an area with a traditional commercial identity, but smaller in scale, along a street with good transit services.
- Corridors: Development along a primary and frequent transit corridor that encourages mixed use and pedestrian access to transit.


## Chapter 3

 Existing ConditionsExisting transportation conditions were evaluated as part of the City of Hillsboro Transportation System Plan. An analysis of current conditions provides an understanding of facility development, service and performance. This chapter summarizes existing conditions relating to traffic and transportation in Hillsboro. It considers vehicle, transit, pedestrian, bicycle, truck/freight and other modes such as rail, pipeline and airport facilities.

To understand existing travel patterns and conditions, multiple aspects of the city's transportation system were evaluated. An inventory of traffic conditions in Hillsboro was completed in 2001 and 2002 to establish a base year for all subsequent analysis. Much of this data provides a benchmark (basis of comparison) for future assessment of transportation system and travel mode performance in Hillsboro relative to desired goals and policies.

The following sections briefly describe existing roadway functions, circulation, traffic speeds and volumes and levels of service in the Hillsboro transportation system. The study area includes 119 intersections that were selected ${ }^{1}$ to evaluate traffic conditions in Hillsboro.

## STREET NETWORK

The Transportation Planning Rule requires that classification of streets within the City be provided. ${ }^{2}$ The classification must be consistent with state and regional transportation plans for continuity between adjacent jurisdictions. The City of Hillsboro has an existing street classification system within a designated study area as part of the current Transportation System Plan. ${ }^{3}$ With the adoption of the TSP Update, that study area has been expanded to incorporate areas south of TV Hwy between $198^{\text {th }}$ and $209^{\text {th }}$ Avenues and other areas within the Hillsboro School District that could be considered for eventual City annexation.

[^5]
## Functional Classification

Roadways have two functions; to provide mobility and to provide access. From a design perspective, these functions can be incompatible since high or continuous speeds are desirable for mobility, while low speeds are more desirable for land access. Arterials emphasize a high level of mobility for through movement; local facilities emphasize the land access function; and collectors offer a balance of both functions.


## Safe, Easy, and Higher Speeds for Travelers

Arterial streets serve to interconnect and support the principal arterial highway system. These streets link major commercial, residential, industrial and institutional areas. Arterial streets are typically spaced about one mile apart to assure accessibility and reduce the incidence of traffic using collectors or local streets in lieu of a well placed arterial street. Many of these routes connect to cities surrounding Hillsboro.

Collector streets provide both access and circulation within residential and commercial/industrial areas. Collectors differ from arterials in that they provide more of a citywide circulation function, do not require as extensive control of access and penetrate residential neighborhoods, distributing trips from the neighborhood and local street system.

Neighborhood Routes are usually long relative to local streets and provide connectivity to collectors or arterials. Because neighborhood routes have greater connectivity, they generally have more traffic than local streets and are used by residents in the area to get out of the neighborhood, but do not serve citywide/large area circulation. Traffic from cul-de-sacs and other local streets may drain onto neighborhood routes to gain access to collectors or arterials.

Local Streets provide access to adjacent land and deliberately discourage by design through traffic movement.

Under the existing Hillsboro functional classification plan is provide in the current TSP. In that plan, any street not designated as either an arterial, collector or neighborhood route is considered a local street. The current roadway functional classification system was reviewed as part of this TSP update and presented in Chapter 1.

A comparison of functional classification of adjacent jurisdictions for streets in Hillsboro is summarized below.

City of Beaverton roadway classifications are generally consistent with City of Hillsboro at the adjacent city limits. A comparison of the City of Hillsboro and City of Beaverton functional classification plans found that designations differ on Fieldstone Way, Holly Street, Heritage Parkway, Jay Street and Augusta Lane just east of $185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue. These roadways are designated neighborhood routes by the City of Beaverton.

Washington County roadway classifications ${ }^{4}$ are generally consistent with City of Hillsboro designations. A comparison of the City of Hillsboro and Washington County functional classifications was conducted. The major inconsistencies are summarized in Table 3-1.

Table 3-1
Functional Classification Comparison to Washington County

| Roadway | City of Hillsboro <br> Designation | Washington County <br> Designation |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Lois Street - west of Cornelius Pass | Collector | Neighborhood Route |
| Cedar Street - Brookwood to 32nd | Collector | Neighborhood Route |
| Bentley Street - Brookwood to 32nd | Collector | Neighborhood Route |
| Wagon Way - west of Cornelius Pass | Collector | Neighborhood Route |
| Orenco Station Pkwy - Cornell to Butler | Neighborhood Route | Collector |

[^6]ODOT and Metro only classify roads that are considered to be of statewide or regional significance, respectively. These classifications are compatible with Hillsboro classifications, although the specific classification names may differ. ODOT and Metro classifications can be found in the Roadway Functional Classification According to Jurisdiction table in the appendix of this report. Figure 3-1 shows the roadway jurisdiction for operating and maintenance purposes. Because of their more regional or area wide significance, the designation of arterials and collectors by ODOT, Metro and Washington County guides the City in its functional classification.

## EXISTING CIRCULATION

The following sections review the performance of various key routes in Hillsboro in terms of traffic volumes, capacity, accidents, adjacent land uses, intersection Level of Service, arterial Level of Service and general observations.

The key routes include US 26 (Sunset Highway), ORE 8 (TV Highway), Cornell Road, Cornelius Pass Road, $185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue, Baseline Road, Evergreen Road, Glencoe Road- $1^{\text {st }}$ Avenue (ORE 219), Brookwood Parkway-Shute Road-Helvetia Road, Walker Road, Jackson School Road, River Road, Minter Bridge Road, Cypress Street- $32^{\text {nd }}$ Avenue, $28^{\text {th }}$ Avenue, $25^{\text {th }}$ Avenue and West Union Road. The state highway routes are summarized below to provide a description in terms of functional classification, connectivity and roadway volumes.

## State Highways

Sunset Highway (US 26) is classified by ODOT as a Statewide Highway/Expressway and as a freeway by adjacent jurisdictions. It serves vehicles traveling between Portland (I-405 to the east) and various destinations in western Oregon to the Oregon coast. US 26 also provides travel between cities in the Portland Metropolitan area. It is used as a commuter route between Washington County and Portland. Lastly, US 26 serves some local travel which may occur within Hillsboro or between Hillsboro and a neighboring city such as Beaverton or Portland. The Oregon Highway Plan has established access management interchange spacing standards for state highways.

Tualatin Valley Highway (ORE 8) is classified by ODOT as a District Highway. The City of Hillsboro and Washington County classify TV Highway as a Principal Arterial (east of Brookwood Avenue) and Arterial (west of Brookwood Avenue). Metro classifies TV Highway as a Principal Arterial (Highway) east of Brookwood Avenue and as a Major Arterial west of Brookwood Avenue. TV Highway provides direct access from Hillsboro to Beaverton, Aloha, Forest Grove and Portland.

Glencoe Road/ $\mathbf{1}^{\text {st }}$ Avenue (ORE 219) is classified by ODOT as a District Highway south of Baseline. The City of Hillsboro classifies Glencoe Road/1st Avenue as a Major Arterial (interim classification). Washington County classifies Glencoe Road/ $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ Avenue as a Minor Arterial and Metro classifies Glencoe Road- $1^{\text {st }}$ Avenue as a Minor Arterial south of Evergreen Road and as a Rural Arterial north of Evergreen Road. Glencoe Road - $1^{\text {st }}$ Avenue provides direct access to the Sunset Highway and North Plains.


## PAVEMENT CONDITIONS

A visual inspection of Hillsboro's surface street system is prepared annually by the City of Hillsboro Engineering Department. This inspection, basically a "report card" of pavement condition rates each roadway in Hillsboro. Actual roadway ratings prepared by the City of Hillsboro are provided in the appendix. Table 3-2 summarizes the roadway maintenance funding history for the last four fiscal years. For the year 2002, Hillsboro had 200 total miles of roadways with 3.2 miles of roadway overlayed. Figure 3-2 summarizes the roadway maintenance completed in fiscal year 1999-2000.

Table 3-2
City of Hillsboro Street Maintenance Funding History

|  | FY 99-00 | FY 00-01 | FY 01-02 | FY 02-03 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A.C Overlay | $\$ 438,273$ | $\$ 402,131$ | $\$ 392,253$ | $\$ 574,661$ |
| Crack Seal | $\$ 112,755$ | $\$ 80,595$ | $\$ 80,595$ | $\$ 78,429$ |
| Slurry Seal | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 21,458$ |
| Chip Seal | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |
| Concrete Replacement | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 169,738$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |
| Total | $\$ 551,028$ | $\$ 652,464$ | $\$ 472,848$ | $\$ 674,548$ |

FY = Fiscal Year

## Figure 3-2

Street Maintenance Completed in Fiscal Year 1999-2000

Fiscal Year 2002-2003


## TRAFFIC SPEED AND VOLUME

## Speed

Speed zones on arterials and collectors within the City of Hillsboro are summarized in Figure 3-3. Speed zones are set by the Oregon Department of Transortation and the local road authority. ODOT has the responsibility to investigate roads for establishing new speed zones or changing posted speeds of existing speed zones. ODOT conducts engineering studies and considers many factors such as roadway width, surface, lanes, shoulders, signals, intersections, roadside development, parking, accidents and $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speed. The $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speed is commonly used to establish speed zones for arterial and collector roadways. Typically, the $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile represents the speeds that are reasonable and prudent for prevailing conditions ${ }^{5}$. These investigations are performed at the request of the local road authority. If mutual agreement cannot be reached, the speed zone decision is referred to Oregon's Speed Zone Review Panel. The panel reviews contested speed zone cases and makes the final recommendation. A decision made by the Speed Zone Review Panel is not arbitrary or political, and is based on the considerations described above. ${ }^{6}$

## Traffic Volume

An inventory of daily traffic conditions was performed in Spring 2001 as part of the TSP update. Overall, the daily two-way traffic volumes in the study area have grown from 1996 (prior TSP data) to 2001 with increases ranging from 2 to 40 percent. Traffic data collected over the course of this study illustrates the typical fluctuations of traffic over the course of a day. Average daily traffic (ADT) volumes and PM peak hour volumes for various roadways in Hillsboro are shown in Figure 3-4 Profiles of daily traffic volumes indicate the period when traffic is greatest (Figures 3-5 to 3-7).

Based on 2001 data, $185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue carries approximately 53,000 vehicles per day (two-way) near Evergreen Parkway. As a comparison, daily traffic on US 26 (Sunset Highway) is about 61,700 vehicles per day (two-way) west of the $185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue interchange. ${ }^{7}$ The most significant increase in traffic volumes from 1996 to 2001 occurred on Evergreen Parkway (volumes to the west of Shute Road have increased by approximately 40 percent). South of US 26, daily volumes on Shute Road have increased by approximately 20 percent from 1996 to 2001. These volume increases can be attributed to growth around the Intel campus area as well as the residential and commercial areas near MAX transit stations.

Daily two-way traffic volumes on Cornell Road west of Brookwood and Cornelius Pass south of US 26 have experienced moderate growth since the previous study period. Traffic volumes on these roadways have increased approximately five percent between 1996 and 2001. Daily two-way traffic volumes on TV Highway west of Brookwood Avenue have remained fairly constant between 1996 and 2001 with two percent growth since the previous study period. Typically as roadways approach capacity they have limited ability to serve growth in traffic.

[^7]



Figure 3-5 Hourly Traffic Variations




Figure 3-6 Traffic Variations



Figure 3-7 Traffic Variations
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## TRAVEL TIME RUNS

Travel time is a key measure of transportation service and accessibility in a city. It provides a common reference for comparison between travel modes and a historical reference in future years. Travel time runs were conducted on several key routes in Hillsboro. These travel time runs measured the length of time it took to travel across key routes during the weekday PM peak period (4:00 PM to 6:00 PM). Seven key routes were surveyed to provide a profile of travel times in Hillsboro:

- TV Highway from $185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue to Dennis Avenue
- Cornell Road from $185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue to Baseline Road
- Evergreen Road from $185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue to Glencoe Road
- Baseline Road from $185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue to Cornell Road
- Cornelius Pass Road from West Union to TV Highway
- $185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue from West Union Road to TV Highway
- US 26 from Jackson School Road interchange to $185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue interchange

Figure 3-8 shows the locations of the weekday evening peak period travel time runs. The results of these travel time runs are shown in Table 3-3 and in Figures 3-9 and 3-10. In general, it is possible to get across the city (either north/south or east/west) in approximately 15 to 25 minutes. This translates to average speeds of approximately 25 miles per hour, including delays at traffic signals and stop signs. Today during the PM peak period, the routes surveyed would relate to Level of Service (LOS) D or better conditions.

Travel time along urban arterials can also be used as a measure of Level of Service. ${ }^{8}$ Compared to capacity analysis, the average travel speed can help identify congested areas. TV Highway, Cornell Road, Evergreen Road, Cornelius Pass Road and $185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue were surveyed in both 1996 and 2000. On the average, average travel speeds on these corridors have decreased by 4 to 8 mph over the 4 -year period. These deteriorations correspond to increases in traffic on cross streets as well as the corridors themselves.

[^8]
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Figure 3-9

DKS Associates


Figure 3-10

Table 3-3
2001 PM Peak Period Travel Time Surveys

| Route | Direction | Time (min.) | Distance (miles) | 2001 <br> Average <br> Speed <br> (mph) | $1996$ <br> Average Speed (mph) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Evergreen Road (from Glencoe Road to $185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue) | Eastbound | 13.4 | 6.6 | 29.6 | 38.2 |
|  | Westbound | 12.5 | 6.6 | 31.8 | 35.0 |
| Cornell Road (from Baseline Road to 185th Avenue) | Eastbound | 14.6 | 5.9 | 24.3 | 28.9 |
|  | Westbound | 15.5 | 5.9 | 22.9 | 27.7 |
| Baseline Road (from Cornell Road to $185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue) | Eastbound | 13.1 | 5.3 | 24.3 | -- |
|  | Westbound | 13.4 | 5.3 | 23.8 | -- |
| TV Highway <br> (from $185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue to Dennis Avenue) | Eastbound | 18.2 | 7.0 | 23.1 | 25.9 |
|  | Westbound | 19.0 | 7.0 | 22.1 | 27.5 |
| US 26 <br> (from Jackson School Road to $185^{\text {th }}$ Ave) | Eastbound | 6.2 | 5.7 | 55.1 | -- |
|  | Westbound | 6.5 | 5.7 | 53.0 | -- |
| Cornelius Pass Road (from West Union to TV Highway) | Northbound | 11.3 | 4.9 | 26.0 | 30.6 |
|  | Southbound | 12.1 | 4.9 | 24.2 | 28.4 |
| $\mathbf{1 8 5}^{\text {th }}$ Avenue <br> (from West Union to TV Highway) | Northbound | 10.9 | 4.4 | 24.2 | 27.0 |
|  | Southbound | 11.9 | 4.4 | 22.2 | 25.4 |

Note: Arterial LOS D (for a class II arterial) is less than 17 mph .

## TRAFFIC CONTROL

The existing traffic signals in the Hillsboro Transportation System Plan study area were updated with information provided by the City of Hillsboro. The TSP study area has over 100 signalized intersections with the majority on arterial streets. As of 2002, ten new traffic signals were added to the transportation system since 1996. Three of the new signals are not study intersections (Lois Street/Cornelius Pass Road, Bickering Place/Imbrie Drive and $229^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/Intel North Entrance). Figure 3-11 shows the existing signalized intersection locations.

Traffic signals are valuable devices for the control of vehicle and pedestrian traffic. Traffic control signals, properly located and operated can have one or more of the following advantages:

- They provide for the orderly movement of traffic.
- On larger roadways where proper physical layouts and control measures are used, they can increase the traffic handling capacity of the intersection.
- They reduce the frequency of certain types of accidents, especially the right angle type.
- Under favorable conditions, they can be coordinated to provide continuous or nearly continuous movement of traffic at a definite speed along a given route.
- They permit minor street traffic, vehicular or pedestrian, to enter or cross continuous traffic on the major street.


Improper or unwarranted signal installations may cause:

- Excessive delay
- Disregard of signal indications
- Circuitous travel of alternative routes
- Increase fuel use and wear and tear on vehicles, especially trucks
- Increased accident frequency, particularly rear-end type

Consequently, it is important that the consideration of a signal installation and the selection of equipment be preceded by a thorough study and based on consistent criteria. These studies identify the need for left turn phasing, lanes and phase type. The justification for the installation of a traffic signal at an intersection for ODOT, Washington County and Hillsboro is based upon the warrants stated in the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices ${ }^{9}$ (MUTCD). The MUTCD has been adopted by the state of Oregon and is used throughout the nation. The Oregon Administrative Rule ${ }^{10}$ (OAR) has established criteria for consideration of new traffic signals on state facilities in addition to MUTCD warrants. The OAR requires an engineering investigation of traffic conditions and physical characteristics (including type of highway, grades, sight distance, existing Level of Service, conflicting accesses, signal spacing and the effect on existing or future traffic signal systems) for the proposed traffic signal location. In general, traffic signals should be considered on public street connections but not for private access that does not provide through connections to public right-of-way.
The same conditions hold true for installation of stop sign traffic controls. Specific warrants identify conditions which may warrant two-way or multi-way stop sign installations. A stop sign is not a cure-all and is not a substitute for other traffic control devices. Guidelines and warrants for stop sign installations are outlined in the MUTCD.

## TRAFFIC OPERATING CONDITIONS

While analysis of traffic flows and functional classifications are useful in attempting to reach an understanding of the general nature of traffic in an area, traffic volume alone indicates neither the ability of the street network to carry additional traffic nor the quality of service afforded by the street facilities. For this, the concept of Level of Service has been developed to correlate traffic volume data to subjective descriptions of traffic performance at intersections. Level of Service is used as a measure of effectiveness for intersection operation. It is similar to a "report card" rating based upon average vehicle delay. Level of Service A, B and C indicates conditions where traffic moves without significant delays over periods of peak travel demand. Level of Service D and E represent progressively worse peak hour operating conditions. Level of Service F represents conditions where the average vehicle delay exceeds 80 seconds per vehicle entering a signalized intersection and demand has exceeded the capacity. This delay represents jammed conditions and any additional vehicle traffic would require mitigation. This condition is typically evident where long queues and delays exist. Level of Service D or better has generally been the accepted standard for signalized intersections in urban conditions.

Unsignalized intersections provide levels of service for major and minor street turning movements. For this reason, LOS E and even LOS F can occur for a specific turning movement; however, the majority of traffic may not be delayed (in cases where major street traffic is not required to stop). LOS E or F

[^9]conditions at unsignalized intersections generally provide a basis to study the intersections further and to determine availability of acceptable gaps, safety and traffic signal warrants. A summary of the descriptions of Level of Service for signalized and unsignalized intersections in the City is provided in the appendix.
The volume to capacity ratio is also used as a measure of effectiveness for intersection operation. It compares the amount of traffic volume entering an intersection to the available capacity of the intersection over a specific time period. The following section outlines the volume to capacity ranges provided in the Highway Capacity Manual ${ }^{11}$.
0.00-0.60 Free Flow/Insignificant Delays: No approach phase is fully utilized by traffic and no vehicle waits longer than one red indication. Most vehicles do not stop at all. Progression is extremely favorable and most vehicles arrive during the green phase.
0.61-0.70 Stable Operation/Minimal Delays: An occasional approach phase is fully utilized. Many drivers begin to feel somewhat restricted within platoons of vehicles. This level generally occurs with good progression, short cycle lengths, or both.
0.71-0.80 Stable Operation/Acceptable Delays: Major approach phases fully utilized. Most drivers feel somewhat restricted. Higher delays may result from fair progression, longer cycle lengths, or both. Individual cycle failures may begin to appear at this level, and the number of vehicles stopping is significant.
0.81-0.90 Approaching Unstable/Tolerable Delays: The influence of congestion becomes more noticeable. Drivers may have to wait through more than one red signal indication. Longer delays may result from some combination of unfavorable progression, long cycle lengths, or high $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratios. The proportion of vehicles not stopping declines, and individual cycle failures are noticeable.
0.91-1.0 Unstable Operation/Significant Delays: Volumes at or near capacity. Vehicles may wait though several signal cycles. Long queues form upstream from intersection. These high delay values generally indicate poor progression, long cycle lengths, and high v/c ratios. Individual cycle failures are a frequent occurrence.
$\geq 1.00$ Forced Flow/Excessive Delays: Represents jammed conditions. Queues may block upstream intersections. This level occurs when arrival flow rates exceed intersection capacity, and is considered to be unacceptable to most drivers. Poor progression, long cycle lengths, and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratios approaching 1.0 may contribute to these high delay levels.

Intersection turn movement counts were conducted at 119 study intersections shown in Figure 3-12 during the evening peak periods to determine existing LOS based on the Highway Capacity Manual ${ }^{12}$ methodology for signalized and unsignalized intersections. These intersections were chosen in coordination with the City of Hillsboro staff in order to update the existing conditions, incorporate the new revised study area, and address areas of noted concern. Traffic counts, Level of Service calculation sheets and descriptions of Level of Service for signalized, unsignalized and all-way-stop controlled intersections can be found in the appendix of this report.

[^10]
## DKS Associates

The following sections describe the updated existing PM peak hour levels of service conditions for study intersections along several key corridors in Hillsboro. Figure 3-13 provides a summary of PM peak hour levels of service for the study intersections in Hillsboro. Most signalized intersections in Hillsboro operate at LOS D or better, with some exceptions.

## $185{ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue

Nine intersections were analyzed along the $185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue corridor. All of the intersections are signalized and operate at a LOS of D or better except TV Highway at $185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue which operates at maximum capacity with LOS E. The 1996 existing conditions showed similar results. Significant Level of Service changes over the last six years were observed at the West Union Road intersection, which improved from LOS F in 1996 to LOS D as a result of intersection improvements provided by an adjacent private development. Table 3-4 summarizes operating conditions along $185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue.
Table 3-4
$185{ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue PM Peak Hour Intersection Level of Service

| Intersection | $\mathbf{2 0 0 2}$ |  |  | 1996 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Average <br> Delay | Volume/ <br> Capacity | Level of <br> Service | Level of <br> Service |
| TV Highway/185 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | 67.1 | 0.99 | E | D |
| Johnson Street $/ 185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | 22.7 | 0.78 | C | - |
| Baseline Road $/ 185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | 33.5 | 0.82 | C | D |
| Walker Road/185 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | 36.3 | 0.85 | D | D |
| Cornell Road/185 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | 34.4 | 0.87 | C | D |
| Evergreen Parkway $/ 185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | 38.0 | 0.83 | D | C |
| US 26 Eastbound Ramps $/ 185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | 4.1 | 0.53 | A | A |
| US 26 Westbound Ramps $/ 185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | 24.9 | 0.80 | C | C |
| West Union Road $/ 185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | 50.1 | 0.93 | D | F |

Note: 1996 Level of Service based on 1994 Highway Capacity Manual methodology.



## DKS Associates

## TV Highway

Thirteen intersections were analyzed along the TV Highway corridor. All of the signalized intersections operate at a LOS of D or better except TV Highway at $185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue which operates at maximum capacity with LOS E. The unsignalized $239^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/TV Highway intersection operates at LOS F for the minor street approach. The 1996 existing conditions showed similar results. Table 3-5 shows the operating conditions along the TV Highway corridor.
Table 3-5
TV Highway PM Peak Hour Intersection Level of Service

| Intersection | 2002 |  |  | 1996 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Average Delay | Volume/ Capacity | Level of Service | Level of Service |
| $13^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/River Road/TV Highway | 25.9 | 0.91 | C | B |
| Minter Bridge Road/TV Highway | 39.5 | 0.80 | D | D |
| Sunset Esplanade West/TV Highway | 11.2 | 0.65 | B | - |
| Sunset Esplanade East/TV Highway | 9.0 | 0.62 | A | - |
| Brookwood Avenue/TV Highway | 21.9 | 0.81 | C | B |
| Witch Hazel Road/TV Highway | 13.1 | 0.80 | B | C |
| $239^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/TV Highway | >80.0 | -- | C/F | C/F |
| 234 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/TV Highway | 19.2 | 0.82 | B | B |
| $229^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/TV Highway | 7.9 | 0.65 | A | B |
| Cornelius Pass Road/TV Highway | 20.2 | 0.84 | C | C |
| $209{ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/TV Highway | 29.1 | 0.94 | C | - |
| $198{ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/TV Highway | 37.1 | 0.84 | D | - |
| $185{ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/TV Highway | 67.1 | 0.99 | E | - |

© indicates unsignalized intersection
Note: 1996 Level of Service based on 1994 Highway Capacity Manual methodology.

## DKS Associates

## Cornell Road

Fifteen intersections were analyzed along the Cornell Road corridor. All of the intersections are signalized and operate at a LOS of D or better. The 1996 existing conditions showed similar results. Table 3-6 shows the operating conditions along the Cornell Road corridor.
Table 3-6
Cornell Road PM Peak Hour Intersection Level of Service

| Intersection | 2002 |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 1996 \\ \hline \text { Level of } \\ \text { Service } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Average Delay | Volume/ <br> Capacity | Level of Service |  |
| $10^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/Main Street/Cornell Road | 33.1 | 0.78 | C | D |
| Grant Street/Cornell Road | 20.0 | 0.66 | B | C |
| Arrington Road/Cornell Road | 8.1 | 0.62 | A | - |
| $25^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/Cornell Road | 40.2 | 0.80 | D | D |
| Brookwood Parkway/Cornell Road | 41.8 | 0.86 | D | B |
| Elam Young West/Cornell Road | 13.0 | 0.56 | B | B |
| Shute Road/Cornell Road | 14.8 | 0.72 | B | B |
| Elam Young East/Cornell Road | 16.1 | 0.69 | B | B |
| Orenco Parkway/Cornell Road | 2.7 | 0.57 | A | - |
| $229^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/Cornell Road | 38.3 | 0.86 | D | C |
| Walbridge Lane/Cornell Road | 8.0 | 0.62 | A | - |
| Cornelius Pass Road/Cornell Road | 50.4 | 0.89 | D | C |
| John Olsen Avenue/Cornell Road | 20.4 | 0.64 | C | B |
| Stucki Avenue/Cornell Road | 23.5 | 0.77 | C | C |
| $185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/Cornell Road | 34.4 | 0.83 | C | D |

Note: 1996 Level of Service based on 1994 Highway Capacity Manual methodology.

## Cornelius Pass Road

Fifteen intersections were analyzed along the Cornelius Pass Road corridor. All of the signalized intersections operate at a LOS of D or better except the Baseline Road/Cornelius Pass Road intersection which operates at LOS E. Several of the study intersections operate with a volume to capacity ratio above 0.80. The Wagon Way/Cornelius Pass Road unsignalized intersection operates at LOS F for the minor street approach. The West Union Road/Cornelius Pass Road intersection improved to LOS C with the installation of a traffic signal. The 1996 existing conditions showed similar results. Table 3-7 shows the operating conditions along the Cornelius Pass corridor.
Table 3-7
Cornelius Pass Road PM Peak Hour Intersection Level of Service

| Intersection | $\mathbf{2 0 0 2}$ |  |  | 1996 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Average <br> Delay | Volume/ <br> Capacity | Level of <br> Service | Level of <br> Service |
| Johnson Street/Cornelius Pass Road | 20.2 | 0.84 | C | C |
| Frances Street/Cornelius Pass Road | 20.8 | 0.74 | C | $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{C}$ |
| Lois Street/Cornelius Pass Road | 11.0 | 0.80 | B | $\mathrm{~B} / \mathrm{D}$ |
| Baseline Road/Cornelius Pass Road | 24.4 | 0.93 | C | - |
| Quatama Street/Cornelius Pass Road | 61.8 | 0.95 | E | D |
| Walbridge Lane/Cornelius Pass Road | 11.0 | 0.78 | B | $\mathrm{~B} / \mathrm{E}$ |
| Amberwood Drive/Cornelius Pass Road | 26.7 | 0.53 | C | - |
| Cornell Road/Cornelius Pass Road | 50.4 | 0.81 | C | - |
| Evergreen Parkway/Cornelius Pass Road | 49.9 | 0.88 | D | C |
| US 26 Eastbound Ramps/Cornelius Pass Rd | 16.9 | 0.75 | B | C |
| US 26 Westbound Ramps/Cornelius Pass Rd | 12.0 | 0.70 | B | C |
| Wagon Way/Cornelius Pass Road | $>80.0$ | -- | $\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{F}$ | B |
| Jacobson Road/Cornelius Pass Road | 19.8 | -- | $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{C}$ | A |
| West Union Road/Cornelius Pass Road | 23.5 | 0.74 | C | D |

indicates unsignalized intersection
Note: 1996 Level of Service based on 1994 Highway Capacity Manual methodology.
The remaining study intersection operations are listed in Table 3-8. Currently, thirteen of these intersections operate with LOS E or F. All of these intersections are unsignalized with high delays on the minor street approach. An exception is Evergreen Parkway at $229^{\text {th }}$ Avenue which is signalized and operates at LOS E. Compared to the 1996 existing conditions, significant LOS changes have occurred at River Road/Witch Hazel Road (LOS A/D to LOS A/F), Evergreen Road/229 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue (LOS B to LOS E), Grant Street/ $1^{\text {st }}$ Avenue (LOS A/D to LOS B/F), Evergreen Road/Jackson School Road (west) (LOS A/C to A/F), Evergreen Road/Jackson School Road (east) (LOS B/D to LOS A/F) and Hornecker Road/Glencoe Road (LOS A/D to LOS A/F).

## DKS Associates

transportation solutions

Table 3-8
Study Intersection PM Peak Hour Intersection Level of Service

| Intersection |  | 2002 |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 1996 \\ \hline \text { Level of } \\ \text { Service } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Average Delay | Volume/ Capacity | Level of Service |  |
| $1^{\text {st }}$ Avenue/Baseline Street |  | 15.5 | 0.69 | B | B |
| $10^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/Baseline Street |  | 39.6 | 0.86 | D | C |
| $10^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/Oak Street |  | 43.6 | 0.98 | D | C |
| $1^{\text {st }}$ Avenue/Main Street |  | 34.1 | 0.83 | C | C |
| $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ Avenue/Oak Street |  | 15.4 | 0.80 | B | B |
| $1^{\text {st }}$ Avenue/Walnut Street | 0 | >80.0 | -- | A/F | - |
| River Road/Minter Bridge Road |  | 28.4 | 0.77 | C | C |
| River Road/Rood Bridge Road |  | 25.1 | 0.73 | C | B |
| River Road/Witch Hazel Road | 0 | 56.1 | -- | A/F | A/D |
| Main Street/24 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue |  | 12.5 | 0.66 | B | - |
| Main Street/28 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue |  | 24.8 | 0.77 | C | B/F |
| Main Street/Baseline Road/32 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ Avenue |  | 22.7 | 0.78 | C | D |
| Cedar Street/32 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ Avenue | 0 | 14.9 | -- | A/B | - |
| Bentley Street/32 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ Avenue | 0 | 14.2 | -- | A/C | - |
| Cedar Street/Brookwood Avenue | 0 | 20.8 | -- | A/C | - |
| Bentley Street/Brookwood Avenue | 0 | 21.0 | -- | A/C | - |
| Baseline Road/Brookwood Avenue |  | 50.7 | 0.90 | D | B |
| Golden Road/Brookwood Avenue | 0 | 20.1 | -- | A/C | - |
| Frances Street/ $239^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | 0 | 11.9 | -- | A/B | A/B |
| Johnson Street/239 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | 0 | 19.3 | -- | A/C | - |
| Johnson Street/229 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue |  | 1.6 | 0.15 | A | A |
| Baseline Road/53 ${ }^{\text {rd }}$ Avenue |  | 21.2 | 0.79 | C | C |
| Baseline Road/231 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ Avenue |  | 24.6 | 0.76 | C | C |
| Baseline Road/206 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue |  | 43.0 | 0.84 | D | C |
| Baseline Road/197 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue |  | 12.2 | 0.69 | B | - |
| Johnson Street/185 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue |  | 22.7 | 0.78 | C | - |
| Quatama Street/205 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | 0 | 71.8 | -- | A/F | - |
| Amber Glen Parkway/Walker Road |  | 14.9 | 0.46 | B | B |
| Stucki Avenue/Evergreen Parkway |  | 10.9 | 0.51 | B | B/D |
| Evergreen Parkway/John Olsen Avenue |  | 20.4 | 0.64 | C | B/D |
| Evergreen Parkway/Aloclek Drive |  | 12.5 | 0.38 | B | - |
| Butler Road/Shute Road | 0 | 46.4 | -- | A/E | - |
| Butler Road/229 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | 0 | >80.0 | -- | A/F | - |
| Evergreen Road/229 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue |  | 61.4 | 0.99 | E | B |
| Brookwood Parkway/Shute Road |  | 16.4 | 0.52 | B | - |
| Evergreen Road/Shute Road |  | 33.1 | 0.78 | C | C |

## DKS Associates

transportation solutions

| Intersection |  | 2002 |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 1996 \\ \hline \text { Level of } \\ \text { Service } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Average Delay | Volume/ Capacity | Level of Service |  |
| Airport Road/Brookwood Parkway | 0 | 13.1 | -- | A/B | - |
| Grant Street/ $28^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | 0 | 23.2 | -- | B/C | B/C |
| Grant Street/5 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue |  | 14.4 | 0.63 | B | A |
| Grant Street/ ${ }^{\text {st }}$ Avenue | 0 | 54.8 | -- | B/F | A/D |
| Garibaldi Street/Connel Avenue | 0 | 13.8 | -- | A/B | - |
| Sunrise Lane/25 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | 0 | 41.3 | -- | B/E | - |
| Sunrise Lane/ $15{ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | 0 | 13.5 | -- | A/B | - |
| Arrington Road/Jackson School Road | 0 | 14.4 | -- | A/B | - |
| Sunrise Lane/Jackson School Road | 0 | 25.2 | -- | A/D | - |
| Harewood Street/Jackson School Road | d | 16.6 | -- | A/C | - |
| Harewood Street/ ${ }^{\text {st }}$ Avenue/Glencoe Road | 0 | 25.5 | -- | A/D | - |
| Hornecker Road/Glencoe Road | c | 33.8 | -- | A/D | A/F |
| Evergreen Road/Glencoe Road |  | 23.2 | 0.78 | C | B |
| Evergreen Road/Jackson School Road (west) | 0 | $>80.0$ | -- | A/F | A/C |
| Evergreen Road/Jackson School Road (east) | c | $>80.0$ | -- | A/F | B/D |
| Evergreen Road/ $15^{\text {th }}$ Avenue |  | 22.0 | 0.47 | B | A/C |
| Evergreen Road $/ 25^{\text {th }}$ Avenue |  | 13.7 | 0.51 | C | C |
| US 26/Shute Road Eastbound Ramps | 0 | >80.0 | -- | A/F | A/D |
| US 26/Shute Road Westbound Ramps |  | 22.0 | 0.80 | C | B |
| US 26/Jackson School Road | 0 | $>80.0$ | -- | B/F | C/F |
| Anthony Drive/209 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/Johnson Street |  | 14.6 | 0.67 | B | - |
| $206{ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/Rock Road | 0 | 34.0 | -- | A/D | - |
| Anthony Drive/Rock Road | 0 | 17.9 | -- | A/C | - |
| $198{ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/Johnson Street | 0 | 51.6 | -- | A/F | - |
| Blanton Street/209 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | 0 | 13.6 | -- | A/B | - |
| Blanton Street/198 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | 0 | 20.6 | -- | A/C | - |
| Kinnaman Road/209 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | 0 | 16.0 | -- | A/C | - |
| Kinnaman Road/198 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue (south) | 0 | 20.5 | -- | A/C | - |
| Kinnaman Road/198 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue (north) | 0 | 34.1 | -- | A/D | - |
| Rosa Road/209 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | 0 | 12.1 | -- | A/B | - |
| Rosa Road/198 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | 0 | 13.2 | -- | A/B | - |
| Connel Avenue/Main Street | 0 | 18.0 | -- | A/C | - |
| Dennis Avenue/Main Street | 0 | 16.2 | -- | A/C | - |
| Rosedale Road/229 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | 0 | 11.3 | -- | A/B | - |
| Rosedale Road/River Road | 0 | 19.6 | -- | A/C | - |
| Alexander Street/229 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | 0 | 9.9 | -- | A/A | - |

o indicates unsignalized intersection
Note: 1996 Level of Service based on 1994 Highway Capacity Manual methodology.

The majority of the study intersections are currently operating at acceptable capacity levels. Table 3-9 provides a list of the intersections currently operating above a V/C ratio of 0.90 or Level of Service F and how the capacity problem was planned to be addressed in the previous TSP. The status of improvements is also noted, indicating what recent improvements have been made since the adoption of the prior TSP.

Table 3-9
Intersections Operating at Capacity under Existing Conditions

| Intersection | Capacity Improvement Action From Prior TSP | Improvement Status |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Evergreen Road/229 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | Add NB and EB right-turn lanes, protected/permitted phasing north-south | NB right-turn lane added |
| Evergreen Road/Jackson School Road (east) | Install a traffic signal, add SB right-turn lane, widen Evergreen to 5 -lanes | SB right-turn lane added |
| Baseline Road/Cornelius Pass Rd | Add NB, SB and WB right-turn lanes | SB right-turn lane added |
| West Union Road/Cornelius Pass Rd | Install a traffic signal, add SB, EB and WB left-turn lanes, add NB and EB right-turn lanes | Not completed |
| Baseline Road/53 ${ }^{\text {rd }}$ Avenue | Widen Baseline Road to 5 lanes | Not completed |
| Baseline Road/206 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | Add EB and WB right-turn lanes | Not completed |
| US 26/Shute Road EB \& WB Ramps | Add $2^{\text {nd }} \mathrm{NB}$ thru lane, new loop ramp and interchange modifications | Not completed |
| $239{ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/TV Highway | Add a traffic signal | Not completed |
| $229{ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/Cornell Road | Add EB and SB right-turn lanes, add WB $2^{\text {nd }}$ left turn-lane | Not completed |
| US 26/Jackson School Road | Channelization and safety improvements | Completed |
| $198^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/Johnson Street | Install a traffic signal | Not completed |
| TV Highway/River Rd/13 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | Add EB right-turn lane | Not completed |
| Grant Street/ ${ }^{\text {st }}$ Avenue | No improvements listed in prior TSP | -- |
| TV Highway/185 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | Not studied in prior TSP | -- |
| $198{ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/TV Highway | Not studied in prior TSP | -- |
| Connel Avenue/Main Street | Not studied in prior TSP | -- |
| $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ Avenue/Walnut Street | Not studied in prior TSP | Planned |
| Butler Road/229 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | Not studied in 1999 TSP | -- |

## DKS Associates

## COLLISIONS

Collision data was obtained from the City of Hillsboro Engineering Department for 2002. The data was used to update the high collision intersection list from the previous TSP, with only one location ( $185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/Sunset Highway) remaining in the top ten of the current list. In general, intersections that dropped off of the list continue to experience approximately the same number of accidents in 2002 as in 1996. However, other intersections within Hillsboro have had an increase in accident frequency over the last four years. Intersections that have been added to the list since the prior TSP could have an increase in collision numbers due to an increase in volume and congestion, which can create more conflicts and aggressive driving behavior, or are intersections that are included in this study as part of the new study area. Table 3-10 shows the ten highest reported accident locations and number of reported accidents for 2002. Figure 3-14 shows the study intersections in Hillsboro with five or more reported accidents in 2002.

Table 3-10
Ten Highest Reported Accident Locations in Hillsboro for 2002

| Ranking | Roadway | Location | Number of <br> Accidents |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| 1 | $185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | Baseline Road | 20 |
| 2 | $10^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | Baseline Road | 18 |
| 3 | $185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | Evergreen Parkway | 17 |
| 4 | $10^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | Maple Street | 17 |
| 5 | $10^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | Oak Street | 17 |
| 6 | $1^{\text {st }}$ Avenue | Baseline Road | 17 |
| 7 | $185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | Sunset Highway (US 26) | 15 |
| 8 | $185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | Cornell Road | 13 |
| 9 | $10^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | Cedar Street | 12 |
| 10 | $1^{\text {st }}$ Avenue | Walnut Street | 11 |

Based on accident data provided by the City of Hillsboro for 2002.


Accident data was also obtained from Washington County for the period between 1998 through 2000. Washington County takes data collected by the State of Oregon and converts it to a Safety Priority Index System (SPIS) number. SPIS represents the combination of accident rates, frequency, severity and volumes. The SPIS number associated with a given intersection represents only those accidents that took place within or very near that intersection. The SPIS system of accident reporting does not necessarily identify broad areas (i.e. a one-half mile segment) where a number of accidents may take place. The SPIS numbers for each intersection in Washington County where accidents have occurred were then ranked from highest to lowest. Table 3-11 summarizes the ten highest accident intersections within Hillsboro in the Washington County ranking (data for 1998-2000). The 2000 data includes over 50 intersections within Hillsboro, which were identified on the Washington County SPIS list out of 245 on the overall listings.

Table 3-11
Ten Highest SPIS Ranked Intersections in Hillsboro from Washington County Data (1998-2000)

| SPIS List <br> Ranking | Street | Number of <br> Accidents | SPIS <br> Number |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Baseline Road | $185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | 109 | 172.49 |
| 4 | Evergreen Parkway | $185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | 80 | 107.83 |
| 10 | TV Highway | $185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | 91 | 94.19 |
| 11 | Highway 26 | Jackson School Road | 37 | 91.76 |
| 14 | TV Highway | Brookwood Avenue | 29 | 86.43 |
| 16 | TV Highway | River Road/13 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | 46 | 84.15 |
| 17 | Evergreen Parkway | Shute Road | 29 | 82.80 |
| 27 | TV Highway | Cornelius Pass Road | 45 | 70.00 |
| 32 | TV Highway | Witch Hazel Road | 32 | 65.88 |
| 37 | TV Highway | $209^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | 35 | 64.47 |

In comparison, Table 3-12 summarizes the ten highest accident intersections in Hillsboro in the Washington County ranking (data for 1994-1996) presented in the prior TSP and the current (data for 1998-2000) SPIS ranking for the intersections. Several of the locations have experienced a drop in SPIS ranking over the last six years. The Evergreen Parkway $/ 188^{\text {th }}$ Avenue intersection traffic signal was modified in 1997, which dropped its SPIS list ranking from \#10 to \#241. The Quatama Road/Cornelius Pass Road SPIS list ranking dropped from \#28 to off the list with a traffic signal modifaction and the addition of separate northbound/southbound left-turn lanes. Several additional intersections have dropped off the SPIS list completely.

## DKS Associates

Several of the locations have experienced a rise in SPIS ranking over the last six years. The SPIS ranking for the $185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/Baseline Road intersection has increased from \#17 to \#1 over the last six years.
Recent improvements at the intersection (including the replacement of the eastbound left turn lane with a right-turn jughandle in 1998) has not reduced the SPIS number for the intersection as expected. The $185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/Evergreen Parkway intersection rose to make the SPIS top ten list for Hillsboro with its ranking increasing from \#40 to \#4.
Table 3-12
Comparison to Prior TSP SPIS Rankings

| Old <br> SPIS List <br> Ranking <br> $\mathbf{( 1 9 9 4 - 1 9 9 6 )}$ | Current <br> SPIS List <br> Ranking <br> $(1998-2000)$ | Street | Old <br> Number of <br> Accidents <br> $(\mathbf{1 9 9 4 - 1 9 9 6})$ | Old <br> SPIS <br> Number <br> $\mathbf{1 9 9 4 - 1 9 9 6}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| 9 | 19 | Evergreen Road | Jackson School Road | 16 | 58.81 |
| 10 | 241 | Evergreen Parkway | $188^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | 13 | 56.88 |
| 13 | 10 | TV Highway | $185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | 75 | 56.02 |
| 17 | 1 | Baseline Road | $185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | 47 | 53.60 |
| 24 | NA | Baseline Street | $1^{\text {st }}$ Avenue | 30 | 50.47 |
| 26 | NA | Oelrich Road | $231^{\text {st }}$ Avenue | 4 | 50.09 |
| 28 | NA | Quatama Road | Cornelius Pass Road | 15 | 49.68 |
| 31 | 230 | Evergreen Parkway | John Olsen Road | 12 | 49.17 |
| 36 | 37 | TV Highway | $209^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | 37 | 47.78 |
| 40 | 4 | Evergreen Parkway | $185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | 33 | 46.95 |

## AVERAGE VEHICLE OCCUPANCY

Average vehicle occupancy is a measure of the movement of people on key routes. For Hillsboro, the locations of Cornell Road between Brookwood Avenue and $25^{\text {th }}$ Avenue and Baseline Road between Brookwood Avenue and $53^{\text {rd }}$ Avenue were selected as representative monitoring points for Hillsboro vehicle activity. Average vehicle occupancy (AVO) was measured during March and June 2001 for the PM peak hour (4:00 PM to 6:00 PM) on Baseline Road to be 1.32 persons per vehicle and on Cornell Road to be 1.24 persons per vehicle. The rate observed on Cornell Road is slightly lower than typical ranges for auto occupancy (over all time periods and trip purposes) which range from about 1.31 to 1.54 persons per vehicle. ${ }^{13}$ Figure 3-15 shows the percentage of vehicles with one, two or greater than two occupants at each survey site for 2001 and 1996 for the prior TSP. The 2001 AVO rates are similar to the 1996 AVO data with Baseline Road showing a 7\% increase in average vehicle occupancy over the last four years.

Figure 3-15
2001 Average Vehicle Occupancy


## 1996 Average Vehicle Occupancy
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## TRANSIT

Transit service is provided in Hillsboro by the Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation District of Oregon (Tri-Met). Since the previous TSP, the use of transit as an alternative mode has risen ${ }^{14}$ due to an increase in frequency and coverage throughout the city and the Westside Light Rail Project. Bus route service in Hillsboro has changed significantly due to new light rail service. Bus routes were removed from areas serviced by MAX light rail to eliminate redundant service. A weekday shuttle route that operates during peak periods was added to increase connections to MAX transit stations. New bus routes were added to extend transit coverage to North Hillsboro. Currently, there are nine Tri-Met bus routes and nine MAX Light Rail stations which serve Hillsboro (see Figure 3-16):

## Bus Routes

46: North Hillsboro
47: Baseline - Evergreen
48: Cornell
49S: Quatama MAX Shuttle
52: Farmington - 185th
57: TV Highway - Forest Grove
59: Walker - Park Way
88: Hart - 198th
89: Tanasbourne

## MAX Light Rail Stations

Willow Creek/SW $185^{\text {th }}$ Ave TC
Quatama/NW 205 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave
Orenco/NW $231^{\text {st }}$ Ave
Hawthorne Farm
Fair Complex/Hillsboro Airport
Washington St/SE $12^{\text {th }}$ Ave
Tuality Hospital/SE $8^{\text {th }}$ Ave
Hillsboro Central TC/SE $3^{\text {rd }}$ Ave
Hatfield Government Center
MAX light rail and the majority of bus routes provide service all day throughout the week and on weekends. Shuttle bus routes connecting to MAX transit stations operate weekdays during the peak periods only. Table 3-13 provides the service days for the Tri-Met routes serving Hillsboro.
Table 3-13
Transit Service in Hillsboro

| Weekday All Day Tri- <br> Met Routes | Weekday Peak Only <br> Tri-Met Routes | Saturday <br> Tri-Met Routes | Sunday <br> Tri-Met Routes |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $46,47,48,52,57,59,88$, <br> 89, MAX | 41 S, 42S, 49S | $47,48,52,57,59,88$, <br> 89, MAX | $47,48,52,57,59,88$, <br> 89, MAX |
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## DKS Associates

The 2000 and 2003 average weekday ridership volumes within the TSP study area are summarized in Table 3-14. A comparison of overall transit ridership within the study area shows less than $1 \%$ growth from 2000 and 2003. A bus route level comparison shows ridership over the last three years has changed significantly for several routes. Weekday ridership volumes over the last three years have increased by more than $40 \%$ on Route 46 : North Hillsboro and $27 \%$ on Route 47: Baseline - Evergreen. Route 57: TV Highway - Forest Grove continues to operate with the highest average weekday ridership volumes although ridership is down $10 \%$ over the last three years. Route 59 : Walker - Park Way ridership has decreased $12 \%$ over the last three years.

Table 3-14
Tri-Met Weekday Ridership in Study Area (Spring 2000 \& 2003)

| Route | Direction | 2000 |  |  | 2003 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Ons | Offs | Total | Ons | Offs | Total |
| 46: North Hillsboro | Outbound | 67 | 69 | 136 | 94 | 99 | 193 |
|  | Inbound | 59 | 58 | 117 | 70 | 93 | 163 |
| 47: Baseline-Evergreen | Outbound | 234 | 348 | 582 | 330 | 405 | 735 |
|  | Inbound | 294 | 285 | 579 | 384 | 361 | 745 |
| 48: Cornell | Outbound | 291 | 344 | 635 | 282 | 332 | 614 |
|  | Inbound | 282 | 271 | 533 | 293 | 276 | 569 |
| 49S: Quatama Shuttle | Outbound | 43 | 12 | 55 | 41 | 12 | 53 |
|  | Inbound | 32 | 43 | 75 | 20 | 49 | 69 |
| 52: Farmington-185th | Outbound | 1,493 | 1,800 | 3,293 | 1,778 | 1,850 | 3,628 |
|  | Inbound | 1,333 | 1,491 | 2,824 | 1,671 | 1,919 | 3,590 |
| 57: TV Highway-Forest Grove | Outbound | 3,410 | 3,940 | 7,350 | 2,954 | 3,135 | 6,089 |
|  | Inbound | 2,552 | 3,091 | 5,643 | 2,577 | 2,925 | 5,502 |
| 59: Walker-Park Way | Outbound | 204 | 191 | 395 | 203 | 163 | 366 |
|  | Inbound | 160 | 194 | 354 | 119 | 174 | 293 |
| 88: Hart-198 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ | Outbound | 695 | 822 | 1,517 | 681 | 680 | 1,361 |
|  | Inbound | 534 | 649 | 1,183 | 587 | 677 | 1,264 |
| 89: Tanasbourne | Outbound | 446 | 350 | 796 | 469 | 316 | 785 |
|  | Inbound | 243 | 408 | 651 | 311 | 467 | 778 |
| TOTAL |  |  |  | 26,718 |  |  | 26,797 |

Source: Spring 2000 \& Spring 2003 Route Level Passenger Census, Tri-Met.
Table 3-15 summarizes general trip frequency (in minutes) and average boarding rides per revenue hour ${ }^{15}$ for Tri-Met routes serving Hillsboro. All of the existing routes exceed the Tri-Met minimum boardings per revenue hour performance standard of 10 boarding per revenue hour. All of the transit routes operate at headways of 30 minutes or better during both the AM and PM peak hours. Headways of 30 minutes or better correspond to a LOS D or better as defined in the Highway Capacity Manual methodology ${ }^{16}$.

[^13]Table 3-15
Weekday System-Wide Frequency and Average System-Wide Boarding Rates Serving Hillsboro

| Route | $\mathbf{7 : 0 0}-$ <br> $\mathbf{8 : 3 0} \mathbf{~ a m}$ | $\mathbf{8 : 3 0} \mathbf{~ a m -}$ <br> $\mathbf{4 : 0 0} \mathbf{~ p m}$ | $\mathbf{4 : 0 0} \mathbf{-}$ <br> $\mathbf{6 : 0 0} \mathbf{~ p m}$ | $\mathbf{6 : 0 0}-$ <br> $\mathbf{9 : 3 0} \mathbf{~ p m}$ | 9:30 pm- <br> Midnight | Boarding <br> Rides Per <br> Revenue <br> Hour |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MAX | 7 | 10 | 7 | 15 | $15 / 30$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| 46: North Hillsboro | 30 | 60 | 30 | - | - | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| 47: Baseline - Evergreen | 30 | 30 | 30 | 60 | - | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| 48: Cornell | 30 | 30 | 30 | 60 | - | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| 49S: Quatama Shuttle | 20 | - | 20 | - | - | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| 52: Farmington - 1855 $*$ | 15 | 15 | 15 | 30 | 60 | 41.5 |
| 57: TV Hwy - Forest Grove | 15 | 15 | 15 | 30 | 30 | 37.1 |
| 59: Walker - Park Way | 30 | 30 | 30 | 60 | - | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| 88: Hart - 198 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ | 30 | 30 | 30 | 60 | - | 38.2 |
| 89: Tanasbourne* | 30 | 30 | 30 | 60 | - | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |

Source: Transit Choices for Livability Handbook, Tri-Met, Tables 1 and 2, 2000.

* Less frequent service provided to portion or end of route.

Figure 3-17 shows the transit coverage of transit supportive land use in the Hillsboro area. The Highway Capacity Manual ${ }^{17}$ defines transit supportive areas as having either a household denisty of three households per acre or an employment density of four employees per acre ${ }^{18}$. The TSP 2000 base model land use was used to define existing conditions. The transit coverage area (transit buffer) is defined as 0.25 miles from a bus stop, 0.25 miles from a transit shuttle service area, and 0.50 miles from a LRT (light rail transit) station. Approximately $87 \%$ of the transit supportive zones ( 8,437 of 9,703 acres) are covered within the transit buffer. However, there are areas that do not have walking access to transit and therefore does not meet the Hillsboro TSP goal of providing coverage within one-quarter mile to all of Hillsboro. Specific areas include north of US 26, along Shute Road north of Butler Road and Cornelius Pass Road between Johnson Street and Baseline Road.

A new commuter rail line to be operated by Tri-Met is planned to serve the SW Portland Metro Area. The route will operate between Wilsonville and the Beaverton Town Center on existing freight rail tracks with stops at major roadway crossings and the Tigard Town Center. The new commuter rail line is expected to increase light rail ridership in Hillsboro by expanding the existing rail transit network to areas to the south including Tigard, Tualatin and Wilsonville.

Tri-Met's most recent passenger census was used to determine boardings at each bus stop ${ }^{19}$. Bus stops with boardings of at least 35 passengers per day meet Tri-Met's criteria for consideration of bus shelter locations.
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## DKS Associates

## BICYCLE

Bicycle counts were conducted during the evening peak period (4:00 to 6:00 PM) at the study intersections in Hillsboro and are shown in Figure 3-18. Of over the hundred intersections analyzed, 46 were conducted in the fall of 2002 with the remainder done during spring 2001. These counts represent a small sample of the existing bicycle activity at the study intersection based on one evening peak hour during the Fall of 2001. The level of bicycle ridership is influences by several factors such as time of year and weather. Wide variations in bicycle activity at the study intersections would be expected with data collection over extended periods of time.

The highest bicycle volumes were observed on Baseline Road at $28^{\text {th }}$ Avenue and Cornelius Pass Road at Amberwood Drive. Bicycle counts were not conducted for the prior TSP, therefore a comparison between 1996 and current bicycle usage in Hillsboro cannot be made. The updated existing bike lanes, designated bikeways and off-street bike pathways are shown in Figure 3-19. The designated bikeway facilities may or may not have future bike lanes.

There is limited connectivity for bicyclists traveling to activity centers in Hillsboro. However, there are three primary east/west routes (TV Highway, Cornell Road and Evergreen Road) and one primary north/south route ( $185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue) in Hillsboro. Bike lane gaps on Cornell Road, Cornelius Pass Road, and Evergreen Road should be addressed to provide connectivity for bicyclists on arterials. Bicycles are permitted on all roadways in the City except for US 26. Bicycle use in Hillsboro is generally for recreational, school and commuting purposes.



## PEDESTRIANS

Pedestrian counts were updated with the current intersection PM peak turn movement counts. These counts represent a small sample of the existing pedestrian activity at the study intersection based on one evening peak hour during Spring 2001 - with 46 of the intersection analyzed in Fall 2002. Pedestrian activity is influences by several factors such as time of year and weather. Wide variations in pedestrian activity at the study intersections would be expected with data collection over extended periods of time.

The current counts were broken down into both the peak hour and peak period count for pedestrians, while the previous TSP used only the peak period (4-6 PM) for pedestrian volumes. Therefore, the current pedestrian volumes shown in Figure 3-20 represent a smaller one hour time interval compared to the pedestrian volume figure in the prior TSP. Table 3-16 compares peak period (4-6 PM) pedestrian counts for current 2001/2002 and 1996 conditions at several intersections throughout Hillsboro. In general, pedestrian volumes have remained constant over the last five years. Pedestrian volumes have increased near new light rail stations, which are a large pedestrian generator. The most significant pedestrian movements occur in the Hillsboro downtown area, Tanasbourne and along TV Highway. Figure 3-20 summarizes the updated pedestrian counts.

Figure 3-21 shows the updated existing sidewalks in Hillsboro. A majority of arterial and collector streets in Hillsboro have sidewalks on at least one side of the street. In some cases, neighborhoods have extensive sidewalks and the adjacent arterial/collector do not have sidewalks which creates isolated subareas. There are some locations where sidewalks are not connected; however, on the whole connectivity and pedestrian linkages are relatively improved over conditions from 1996. In addition to facilities that are shown on this map, many residential streets also have sidewalks.

Table 3-16
Pedestrian Volumes for 2001 and 1996 in Hillsboro

| Intersection | 2001/2002 Pedestrian <br> Volume | $\mathbf{1 9 9 6}$ Pedestrian <br> Volume |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Cornell Road/25 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | 18 | 23 |
| Evergreen Road/229 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | 10 | 7 |
| TV Highway/13 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/River Road | 40 | 37 |
| Cornell Road/Stucki Avenue | 40 | 40 |
| $185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/Walker Road | 11 | 110 |
| Jackson School Road/Grant Street | 11 | 15 |
| River Road/Minter Bridge Road | 14 | 9 |
| $1^{\text {st }}$ Avenue/Oak Street | 56 | 44 |
| $10^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/Oak Street | 81 | 148 |

Sidewalks at least five feet wide are required in all new development. Existing roadways that do not have sidewalks are being retrofitted where terrain and right-of-way make it economically feasible to do so. All newly constructed sidewalks include wheelchair ramps at intersections to permit easy ingress/egress for wheelchairs. The City of Hillsboro should work to continue increasing the sidewalk coverage on all arterials, collectors, and residential streets in the Hillsboro area.

## DKS Associates

In addition to sidewalks, pedestrian paths are included in many of the City's parks, open spaces and greenways, including the Rock Creek Trail. The City of Hillsboro Parks Department has recently extended the Rock Creek Trail from Evergreen Parkway to Rock Creek Boulevard north of US 26 with a pedestrian underpass.



## TRUCKS/FREIGHT

Truck routes that have been identified in Hillsboro are generally located on roadways classified as an arterial or above and not collectors, neighborhood routes or local streets. This system provides connections with truck routes serving areas within and outside of Hillsboro making efficient truck movement and the delivery of raw materials, goods, services, and finished products possible. These routes are generally found in and serve areas where there are concentrations of commercial and/or industrial land uses. Figure 3-22 shows through truck routes within the vicinity of Hillsboro.

The truck percentages (heavy vehicles) as a portion of through traffic at the study intersections were updated with the current turn movement counts. The current truck percentages, which range from 0 to 5 percent, are shown on Figure 3-23. Table 3-17 compares peak period (4-6 PM) pedestrian counts for current 2001 and 1996 conditions at several intersections throughout Hillsboro. Overall, the truck percentages have not changed significantly from the 1996 data. Truck percentages have decreased on TV Highway from Brookwood Avenue to Cornelius Pass Road by approximately 1\%. The most significant truck percentages in Hillsboro occur at the US 26 interchanges, on Cornelius Pass Road north of US 26 and along the TV Highway corridor.

Table 3-17
Truck Percentages for 2001 and 1996 in Hillsboro

| Intersection | 2001 <br> Truck Percentage | $\mathbf{1 9 9 6}$ <br> Truck Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Cornelius Pass Road/Cornell Road | $2 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| TV Highway/Oak Street | $2 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| Evergreen Road/Glencoe Road | $3 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| $1^{\text {st }}$ Street/Grant Street | $3 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| TV Highway/Witch Hazel Road | $2 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| Cornelius Pass Road/Jacobson Road | $5 \%$ | $6 \%$ |
| US 26 Westbound Ramps/185 |  |  |




## RAIL

All freight rail lines within the vicinity of Hillsboro are operated by Portland \& Western (P\&W), a sister company of Willamette \& Pacific (W\&P) Railroad and a subsidiary of Genesee \& Wyoming Incorporated. Figure 3-24 shows the existing rail routes and crossing treatments within the boundaries of Hillsboro. The rail lines in the Hillsboro area are low-density, meaning they are not used as mainline routes. Trains generally operate within the Hillsboro area Monday through Saturday. Time of operation can vary, but the approximate number of trains per day remains constant. Table 3-18 is a list of train origins, destinations, hours of operation and the number of trains per day.

Table 3-18
Train Schedules for the Hillsboro Area

| Origin | Frequency and Hours of Operation |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | AM | PM |
| Beaverton (St. Mary's) | Hillsboro Depot | None | 1 train daily <br> Monday - Friday |
| Hillsboro Depot | Cornelius | None | 1 train daily <br> Monday - Friday |
| Deer Island or <br> Donquin (near Wilsonville) | Hillsboro Depot | 5 trains per week | None |
| Hillsboro Depot | Banks | 12 trains per week, schedule times varies |  |

Accident data provided by the ODOT Rail Division indicates three train related accidents have occurred in Hillsboro in the last ten years. The accidents occurred on the railline located south of TV Highway at the River Road, Labor Camp Road and Minter Bridge Road rail crossings. The rail crossings at River Road and Minter Bridge Road are controlled by automatic gates. The Labor Camp Road rail crossing is uncontrolled and scheduled for eventual removal.

The area between $209^{\text {th }}$ Avenue and $229^{\text {th }}$ Avenue is the only available staging area along TV Highway where vehicle and other modes of travel are not disrupted due to blocked crossings caused by parked trains. Thus, should an extension of Cornelius Pass Road south of TV Highway be considered at some future date, a grade separation scheme will likely by required.

A new commuter rail line to be operated by Tri-Met is planned to serve the SW Portland Metro Area. The route will operate between Wilsonville and the Beaverton Transit Center on existing freight rail tracks with stops at major roadway crossings and the Tigard Town Center.



#### Abstract

AIR Hillsboro Airport is located in the north central portion of the city. It is bordered by Brookwood Parkway to the east, Cornell Road to the south, $25^{\text {th }}$ Avenue to the west and Evergreen Road to the north. Hillsboro Airport is an 870 -acre airport which supports all facets of general aviation activity (business, recreational, etc). The airport facility is owned and operated by the Port of Portland as part of the Port's general aviation reliever system of airports. The 2003 Master Plan and Compatibility Study Update is currently being conducted for this facility by the Port of Portland.

Hillsboro Airport is Oregon's second busiest airport with over 200,000 operations annually trailing only Portland International. With two runways (Runway $12 / 30-6,600^{\prime}$ and Runway $2 / 20-4,050$ ') and three full-service fixed-based operators, the Hillsboro Airport supports jet and propeller-driven aircraft and helicopters. Runway $12 / 30$ is equipped with high intensity edge lighting, runway end identifier lights (REILs), and an instrument landing system (ILS). The airport consists of the airfield, developed areas, runway protection zones and non-aviation industrial and commercial land. A MAX light rail station is located on NE 34th Avenue approximately $1 / 3$ mile south of the airport providing travelers with access to regional destinations including Portland.


The Hillsboro area has three additional aviation facilities. All of these facilities are currently active. Figure 3-25 shows the location of the identified aviation facilities in Hillsboro.

- Teufel Farm Strip is a private airport located south of TV Highway near $13^{\text {th }}$ Avenue.
- Licorice Lane is a private airport located outside the Hillsboro City Limits west of Rood Bridge Road.
- Amberglen Business is a private heliport located east of Aloclek Drive between Evergreen Parkway and Cornell Road.


## WATER

There are no navigable waterways within the vicinity of Hillsboro that support commercial use. The Tualatin River, to the south of Hillsboro is used for recreational purposes. No policies or recommendations in this area of transportation are provided.

## PIPELINE

The only major pipeline facilities running through the Hillsboro area are high pressure natural gas feeder lines owned and operated by Northwest Natural Gas Company. Figure 3-26 shows the feeder line routes for Hillsboro. ${ }^{20}$ The feeder lines serving Hillsboro originate at Sauvie Island. From Hillsboro, these lines branch north to North Plains and west to Forest Grove. The South Mist Pipeline Extension is a new pipeline corridor proposed by Northwest Natural Gas Company. The proposed pipeline would extend from north of US 26 near North Plains to Molalla traversing outside the west city limits of Hillsboro.
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## Chapter 4 Future Demand and Land Use

The Hillsboro Transportation System Plan Update identifies existing transportation system needs and additional facilities that are required to serve future growth for all modes of travel. Metro's transportation model was used to forecast future traffic volumes in Hillsboro. This forecast model assigns motor vehicles to the roadway network based on assumed existing and future land uses. These traffic volume projections form the basis for identifying potential roadway deficiencies and for evaluating alternative improvements. This section describes the forecasting process including key assumptions and the land use scenario.

## FUTURE LAND USES

Land use is a key factor in developing a functional transportation system. The area of land that is planned to be developed, the types of land uses, and how the land uses are mixed together have a direct relationship to forecasted demands on the transportation system. Understanding the amount and types of land use is critical to taking actions to maintain or enhance transportation system operation. Projected land uses were developed for areas within the urban growth boundary and reflect Metro's land use assumptions for the year 2020. Complete land use data sets were developed for existing 2000 conditions and year 2020 conditions.

The base year travel model is updated periodically and for this study effort, the available base model provided by Metro was for 2000. The City of Hillsboro conducted a detailed inventory of existing land uses which was incorporated into the base model by Metro. The land use database includes the number of dwelling units, the number of retail employees, and the number of other employees. Table 4-1 summarizes the land uses for existing conditions and the future 2020 scenario within the Hillsboro TSP Update study area. Since development of the 2015 Hillsboro TSP, more detailed analysis tools were developed that allow refined calculations of the land use data. Although these summaries only outline land uses in Hillsboro for the purposes of this study, the travel demand forecasts that have been evaluated reflect the regional land use growth throughout the Portland metropolitan area. ${ }^{1}$

[^16]Table 4-1
Hillsboro Land Use Summary

| Land Use | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | Increase | Percent Increase |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Households (HH) | 38,292 | 50,802 | 12,510 | $33 \%$ |
| Retail Employees (RET) | 10,323 | 19,054 | 8,731 | $85 \%$ |
| Other Employees (OTH) | 50,241 | 124,576 | 74,335 | $148 \%$ |

Based on existing conditions, the transportation system generally operates without significant deficiencies in the study area. As land uses are changed in proportion to each other (i.e. there is a significant increase in other employment relative to household growth), there will be a shift in the overall operation of the transportation system. Additionally, if a community is uniform in land use character (i.e. all employment or residential), the transportation system must support significant trips coming to or from the community rather than remaining within the community. Typically, there should be a mix of residential, commercial, and employment type land uses so that some residents may work and shop locally, reducing the need for residents to travel long distances. Table 4-1 indicates that significant growth is expected in Hillsboro in the coming decades and the housing-employment imbalance will continue.

For transportation forecasting, the land use data is divided into geographical areas called transportation analysis zones (TAZs), which represent the sources of vehicle trip generation. There are 64 Metro TAZs within the Hillsboro TSP Update study area. These 64 TAZs were subdivided into 353 TAZs to more specifically represent land use in Hillsboro as part of this plan. The disaggregated model zone boundaries are shown in Figure 4-1.

## METRO AREA TRANSPORTATION MODEL

An evaluation of future transportation system needs in Hillsboro requires the ability to accurately forecast travel demand resulting from estimates of future population and employment for the City. The objective of the transportation planning process is to provide the information necessary for making decisions on when and where improvements should be made to the transportation system to meet travel demand as developed in an urban area travel demand model as part of the Regional Transportation Plan update process. Metro uses EMME/2, a computer based program for transportation planning, to process the large amounts of data for the Portland Metropolitan area. For the Hillsboro TSP, the eastern Washington County area was evaluated at a level of detail consistent with Washington County travel forecast efforts for the 2020 travel through a traversal process and substantially more detail added into the Hillsboro area.

Traffic forecasting can be divided into several distinct but integrated components that represent the logical sequence of travel behavior. These components and their general order in the traffic forecasting process are as follows:

- Trip Generation
- Trip Distribution
- Mode Choice
- Traffic Assignment


The initial roadway network used in the traffic model was the existing streets and roadways. Future 2020 land use scenarios were tested and roadway improvements were added to mitigate the impacts of motor vehicle traffic growth, using the RTP Priority System and the 2015 Hillsboro TSP improvements as a starting basis. Improvements in each of these plans (the RTP and TSP) were validated in the study process. Forecasts of PM peak period traffic flows were produced for every major roadway segment within Hillsboro. Traffic volumes were projected on all arterials and most collector streets. Some local streets were included in the model, but many are represented by centroid connectors in the model process.

## Trip Generation

The trip generation process translates land use quantities (number of dwelling units, retail, and other employment) into vehicle trip ends (number of vehicles entering or leaving a TAZ or sub-TAZ) using trip generation rates established during the model verification process. The Metro trip generation process is elaborate, entailing detailed trip characteristics for various types of housing, retail employment, non-retail employment, and special activities. Typically, most traffic impact studies rely on the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) research for analysis ${ }^{2}$. The model process is tailored to variations in travel characteristics and activities in the region. For reference, Table 4-2 provides a summary of the approximate average evening peak hour trip rates used in the Metro model. These are averaged over a broad area and thus, are different than driveway counts represented by ITE. This data provides a reference for the trip generation process used in the model.

Table 4-2
Approximate Average PM Peak Period Trip Rates Used in Metro Model

|  | Average Trip Rate/Unit |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Unit | In | Out | Total |
| Household (HH) | 0.43 | 0.19 | 0.62 |
| Retail Employee (RET) | 0.78 | 0.69 | 1.47 |
| Other Employee (OTH) | 0.07 | 0.29 | 0.36 |

Source: DKS/Metro
Table 4-3 illustrates the estimated growth in vehicle trips generated within the Hillsboro area (the area shown in Figure 4-1) during the PM peak period (2-hr peak) between 2000 and 2020. It indicates that vehicle trips in Hillsboro would grow by approximately 50 percent between 2000 and 2020 if the land develops according to Metro's 2020 land use assumptions. Assuming a 20-year horizon to the 2020 scenario, this represents annualized growth rate of about two percent per year.

Table 4-3
Existing and Future Projected Vehicle Trip Generation PM Peak 2-Hour Period Vehicle Trips

|  | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ Trips | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ Trips |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Hillsboro TSP study area | 57,000 | 104,000 |
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## Trip Distribution

This step estimates how many trips travel from one zone in the model to any other zone. Distribution is based on the number of trip ends generated in each zone pair, and on factors that relate the likelihood of travel between any two zones to the travel time between zones. In projecting long-range future traffic volumes, it is important to consider potential changes in regional travel patterns.

Although the locations and amounts of traffic generation in Hillsboro are essentially a function of future land use in the city, the distribution of trips is influenced by regional growth, particularly in neighboring areas such as Portland and Beaverton as well as unincorporated areas to the north, south, and west of Hillsboro. External trips (trips that have either an origin and not a destination in Hillsboro or have a destination but not an origin in Hillsboro) and through trips (trips that pass through Hillsboro and have neither an origin nor a destination there) were projected using trip distribution patterns based upon the Metro Regional Travel Demand Forecast Model.

## Mode Choice

This step determined how many trips will be made by various modes (single-occupant vehicle, transit, carpool, pedestrian, bicycle, etc.). The 2000 mode splits are incorporated into the base model and adjustments to that mode split may be made for the future scenario, depending on any expected changes in transit or carpool use. These considerations are built into the forecasts used for 2020.

Based upon analysis of the forecasted mode choice in 2020, an analysis was performed to determine the level of non-single occupant vehicle (SOV) mode share in Hillsboro. The travel model provides estimates of the various modes of travel that can be generally assessed at the transportation analysis zone level. Figures 4-3 to 4-5 (shown in following section) summarize the level of non-SOV mode share estimated for 2020 using the regional travel demand forecast model in comparison to the modal targets established in the RTP. Generally the areas served by light rail transit and frequent bus service have the highest levels of non-SOV mode use. Overall, the 2040 modal targets for the regional center/town center areas is nearly met in 2020 and is within the lower end of the target range for other land use designations.

## Traffic Assignment

In this process, trips from one zone to another are assigned to specific travel routes in the network, and resulting trip volumes are accumulated on links of the network until all trips are assigned. Network travel times are updated to reflect the congestion effects of the traffic assigned through an equilibrium process. Congested travel times are estimated using what are called "volume-delay functions" in $\mathrm{EMME} / 2$. There are different forms of volume/delay functions, all of which attempt to simulate the impact of congestion on travel times (greater delay) as traffic volume increases. The volume-delay functions take into account the specific characteristics of each roadway link, such as capacity, speed and facility type. This allows the model to reflect conditions somewhat similar to driver behavior.

## Model Verification

The base 2000 modeled traffic volumes were compared against actual traffic volume counts across on key arterials, at key intersections and screenlines (a straight line across the study area to assess directional volumes on each roadway crossing that line). Most arterial traffic volumes meet screenline tolerances for forecast adequacy. Based on this performance, the model was used for future forecasting and assessment of circulation change.

## Model Application to Hillsboro

Intersection turn movements were extracted from the model at key intersections for both the base year 2000 and forecast year 2020 scenarios. These intersection turn movements were not used directly, but a portion of the increment of the year 2020 turn movements over the 2000 turn movements was applied (added) to existing (actual 2000) turn movement counts in Hillsboro. A post processing technique is utilized to refine model travel forecasts to the volume forecasts utilized for 2020 intersection analysis. The turn movement volumes used for future year intersection analysis can be found in the technical appendix for the TSP.

## FORECASTED 2020 CAPACITY DEFICIENCIES

The forecasted 2020 no build scenario was evaluated to assess the worst case operating conditions. This scenario, based on the Metro Regional Travel Demand Forecast Model, does not include any planned or preferred transportation system improvements but the 2020 model does use the priority trip table. Figures 4-2 and 4-3 show the forecasted demand/capacity on roadways for the TSP 2000 base and 2020 no build scenarios. As shown in the figure, the no build scenario transportation system lacks adequate roadway capacity to serve the expected future travel needs. Demand/Capacity (D/C) ratios exceed 1.0 system wide. Table $4-4$ lists the forecasted $\mathrm{D} / \mathrm{C}$ ratios on major roadways in the TSP study area that would exceed standards. To meet performance standards and serve future growth, the future transportation system needs significant multi-modal improvements and strategies to manage the forecasted travel demand.

Table 4-4: Forecasted 2020 Demand/Capacity Ratios (Priority Scenario) 2-Hour

| Roadway Section | Forecasted D/C ratio |
| :--- | :---: |
| TV Highway from $185^{\text {th }}$ to 198 th | 1.10 |
| TV Highway from $209^{\text {th }}$ to Cornelius Pass | 1.07 |
| TV Highway from Cornelius Pass to $229^{\text {th }}$ | 1.08 |
| Brookwood from Cedar to Bentley | 1.03 |
| Baseline from $53^{\text {rd }}$ to Brookwood | 1.03 |
| Baseline from $1^{\text {st }}$ to $5^{\text {th }}$ | 1.02 |
| Cornell from Brookwood to $28^{\text {th }}$ | 1.24 |
| Cornelius Pass from Quatama to Baseline | 1.27 |
| Cornleius Pass from Wagon Way to US 26 | 1.06 |
| Evergreen from $15^{\text {th }}$ to Jackson School | 1.41 |
| Evergreen from Aloclek to John Olsen | 1.05 |
| $185^{\text {th }}$ from Walker to Baseline | 1.08 |
| ${\text { Walker from } 185^{\text {th }} \text { to Amberglen }}^{1.36}$ |  |
| West Union from Cornelius Pass to $185^{\text {th }}$ | 1.24 |
| $53^{\text {rd }}$ from Elam Young to Baseline | 1.19 |




## Transportation Demand Management

Transportation Demand Management (TDM) is the general term used to describe any action that removes single occupant vehicle trips from the roadway network during peak travel demand periods. As growth in the Hillsboro area occurs, the number of vehicle trips and travel demand in the area will also increase. The ability to change a users travel behavior and provide alternative mode choices will help accommodate this growth. Generally, TDM focuses on reducing vehicle miles traveled and promoting alternative modes of travel for large employers of an area. This is due in part to the Employee Commute Options (ECO) rules that were passed by the Oregon Legislature in 1993 to help protect the health of Portland area residents from air pollution and to ensure that the area complied with the Federal Clean Air Act. ${ }^{3}$

Research has shown that a comprehensive set of complementary policies implemented over a large geographic area can have an effect on the number of vehicle miles traveled to/from that area. ${ }^{4}$ However, the same research indicates that in order for TDM measures to be effective, they should go beyond the low-cost, uncontroversial measures commonly used such as carpooling, transportation coordinators/associations, priority parking spaces, etc. The more effective TDM measures include elements related to parking and congestion pricing, improved services for alternative modes of travel, and other market-based measures. However, TDM includes a wide variety of actions that are specifically tailored to the individual needs of an area. Table $4-5$ provides a list of several strategies outlined in the ECO program that could be applicable to the Hillsboro area.

Table 4-5
Transportation Demand Management Strategies

| Strategy | Description | Potential Trip Reduction |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Telecommuting | Employees perform regular work duties at home or at a work center closer to home, rather than commuting from home to work. This can be full time or on selected workdays. This can require computer equipment to be most effective. | 82-91\% (Full Time) 14-36\% (1-2 day/wk) |
| Compressed Work Week | Schedule where employees work their regular scheduled number of hours in fewer days per week. | $\begin{array}{ll} \hline 7-9 \% & (9 \mathrm{day} / 80 \mathrm{hr}) \\ 16-18 \% & (4 \mathrm{day} / 40 \mathrm{hr}) \\ 32-36 \% & \text { (3day/36hr) } \end{array}$ |
| Transit Pass Subsidy | For employees who take transit to work on a regular basis, the employer pays for all or part of the cost of a monthly transit pass. | 19-32\% (full subsidy, high transit service) 2-3\% (half subsidy, medium transit service) |
| Cash Out Employee Parking | An employer that has been subsidizing parking (free parking) discontinues the subsidy and charges all employees for parking. An amount equivalent to the previous subsidy is then provided to each employee, who then can decide which mode of travel to use. | 8-20\% (high transit service available) 5-9\% (medium transit services available) 2-4\% (low transit services available) |
| Reduced Parking Cost for HOVs | Parking costs charged to employees are reduced for high occupancy vehicles (HOV) such as carpools and vanpools. | 1-3\% |
| Bicycle Program | Provides support services to those employees that bicycle to | 0-10\% |

[^18]| Strategy | Description | Potential Trip <br> Reduction |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
|  | work. Examples include: safe/secure bicycle storage, shower <br> facilities and subsidy of commute bicycle purchase. | $1-2 \%$ |
| On-site Rideshare <br> Matching for <br> HOVs | Employees who are interested in carpooling or vanpooling <br> provide information to a transportation coordinator regarding <br> their work hours, availability of a vehicle and place of <br> residence. | Employees that live near each other are organized into a <br> vanpool for their trip to work. The employer may subsidize the <br> cost of operation and maintaining the van. |
| Provide Vanpools | $15-25 \%$ (company <br> provided van with fee) <br> $30-40 \%$ (company <br> subsidized van) |  |
| Gift/Awards for <br> Alternative Mode <br> Use | Employees are offered the opportunity to receive a gift or an <br> award for using modes other than driving alone. | $0-3 \%$ |
| Walking Program | Provide support services for those who walk to work. This <br> could include buying walking shoes or providing lockers and <br> showers. | $0-3 \%$ |
| Company Cars for <br> Business Travel | Employees are allowed to use company cars for business-related <br> travel during the day | $0-1 \%$ |
| Guaranteed Ride <br> Home Program | A company owned or leased vehicle or taxi fare is provided in <br> the case of an emergency for employees that use alternative <br> modes. | $1-3 \%$ |
| Time off with Pay <br> for Alternative <br> Mode Use | Employees are offered time off with pay as an incentive to use <br> alternative modes. | $1-2 \%$ |

Source: Guidance for Estimating Trip Reductions from Commute Options, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, August 1996.

Redevelopment in the Hillsboro area will also allow for an increased use in TDM measures. Setting TDM goals and policies for new development will be necessary to implement TDM measures in the future. With many regional trips destined to and from the Hillsboro area, region wide TDM measures should help to reduce congestion. Metro has established non-SOV (Single Occupancy Vehicle) mode share targets by 2040 for regional centers. The 2040 non-SOV model target for regional centers, town centers, LRT (light rail transit) communities, main streets, and corridors is 45-55\%. ${ }^{5}$

The RTP ${ }^{6}$ outlines non-SOV targets for the year 2040 for the Portland region. Non-SOV trip percentages for the Hillsboro area, based on the Metro 2020 forecast model, are summarized in Table 4-6. The 2020 Priority system forecasted rates indicate that the significant investment in transportation improvements will, in general, achieve a three percent reduction in SOV trips in the Hillsboro area, compared to the committed funding scenario. Figures 4-4 to $4-6$ show the non-SOV trip percentages by Metro TAZ for the committed, priority, and growth in non-SOV between committed and priority scenarios.

[^19]Table 4-6
Forecasted non-SOV shares in the Hillsboro TSP Study Area

| Area | 2020 RTP Committed System Model Rate | 2020 RTP Priority System Model Rate | 2040 Metro Goal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Overall TSP Study Area | 33\% | 36\% | N/A |
| 2040 Design Type: <br> - Regional Centers <br> - Town Centers <br> - LRT Communities <br> - Main Streets <br> - Corridors | 36\% | 40\% | 45-55\% |
| 2040 Design Type: <br> - Industrial areas <br> - Intermodal facilities <br> - Employment areas <br> - Inner neighborhoods <br> - Outer neighborhoods | 30\% | 32\% | 40-45\% |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { Source: } & 2020 \text { Metro Regional Travel Demand Model } \\ & 2000 \text { Metro Regional Transportation Plan }\end{array}$ |  |  |  |

The forecasted non-SOV percentages can only be achieved with significant improvements to the transportation system and implementation of trip reduction strategies. The City of Hillsboro should coordinate with Washington County, the Westside Transportation Alliance, and Tri-Met to implement strategies to ensure TDM assumptions in the RTP are implemented. The City of Hillsboro, Washington County, and Tri-Met should coordinate to implement the pedestrian, bicycle, and transit system improvements, which offer alternative modes of travel.

TRANSPORTATION SOLUTIONS

## Transportation System Plan



Figure 4-4 NON-SOV PERCENTAGES
Town Center, Regional Center, Station Community, Corridor, Main Street

Study Area Boundary



## PEDESTRIANS

The existing pedestrian system network map was updated from the previous TSP to reflect recent improvements and the expanded TSP Study Area. In most cases sidewalk improvements are aimed at closing gaps in the existing sidewalk network to provide connectivity rather than capacity.

Existing strategies contained within the TSP for identifying and prioritizing future pedestrian projects in Hillsboro were revised over the past three years by the Hillsboro Bicycle and Pedestrian Task Force in order to address new emphases on providing safe routes to school and safe access to transit.

The Hillsboro Bicycle and Pedestrian Task Force were formed in late 2000 as the citizen participation committee charged with implementing Strategy 11 of the Hillsboro 2020 Vision and Action Plan. Strategy 11 calls for completion of "an integrated system of sidewalks and bike paths to serve the entire city, improving neighborhood connections, recreation options and safety." Two of the key implementing actions for Strategy 11 are developing an inventory and mapping local neighborhood bike/pedestrian pathways and exploring feasible funding options.

The Task Force identified and prioritized pedestrian projects using seven criteria that were designed to provide pedestrians with system-wide connectivity to key destinations in a safe, convenient manner. Built into the seven criteria was the new emphasis on providing safe routes to school whereby pedestrian projects that would provide a safe route to school received more points than projects that do not. The highest total score that a pedestrian project could receive is 20 points. All projects receiving 12 points or more were included in the Pedestrian Master Plan project list. The Task Force selected this point range to ensure an equitable geographic distribution of projects in addition to system-wide connectivity. These criteria were also used to identify and prioritize bicycle projects. The seven criteria and their point value are as follows:

1. Destinations. Does the project provide connections to schools, parks, recreational uses and activity centers? This criterion was intended to ensure that safe connections are provided to popular or likely destinations, especially destinations where children are likely to travel. (2 points for each school; 2 points for downtown; and 1 point per park and shopping/employment area, up to a maximum of 5 points).
2. Potential usage. Does the project has or is likely to have a high daily usage? This criterion was intended to make sure that projects that were likely to have a high daily usage were given more points than ones that do not. (Maximum of 4 points based on land uses and pedestrian attractors).
3. Connects to transit. Does the project provide access to bus stops, light rail transit (LRT) stations and park and ride sites? Connectivity to other transportation modes such as transit is a high priority. (Maximum of 3 points if project is located on street with existing or planned bus line; 2 points if project is on street with MAX line in the Regional Center (RC) or within $1 / 4$ mile of MAX in RC, or is within $1 / 4$ mile of existing or planned bus line; 1 point if project is between $1 / 4$ to $1 / 2$ mile from existing or planned transit line; 0 points if project is greater than $1 / 2$ mile from existing or planned transit line).
4. Connects to existing pedestrian network. Does the project link, complete or extend existing or funded systems (e.g. bikeways or walkways) or is the first element of a planned system? This criterion was intended to give more points to projects that provide connections on both ends to planned or existing bikeways or walkways. (Maximum of 3 points if project connects
on both ends to planned or existing bikeways or walkways; 2 points if it connects on one end; and 1 point if it stands alone).
5. Benefits both bicyclists and pedestrians. Does the project consider the needs of both bicyclists and pedestrians? This criterion was intended to give more points to projects that are multi-modal and the needs of bicyclists and pedestrians are both considered. If the project only provides for one mode, the design of the project should not preclude use by the other mode, now or in the future, where appropriate. (Maximum of 2 points if project is multimodal; 1 point if marginal benefit, e.g., pedestrians can now walk in bike lane).
6. Overcomes barrier. Does the project overcome an existing barrier or road that is a deterrent to safe bicycle or pedestrian travel? This criterion was intended to ensure those barriers such as river crossings (e.g., bridge improvements); freeway, arterial or railroad crossings; and other "squeeze points" such as lack of shoulders on high speed/volume roadways, dangerous/complicated intersections, poor sight distance, or other obstacles to direct travel were addressed in the project. (Maximum of 2 points if a barrier like a major street without sidewalks or lots of intersections is overcome; 1 point if minor barrier, e.g. no sidewalks now is overcome).
7. Safe route to school. Does the project provide a safe route to school? This criterion was intended to capture projects located within school walk boundaries that provide a safe route to school. For bicycle projects, it was assumed that children would be riding their bicycles on sidewalks or streets with bike lanes that are located within school walk boundaries. (If this criterion is met, 1 point is given).

In the identification and prioritization of pedestrian projects, the Task Force discovered that the sidewalk gaps within the network are mainly found on unimproved streets (i.e. street with inadequate drainage lacking curb and gutter). Many of these streets also have been identified as needing bike lanes to fill gaps in the bikeway network. Because of these conditions, projects that are multi-modal e.g. provide the opportunity to choose among more than one transportation mode (pedestrian, bicycle, access to transit) received more points.

See Chapter 1, Table 1-1 for the Pedestrian Master Plan Priority Projects list.
The 2000 Regional Transportation System Plan (RTP) includes designations for pedestrian districts and transit/mixed use corridors (see Figure 1-2). The RTP defines pedestrian districts as areas of high or potentially high pedestrian activity where regional policy places priority on creating a safe, direct, and attractive pedestrian environment. In general, these are areas planned for compact, mixed-use development served by transit and correspond to the following 2040 design type designations within the City of Hillsboro: regional centers, town centers, main streets, and station communities. The corresponding areas within the City of Hillsboro include the Hillsboro Regional Center (downtown Hillsboro), Orenco Town Center, the Tanasbourne Town Center, the NE $28{ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/East Main Street Planning Area, and the Station Community Planning Areas (SCPA). These areas are characterized by buildings oriented to the street and by boulevard street design features such as wider sidewalks with buffering from traffic, marked street crossing at intersections, pedestrian-scale lighting, benches, bus shelters, and street trees.

Transit/mixed-use corridors are defined as priority areas for pedestrian travel served by good quality transit service that will generate substantial pedestrian traffic near neighborhood-oriented retail development, schools, parks, and bus stops. These corridors should include such design features as wide sidewalks with buffering from traffic, pedestrian scale-lighting, benches, bus shelters, and street
trees. The 2040 design type designation for transit/mixed-use corridors is "Corridors". The corresponding corridor areas within the City of Hillsboro include Tualatin Valley Highway, $185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue, Baseline Road, Cornell Road, Evergreen Parkway, $229^{\text {th }}$ Avenue and the Baseline Street/Oak Street couplet. As shown in Figure 1-2, the Pedestrian Master Plan identifies improvements to provide a connected pedestrian network to and within the RTP designated pedestrian districts and transit/mixed use corridors. The City of Hillsboro Development Code regulations should require new development in the pedestrian districts and transit/mixed use corridors to comply with the RTP descriptions listed above.

In general, the most important existing pedestrian need in Hillsboro is a well-connected pedestrian system within a half-mile grid and connectivity to light rail transit (LRT) stations and key centers in Hillsboro (parks, schools, retail, etc.). The seven criteria previously described were designed to identify the greatest needs and barriers to providing a safe, well-connected pedestrian system in Hillsboro (see described description of the criteria). A well-connected pedestrian system to and within the pedestrian districts and transit/mixed use corridors will ensure direct and logical pedestrian crossing at transit stops. The City of Hillsboro should coordinate with Washington County, Tri-Met, Metro, and ODOT to ensure that major transit stops will be located at sites with a signalized and/or marked pedestrian crossing. In the future, pedestrian needs will be similar in the City, but there will be additional activity centers that will need to be considered and interconnected.

In 2003, due to the numerous changes to the existing sidewalk inventory of collector and arterial streets conducted in 1996, it was determined that a new sidewalk inventory should be conducted. The new sidewalk inventory also inventoried streets designated as neighborhood routes. Identifying gaps in the sidewalk system for neighborhood route streets is important as they provide key connectivity to popular destinations and are more likely to experience heavy pedestrian usage due to their characteristics such as lower traffic volumes which provide for a safer, more pleasant walking experience. Rather than starting from scratch with a new inventory, the City used a regional sidewalk inventory conducted 2001-2002 by Tri-Met in as part of their Pedestrians to Transit project as a base inventory. The City updated the base inventory to reflect conditions as of August 2003. This new sidewalk inventory shows gaps in the sidewalk system that were not identified in 1996, as well as new sidewalks that were added since the 1996 inventory.

The main changes to the Pedestrian Master Plan that are a result of the new sidewalk inventory consist of the addition of existing and planned sidewalks on streets designated as Neighborhood Routes, new street connections including planned sidewalks such as those to Witch Hazel Village located south of Tualatin Valley Highway (see Figure 1-5, Street Improvement Plan), and changing the type of pedestrian facility from planned sidewalk to multi-use trail connections for some streets that would need to cross creeks or wetlands such as SE $18^{\text {th }}$ Avenue or Brogden Street. Overall, the changes that are a result of the new sidewalk inventory document a more realistic picture of what is actually on the ground in terms of gaps in the pedestrian system than was shown previously in the TSP. For example, arterial, collector and neighborhood route streets as depicted on the Pedestrian Master Plan map (see Figure 1-2) are only shown as having existing sidewalks if there are sidewalks on both sides of the street, and if there are sidewalks missing on one side of the street, then planned sidewalks are shown.

## BICYCLES

The Bicycle Master Plan has been updated from the previous TSP and includes completed
improvement projects, the addition of new improvement projects, a new type of bikeway facility, and an expanded TSP Study Area (See Figure 1-3). Bikeway improvements are intended to close the gaps in the bicycle network along arterial and collector roadways and improve connectivity to key destinations (schools, parks, employment areas, and activity centers).

Existing strategies contained within the TSP for identifying and prioritizing future bicycle projects in Hillsboro were revised over the past three years by the Hillsboro Bicycle and Pedestrian Task Force in order to improve connectivity and provide bikeway facilities that better address safety issues for children and commuters and a new emphasis on providing safe routes to school.

In review of the existing bikeway network, the Task Force realized that there was a need for some methodology for determining if bike lanes were appropriate for existing collector streets that are currently designated as bicycle way network streets in the TSP. The Task Force found guidelines developed by the City of Portland for determining under which circumstances bike lanes are appropriate for all new or reconstructed streets and applied these guidelines to existing collector streets currently designated as bicycle way network streets.

These guidelines are based on the average number of vehicles per day (vpd) and the functional classification of a street. In some cases, due to width or topographical constraints, on-street parking or traffic calming needs, it may not be possible to provide bike lanes. All collector streets with over $3,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ were evaluated and as a result, many streets not previously designated for bike lanes were designated as appropriate for bike lanes.

In order to address the need for the provision of bikeway facilities that were more safe for children and commuting cyclists looking for routes on streets with less traffic volumes that provide connectivity to key destinations, the Task Force determined that a new type of bikeway facility would be appropriate. This new bikeway facility - a bicycle boulevard is suggested in the Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan as a refinement of the shared roadway concept (bicycle way network).

A bicycle boulevard is a shared roadway where the through movement of bicycles is given priority over motor vehicle travel on a local street. Traffic calming and control devices including signage are used to control traffic speeds and limit conflicts between automobiles and bicyclists and favor bicycle movement on bicycle boulevard streets. There are three bicycle boulevard streets in Hillsboro (see Figure 1-3). They include Connell Avenue from W. Main Street to NW Cory Street, Grant Street from N. $1^{\text {st }}$ Avenue to NE $28^{\text {th }}$ Avenue and Walnut Street from S. $1^{\text {st }}$ Avenue to SE $18^{\text {th }}$ Avenue. These streets were selected due to their primarily residential character, their length and connectivity to key destinations and lower speeds.

Bicycle projects were identified and prioritized by the Hillsboro Bicycle and Pedestrian Task Force using the same seven criteria used to identify and prioritize pedestrian projects. All projects with a score of 12 or greater out of 20 possible points were included on the Bicycle Master Plan project list (see Table 1-2). All multi-use trail projects which consist of off-street facilities were also included on the Bicycle Master Plan project list as they supplement the bikeway network by providing additional connectivity to key destinations and recreational opportunities.

The 2000 Metro RTP includes a bicycle functional classification system with the following designations:

- Regional Access Bikeway: Function focuses on accessibility to and within the central city, regional centers, and larger town centers. Travel time is an important factor as these bikeways generally have high volumes.
- Regional Corridor On-Street Bikeway: Functions as longer routes that provide point-to-point connection between the central city, regional centers, and larger town centers. Generally higher automobile speeds and volumes than community connector bikeways.
- Community Connector Bikeway: Connect smaller town centers, main streets, station areas, industrial areas, and other regional attractions.
- Regional Corridor Off-Street Bikeway (multi-use paths with bicycle transportation function): Likely to be used for commuting to work or school, accessing transit, or traveling to a store, library, or other local destination. Bicycle/pedestrian sidewalks on bridges are included in this classification. Design includes physical separation from motor vehicle traffic by open space or barrier.

Regional bikeway facilities in TSP Study Area are as follows:

## Regional Access Bikeway

- $1^{\text {st }}$ Avenue (South city limits to NE Jackson St)
- SE $10^{\text {th }}$ Avenue (SE Walnut St to SE Baseline St)
- NW $185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue (W Baseline Rd to US 26)
- NW $231^{\text {st }}$ Avenue (W Baseline Rd to NW Cornell Rd)
- SE Baseline Street (S $1^{\text {st }}$ Ave to SE $10^{\text {th }}$ Ave)
- NW Evergreen Parkway (NW Stucki Ave to NW Cornell Rd)
- SE Oak Street (S $1^{\text {st }}$ Ave to SE $10^{\text {th }}$ Ave)


## Regional Corridor On-street Bikeway

- N $1^{\text {st }}$ Avenue/NW Glencoe Road (NE Jackson St to US 26)
- NW $185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue (US 26 to NW Springville Rd)
- SW $185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue (W Baseline Rd to TV Hwy)
- SW Baseline Street (S $1^{\text {st }}$ Ave to TV Hwy)
- Cornell Road (E Main St to east city limits)
- E Main Street/W Baseline Road (SE $10^{\text {th }}$ Ave to NW $185^{\text {th }}$ Ave)
- SW Oak Street (S ${ }^{\text {st }}$ Ave to TV Hwy)
- Tualatin Valley Highway (east city limits to SE $10^{\text {th }}$ Ave)
- Tualatin Valley Highway (SW Baseline/Oak St to west city limits)


## Community Connector Bikeway

- SW 205 ${ }^{\text {th }} /$ NW $206{ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenues (SW Baseline Rd to NW Cornell Rd)
- SW $209^{\text {th }}$ Avenue (TV Hwy to SW Farmington Rd)
- NW $229^{\text {th }}$ Avenue (NE Cornell Rd to NW Evergreen Pkwy)
- NE $28^{\text {th }} / \mathrm{NE} 25^{\text {th }}$ Avenues (E Main St to NW Evergreen Rd)
- SW $231^{\text {st }} /$ SW $234^{\text {th }}$ Avenues/Century Blvd (TV Hwy to W Baseline Rd)
- NE Airport Road/NE Butler Street/Road (NE Brookwood Pkwy to NW Cornelius Pass Rd)
- NW Amberglen Parkway/NW Stucki Avenue (NW $206^{\text {th }}$ Ave to NW Evergreen Pkwy)
- Brookwood Avenue/Parkway/NW Shute Road (TV Hwy to NW Helvetia Rd)
- Cornelius Pass Road (TV Hwy to West Union Rd)
- NW Evergreen Road/Parkway (NW Glencoe Rd to NW Stucki Ave)
- NW Walker Road (NW Amberglen Pkwy to east city limits)
- West Union Road (NW Shute Rd to NW $185^{\text {th }}$ Ave)


## Regional Corridor Off-street Bikeway

- Beaverton Creek Trail (NW $231^{\text {st }}$ Ave/Baseline Rd to SW $185^{\text {th }}$ Ave)
- Rock Creek Trail (Tualatin River to West Union Rd)
- Bronson Creek Trail (WW 205 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave to NW Cornell Rd)

The proposed updates to the Bicycle Master Plan are summarized in Table 4-7.
Table 4-7
Updates to Bicycle Master Plan

| Roadway | Hillsboro 2015 TSP | Draft Hillsboro 2020 TSP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $6{ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue - NE Lincoln St to SE Washington St | N/A | Bicycle Way Network |
| NE $10^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/NE Queens Lane/NE Delsey Street - NE Kathryn St to NE Grant St | N/A | Bicycle Way Network |
| NE $15^{\text {th }}$ Avenue - NE Kathryn St to NW Evergreen Rd | Bicycle Way Network | Planned Bike Lanes |
| NE $15^{\text {th }}$ Avenue - NE Sunrise Ln to NE Kathryn St | Bicycle Way Network | N/A |
| NE $17^{\text {th }}$ Avenue - NE Cornell Rd to NE Sunrise Ln | Bicycle Way Network | N/A |
| NE $18{ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue - E Main St to NE Grant St | N/A | Bicycle Way Network |
| SE $21{ }^{\text {st }}$ Avenue - SE Cypress St to SE Maple St | Bicycle Way Network | Planned Bike Lanes |
| SW $211^{\text {th }}$ Avenue - SW Rock Rd to SW Jay St | N/A | Bicycle Way Network |
| SE $24^{\text {th }}$ Avenue - SE Maple St to E Main St | Bicycle Way Network | Planned Bike Lanes |
| NW 228 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/NW Alder Street - NW Dogwood St to NW $2311^{\text {st }}$ Ave | N/A | Bicycle Way Network |
| SW $229^{\text {th }}$ Avenue - TV Hwy to SW Johnson St | Bicycle Way Network | Planned Bike Lanes |
| NW $235^{\text {th }}$ Avenue - NW Evergreen Pkwy to NW Bennett St | N/A | Bicycle Way Network |
| SW $239^{\text {th }}$ Avenue - TV Hwy to SW Lois St | Bicycle Way Network/ N/A | Planned Bike Lanes |
| NE $25^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/NE Hampton Court - E Main St to Multi-use path connecting to NE $28^{\text {th }}$ Ave | N/A | Bicycle Way Network |
| NW $253^{\text {rd }}$ Avenue Realignment - NW Evergreen Rd to NW Huffman St | N/A | Planned Bike Lanes |
| NW $317^{\text {th }}$ Avenue - W Main St to NW Jackson St | Bicycle Way Network | N/A |
| Hillsboro Transportation System Plan Update Future Conditions | 4-21 | P00355 January 2004 |


| Roadway | Hillsboro 2015 TSP | Draft Hillsboro 2020 TSP |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{array}{l}\text { NE 53 } \\ \text { rd } \\ \text { Young Pkwy }\end{array}$ | Planned Bike Lanes |  |
| $\begin{array}{l}\text { NE } 7^{\text {th }} \text { Avenue - NE Lincoln St to SE Washington } \\ \text { St }\end{array}$ | Bicycle Way Network | N/A |
| $\begin{array}{l}\text { SE Alexander Street }- \text { SW 229 } \\ \text { Brookwood Ave }\end{array}$ |  |  |
| Baseline Street - SW Dennis Ave to SE 10 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave | N/A | Bicycle Way Network |$]$| Planned Bike Lanes |
| :---: |
| NE Campus Court Extension - to NE Ray Circle |


| Roadway | Hillsboro 2015 TSP | Draft Hillsboro 2020 TSP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| W Main Street - SW Baseline St to N $1^{\text {st }}$ Ave | Bicycle Way Network | Planned Bike Lanes |
| SE Maple Street - SE $13{ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave to SE $24{ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave | Bicycle Way Network | Planned Bike Lanes |
| SE Meadowlark Drive/SE Thrush Avenue/SE Rood Bridge Drive - SE Minter Bridge Rd to SE Rood Bridge Dr | N/A | Bicycle Way Network |
| SE Morgan Road/SE Smith Drive/SE Singing Woods Drive - SE Minter Bridge Rd to SE Rood Bridge Rd | N/A | Bicycle Way Network |
| North/South Road - NW Huffman St to NW Meek Rd | N/A | Bicycle Way Network |
| Oak Street - SW Dennis Ave to SE $10^{\text {th }}$ Ave | Bicycle Way Network | N/A |
| SE River Road - TV Hwy to SE Witch Hazel Rd | Bicycle Way Network | Planned Bike Lanes |
| SE Rood Bridge Road - SE River Rd to south city limits | Bicycle Way Network | Planned Bike Lanes |
| NE Rosebay Drive/NE Walbridge Street - NE Orenco Station Pkwy to NE Cornell Rd | N/A | Bicycle Way Network |
| NE Shute Road - NE Cornell Rd to NE Brookwood Pkwy | Bicycle Way Network | Planned Bike Lanes |
| NW Springville Rd Extension - NW $185^{\text {th }}$ Ave to West Union Rd | N/A | Planned Bike Lanes |
| NE Sunrise Lane - NE Jackson School Rd to NE $25^{\text {th }}$ Ave | Bicycle Way Network | N/A |
| NW Wagon Way - NW 229 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave/Century Blvd to NW Croeni Rd | N/A | Bicycle Way Network |
| SE Walnut Street - S $1^{\text {st }}$ Ave to SE $188^{\text {th }}$ Ave | Bicycle Way Network/ <br> N/A | Bicycle Boulevard (also Bicycle Way Network) |
| SE Washington Street - SE $6^{\text {th }}$ Ave to SE $7^{\text {th }}$ Ave | N/A | Bicycle Way Network |
| Witch Hazel Village - multiple new and rebuilt streets such as SW Lone Oak St | N/A | Bicycle Way Network |

## TRANSIT

Currently, there are eight Tri-Met transit routes serving Hillsboro (see Figure 1-4). The transit service has been significantly changed from the 1999 TSP due to the opening of the Westside MAX. The existing transit system coverage area (see Figure 3-17) includes approximately 50 percent of the modeled transit supportive zones within the Hillsboro TSP study area ${ }^{7}$. The City of Hillsboro should coordinate with Tri-Met to focus possible future transit coverage on those transit supportive areas not covered by the existing system.

The proposed updates to the Transit Master Plan are summarized in Table 4-8.

[^20]Table 4-8
Updates to Transit Master Plan

| Transit Route | Hillsboro 2015 TSP | Draft Hillsboro 2020 TSP |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Bus Route 89 | Existing Bus Route Line | Relocated to Evergreen east <br> of Tanasbourne TC |
| Bus Route 42 | Existing Bus Route Line | Removed from operation |
| Bus Route 41 | Existing Bus Route Line | Removed from operation |
| Planned RTP Community Bus | na | Bus Routes Identified |
| Frequent Bus Stop Ranking - TV Highway | na | Bus Stops Identified |

Corridor level transit services will need to be improved and expanded to help relieve congestion and increase passenger convenience. TV Highway has been designated a planned frequent bus corridor by Tri-Met with passenger amenities identified for each bus stop based on average ridership. The frequent bus stop rankings are shown in Figure 4-7. The bus stop amenities associated with the bus stop ranking are summarized in Table 4-9.

Table 4-9
Frequent Bus Stop Rankings

| Level 1A | Level 1B | Level 2A | Level 2B | Level 3A | Level 3B |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Frequent sign | Frequent sign | Frequent sign | Frequent sign | Frequent sign | Frequent sign |
| Pole \& sign | Pole \& sign | Pole \& sign | Pole \& sign | Pole \& sign | Pole \& sign |
| Schedule <br> display | Schedule <br> display | BCID in shelter | BCID in shelter | BCID in shelter | BCID in shelter |
| Sidewalk access | Sidewalk access | Sidewalk access | Sidewalk access | Sidewalk access | Sidewalk access |
|  | Bench | Bench | Bench | Bench | Bench |
|  | Curb ramp | Curb ramp | Curb ramp | Curb ramp | Curb ramp |
|  | Optional: | A/B shelter | A/B shelter | BX/BB shelter | High capacity <br> shelter |
|  | A/B shelter | Rear door pad | Rear door pad | Rear door pad | Rear door pad |
|  | Rear door pad | Trash can | Trash can | Trash can | Trash can |
|  |  | Lighting/electric | Lighting/electric | Lighting/electric | Lighting/electric |
|  |  |  | Transit tracker | Transit tracker | Transit tracker |
|  |  |  | Bptional: | Bike rack | Bike locker |
|  |  |  | Optional: | Artwork <br> element |  |
|  |  |  | Public telephone | Public telephone |  |
|  |  |  | Artwork | Concessions <br> element | Custom <br> landscaping |

BCID (Bus Catcher Information Display)
A/B (Standard Shelter) with approx $25 \%$ increase in size
BX/BB (Largest Bus Shelter)
The City of Hillsboro should coordinate with Tri-Met, ODOT, and Washington County to provide
signal priority for transit routes along TV Highway, the RTP designated frequent bus lines. Signal priority along the section of TV Highway within the study area would include approximately 15 signals at approximately $\$ 10,000$ each. Signal priority along the frequent transit routes would improve transit service speed and reliability along these congested corridors with high multi-modal trip potential.


## MOTOR VEHICLES

## Functional Classification

Roadways have two functions, to provide mobility and to provide access. These functions can be incompatible since high or continuous speeds are desirable for mobility, while low speeds are more desirable for land access. Arterials emphasize a high level of mobility for through movement; local facilities emphasize the land access function; and collectors offer a balance of both functions.

Principal Arterials are typically state highways that provide the highest level of connectivity. These routes connect over the longest distance (sometimes miles long) and are less frequent than other arterials or collectors. These highways generally span several jurisdictions and many times have statewide importance.

Arterial streets serve to interconnect and support the principal arterial highway system. These streets link major commercial, residential, industrial and institutional areas. Arterial streets are typically spaced about one mile apart to assure accessibility and reduce the incidence of traffic using collectors or local streets in lieu of a well placed arterial street. Many of these routes connect to surrounding cities.

Collector streets provide both access and circulation within residential and commercial/industrial areas. Collectors differ from arterials in that they provide more of a citywide circulation function, do not require as extensive control of access and penetrate residential neighborhoods, distributing trips from the neighborhood and local street system.

Neighborhood routes are usually long relative to local streets and provide connectivity to collectors or arterials. Because neighborhood routes have greater connectivity, they generally have more traffic than local streets and are used by residents in the area to get into and out of the neighborhood, but do not serve citywide/large area circulation. Traffic from cul-de-sacs and other local streets may drain onto neighborhood routes to gain access to collectors or arterials. Because traffic needs are greater than a local street, certain measures should be considered to retain the neighborhood character and livability of these routes. Neighborhood traffic management measures are often appropriate (including devices such as speed humps, traffic circles and other devices - refer to later section in this chapter). However, it should not be construed that neighborhood routes automatically get speed humps or any other measures. While these routes have special needs, neighborhood traffic management is only one means of retaining neighborhood character and vitality.

Local Streets have the sole function of providing access to immediate adjacent land. Service to "through traffic movement" on local streets is deliberately discouraged by design.

The current functional classification of streets in Hillsboro was updated to reflect the expanded TSP study area, on-going regional planning, the functional needs of Hillsboro, and consistency with the Regional Transportation Plan. Changes in land use, environmental issues or barriers, topographic constraints, and demand for facilities can change the frequency for routes of certain functional classifications. While spacing standards can be a guide, they must consider other features and potential long term uses in the area. Figure 1-9 shows the functional classification plan. The updates to the Functional Classification Plan are summarized in Table 4-10. Streets designated in the RTP should be designed with a modal orientation that reflects the function of the street and the character of
surrounding land uses as defined in Chapter 1 of the $\mathrm{RTP}^{8}$.
The functional classification update included an evaluation of how each roadway currently serves traffic in the Hillsboro area and the access spacing requirement for each designation. Approximately 13 roadways were upgraded from a local street designation to neighborhood route or collector to reflect the future characteristics of the roadway. An additional seven roadways were updated from a neighborhood route designation to collector. The expanded study area added approximately 22 roadways with designations higher than local street to the functional classification plan. Several roadways dropped the planned designation to reflect roadway projects completed since the 1999 TSP.

Table 4-10
Updates to Functional Classification Plan

| Roadway | Hillsboro 2015 TSP | Draft Hillsboro 2020 TSP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Evergreen extension - Glencoe to Hornecker | na | Planned Collector |
| $317{ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue - Jackson to Connell | Collector | Local Street |
| Wood - Hwy 219 to Armco | Planned Collector | Collector |
| Garibaldi - Connell to $1^{\text {st }}$ Avenue | Neighborhood Route | Collector |
| $30^{\text {th }} /$ Ripplewood/Tumblestone $/ 28^{\text {th }}-$ TV Hwy to Cypress | Planned Neighborhood Route | Neighborhood Route |
| Arbor Rose Street Connections - TV Hwy to River Road | na | Planned Neighborhood Route |
| $24^{\text {th }}$ Avenue - TV Hwy to River Road | Planned Neighborhood Route | Collector |
| Morgan - Minter Bridge to Noland | Local Street | Collector |
| Tanager Circle - Meadowlark to Rood Bridge | Planned Neighborhood Route | Neighborhood Route |
| Jacquelin, Brent, Eric, Gerhard, Smith and | Local Street | Neighborhood Route |
| Daren - Morgan to Gerhard | Local Street | Neighborhood Route |
| $231{ }^{\text {st }}$ Avenue - Gaboes Ct to Borwick | Planned Collector | Collector |
| Dogwood and Oelrich $-60^{\text {th }}$ to 231 st | Local Street | Neighborhood Route |
| $60^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/Orenco Gardens - Baseline to Elam Young | Local Street | Neighborhood Route |
| Campus Ct extension to Ray Circle | na | Planned Collector |
| Stile Drive extension to $61{ }^{\text {st }}$ Avenue | Neighborhood Route | Planned Neighborhood Route |
| Brighten Street - Orenco Station Pkwy to Cornell | Planned Neighborhood Route | Local Street |
| Orenco Station Pkwy - Butler to Campus Ct | Collector | Neighborhood Route |
| Rosebay/Walbridge - Orenco to Cornell | Local Street | Neighborhood Route |

[^21]| Roadway | Hillsboro 2015 TSP | Draft Hillsboro 2020 TSP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Proposed road - Aloclek to $229^{\text {th }}$ south of Evergreen | na | Planned Neighborhood Route |
| Dawson Creek - realignment south of Evergreen | na | Planned Collector |
| $253{ }^{\text {rd }}$ Avenue realigned - Evergreen to Huffman | na | Planned Collector |
| Huffman - $253{ }^{\text {rd }}$ to Shute | na | Planned Collector |
| North/South road - Huffman to Meek | na | Planned Collector |
| Springville extension $-185^{\text {th }}$ to West Union | na | Planned Arterial |
| Croeni - Wagon Way to Jacobson | Neighborhood Route | Local Street |
| Mauzey - Jacobson to West Union | Neighborhood Route | Local Street |
| Wagon Way - Croeni to Cornelius Pass | Neighborhood Route | Collector |
| Wagon Way - Croeni to Century | Local Street | Collector |
| Century - Wagon Way to Jacobson | Planned Collector | Collector |
| Century - Appox. 900 feet north of Jacobson to West Union | Planned Collector | Collector |
| Salix extension $-185^{\text {th }}$ to Walker* | Collector | Planned Collector |
| Heritage - $185^{\text {th }}$ to Salix | Collector | Planned Collector |
| East-West connection - Salix to Stucki | Planned Collector | na |
| Brookwood - Cornell to Baseline | Planned Arterial | Arterial |
| $48^{\text {th }}$ Avenue - Cornell to Airport Road | Local Street | Neighborhood Route |
| $43^{\text {rd }}$ Avenue - Brogden to Main | Local Street | Neighborhood Route |
| Cedar - Brookwood to $32{ }^{\text {nd }}$ | Neighborhood Route | Collector |
| Bentley - Brookwood to 32 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ | Neighborhood Route | Collector |
| $313{ }^{\text {th }} / \mathrm{Miln}$ /Lenox/Merle - west of Glencoe | Local Street | Planned Neighborhood Route |
| Wilkins $-206^{\text {th }}$ to Arroyo | Planned Collector | Collector |
| Cherry - $231{ }^{\text {st }}$ to Cornelius Pass | Planned Collector | Collector |
| Maple $-6^{\text {th }}$ to $7^{\text {th }}$ | Neighborhood Route | Planned Neighborhood Route |
| $12^{\text {th }}-$ Maple to Oak | Local Street | Neighborhood Route |
| Borwick - $231^{\text {st }}$ to Baseline | Neighborhood Route | Collector |
| Lois - $239{ }^{\text {th }}$ to Cornelius Pass | Neighborhood Route | Collector |
| $239^{\text {th }}$ - Lois to TV Hwy | Neighborhood Route | Collector |
| Expanded Study Area: South Hillsboro |  |  |
| East/West road - River Road to Brookwood | na | Planned Arterial |
| Blanton: $198{ }^{\text {th }}$ to $209^{\text {th }}$ | na | Neighborhood Route |
| Kinnaman: $198{ }^{\text {th }}$ to $209^{\text {th }}$ | na | Collector |
| Stoddard/205 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ : Blanton to 209th | na | Neighborhood Route |


| Roadway |  | Hillsboro 2015 TSP |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Draft Hillsboro 2020 TSP |  |  |
| 209 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue: TV Hwy to Farmington | Collector | Arterial |
| Rosa: $198^{\text {th }}$ to $209^{\text {th }}$ | na | Neighborhood Route |
| Deline: $198^{\text {th }}$ to $209^{\text {th }}$ | na | Neighborhood Route |
| Alexander: $229^{\text {th }}$ to $247^{\text {th }}$ | Neighborhood Route | Collector |
| Alexander extension: west of Brookwood $\left(247^{\text {th }}\right)$ <br> to Davis extension | Planned Neighborhood <br> Route | Planned Collector |
| Continuation of Alexander extension south of <br> Davis extension to Pleasant Street | Planned Neighborhood <br> Route | Na |
| Pleasant Street - Brookwood $\left(247^{\text {th }}\right)$ to end | Neighborhood Route | Local Street |
| Pleasant Street extension to River Road | Planned Neighborhood <br> Route | na |

* Part of the East-West Connector Study Area


## Characteristics of Streets for each Functional Classification

The design characteristics of streets in Hillsboro were developed in the 1999 TSP. No changes to the roadway cross sections are proposed in this TSP update. The analysis of capacity needs indicated several roadway cross sections. Where center left turn lanes are identified ( 3,5 and 7 lanes sections) the actual design of the street may include sections without center turn lanes ( 2,4 , and 6 lane sections) where feasible. The Future Streets Right-of-Way Plan (Figure 1-6) provides the right-of-way requirements for arterial and collector streets which are anticipated within the TSP planning horizon to require more than two lanes. The updates to the Future Streets Right-of-Way Plan are summarized in Table 4-11.

Table 4-11
Updates to Future Streets Right-of-Way Plan


| Roadway |  | Hillsboro 2015 TSP |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Griffin Oaks $-15^{\text {th }}$ to $25^{\text {th }}$ | $2 / 3$ lanes | 2 lanes |
| East-West road - Salix to Stucki | Planned 2/3 lanes | na |
| Campus Ct extension to Ray Circle | na | Planned $2 / 3$ lanes |
| Orenco Station - Butler to Cornell | Planned $2 / 3$ lanes | $2 / 3$ lanes |
| Butler - east of Shute | Planned $2 / 3$ lanes | $2 / 3$ lanes |
| $194^{\text {th }}$ Terrace - Cornell to Evergreen | Planned $2 / 3$ lanes | $2 / 3$ lanes |
| $227^{\text {th }}-$ Quatama to Dogwood | $2 / 3$ lanes | 2 lanes |
| Dogwood $-231^{\text {st }}$ to $227^{\text {th }}$ | $2 / 3$ lanes | 2 lanes |
| Expanded Study Area: South Hillsboro |  |  |
| East/West road - River Road to Brookwood | na | $2 / 3$ lanes |
| $209^{\text {th }}-$ TV Hwy to south of Rosa | na | $2 / 3$ lanes |
| Alexander: $170^{\text {th }}$ to 209 th | na | $2 / 3$ lanes |
| Kinnaman: $209^{\text {th }}$ to Farmington | na | $2 / 3$ lanes |
| $185^{\text {th }}-$ TV to south of Rosa | na | $2 / 3$ lanes |
| Kinnaman extension: $209^{\text {th }}$ to Cornelius Pass | na | $2 / 3$ lanes |
| Davis $-234^{\text {th }}$ to $239^{\text {th }}$ | na | Planned $2 / 3$ lanes |
| Davis - Brookwood to River Road | na | Planned $2 / 3$ lanes |

## Connectivity/Local Street Plan

There are a number of locations in Hillsboro where, due to the lack of alternative routes, the majority of neighborhood traffic is funneled onto one single street. This type of street network results in out-ofdirection travel for motorists and an imbalance of traffic volumes that impacts residential neighborhoods. By providing connectivity between neighborhoods, out-of-direction travel and accessibility between various modes can be enhanced and traffic levels can be balanced out between various streets. Several goals and policies established by this TSP are intended to address these objectives. Improved connectivity could mitigate capacity deficiencies by better dispersing traffic.

Several roadway connections will be needed within neighborhood areas to reduce out of direction travel for vehicles, pedestrians and bicyclists. The proposed Functional Classification Plan (Figure 1-9) shows several neighborhood routes through future development areas and recommended connection points to arterial or collector roadways. In most cases, the connector alignments are not specific and are intended to reduce potential neighborhood traffic impacts by balancing traffic flows on neighborhood routes. The updated recommended local connections for vehicles and pedestrians/bicycles are shown on Figures 1-10 to $1-17$ (representing the City of Hillsboro neighborhood districts). The updates to the connectivity plans are summarized in Table 4-12.

Table 4-12
Updates to Local Street Connectivity Maps

| City Area | Roadway | Hillsboro 2015 TSP | Draft Hillsboro |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West Hillsboro | Connell connection between West Main and <br> Washington | Planned Local Street <br> Connection | Deleted |


| City Area | Roadway | Hillsboro 2015 TSP | Draft Hillsboro |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Northwest Hillsboro | Cory Extension from Glencoe to Hornecker | Study Area | Deleted (Completed) |
| Northwest Hillsboro | Simmental Street extension east beyond $10^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | Planned Local Street Connection | Deleted (Completed) |
| Northwest Hillsboro | Moon Rise Drive extension beyond $11^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | Planned Local Street Connection | Deleted (road extends to $10^{\text {th }}$ Avenue) |
| Northwest Hillsboro | Extension of $11^{\text {th }}$ Avenue south of Moon Rise Drive | Planned Local Street Connection | Deleted (road extends to Morning Sun Drive) |
| Northwest Hillsboro | Tina Street extension east beyond $9^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | Planned Local Street Connection | Deleted (road extends to $10^{\text {th }}$ Avenue) |
| Northwest Hillsboro | Extension of Setting Sun Drive west | Planned Local Street Connection | Deleted (road extends to $12^{\text {th }}$ Avenue, which links with Morning Sun Drive to the south) |
| Northwest Hillsboro | New road connection between $10^{\text {th }}$ and $13^{\text {th }}$ Avenues | Planned Local Street Connection | Deleted (completed; now called Morning Sun Drive) |
| Northwest Hillsboro | Extension of $10^{\text {th }}$ Avenue north of Kathryn Street | Planned Local Street Connection | Deleted (road extends north to Rogahn Street) |
| Northwest Hillsboro | Extension west off of $15^{\text {th }}$ Avenue north of Prahl Pkwy. | Planned Local Street Connection | Deleted |
| Northwest Hillsboro | Extension of $9^{\text {th }}$ Avenue south to Sunrise Lane | Planned Local Street Connection | Deleted |
| Northwest Hillsboro | Extension of Lilac Ct west to $12{ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | Planned Local Street Connection | Deleted |
| Northwest Hillsboro | Southwest pedestrian connection at Mooberry Elementary School off Kennedy Lane | Planned Ped/Bike Connection | Deleted |
| Northwest Hillsboro | North pedestrian connection off $17^{\text {th }}$ Avenue to Griffin Oaks Street | Planned Ped/Bike Connection | Deleted |
| Northwest Hillsboro | Connection off Barberry Drive south to Cornell Road between $17^{\text {th }}$ and $21^{\text {st }}$ Avenues | Planned Local Street Connection | Deleted |
| Central Hillsboro | $\begin{gathered} \text { Extension of } 5^{\text {th }} \text { Avenue south of Cedar } \\ \text { Street } \end{gathered}$ | Planned Local Street Connection | Deleted, replaced with a Planned Ped/Bike Connection south of railroad tracks |
| Central Hillsboro | Hollow Street extension east | Planned Local Street Connection | Changed to Planned Ped/Bike Connection |


| City Area | Roadway | Hillsboro 2015 TSP | Draft Hillsboro |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Central Hillsboro | $28^{\text {th }}$ Avenue extension south of Cypress | Planned Local Street Connection | Deleted (road extends south to Tumblestone Drive) |
| Central Hillsboro | $30^{\text {th }}$ Avenue extension south of Cypress | Planned Local Street Connection | Deleted (road extends south to Rosespring Drive) |
| Central Hillsboro | $30^{\text {th }}$ Avenue extension north off TV Hwy | Planned Local Street Connection | Deleted (complete) |
| South Hillsboro | Lone Oak connection to River Road south of Witch Hazel | na | Planned Local Street Connection |
| South Hillsboro | $49^{\text {th }}$ Avenue connection to Lone Oak north of Witch Hazel | na | Planned Pedestrian/ Bicycle Connection |
| South Hillsboro | Connection west off River Road to Rock Creek | na | Planned Pedestrian/ Bicycle Connection |
| South Hillsboro | South extension of Currin Lane | na | Planned Local Street Connection |
| South <br> Hillsboro | Extension of Meadowlark Drive west of Minter Bridge Road | na | Planned Local Street Connection |
| South Hillsboro | Extension of $12^{\text {th }}$ Court north toward Currin Lane | na | Planned Local Street Connection |
| South Hillsboro | South extension of April Court | na | Planned Local Street Connection |
| South <br> Hillsboro | Connection of Gerhard Drive to Minter Bridge Road | Planned Local Street Connection | Deleted |
| South <br> Hillsboro | Connection of TV Hwy and River Road east of Minter Bridge Road | Planned Local Street Connection | Deleted (complete) |
| Brookwood | $43^{\text {rd }}$ Avenue connection north of Bentley | na | Planned Local Street Connection |
| Brookwood | Azalea Street connection at $32{ }^{\text {nd }}$ Avenue | na | Planned Local Street Connection |
| Brookwood | $39^{\text {th }}$ Avenue extension north of Brogden Avenue | na | Planned Local Street Connection |
| Brookwood | Laurel Street connection to Brookwood Pkwy | Planned Local Street Connection | Deleted |
| Brookwood | Connection east off $49^{\text {th }}$ Avenue north and parallel with Baseline Road | Planned Local Street Connection | Deleted (completed) |
| East Hillsboro | East/west connection from Cornelius Pass to $229^{\text {th }}$ Avenue north of Cornell | na | Planned Local Street Connection |
| East Hillsboro | South connection from Walker between $185^{\text {th }}$ <br> Avenue and Stucki | Planned Local Street Connection | na * |
| Northeast Hillsboro | Campus Ct connection to Ray Circle south of Cornell | Planned Pedestrian/ Bicycle Connection | Planned Local Street Connection |


| City Area | Roadway | Hillsboro 2015 TSP | Draft Hillsboro |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Northeast Hillsboro | Connection of $48^{\text {th }}$ Avenue to Airport Road | Planned Local Street Connection | Deleted (completed) |
| Northeast Hillsboro | South and east connection within Orenco Station Town Center | Planned Local Street Connection | Deleted (completed) |
| Northeast Hillsboro | Connections within Orenco/Arbor Garden | Planned Local Street Connection | Deleted (completed) |
| Northeast Hillsboro | Extension of Croeni Avenue north of Jacobson Road | Planned Local Street Connection | Deleted (completed) |
| Northeast Hillsboro | Extension of $229^{\text {th }}$ Avenue north of Wagon Way | Planned Local Street Connection | Deleted (completed) |
| Northeast Hillsboro | Connection of $66^{\text {th }} / 230^{\text {th }}$ Avenues between Deer Run Street and Dogwood Street | na | Planned Local Street Connection |
| Northeast Hillsboro | Extension of Fir Street west of $228{ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | na | Planned Local Street Connection |
| Southeast <br> Hillsboro | Maxwell and Montego connections to Brookwood north of TV Highway | na | Planned Local Street Connections |
| Southeast Hillsboro | $47^{\text {th }}$ Avenue extension | Planned Local Street Extension | Deleted (completed) |
| Southeast Hillsboro | $229^{\text {th }}$ Avenue connection south of Alexander | Planned Local Street Connection | na * |
| Southeast Hillsboro | Extension of $49^{\text {th }}$ Avenue south of Witch Hazel Road | Planned Local Street Connection | Planned <br> Pedestrian/Bicycle Connection |
| Southeast Hillsboro | Connection between Drake and Ozark Lanes | Planned Local Street Connection | Planned <br> Pedestrian/Bicycle Connection |
| Southeast Hillsboro | East extension of Cedarbrook Street | Planned Local Street Connection | Planned <br> Pedestrian/Bicycle Connection |
| Southeast Hillsboro | Extension of Golden Street east and $61^{\text {st }}$ Drive north | Planned Local Street Connection | Deleted (completed) |
| Southeast Hillsboro | Connection of Jess Court east to Century Blvd | na | Planned Pedestrian/Bicycle Connection |
| Southeast Hillsboro | Connection of Rancho Street east to $239^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | Planned Local Street Connection | Deleted (completed) |
| Southeast Hillsboro | Connection of Hacienda Street to Rancho Street | Planned Local Street Connection | Deleted |
| Southeast Hillsboro | Connection of $60^{\text {th }}$ Avenue south of Hacienda Street | Planned Local Street Connection | Deleted (completed) |
| Southeast Hillsboro | Connection of Sierra Street to Century Blvd | Planned Local Street Connection | Deleted |
| Southeast Hillsboro | Extension of $62^{\text {nd }}$ and $63^{\text {rd }}$ Avenues south of Hacienda Street | Planned Local Street Connection | Deleted (completed) |
| Southeast Hillsboro | East extension of Gadroom Street | Planned Local Street Connection | Deleted (completed) |


| City Area | Roadway | Hillsboro 2015 TSP | Draft Hillsboro |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Southeast Hillsboro | West extension of Reedville Creek Drive | Planned Local Street Connection | Deleted |
| Southeast Hillsboro | West connection of Drake Street to $229^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | Planned Local Street Connection | Deleted (completed) |
| Southeast Hillsboro | East extension of Beverly and Shamrock Lanes | Planned Local Street Connection | Deleted |
| Southeast Hillsboro | East connection of Hacienda Street to Cornelius Pass Road | Planned Local Street Connection | Deleted |
| Southeast Hillsboro | Northwest extension of $73^{\text {rd }}$ Avenue off Francis Avenue | Planned Local Street Connection | Deleted |
| Southeast Hillsboro | Austin Drive connection between $65^{\text {th }}$ and $68^{\text {th }}$ Avenues | Planned Local Street Connection | Deleted (completed) |
| Southeast Hillsboro | North extension of $67^{\text {th }}$ Avenue to Austin Drive | Planned Local Street Connection | Deleted (completed) |
| Southeast Hillsboro | Green Street connection between $62^{\text {nd }}$ <br> Avenue and Century Blvd | Planned Local Street Connection | Deleted (completed) |
| Southeast Hillsboro | Extension of $62^{\text {nd }}$ Avenue south of Green Street | Planned Local Street Connection | Deleted |
| Southeast Hillsboro | Extension of $61^{\text {st }}$ Avenue south of Sigrid Street | Planned Local Street Connection | Deleted |
| Southeast Hillsboro | Extension of Madison Street west of $67^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | Planned Local Street Connection | Deleted |
| Southeast Hillsboro | Extension of Madison Street east of $71^{\text {st }}$ Avenue | Planned Local Street Connection | Deleted (completed) |
| Southeast Hillsboro | Extension of $71^{\text {st }}$ Avenue north of Ariel Street | Planned Local Street Connection | Deleted (completed) |
| Southeast Hillsboro | Connection to $71^{\text {st }}$ Avenue south off Borwick Road | Planned Pedestrian/Bicycle Connection | Deleted |
| East Hillsboro | Aloclek Drive connection to Amberwood Drive | Na | Planned Local Street Connection |
| East Hillsboro | South extension of $196{ }^{\text {th }}$ Terrace | Planned Local Street Connection | Deleted (completed) |
| East Hillsboro | Connection of $194^{\text {th }}$ Terrace between Evergreen Pkwy and Cornell Road | Planned Local Street Connection | Deleted (completed) |
| East Hillsboro | Extension of Venetian Drive off Stucki Avenue connecting to $194^{\text {th }}$ Terrace | Planned Local Street Connection | Deleted (completed) |
| East Hillsboro | Street extension north off Wilkins Street east of $206^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | Planned Local Street Connection | Deleted |
| East Hillsboro | Street extension west off $206^{\text {th }}$ Avenue north of Wilkens Street | Planned Local Street Connection | Deleted |
| East Hillsboro | Street Connections within OHSU Campus | Planned Local Street Connections | na * |

* Reclassified as study areas


## Capacity Needs

Future motor vehicle capacity needs in Hillsboro were determined based on the same approach outlined in chapter 8 of the 1999 TSP. The updated TSP is based on an evening peak hour forecast for the future 2020 scenario. The 2020 scenario assumes that Transportation Demand Management (TDM) will occur and that significant shifts to transit will occur. While numerous analysis scenarios were developed, the base 2020 conditions assumed a street network that included the RTP Priority System improvements and the improvements identified in the 1999 Hillsboro TSP. This was done because the prior TSP and RTP both confirmed that this level of motor vehicle transportation investment would be necessary to minimally address the future 2020 needs of the Hillsboro area.

The need for additional improvement projects beyond the recommendations of the 1999 TSP were expected based on the additional five years of traffic growth (2020 instead of 2015 conditions) included in the operational analysis. Performance was evaluated using a three-tiered assessment of capacity and operations.

- Roadway segments with a demand to capacity ratio ${ }^{9}$ exceeding 1.0 were studied for potential improvements (based on a 1-hour and 2-hour D/C ratio). Areas within a 2040 design type of Regional Center, Town Center, Main Street, or Station Communities were studied if the 1hour $\mathrm{D} / \mathrm{C}$ ratio exceeded 1.1 or the second hour exceeded 1.0.
- Intersection level data were developed for approximately 119 intersections in Hillsboro. While this is a broad sampling of intersections, it does not represent every intersection in the City. Therefore, there may be other locations that may require some mitigation. Alternative improvements were considered where $\mathrm{D} / \mathrm{C}$ ratios exceeded 1.0 or Level of Service (LOS) was at F . Mitigated levels of service were generally brought to the $\mathrm{D} / \mathrm{C}$ ratio 1.0 or LOS of $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{F}$ range for the 20-year planning assessment.
- New roadway alignments were considered if connectivity was needed to reduce traffic volumes on congested roadways. The goal of new road alignments was to achieve a roadway that would carry a daily volume of at least 5,000 to 10,000 vehicles per day or would significantly reduce the volume on other congested roadway facilities. Additionally, new road connections/alignments were considered if they would reduce neighborhood traffic volumes by 2,000 to 4,000 vehicles per day.

Updates to the Street Improvement Plan (Figure 1-5) and the Traffic Signal Master Plan (Figure 1-8) are summarized in Table 4-13 and 4-14.

Table 4-13
Updates to Street Improvement Plan

| Roadway | Hillsboro 2015 TSP | Draft Hillsboro 2020 TSP |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Evergreen: Glencoe to 15th | Proposed 3 lanes | 5 lanes |
| Evergreen extension: Glencoe to Hornecker | na | Proposed street |
| $209^{\text {th }}$ Avenue: TV Hwy to Farmington | na | 3 lanes |
| TV Hwy $-185^{\text {th }}$ to Cornelius Pass | Street widening | 7 lanes |
| Springville extension $-185^{\text {th }}$ to West Union | na | Proposed street |

[^22]| Roadway | Hillsboro 2015 TSP | Draft Hillsboro 2020 TSP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Proposed road - Aloclek to $229^{\text {th }}$ south of Evergreen | na | Proposed street |
| Proposed road - Aloclek to Cornelius Pass north of Evergreen | na | Proposed street |
| North/South road - Huffman to Meek | na | Proposed street |
| $253^{\text {rd }}$ Avenue realigned - Evergreen to Huffman | na | Proposed street |
| Huffman - $253{ }^{\text {rd }}$ to Shute | na | Proposed street |
| Dawson Creek - realignment south of Evergreen | na | Proposed street |
| Tanasbourne interior roadways north of Walker | Existing street widening | Proposed street |
| Baseline - Brookwood to $10^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | Proposed street | na |
| Holly $-185^{\text {th }}$ to Salix * | Proposed street | Street widening |
| Parr - $185{ }^{\text {th }}$ to Salix * | Proposed street | Street widening |
| Johnson - 185 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ to Brookwood | na | 3 lanes |
| Wilkins $-206^{\text {th }}$ to Arroyo | Proposed street | Removed |
| Cherry - $229^{\text {th }}$ to 72nd | Proposed street | Removed |
| Jacobson - Croeni to Cornelius Pass | Proposed 3 lanes | Removed |
| Amberwood - Cornell to Evergreen | Proposed 3 lanes | Removed |
| $253{ }^{\text {rd }}$ extension - south of Evergreen | Proposed 2/3 lanes | Removed |
| East/West connection from $185^{\text {th }}$ to $206{ }^{\text {th }}$ | Proposed 2/3 lanes | Future Study Area |
| Brogden $-28^{\text {th }}$ to Brookwood | Proposed 3 lanes | Removed |
| East/West road - Salix to Stucki | Proposed street | Future Study Area |
| Expanded Study Area: South Hillsboro |  |  |
| Cornelius Pass extension - TV Hwy to 209 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ | na | Proposed street |
| Kinnaman extension $-209^{\text {th }}$ to Cornelius Pass | na | Proposed street |
| Davis - $234^{\text {th }}$ to $239^{\text {th }}$ | na | Proposed street |
| Davis - Brookwood to River Road | na | Proposed street |
| East/West road - River Road to Brookwood | na | Proposed street |

* Part of the East-West Connector Study Area

Table 4-14
Updates to Traffic Signal Master Plan

| Intersection | Hillsboro 2015 TSP | Draft Hillsboro 2020 TSP |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Evergreen/Jackson School East | New/Future Signal | Existing Traffic Signal |
| Evergreen/Jackson School West | New/Future Signal | Existing Traffic Signal |
| $198^{\text {th }} /$ Johnson | Stop Sign Controlled | Proposed Traffic Signal |
| $209^{\text {th }} /$ TV Hwy | New/Future Signal | Existing Traffic Signal |
| $185^{\text {th }} /$ Holly | New/Future Signal | Stop Sign Controlled |


| $185^{\text {th }} /$ Westview HS | New/Future Signal | Existing Traffic Signal |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Aloclek/Evergreen | New/Future Signal | Existing Traffic Signal |
| John Olsen/Evergreen | New/Future Signal | Existing Traffic Signal |
| Stucki/Evergreen | New/Future Signal | Existing Traffic Signal |
| Orenco Station/Cornell | New/Future Signal | Existing Traffic Signal |
| Witch Hazel Road/River Road | Stop sign controlled | Proposed Traffic Signal |
| Baseline/Adams | Proposed Traffic Signal | na |
| Oak/Adams | Proposed Traffic Signal | na |
| West Union/Springville | na | Proposed Traffic Signal |
| West Union/Century | na | Proposed Traffic Signal |
| Jacobson/Century | na | Proposed Traffic Signal |
| $188^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/Cornell | na | Proposed Traffic Signal |

## TRUCKS/FREIGHT MOVEMENT

Efficient truck and freight movement plays a vital role in the economical movement of raw materials and finished products. The establishment of through truck routes provides for this movement while at the same time maintaining neighborhood livability, public safety and minimizing maintenance costs of the roadway system. To accomplish this, a map of through truck routes in Hillsboro has been developed (Figure 1-18) that is intended to address the movement of trucks through the study area with regional destinations, not local deliveries. The objective of these route designations is to enable the City to better focus on design criteria that is "truck friendly", i.e. 12 foot travel lanes, greater access spacing, 25-35 foot (or larger) curb returns and pavement design that accommodates a larger share of trucks. The designated through truck routes in the TSP Study area include and exceed the coverage included in the RTP designations. Updates to the Truck Master Plan are display in Table 415.

Table 4-15
Updates to Truck/Freight Master Plan

| Roadway | Hillsboro 2015 TSP | Draft Hillsboro 2020 TSP |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Brookwood - Cornell to TV Highway | na | Truck Route |
| Minter Bridge south of TV Highway | Truck Route | na |
| $185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue north of US 26 | Truck Route | na |
| Main - Brookwood to $53^{\text {rd }}$ Avenue | na | Truck Route |

## SPECIAL STUDY AREAS

## East-West Connector Study Area

The Hillsboro TSP update has identified a study area for the property located south of Walker Road between $185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue and Amberglen Parkway and north of the light rail tracks. This study area covers approximately 1,400 -acres with the largest land holding being the Oregon Health Sciences University (OHSU). The potential constraints to achieving acceptable collector-level circulation in the
study area require additional study of both potential land use and circulation prior to any comprehensive plan changes or development approvals that may preclude potential circulation routes.

Uncertain plans for the largest land holding (OHSU) make specific recommendations that meet both circulation and land use needs less definitive. Technical analysis conducted for this TSP update indicates that an east-west connection between a proposed Salix Terrace extension and Amberglen Parkway would have a potential to benefit the future 2020 transportation system. Figure 4-8 summarizes several potential roadway connections that were identified in the TSP update. However, given the speculative future development of the OHSU property, this TSP update does not propose a specific alignment for the east-west connector roadway, nor does it propose a specific alignment for the north-south Salix Extension. Furthermore, the alignments for multi-use paths, such as the Bronson Creek Trail, displayed in the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plans (Figures 1-2 and 1-3) are not intended to be specific. The TSP, therefore recommends a detailed multi-modal transportation subarea analysis be conducted for the study area which considers all reasonable roadway and trail alignment alternatives combined with future land use proposals to produce a balance between traffic circulation needs and the land use/environmental sensitivity of the area, particularly accounting for the unique scientific/research character of the OHSU West Campus.

## Meek Road Study Area

Concerns exist regarding the proximity of the intersection of Meek Road and Shute Road to the interchange at U.S. 26 and Shute Road. Washington County has designated this as a study area (see Figure 4-9) in order to evaluate options for moving the intersection of Meek Road further south. However, reorienting the roadway to the south would place it within the Shute Road Site Special Development District. The 203 acre site, located at the intersection of Evergreen Road and Shute Road, was added to the urban growth boundary for the purpose of providing large lots for high tech industrial development. Meek Road, situated immediately north of the new district, will be influenced by future development within the Shute Road site. The Conceptual Transportation Plan for Shute Road, drafted by Group MacKenzie suggests that additional analysis would be required with regards to Meek Road to determine any relocation of Meek Road or re-routing of traffic.

## Potential Future Connections/Realignments

As a long range plan, the TSP requires enough flexibility to permit consideration of road extensions beyond the study area and urban growth boundary. No specific roadway alignments have been defined for any of these extensions/realignments. However, Figure $4-10$ pinpoints seven study areas that can be categorized as potential future connections/realignments. The seven areas are described as follows:

1. Evergreen Road Extension West of Glencoe Road - the road extension may be deemed necessary at a future date in order to alleviate congestion in the Hillsboro Regional Center and along TV Highway caused by east-west through traffic. The vicinity represents part of a larger study area that is represented on the Washington County 2020 Transportation Plan.
2. Extensions of Huffman Street and Dawson Creek Drive into $253^{\text {rd }}$ Avenue - part of the Shute Road Concept Plan, these road extensions are intended to provide access to the newly added 203-acre Shute Road Special Development District.
3. Jacobson Road Realignment to Helvetia Road - the realignment north of the U.S. 26/Shute

Road interchange is intended to accommodate potential increased right-way-of-way necessary for interchange improvements.
4. Springville Road extension to West Union Road - extension of the roadway, if implemented, would alleviate traffic congestion along $185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue between West Union Road and Springville Road. The area is discussed as a concern in the Washington County 2020 Transportation Plan due to the design of the intersection of $185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue and West Union Road and whether it will be able to handle projected traffic growth.
5. Extension of Cornelius Pass Road South of TV Highway to $209^{\text {th }}$ Avenue - the road extension would serve future development should UGB expansion occur here at some future date and reduce traffic stress along TV Highway as commuters traverse from Cornelius Pass Road to $209^{\text {th }}$ Avenue. The extension was included in the Washington County 2020 Transportation Plan as a placeholder for evaluation purposes. It is recognized that the area will require further study, particularly with regards to resolution of issues along TV Highway before inclusion in the UGB. In particular, the Portland and Western Railroad which runs parallel along the southern side of TV Highway, uses the tracks between $209^{\text {th }}$ and $229^{\text {th }}$ Avenues as a staging area for trains. Subsequently, any extension south of TV Highway in this vicinity will require a grade separated crossing over/under the tracks. The transportation study, therefore, would have to evaluate the Cornelius Pass extension and the transportation needed to support the development prior to any UGB expansion in the area.
6. Extension of Davis Road and Roadway Improvements along $229^{\text {th }}$ Avenue - extensions and improvements within this vicinity would the planned Witch Hazel Village community to potential future development to the east. Along with the Cornelius Pass Road extension, Davis Road and $229^{\text {th }}$ Avenue would provide vital traffic circulation the area between $209^{\text {th }}$ and $229^{\text {th }}$ Avenues.
7. Extension of $247^{\text {th }}$ Avenue (future Brookwood Avenue) to River Road - if deemed necessary, the extension to provide a significant north-south connection to the future Witch Hazel Village and the East Hillsboro communities north of TV Highway.
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