For

Submitted 8/19/24 up to 12/15/24

From: Mike Hannegan <mikehanegan@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2024 5:13 PM
To: Ext - Planning
Subject: Fw: An Old-Timer's Opinion - LAM Expansion.

Hi there,

I just thought I'd add my two cents to the LAM expansion comments. I sent the following email out to the neighborhood group. I am in full support of LAM's expansion. I know they will do what is right for our neighborhood and our city.

Respectfully,

Michael L. Hannegan
17992 SW 110th PL.
Tualatin, OR 97062

----- Forwarded Message -----
From: Mike Hannegan <mikehanegan@yahoo.com>
To: neighborhood@oregonair.org <neighborhood@oregonair.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2024 at 05:05:46 PM PDT
Subject: An Old-Timer's Opinion

Hi Everyone,

My family moved to Tualatin Rd. in the 1940's. I was born in 1956 and have lived on Tualatin Rd. most of my life. Since the 60s, the land on the south side of Tualatin Rd. has been zoned commercial/industrial. Progress and development was always planned for that area. If you didn't like that, you shouldn't have moved to the area. If it wasn't for growth and expansion, there would be no homes on the north side of Tualatin Rd. either. It would still all be small farms.

I support LAM and their right to expand and add jobs to the local area. The traffic calculations on the website seem to be the absolute worst case scenario. They assume every position is filled with everyone driving their own vehicle to and from work every day of the week. In these days of work-from-home and flex days, this just isn't the case.

The people at LAM have been very receptive to making changes to accommodate your requests as best as they can. In many ways they have gone above and beyond over the years. I think we all should cut them some slack.

The local roads can certainly handle the additional traffic. But if I were to make one suggestion for them to consider that may be a solution to all your concerns, it would be to shift their start times. Instead of having 7-4 or 8-5 work hours, shift the times to 6-3 or 9-6. Or maybe they could offer 10 hour days 4 days a week. They should consider scheduling commute times to not be during the peak commuting hours. And try to avoid the school start and end times. I think the Hazelbrook Middle School traffic is way worse than any congestion LAM has.

Respectfully,

Mike Hannegan

Against

Submitted 8/19/24 up to 12/15/24

From: Larry Melton <lmelton63@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 21, 2024 3:49 PM
To: Ext - Planning
Subject: LAM Tualatin Road proposal

To All Planning Commission Members,

I am writing with concern about the proposed entry to LAM off of Tualatin Rd. at 115th Ave. My wife and I have lived off of Tualatin Road in the Fox Run Neighborhood for 32 years and have seen a great deal of change and growth in the area. Most of which has been very positive and I understand that growth and expansion are normal. However, it has become increasingly difficult to get into and out of our neighborhood with the current traffic that flows past the entry to our neighborhood at 112th and the adjacent road at 115th. This has been caused by the growth in the Sherwood and Newberg areas and has created a tremendous strain on Tualatin Rd. I have great concern that allowing LAM to create an entry point at 115th would only exacerbate the situation to a breaking point creating traffic issues as the neighborhood residents along Tualatin Rd try to get out of the neighborhood and into that ever increasing flow of traffic. This would also create safety issues entering the roadway.

I would like to see that new LAM traffic using Leveton Rd. directly to the South of the LAM property. It is not adjacent to any neighborhood traffic and is better designed and constructed to accept that increase in daily flow of cars and trucks in and out of the area.

Thank you for taking my input into consideration.

Larry Melton
Fox Run Resident

From: Gus keyser <gus.keyser@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 21, 2024 4:35 PM
To: Ext - Planning
Subject: LAM expansion and Tualatin Road

To All Planning Commission members:

Thriving businesses are an important component of the quality of life in Tualatin. However, it is critical that current infrastructure is protected as the business traffic increases.

The LAM expansion has an alternative to putting undue pressure on Tualatin Road and it must use it. Tualatin Road is the only access in or out for so many residents because of their proximity to the river. Conversely, the LSM traffic can be directed to and from their south via Leveton Drive, the road that was built for this purpose.

The first priority of our city government is the safety and livability of our city for our residents.

Please keep Tualatin Road as an open ingress and egress for those of us who depend on it.

Gus Keyser
17810 SW Shawnee Trail
Tualatin
Sent from my iPad

From: Steve Sethi <stevesethi@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 21, 2024 8:28 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Council
Subject: Lam proposal for Tualatin Rd

Hello,

I'm writing as a resident of Shasta Trail for the last 19 years, to express my opposition to the Lam Research proposal to add a truck entrance to Tualatin Road. This is a residential street with access for thousands of Tualatin residents, and the alteration of the Lam commercial access point would negatively impact traffic and quality of life.

I appreciate that Tualatin has had a business friendly approach to city government, and I have no opposition to Lam building new facilities that expand jobs in the area. However, this is a mixed use neighborhood and the city needs to better balance livability in a way that prioritizes families. Lam has the opportunity to use Leveton Drive for trucks and commercial vehicles and should avoid adding traffic to Tualatin Road.

I have not engaged in local politics and generally appreciate the professional and minimally invasive approach the city takes, but if this proposal goes through I will hold council members accountable at the next election.

Best regards,
Steve Sethi
503.484.4243

From: Sonia Mann <soniajmann@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 21, 2024 5:27 PM
To: Ext - Planning
Subject: Lam Proposal - Tualatin Road

To All Planning Commission Members,

My name is Sonia Mann. I live at 11100 SW Apalachee Street, Tualatin 97062. My back yard directly faces Tualatin Rd. I vehemently oppose Lam Research's proposal to widen and create a bigger entrance for vehicles going to and from Lam on Tualatin Rd and the traffic lights they want to install there. There is Leveton Drive, an industrial road which is extremely underused, why doesn't Lam build a bigger entrance there? The traffic noise in my back yard can be deafening at times, and the proposed Lam entrance will funnel more traffic into Tualatin Rd which is already a main vein and has become busier since we moved into the area over four years ago. Further, Lam's proposed traffic lights will funnel traffic directly through my neighborhood as drivers try and circumvent the traffic light.

The only way I would agree to Lam's proposal is if they paid to put thick and tall noise barriers all along Tualatin Road and stop signs at each street intersecting with Tualatin Road. Until then, I vehemently oppose Lam's proposal and think that it is horrendous they did not consult with the neighborhood more about it.

Kind Regards,

Sonia Mann

From: Doug Rice <DRice@pioneermetal.com>
Sent: Friday, August 23, 2024 11:39 AM
To: Ext - Planning
Subject: Tualatin Resident Concern, LAM Research, Tualatin Road Proposal

All Planning Commission Members,

As a longtime resident and employee in Tualatin I am writing to advocate against the LAM Research plans for Tualatin Road.

As currently situated, Tualatin Road between SW 124th to the west and SW Cheyenne Way is primarily residential access. This stretch of road is already a commuter cut through from Hwy 99 towards I-5. Implementing the proposed changes would only make the heavy traffic on this road worse (particularly during morning and evening commute times).

Reviewing a map and driving the local roads, LAM can have all access to its facility off SW Leveton Road. SW 124th is two lanes and provides easy access, and SW Herman Road off Tualatin Road is already completely commercially zoned.

Further, proposed plans to add a stop light at SW 115th and Tualatin Road is not necessary, particularly to placate one employer who has access already on SW Leveton.

As a resident of David's Fox Run with access at SW Tualatin Road and SW 112th, making this residential entrance a right turn in, right turn out only would significantly hinder the residents of my neighborhood to freely enter and leave our community.

Please take this into consideration as you review this project.

Sincerely,

Doug Rice
Program Manager
Pioneer Metal Finishing
503.563.1743 O
503.509.7500 M
drice@pioneermetal.com
19005 SW 125th Court
Tualatin, OR 97062
www.pioneermetal.com

This message is intended only for the designated recipient(s). It may contain confidential, privileged or proprietary information. If you are not a designated or intended recipient, you may not review, copy, distribute, use, or take any action in reliance upon this message or any

attachments. If you receive this message in error, please notify the sender by reply email and delete this message and any attachments.

From: Rick Cady <rcadycvelo@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 24, 2024 3:04 PM
To: Ext - Planning
Cc: Regina Chante
Subject: LAM research expansion proposal and safety of Tualatin Road/All planning commission members PLEASE READ

To all planning commission members:

My wife and I moved to Tualatin in 2019, and our house is located with its backside to Tualatin Road. We fell in love with the house, community, neighborhood and nearby Jurgens park. Our only hesitation in purchasing was the traffic noise generated by the road and adjacent industries. At that time, however, traffic was audible but not outrageous, so we felt the move was worth the risk, given the other benefits we saw.

Since our move here over four years ago, we've noticed a dramatic increase in cars, trucks, and motorcycles racing down the street, well beyond speed limits. Many of these vehicles have modified muffler systems that substantially increase volume and pollution on acceleration. We have reached out to the Tualatin police department, but due to limited capacities they are unable to provide consistent, necessary deterrents to address traffic volume and reckless driving behavior.

In reviewing the proposal from LAM, it appears that approval of their expansion would increase traffic congestion, especially as fall returns and school buses and students crossing streets are added to the equation. Additionally, there are several elderly folks living in the neighborhood, some that use walkers to get around, and this expansion would put these citizens at increased risk as they try to exercise and move around their neighborhood. The increase of commuter traffic inherently increases noise volume, and air pollution from idling vehicles (already an issue). The lack of law enforcement monitoring Tualatin Road ultimately increases the potential risk of vehicular and pedestrian accidents. The ability of homeowners, renters, and retirement home residents who live adjacent to Tualatin Road to relax, enjoy, and feel safe and sane in their own outdoors would be greatly impacted in a negative way.

"*Citizens to Save Tualatin Road*" created a proposal we would like LAM to adopt. The proposal suggests creating an entrance to LAM via Leveton Drive which is designed to handle the vehicular capacity of the company's expansion. This alternate entry would serve to divert more traffic south of the neighborhood into already developed, industrialized land, and away from our neighborhoods.

Additionally, we would like to see Tualatin Road fit with interventions that would be appropriate and consider ideas, such as speed bumps, video radar, and/or police presence along this business/neighborhood corridor. Signs reflecting the need for safety of pedestrians and children could also be considered. We are very concerned for the safety, health and well-being of all who live here, and of those who travel Tualatin Road.

We appreciate your consideration of our letter as a concerned citizen of Tualatin, and we ask the

appropriate committees to vote “NO” on the LAM expansion as it is currently proposed and to consider additional measures to improve the safety and livability for all of us that border this high traffic street.

Thank you,

Rick Cady and Regina Chante

From: William Smith <william@thesmithlo.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 24, 2024 9:48 AM
To: Ext - Planning
Subject: Lam Expansion Plan

All Planning Commission Members,
My name is William Smith. I am an attorney who has had an office in Tualatin for over 10 years. I also live in Tualatin, and have lived at my current residence for over 15 years. My back fence runs along Tualatin Road. Tualatin Road has become increasingly busy over the years I have lived here.
With the Lam proposed expansion, Tualatin Road will become even more traveled and congested, and I fear some of these properties, such as mine, will become less and less livable.
There is no need for Lam to have direct access to Tualatin Road. Access for Lam is the entire purpose of Leveton Dr., a road already under-utilized. Please force Lam to utilize Leveton Dr, and maintain, if not increase, the berm between Lam and Tualatin Road.
Thank you,
William E. Smith

--
William E. Smith
Attorney

The Smith Law Office, P.C.
7945 SW Mohawk St.
Tualatin, OR 97062

NEW!!! Phone: (503) 855-5806
FAX: (503) 389-1050

NOTE: This e-mail is intended only for the use of the addressee(s) and may contain confidential or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, please call me immediately and delete this message. Thank you.

From: Joanne Santee <jojo10k@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2024 5:28 PM
To: Ext - Planning
Subject: Save Tualatin Road

Please listen to those of us who live off Tualatin Road! I purchased my house on Lucas Ct in 1995 and definitely see the traffic increase on Tualatin Road. Adding an entrance to LAM will NOT be in the best interest of the residents who live here!! Please save our road and do not allow this to happen!
Joanne Schenk

From: Ken Johnson <kenj4609@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 29, 2024 7:03 PM
To: Ext - Planning
Subject: LAM Expansion

To whom it may concern
I am including the message I sent to the city council. I hope you will consider my request.

To all Council Members
I have lived in the Riverpark area since 1993. As a long time resident, I have long admired how our city has worked to keep high traffic flows from our neighborhoods. I served on the citizens committee for the Tualatin 2040 plan. I care about our community. I am a great supporter of our strong industrial tax base, and commend LAM for their expansion.
I cannot however support the consideration of allowing a new light at SW 115th, and allowing the tremendous flow of traffic that will come straight down SW 115th to access Highway 99 from Hazelbrook Road. Traffic seeking Hwy 99 access will also come down Jurgens in order to gain access to Hazelbrook Rd. That brings higher traffic flow past a park and a school.
I urge you to consider these tremendous impacts on our neighborhood, and require LAM to use Leveton Rd.
Thank you for your consideration

--
Ken Johnson
17285 SW 108th Ave

From: Nick Lauren <nich.lauren@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2024 8:18 AM
To: Ext - Planning
Subject: More Support for "Save Tualatin Road"



Good morning!

I am writing to lend my support to the Save Tualatin Road proposals. I live at 17935 SW 114th Ave, Tualatin, OR 97062, just across from Lam between SW 115 Ave and SW 112th Ave. I regularly run and bike on Tualatin Road with my two young sons.

I hope the planning committee agrees that we should minimize vehicle traffic on streets where families and children play, especially when there is a feasible alternative. It makes good sense for our community to have Lam employees use SW Leviton Dr.

I understand you have competing priorities and that forging next steps may entail difficult decisions. Lam is a good neighbor (as far as light industrial neighbors go!), and I appreciate the economic prosperity they help bring to our community. That said, please know that the collective will of the Fox Run neighborhood is to keep traffic down on Tualatin Road.

Thanks for your time and consideration.

Best regards,

Nick Lauren
nich.lauren@gmail.com
509-240-6791
Owner of 17935 SW 114th Ave, Tualatin, OR 97062

From: Steve Koper
Sent: Monday, September 9, 2024 8:54 AM
To: Keith Leonard
Subject: FW: Save Tualatin Road

From: Carmen O. <carmenofearth@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 08, 2024 3:49 PM
To: Council <council@tualatin.gov>
Subject: Save Tualatin Road

To City Council council@tualatin.gov
and Planning Department planning@tualatin.gov

I am strongly opposed to Lam Research adding a new entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue. Tualatin Road provides the main access to our residential neighborhoods and is already overloaded with cut-through commuter traffic. Leveton Drive, on the other hand, was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available.

Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus, but the proposed site expansion would eliminate that driveway. This is unacceptable. Lam's new site plan needs to include a usable driveway that connects their main parking lots directly to Leveton Drive.

The last thing Tualatin Road needs is a thousand more cars per day, especially when a better alternative already exists. We are asking the City Council and City Staff to get creative and find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road.

Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road.

Thank You!
Carmen Oliver
17955 SW Shasta Trail
Tualatin OR 97062
503-724-1419

From: Dan Gaur <dgaur@frontier.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 8, 2024 3:54 PM
To: Council; Ext - Planning
Subject: Opposition to Lam entrance on Tualatin road: Tualatin Moving Forward initiative, $cost and student safety

I'm writing in opposition to the new Lam entrance on Tualatin Road. The north side of Tualatin road is obviously an entirely residential area, including Hazelbrook Middle School + Jurgens Park. Deliberately increasing traffic on Tualatin Road will only increase the risk to these students and residents in this area.

As concrete data-points:

* As part of the "Tualatin Moving Forward" initiative, the city already invested $142,000 of taxpayer bond funds into pedestrian safety improvements on Tualatin Road between 105th Ave and 115th Ave. The city invested another $15,000 of bond money for traffic/pedestrian safety on 115th Ave between Tualatin Road to Hazelbrook Road, one block from Hazelbrook Middle School.

* At the west end of Tualatin Road, there is already a large school bus-stop (approx 10-15 students each morning) to support the nearby apartment complexes.

* Likewise, the intersection of Tualatin Road and Herman Road also hosts another large bus-stop as well.

The proposed Lam entrance on Tualatin Road will steer that new Lam traffic directly through these bus-stops and recent safety improvements, increasing the risk of accidents and undermining the city's own investment in the Tualatin Moving Forward efforts.

The existing Lam entrance on Leveton has none of these risks or issues. Traffic access from Herman and Leveton roads does not pass through any new residential areas or bus-stops. The city's investment in its own traffic improvements is likewise preserved.

The most-obvious, lowest-risk and lowest-cost option is to funnel this surge in Lam traffic back onto Leveton and Herman roads.

Thanks.

Dan

From: Dan Herr <dannyjherr@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, September 6, 2024 3:20 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Council; Camille Herr
Subject: Request for Maintaining Safe Access to LAM Tualatin Facility

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Council Members,

I am writing to express my concern about changing the entrance to the LAM Tualatin facility. As a resident of Tualatin for the past five years, I believe keeping the entrance on Levaton Road is crucial for the following reasons:

1. Traffic Congestion: Tualatin Road is already heavily trafficked, serving as a key link between I-5 and Pacific Highway. Adding thousands of trips from LAM could worsen congestion and complicate traffic flow.
2. Local Safety: The area around Tualatin Road and 115th includes a nursing home, apartment complexes, and a church. Increased traffic and a potential new traffic light could create safety hazards and disrupt the flow in this busy area.
3. Neighborhood Impact: The Hazelbrook neighborhood, with its many families and school buses, would benefit from keeping traffic away from residential streets. The current entrance on the industrial side is better suited to handle the volume.

I urge you to keep the existing entrance from Levaton Road to ensure safety and manage traffic effectively.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Daniel

From: Hazen Hyland <hazenh@westernwoodstructures.com>
Sent: Friday, September 6, 2024 2:53 PM
To: Ext - Planning
Subject: LAM Entrance



Hello,

I live and work in Tualatin. Have for the past 13 years. I would encourage all Tualatin planning members to assist in doing the right thing, which is maintaining a proper entrance to the LAM Tualatin facility from Levaton Road. An entrance from Levaton Road is much safer, for there is a nursing home on the corner of Tualatin Rd and 115th, apartment complexes on the corner of Tualatin Rd and 115th that stretch to the west nearly to 124th st., and there is a church quite close to the corner of Tualatin Rd and 115th.

There's no reason to make Tualatin Rd busier than it already is. It's a lifeline for folks trying to get between I-5 and Pac Hwy. It's busy nearly all day on weekdays, and throwing 2000+ trips into LAM's campus (and possibly adding a traffic light at the corner of 115th and Tualatin Rd) would push a currently bearable situation into a rather difficult situation.

The Hazelbrook neighborhood is filled with kids and school busses, and keeping unnecessary traffic away from this neighborhood by simply having LAM folks use the traditional entrance, which is on the industrial side of the campus, makes a whole lot of sense.

Hazen Hyland
Bridge & Int'l Sales / Project Manager
Western Wood Structures, Inc.

20675 SW 105th Ave / PO Box 130
Tualatin, OR 97062
Office Ph (503) 692-6900
wwsi.com

Wire fraud is real. Please contact Western Wood Structures directly via phone to confirm any payment method changes requested by any employee.

From: Steve Koper
Sent: Monday, September 9, 2024 8:57 AM
To: Keith Leonard
Subject: FW: Lam entrance.

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

From: Frank Bubenik <fbubenik@tualatin.gov>
Sent: Thursday, August 29, 2024 4:03 PM
To: James Carr <ptownblazers88@gmail.com>; Council <council@tualatin.gov>
Subject: Re: Lam entrance.

Mr. Carr,

Thanks for your email and for sharing your thoughts.

City staff is working with Lam to protect neighborhood livability. I live in the area and want to make sure Tualatin Road does not become congested/overwhelmed. There were new ideas brought forward to redirect many LAM employees off of Tualatin Road. These ideas are being vetting by Lam and city transportation experts. Our traffic folks are working with Lam on the 115th and Tualatin Road intersection to create ways to minimize traffic on 115th and Tualatin Road.

There are many moving pieces on this development and they're moving pretty slowly. The application from Lam is not yet deemed complete and there are missing chunks of information and changes being made.

The Lam proposal will not come to council as this development conforms with the existing use and zoning. An Architecture Review Board (ARB) review is required as well as the Planning Commission review and they are months away. The Industrial Master Plan application will be heard by the Planning Commission and the Architectural Review Application will be heard by the Architectural Review Board.

I am regularly looking into the progress of this project and pushing for staff and Lam to do right by the neighborhood.

MAYOR FRANK BUBENIK

Mayor of Tualatin

fbubenik@tualatin.gov
Cell: 971.420.7443

This e-mail, including attachments, is intended for the exclusive use of the addressee and may contain proprietary, confidential, or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, any dissemination, use, distribution, or copying is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify me via return e-mail, permanently delete the original message, and destroy all copies.

From: James Carr <ptownblazers88@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 29, 2024 3:26 PM
To: Council <council@tualatin.gov>
Subject: Lam entrance.

I work in this area and there are a lot (a lot) of traffic issues in Tualatin. i5 connection is 30 years in the past when it was helpful. The local streets, through streets and commercial truck routes are all one.

And now this huge disaster is on the horizon with LAM research proposed entrance to their compound. I take that route home (beaverton) and it's a crap show now and a school is right there. it's going to be a non-breaking stream of cars just leaving Lam. Plus everyone else. It's not better if they go to the Freeway, which is now on some days a crap show too.

Cheers to a boom I guess, I just think we don't need all that traffic to be funneled into places where families are living, walking to the park, to school. I wish I could live here and walk to work, where are the new homes?

Let's meet in the middle.

From: Jean and Eric Stein <steinjeaneric@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 8, 2024 6:30 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Council
Subject: Tualatin Road

Like many residents of the "River Park" neighborhood, I am strongly opposed to Lam Research adding a new entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue. Tualatin Road provides the main access to our residential neighborhoods and is already overloaded with cut-through commuter traffic. Leveton Drive, on the other hand, was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available. Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus, but the proposed site expansion would eliminate that driveway. This is unacceptable. Lam's new site plan needs to include a usable driveway that connects their main parking lots directly to Leveton Drive. The last thing Tualatin Road needs is a thousand more cars per day, especially when a better alternative already exists. We are asking the City Council and City Staff to get creative and find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road. Use Leveton Drive.

Close the entrances off of 108th, require all Lam Research vehicles to use Herman Road, Leveton and 124th. We already have issues turning from the neighborhoods on the north, onto Tualatin road (especially left). Additionally most School buses leaving Hazelbrook Middle school and servicing our neighborhood, are delayed by the left turn onto Tualatin Road at Jergens road.

Tualatin Road is a feeder street; Herman, Leveton and 124th are industrial roads, keep it that way.

Sincerely Jean and Eric Stein
10320 SW Tawasa Ct,
Tualatin

Save Tualatin Road.

From: Jeremy Howell <jmhowell11@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 9, 2024 1:13 PM
To: Ext - Planning
Subject: Letter to City - Tualatin Rd

Good afternoon,

I am strongly opposed to Lam Research adding a new entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue. Tualatin Road provides the main access to our residential neighborhoods and is already overloaded with cut-through commuter traffic. Leveton Drive, on the other hand, was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available.

Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus, but the proposed site expansion would eliminate that driveway. This is unacceptable. Lam's new site plan needs to include a usable driveway that connects their main parking lots directly to Leveton Drive.

The last thing Tualatin Road needs is a thousand more cars per day, especially when a better alternative already exists. We are asking the City Council and City Staff to get creative and find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road.

Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road.

Thank You!
Jeremy Howell

From: JL Friedman <hikergirl500@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 8, 2024 8:47 AM
To: Ext - Planning
Subject: LAM project on Tualatin Rd

Friends,

I am concerned about Lam Research adding a new entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue. Tualatin Road provides the main access to our residential neighborhoods and is already overloaded with cut-through commuter traffic. Leveton Drive, on the other hand, was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available.

Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus, but the proposed site expansion would eliminate that driveway. This seems unreasonable and will add an additional burden to already busy Tualatin Road. Lam's new site plan should include a usable driveway that connects their main parking lots directly to Leveton Drive which would flow easily onto 124th Ave without causing delays at Tualatin Road.

This route is a better alternative and it already exists.

We are asking the City Council and City Staff to be reasonable, support neighborhood concerns and seriously consider and our proposed solution to this problem.

Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road.

Regards,
Johnnalee Friedman

From: Steve Koper
Sent: Monday, September 9, 2024 8:54 AM
To: Keith Leonard
Subject: FW: Lam entrance proposal

-----Original Message-----
From: Karla Ellis <karla2ke@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 08, 2024 10:02 AM
To: Council <council@tualatin.gov>
Subject: Lam entrance proposal

Dear City Council-

I am strongly opposed to Lam Research adding a new entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue. Tualatin Road provides the main access to our residential neighborhoods and is already overloaded with cut-through commuter traffic. Leveton Drive, on the other hand, was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available. There is absolutely no need for this addition. Lam does not use what they currently have and it is inappropriate to impact residents for their wants when they are currently met on the same property.

Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus, but the proposed site expansion would eliminate that driveway. This is unacceptable. Lam's new site plan needs to include a usable driveway that connects their main parking lots directly to Leveton Drive.

The last thing Tualatin Road needs is a thousand more cars per day, especially when a better alternative already exists. We are asking the City Council and City Staff to get creative and find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road.

Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road.

Thank You!

Karla Ellis
503-703-6789

From: Kerri Moore <ohara.kerri@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 9, 2024 8:01 AM
To: Council; Ext - Planning
Subject: Opposed to Lam Research Expansion

Hello,

I am strongly opposed to Lam Research adding a new entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue. Tualatin Road provides the main access to our residential neighborhoods and is already overloaded with cut-through commuter traffic. Leveton Drive, on the other hand, was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available.

Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus, but the proposed site expansion would eliminate that driveway. This is unacceptable. Lam's new site plan needs to include a usable driveway that connects their main parking lots directly to Leveton Drive.

The last thing Tualatin Road needs is a thousand more cars per day, especially when a better alternative already exists. We are asking the City Council and City Staff to get creative and find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road.

Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road.

Thank You!
Kerri Moore
Tualatin Resident

From: Lexi Howell <alexaehowell@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 9, 2024 12:15 PM
To: Ext - Planning
Subject: Letter to City - Lam Research

Good afternoon,

I am strongly opposed to Lam Research adding a new entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue. Tualatin Road provides the main access to our residential neighborhoods and is already overloaded with cut-through commuter traffic. Leveton Drive, on the other hand, was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available.

Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus, but the proposed site expansion would eliminate that driveway. This is unacceptable. Lam's new site plan needs to include a usable driveway that connects their main parking lots directly to Leveton Drive.

The last thing Tualatin Road needs is a thousand more cars per day, especially when a better alternative already exists. We are asking the City Council and City Staff to get creative and find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road.

Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road.

Thank You!

--
Lexi Howell
(541) 921-7992 | alexaehowell@gmail.com | linkedin.com/in/alexa-howell/

From: Marius Brisan <marlid16@frontier.com>
Sent: Monday, September 9, 2024 12:21 PM
To: Ext - Planning
Subject: please stop planning access to Lam campus directly from Tualatin Rd

Tualatin Planning Team,

I am strongly opposed to Lam Research adding a new entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue, and possibly another one at 112th.
Tualatin Road provides the main access to our residential neighborhoods, and it is already overloaded with cut-through commuter traffic that connects between 99w and I5. Leveton Dr , on the other hand, was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available.

Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus, but the proposed site expansion would eliminate that driveway. This is unacceptable. Lam's new site plan needs to include at least one usable driveway that connects their main parking lots directly to Leveton Drive.

The last thing Tualatin Road needs is a thousand more cars per day, especially when better alternatives already exists. We are asking the City Council and City Staff to get creative and find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road.

Use Leveton Dr. Save Tualatin Road!

Regards,
Marius Brisan

From: Marlene Cable <marleneavilescable@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 7, 2024 8:51 PM
To: Council; Ext - Planning
Subject: Tualatin Road

Dear Council Members and Planning Department,

I am strongly opposed to Lam Research adding a new entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue. Tualatin Road provides the main access to our residential neighborhoods and is already overloaded with cut-through commuter traffic. Leveton Drive, on the other hand, was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available.

Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus, but the proposed site expansion would eliminate that driveway. This is unacceptable. Lam's new site plan needs to include a usable driveway that connects their main parking lots directly to Leveton Drive.

The last thing Tualatin Road needs is a thousand more cars per day, especially when a better alternative already exists. We are asking the City Council and City Staff to get creative and find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road.

Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road.

Thank you,
Marlene Aviles-Cable

From: Mary C. France <francemaryc@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 9, 2024 10:52 AM
To: Council; Ext - Planning
Subject: Save Tualatin Road

Tualatin Road provides the main access to our residential neighborhoods and is already overloaded with cut-through commuter traffic. Leveton Drive, on the other hand, was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available.

Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus, but the proposed site expansion would eliminate that driveway. This is unacceptable. Lam's new site plan needs to include a usable driveway that connects their main parking lots directly to Leveton Drive.

The last thing Tualatin Road needs is a thousand more cars per day, especially when a better alternative already exists. We are asking the City Council and City Staff to get creative and find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road.

Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road.

Thank You!

Mary Colleen France
10570 SW Kiowa Street
Tualatin

503 701 9065
francemaryc@gmail.com

From: Steve Koper
Sent: Monday, September 9, 2024 8:54 AM
To: Keith Leonard
Subject: FW: Tualatin Road

From: Michael Ryan <bluesoxbb@aol.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 08, 2024 8:03 AM
To: Council <council@tualatin.gov>
Subject: Tualatin Road

To the uncaring council,
Is LAM so big that you have no respect for the citizens of this town?
I am strongly opposed to Lam Research adding a new entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue. Tualatin Road provides the main access to our residential neighborhoods and is already overloaded with cut-through commuter traffic. Leveton Drive, on the other hand, was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available.

Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus, but the proposed site expansion would eliminate that driveway. This is unacceptable. Lam's new site plan needs to include a usable driveway that connects their main parking lots directly to Leveton Drive.

The last thing Tualatin Road needs is a thousand more cars per day, especially when a better alternative already exists. We are asking the City Council and City Staff to get creative and find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road.

Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road.

Thank You!

From: Steve Koper
Sent: Monday, September 9, 2024 8:54 AM
To: Keith Leonard
Subject: FW: Tualatin Road

From: mm3soups <mm3soups@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 08, 2024 12:40 PM
To: Council <council@tualatin.gov>
Subject: Tualatin Road

I am strongly opposed to Lam Research adding a new entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue. Tualatin Road provides the main access to our residential neighborhoods and is already overloaded with cut-through commuter traffic. Leveton Drive, on the other hand, was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available.

Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus, but the proposed site expansion would eliminate that driveway. This is unacceptable. Lam's new site plan needs to include a usable driveway that connects their main parking lots directly to Leveton Drive.

The last thing Tualatin Road needs is a thousand more cars per day, especially when a better alternative already exists. We are asking the City Council and City Staff to get creative and find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road.

Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road.

Thank You!

Michele Campbell
112th and Apalachee resident

From: Sherwood, Nicole <nicole.sherwood@vanguard-ems.com>
Sent: Monday, September 9, 2024 10:02 AM
To: Council
Cc: Ext - Planning
Subject: Save Tualatin Road

Dear Tualatin City Council and Tualatin Planning Department:

I am strongly opposed to Lam Research adding a new entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue. Tualatin Road provides the main access to our residential neighborhoods and is already overloaded with cut-through commuter traffic. Leveton Drive, on the other hand, was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available.

Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus, but the proposed site expansion would eliminate that driveway. This is unacceptable. **Lam's new site plan needs to include a usable driveway that connects their main parking lots directly to Leveton Drive**.

The last thing Tualatin Road needs is a thousand more cars per day, especially when a better alternative already exists. We are asking the City Council and City Staff to get creative and find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road.

Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road.

Thank You!

Nicole Sherwood
Master Scheduler/Planner
Nicole.sherwood@vanguard-ems.com
503-672-4267

VANGUARD EMS™
Leading Edge Electronics Manufacturing

From: Patrice Dugan <duganfamily4@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 5, 2024 9:40 PM
To: Ext - Planning
Subject: Tualatin Road

All Planning Commision Members

I have lived in the Jurgens Park neighborhood for 25 years. Our family has been very happy here and have seen many changes during this time. One change has been the increased traffic on Tualatin Rd due to housing additions (single family and apartments). Depending on the time of day, getting on to Tualatin Rd from Jurgens is already quite a challenge.
I am strongly opposed to Lam's proposal which would very negatively impact traffic and neighborhood liveability as currently proposed. There are other roads in the area that are much better suited to this industrial traffic (Herman Rd, Leveton)- please do not allow Lam to feed their traffic from their addition on to Tualatin Road

Sincerely
Patrice and Casey Dugan
10365 SW Tawasa CT
Tualatin 97062

Sent from my iPad

From: pryz10@yahoo.com
Sent: Saturday, September 7, 2024 9:24 PM
To: Ext - Planning
Subject: Tualatin Road

I am strongly opposed to Lam Research adding a new entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue. Tualatin Road provides the main access to our residential neighborhoods and is already overloaded with cut-through commuter traffic. Leveton Drive, on the other hand, was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available.

Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus, but the proposed site expansion would eliminate that driveway. This is unacceptable. Lam's new site plan needs to include a usable driveway that connects their main parking lots directly to Leveton Drive.

The last thing Tualatin Road needs is a thousand more cars per day, especially when a better alternative already exists. We are asking the City Council and City Staff to get creative and find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road.

Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road.

Thank You!

Sent from my iPhone

From: Shari Henry <sharihenry@outlook.com>
Sent: Monday, September 9, 2024 10:50 PM
To: Council; Ext - Planning
Subject: Save Tualatin Road

To: Tualatin City Council: council@tualatin.gov
To: Tualatin Planning Department: planning@tualatin.gov

Dear Tualatin City Council and Tualatin Planning Department:

I am strongly opposed to Lam Research adding a new entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue. Tualatin Road provides the main access to our residential neighborhoods and is already overloaded with cut-through commuter traffic. Leveton Drive, on the other hand, was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available.

Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus, but the proposed site expansion would eliminate that driveway. This is unacceptable. Lam's new site plan needs to include a usable driveway that connects their main parking lots directly to Leveton Drive.

The last thing Tualatin Road needs is a thousand more cars per day, especially when a better alternative already exists. We are asking the City Council and City Staff to get creative and find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road.

Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road.

Thank You!

- Shari Henry

From: Steve Koper
Sent: Monday, September 9, 2024 8:58 AM
To: Keith Leonard
Subject: FW: Lam Research LUX Proposal

From: Frank Bubenik <fbubenik@tualatin.gov>
Sent: Thursday, August 15, 2024 9:55 AM
To: Steve <sntitus@gmail.com>; Council <council@tualatin.gov>
Subject: Re: Lam Research LUX Proposal

Steve,

Thanks for your email and for sharing your thoughts at city council this week.

The Lam proposal will not come to council, just ARB. As this development conforms with the existing use and zoning, no council review is required.

The CIO land use officers attend regularly scheduled land use officer meetings with the city and they are kept informed of development. Rocky Bixby is Riverpark's land use officer. As you mention the Riverpark CIO's purpose is to get the word out to residents and gather opinions/recommendations that they then share with the city.

Our traffic folks are working with Lam on the 115th and Tualatin Road intersection to create ways to minimize traffic on 115th and Tualatin Road. City staff is working with Lam to protect neighborhood livability. I live in the area, as you know, and want to make sure Tualatin Road does not become congested/overwhelmed.

Just a FYI that you may already know - The city's 1,000 foot notice requirement (which expands to include boundaries of sub-divisions that are within the 1,000 foot), is 10x the requirement in the state and most cities (100 foot).

Lam has had their required neighborhood meeting and has talked about having a follow -up, but nothing is scheduled as of yet. If they have it, the CIO and concerned residents need to be ready to attend.

I am regularly looking into the progress of this project and pushing for staff and Lam to do right by the neighborhood.

MAYOR
FRANK BUBENIK

Mayor of Tualatin
fbubenik@tualatin.gov
Cell: 971.420.7443

This e-mail, including attachments, is intended for the exclusive use of the addressee and may contain proprietary, confidential, or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, any dissemination, use, distribution, or copying is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify me via return e-mail, permanently delete the original message, and destroy all copies.

From: Steve <sntitus@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 13, 2024 9:35 AM
To: Council <council@tualatin.gov>; Sherilyn Lombos <slombos@tualatin.gov>
Subject: Lam Research LUX Proposal

Council members:

Thank you for continuing to provide the Public Comment period during the City Council Meetings. The traffic along Tualatin Road is only going to increase when Lam Building G is finished and the LUX project is finished. Additionally there will be more pressure on the Leviton Area roads when the current 6 or 7 industrial sites, currently in process or recently finished, come online.

I expect that the current proposal to "improve" the intersection at Tualatin Rd and 115th will ultimately prevail. The Architectural Review Board will hold their required meetings and pass it to the Council. The Council will have two or three public hearings and the project will pass. After all we need the local jobs and you need the taxes from the additional Assessed Valuation.

I'm not a fan of the implementation of the residential CIO program as it provides no active two-way communication between the residents and Council or City Departments. That said, I would like to see the City go the extra mile in communication to Riverpark CIO on this project.

If for nothing else, to go above and beyond to communicate with the residents will give you additional "talking points" to fall back on against a ground swell of opposition as well as explicitly satisfying State of Oregon, Goal 1: Citizen Involvement requirements.

Thank you,

Stephen Titus
sntitus@gmail.com

From: Yahoo Mail <kikigoodwin@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 7, 2024 8:16 PM
To: Ext - Planning
Subject: NO! to Lam entrance on Tualatin Rd/115th

I am strongly opposed to Lam Research adding a new entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue. Tualatin Road provides the main access to our residential neighborhoods and is already overloaded with cut-through commuter traffic. Leveton Drive, on the other hand, was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available.

Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus, but the proposed site expansion would eliminate that driveway. This is unacceptable. Lam's new site plan needs to include a usable driveway that connects their main parking lots directly to Leveton Drive.

The last thing Tualatin Road needs is a thousand more cars per day, especially when a better alternative already exists. We are asking the City Council and City Staff to get creative and find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road.

Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road.

Thank You!

The Goodwin's
On Pueblo Ct
Tualatin

From: Frank Bubenik
Sent: Tuesday, September 10, 2024 8:39 PM
To: Brett Hamilton; Council; Ext - Planning
Subject: Re: Lam and Tualatin Road

Brett,

Thanks for your email and for sharing your thoughts about Tualatin Road, Lam, and 115th Avenue. A historical FYI that Lam has had an approved industrial master plan for the eventual buildout of its campus since 2001, including access to SW Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue. Lam's master plan was amended in 2022 to include the addition of Building G along Leveton Road, which is currently under construction. The new proposed buildings, referred to as TUX, will be occupied by up to 600 new employees.

I live in the area and want to make sure Tualatin Road does not become congested/overwhelmed. There were new ideas brought forward to redirect many LAM employees off of Tualatin Road. These ideas are being vetting by Lam and city transportation experts. Our traffic folks are working with Lam on the 115th and Tualatin Road intersection to create ways to minimize traffic on 115th and Tualatin Road.

The City of Tualatin is committed to listening to the community, working on traffic solutions, and working to bring together the parties. In that vein, City staff are organizing a neighborhood forum designed to allow the neighborhood to talk about traffic issues and concerns that have arisen. We do not have a date identified at this time but are planning it within the next few weeks. Since the topics are broader than what Lam can be required to do, city council and staff feel it is appropriate for the city to host and facilitate this meeting, with Lam participating. Lam is attuned to the neighborhood concerns and their representatives are willing to be at the table.

There are many moving pieces on this, and they're moving pretty slowly. The application from Lam is not yet deemed complete and there are missing chunks of information and changes being made.

The Lam proposal will not come to council initially as this development conforms with the existing use and zoning. An Architecture Review Board (ARB) review is required as well as the Planning Commission review and they are months away; it could be as late as February or March 2025. The Industrial Master Plan application will be heard by the Planning Commission and the Architectural Review Application will be heard by the Architectural Review Board. Each hearing body would make its own decision based on the applicable criteria for that application; each decision is then potentially separately appealable to City Council.

Please attend the next neighborhood meeting and provide your thoughts and suggestions.

Mayor of Tualatin
fbubenik@tualatin.gov
Cell: 971.420.7443

This e-mail, including attachments, is intended for the exclusive use of the addressee and may contain proprietary, confidential, or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, any dissemination, use, distribution, or copying is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify me via return e-mail, permanently delete the original message, and destroy all copies.

From: Brett Hamilton <brett@simple.be>
Sent: Tuesday, September 10, 2024 2:25 PM
To: Council <council@tualatin.gov>; Ext - Planning <Planning@tualatin.gov>
Subject: Lam and Tualatin Road

Dear Tualatin City Council and Tualatin Planning Department:

I am strongly opposed to Lam Research adding a new entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue. Tualatin Road provides the main access to our residential neighborhoods and is already overloaded with cut-through commuter traffic. Leveton Drive, on the other hand, was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available.

Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus, but the proposed site expansion would eliminate that driveway. This is unacceptable. Lam's new site plan needs to include a usable driveway that connects their main parking lots directly to Leveton Drive.

The last thing Tualatin Road needs is a thousand more cars per day, especially when a better alternative already exists. We are asking the City Council and City Staff to get creative and find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road.

Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road.

Thank You!
Brett Hamilton

From: Chris Mitchell <chris.mitchell@autodesk.com>

Sent: Tuesday, September 10, 2024 11:29 AM

To: Council; Ext - Planning

Subject: Save Tualatin Road!

Hello,

I recently found out about the potential plans for LAM to create a new entrance way on Tualatin Road at 115th Avenue. Quite frankly I am very disappointed that this has even got as far as it has. I've lived in Tualatin near Jurgens Park for almost 20 years now & am very concerned about the impact on the local roads in terms of excessive traffic, (both volume & vehicle size), as well as the potential for more traffic incidents in what is very much a quiet residential neighborhood.

Tualatin has invested very successfully over the years to improve on traffic issues, but I feel that LAM's most recent plans will put that in jeopardy for this area. Much investment in infrastructure has already been done for 124th, Leveton & Herman so LAM should be striving to leverage those as much as possible instead of introducing more traffic on the local residential roads. Any plans already now in place should be revisited with a view to redirecting all traffic to Leveton as the primary - after all that was created to serve exactly such industrial needs.

As the Tualatin City/Planning councils you should not allow these plans to go ahead as-is. I'd be more than happy to discuss this further at your convenience.

Many Thanks,

Chris Mitchell.

BEng, Meng, CEng, FIMechE

From: Cindy Morrison <belydnc1@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, September 13, 2024 4:12 PM
To: Council; Ext - Planning
Subject: Save Tualatin Road

Dear Tualatin City Council and Tualatin Planning Department:

I am strongly opposed to Lam Research adding a new entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue. Tualatin Road provides the main access to our residential neighborhoods and is already overloaded with cut-through commuter traffic. Leveton Drive, on the other hand, was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available.

Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus, but the proposed site expansion would eliminate that driveway. This is unacceptable. Lam's new site plan needs to include a usable driveway that connects their main parking lots directly to Leveton Drive.

The last thing Tualatin Road needs is a thousand more cars per day, especially when a better alternative already exists. We are asking the City Council and City Staff to get creative and find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road.

Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road.

Thank You!

Cindy Morrison

Ty Tolomei

Sherwood Oregon

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone

From: Sherilyn Lombos
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2024 2:11 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Kim McMillan; Mike McCarthy
Subject: FW: Tualatin Road

Sherilyn Lombos
City Manager
Phone: 503.691.3010

From: Frank Bubenik <fbubenik@tualatin.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2024 2:09 PM
To: John Phillips <jphillips4994@icloud.com>; Council <council@tualatin.gov>
Subject: Re: Tualatin Road

Mr. Phillips,

Thanks for your email and for sharing your thoughts about Tualatin Road and Lam. I also want to thank you for driving a school bus that services TTSD students.

A historical FYI that Lam has had an approved industrial master plan for the eventual buildout of its campus since 2001, including access to SW Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue. Lam's master plan was amended in 2022 to include the addition of Building G along Leveton Road, which is currently under construction. The new proposed buildings, referred to as TUX, will be occupied by up to 600 new employees.

I live in the area and want to make sure Tualatin Road does not become congested/overwhelmed. There were new ideas brought forward to redirect many LAM employees off of Tualatin Road. These ideas are being vetting by Lam and city transportation experts. Our traffic folks are working with Lam on the 115th and Tualatin Road intersection to create ways to minimize traffic on 115th and Tualatin Road.

The City of Tualatin is committed to listening to the community and working on traffic solutions. City staff are organizing a neighborhood forum designed to allow the neighborhood to talk about traffic issues in our area. We do not have a date identified at this time but are planning it within the next few weeks. Since the topics are broader than what Lam can be required to do, city council and staff feel it is appropriate for the city to host and facilitate this meeting, with Lam participating. Lam is attuned to the neighborhood concerns and their representatives are willing to be at the table.

There are many moving pieces on this, and they're moving pretty slowly. The application from Lam is not yet deemed complete and there are missing chunks of information and changes being made.

The Lam proposal will not come to council initially as this development conforms with the existing use and zoning. An Architecture Review Board (ARB) review is required as well as the Planning Commission review and they are months away; it could be as late as February or March 2025. The Industrial Master Plan application will be heard by the Planning Commission and the Architectural Review Application will be heard by the Architectural Review Board. Each hearing body would make its own decision based on the applicable criteria for that application; each decision is then potentially separately appealable to City Council. Since the City Council is the appeal body for both of those forums, it is important that we stay neutral and unbiased. If we do hear an appeal on this matter, both LAM and the public have a right to expect that we have not prejudged the matter or are otherwise biased in favor of or against the proposal/s. Our job will be to make a decision based upon the record before us and the applicable criteria.

Please attend the next neighborhood meeting and provide your thoughts and suggestions.

Mayor of Tualatin
fbubenik@tualatin.gov
Cell: 971.420.7443

This e-mail, including attachments, is intended for the exclusive use of the addressee and may contain proprietary, confidential, or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, any dissemination, use, distribution, or copying is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify me via return e-mail, permanently delete the original message, and destroy all copies.

From: John Phillips <jphillips4994@icloud.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2024 1:28 PM
To: Council <council@tualatin.gov>; Brett Hamilton <brett@simple.be>
Subject: Tualatin Road

I drive a Special Needs School bus for the Tigard/Tualatin school district. Tualatin Road is lined with apartments and is used all day long to transport students to and from all the schools in the district. With the addition of more traffic, we along with all the people using this road to get to work, will have more delays than needed with the addition of more traffic. Leveton is not used as often by our buses and would be better served by Lam Research. Please consider this option when making your decision on the proposed routing change.

Thank you,

John C Phillips
Tigard/Tualatin school district

Resident of Tualatin right off of Tualatin Road
Sent from my iPhone

From: MB <mbr14@protonmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2024 10:35 AM
To: Ext - Planning; Council
Subject: Save Tualatin Road - Lam Research proposal

Dear Tualatin City Council and Planning Department,

I am writing to add my voice to the growing coalition opposed to Lam Research building a new entrance to their facilities on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue.

Tualatin Road already serves the local community and does not need more traffic. Currently, Tualatin Road serves as the primary access to several residential neighborhoods as well as handling additional commuter traffic between I-5 and Highway 99. As a result, Tualatin Road already gets backed up at typical commuting times, and the new Lam Research entrance would only add to this problem.

However, the existing Leveton Drive can handle the traffic from Lam Research employees. Further, the existing Leveton Drive is already connected to the Lam Research campus and can be used immediately (saving money and time, rather than creating the new Tualatin Road entrance). While I believe there should be no entrance for Lam Research along Tualatin Road, if that entrance is created then the proposed site expansion proposal to eliminate the existing driveway along Leveton Drive needs to be reconsidered. Maintaining this entrance point would help curb traffic along Tualatin Road, regardless of the final decision regarding a Lam Research entrance along Tualatin Road.
Furthermore, creating more traffic along Tualatin Road makes the road less safe for our children, bikers, pedestrians, and neighbors. For a healthier and happier community, we should not be intentionally and for the long-term adding more traffic to this road.
I believe that the Tualatin City Council and City Staff can find another way to address Lam Research's proposal that does not contribute more traffic along Tualatin Road. *Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road.* Thank you for your time!

Maya Bartel
City of Tualatin volunteer, CERT member, and concerned resident

From: RCB <g4rl1c5@proton.me>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2024 3:25 PM
To: Council; Ext - Planning
Subject: Save Tualatin Road

Dear City of Tualatin,

I am strongly opposed to Lam Research adding a new entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue. Tualatin Road provides the main access to our residential neighborhoods and is already overloaded with cut-through commuter traffic. Leveton Drive, on the other hand, was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available.

Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus, but the proposed site expansion would eliminate that driveway. This is unacceptable. Lam's new site plan needs to include a usable driveway that connects their main parking lots directly to Leveton Drive.

The last thing Tualatin Road needs is a thousand more cars per day, especially when a better alternative already exists. We are asking the City Council and City Staff to get creative and find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road.

Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road.

Thank You!
Riley Bartel
Concerned resident of Tualatin

From: Sherilyn Lombos
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2024 6:50 AM
To: Ext - Planning; Mike McCarthy; Steve Koper; Kim McMillan
Subject: FW: Please Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road.

Sherilyn Lombos
City Manager
Phone: 503.691.3010

-----Original Message-----
From: Samantha Flores <samantha.r.flores@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 10, 2024 8:49 PM
To: Council <council@tualatin.gov>
Subject: Please Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road.

Hello,

My family and I live on 11380 SW Apalachee St and use Tualatin Road everyday. We strongly opposed to Lam Research adding a new entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue. Tualatin Road provides the main access to many residential neighborhoods and is already overloaded with cut-through commuter traffic. Leveton Drive, on the other hand, was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available.

Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus, but the proposed site expansion would eliminate that driveway. Lam's new site plan needs to include a usable driveway that connects their main parking lots directly to Leveton Drive.

The last thing our neighborhood needs is a more cars cutting around the traffic light daily and endangering our kids playing outside. Our neighbors kids and soon my 1 year old son will be playing outside our home and cars will be coming in front of our house (114th & Apalachee) cutting across the traffic light endangering them. Please don't allow that when a better alternative to more traffic on Tualatin Road and the surrounding side streets already exists. We are asking the City Council and City Staff to get creative and find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road.

Please Use Leveton Drive

A concerned Tualatin Resident and Mother of a 1 year old -Samantha Flores-Peña

---
Sent from my iPhone

From: Ken Trotman <ksknstrot@msn.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2024 6:25 PM
To: Council; Ext - Planning
Subject: Lam Research Traffic Problems

Dear Tualatin City Council and Tualatin Planning Department:

The points made below are simply common-sense steps to prevent the degradation of the livability of this area of our city. Since I live in this area and will be directly impacted by your decisions, please carefully consider this request.

I am strongly opposed to Lam Research adding a new entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue. Tualatin Road provides the main access to our residential neighborhoods and is already overloaded with cut-through commuter traffic. Leveton Drive, on the other hand, was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available.

Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus, but the proposed site expansion would eliminate that driveway. This is unacceptable. Lam's new site plan needs to include a usable driveway that connects their main parking lots directly to Leveton Drive.

The last thing Tualatin Road needs is a thousand more cars per day, especially when a better alternative already exists. We are asking the City Council and City Staff to get creative and find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road.

Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road.

Thank You!

Kenneth and Susan Trotman
10799 SW Kiowa CT
Tualatin, OR 97052

From: greg.fronczak@yahoo.com
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2024 7:01 PM
To: Ext - Planning
Subject: Save Tualatin Road

Dear Tualatin Planning Department,

I am strongly opposed to Lam Research adding a new entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue. Tualatin Road provides the main access to our residential neighborhoods and is already overloaded with cut-through commuter traffic. Leveton Drive, on the other hand, was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available.

Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus, but the proposed site expansion would eliminate that driveway. This is unacceptable. Lam's new site plan needs to include a usable driveway that connects their main parking lots directly to Leveton Drive.

The last thing Tualatin Road needs is a thousand more cars per day, especially when a better alternative already exists. We are asking the City Council and City Staff to get creative and find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road.

Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road.

Thank You!

Sincerely,

Greg Fronczak
503-729-0170
greg.fronczak@yahoo.com

From: Brian Craker <crakerb@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2024 7:39 PM
To: Council; Ext - Planning
Subject: Concerns with Lam Research Expansion / Tualatin Road Impact

My name is Brian Craker, and I live at the end of 106th Ct. in Tualatin, one block from Mayor Bubenik. We have lived in Tualatin in 1997, and watched the traffic on Tualatin Rd. grow from a sleepy road of occasion traffic to the constant flow that it is now. Tualatin Rd. is the ONLY option out of neighborhood to go west, east or south, and it is getting more difficult (and more dangerous) to pull out onto in the last two years. Today I had to sit at the end of 106th Ct for over 5 minutes waiting for a break in the traffic so I could go pick up my son in downtown Tualatin, and when I did finally pull out, the person heading west was speeding over 45mph and nearly hit me, because they were in a hurry.

My wife and I are very concerned for our livability and our safety on Tualatin Rd. if the Lam proposal is allowed to drop thousands of additional vehicles onto our road. Allowing that much traffic onto our ONLY access point will essentially trap us in our neighborhood during peak hours, and threaten the safety of our families trying to safely get out. That, and we are certain it will create the same headaches for people who will begin using Jergens to Hazelbrook as a cut-through, adding unsafe speeders in front of a park and a middle school.

I recently drove through the Lam facility to see what was being built. Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus. So why do they want to close this access and divert everyone onto Tualatin Road instead? This is unacceptable. Lam's new site plan needs to keep all of their traffic directly to Leveton Drive where there is currently very little traffic and lots of room for expansion.

Our neighborhood can not handle a thousand more cars per day onto Tualatin Road, especially when a better alternative already exists. I am asking the City Council and City Staff please find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road and destroying our wonderful neighborhood in the city we have called home for over 20 years.

Sincerely,

Brian Craker

<><----------><>
Brian Craker

"Write your plans in pencil, then give God the eraser."
(Unknown)

From: Marje Martinez <nursemarje@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2024 12:00 PM
To: Council; Ext - Planning
Subject: Lam proposal for Tualatin Road



Realized when I sent the first, I put east but I meant west part. However, the rest is correct and wanted to make sure was accurate.

Save Tualatin Road

To: Tualatin City Council: council@tualatin.gov
To: Tualatin Planning Department: planning@tualatin.gov

Dear Tualatin City Council and Tualatin Planning Department:

I am strongly opposed to Lam Research adding a new entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue. Tualatin Road provides the main access to our residential neighborhoods and is already overloaded with cut-through commuter traffic. Leveton Drive, on the other hand, was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available.

Additionally, I personally use Tualatin Road frequently to serve hospice patients in the community. This would put a huge burden on travel time to and from patient's in the west/ north part of our city.

Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus, but the proposed site expansion would eliminate that driveway.

This is unacceptable. Lam's new site plan needs to include a usable driveway that connects their main parking lots directly to Leveton Drive.

The last thing Tualatin Road needs is a thousand more cars per day, especially when a better alternative already exists. We are asking the City Council and City Staff to get creative and find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road.

Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road.

Thank You!

-Marjorie Martinez,
Legacy Hospice RN Case Manager in Tualatin

From: Katie Nelson <katiemn898@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, October 12, 2024 5:21 PM
To: Council; Ext - Planning
Subject: Save tualatin road

Dear Tualatin City Council and Tualatin Planning Department:

I am strongly opposed to Lam Research adding a new entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue. Tualatin Road provides the main access to our residential neighborhoods and is already overloaded with cut-through commuter traffic. Leveton Drive, on the other hand, was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available.

Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus, but the proposed site expansion would eliminate that driveway. This is unacceptable. Lam's new site plan needs to include a usable driveway that connects their main parking lots directly to Leveton Drive.

The last thing Tualatin Road needs is a thousand more cars per day, especially when a better alternative already exists. We are asking the City Council and City Staff to get creative and find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road.

Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road.

Thank You!

From: Nikola Tcherven <ntcherven@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 21, 2024 7:05 PM
To: Council
Cc: Ext - Planning
Subject: Save Tualatin Road!

Dear Tualatin City Council and Tualatin Planning Department:

I am strongly opposed to Lam Research adding a new entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue. Tualatin Road provides the main access to our residential neighborhoods and is already overloaded with cut-through commuter traffic. Leveton Drive, on the other hand, was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available.

Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus, but the proposed site expansion would eliminate that driveway. This is unacceptable. Lam's new site plan needs to include a usable driveway that connects their main parking lots directly to Leveton Drive.

The last thing Tualatin Road needs is a thousand more cars per day, especially when a better alternative already exists. We are asking the City Council and City Staff to get creative and find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road.

Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road.

Thank You!

Nikola Tcherven

From: J.A Ena <al_3401@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 18, 2024 8:40 AM
To: Ext - Planning; Council
Subject: Save tualatin road

To: Tualatin City Council:
To: Tualatin Planning Department:

Dear Tualatin City Council and Tualatin Planning Department:

I am strongly opposed to Lam Research adding a new entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue. I face traffic on tualatin road daily during the school year trying to rush my middle schoolers from school to extra curricular activities. It is already a challenge now. I'm worried this will only increase the stress of getting slow to rise middle schoolers to school and get them from school to the other side of town for practices.

Tualatin Road provides the main access to our residential neighborhoods and is already overloaded with cut-through commuter traffic. Leveton Drive, on the other hand, was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available.

Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus, but the proposed site expansion would eliminate that driveway. This is unacceptable. Lam's new site plan needs to include a usable driveway that connects their main parking lots directly to Leveton Drive.

The last thing Tualatin Road needs is a thousand more cars per day, especially when a better alternative already exists. We are asking the City Council and City Staff to get creative and find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road.

Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road.

Thank You!

Alaina Ena

From: The Corrs <corrs62@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2024 8:36 PM
To: Council
Cc: Ext - Planning
Subject: Proposed road access for LAM

Dear Tualatin City Council and Tualatin Planning Department:

As 27 year residents of Tualatin and living opposite from the Lam facility, I am strongly opposed to Lam Research adding a new entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue. Tualatin Road provides the main access to our residential neighborhoods and is already overloaded with cut-through commuter traffic. Leveton Drive, on the other hand, was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available.

Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus, but the proposed site expansion would eliminate that driveway. This is unacceptable. Lam's new site plan needs to include a usable driveway that connects their main parking lots directly to Leveton Drive.

The last thing Tualatin Road needs is a thousand more cars per day, especially when a better alternative already exists. We are asking the City Council and City Staff to get creative and find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road.

Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road.

Thank You!

John and Janice Corr

From: Melissa McCabe <mdmccabe18@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 21, 2024 3:05 PM
To: Council; Ext - Planning
Subject: Save Tualatin Road by Using Common Sense

Dear Tualatin City Council and Tualatin Planning Department:

I am strongly opposed to Lam Research adding a new entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue. Tualatin Road provides the main access to our residential neighborhoods and is already overloaded with cut-through commuter traffic. Leveton Drive, on the other hand, was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available.

Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus, but the proposed site expansion would eliminate that driveway. This is unacceptable. Lam's new site plan needs to include a usable driveway that connects their main parking lots directly to Leveton Drive.

The last thing Tualatin Road needs is a thousand more cars per day, especially when a better alternative already exists. We are asking the City Council and City Staff to get creative and find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road.

Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road.

Thank You!

Melissa Cerda

From: kminato4sin@gmail.com
Sent: Thursday, October 24, 2024 11:57 PM
To: Keith Leonard
Subject: RE: Opposing Lam Research adding traffic light and entrance on Tualatin Road and 115th Ave.

Hello Keith,

Thank you for your reply to confirm email.

Please allow me to add,
Further reviewing, access to LAM facility at 115th and Tualatin, when cars are leaving LAM facility heading towards 99W,
I think there are more possibility that car will proceed straight to 115th Ave. rather turn left towards Tualatin Road with traffic light when exiting from LAM facility.

This will add more concern of traffic increase not only in Tualatin Road but both in 115th Ave and Tualatin Road for through traffic that should be accessing through Leveton Fr..
For 115th Ave it should be residential traffic for local access mainly not a through traffic accessing to 99W.

Best Regards,
Kazuki Minato
11445 SW Roberts Ct.
Tualatin, OR 97062

From: Keith Leonard <kleonard@tualatin.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2024 8:49 AM
To: kminato4sin@gmail.com
Subject: RE: Opposing Lam Research adding traffic light and entrance on Tualatin Road and 115th Ave.

Good morning Kazuki,

We have received your comments. We will add your comments to the public record. Thank you for taking part in the public process! Have a good day.

Keith Leonard, AICP
Associate Planner
Phone: 503.691.3029

From: kminato4sin@gmail.com <kminato4sin@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 22, 2024 11:25 PM
To: Council <council@tualatin.gov>; Ext - Planning <Planning@tualatin.gov>
Subject: Opposing Lam Research adding traffic light and entrance on Tualatin Road and 115th Ave.

Dear Tualatin City Council and Tualatin Planning Department:

I am strongly opposed to Lam Research adding a new entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue.
Tualatin Road provides the main access to our residential neighborhoods and is already overloaded with cut-through commuter traffic.

I live on Roberts Ct. and seen traffic increased on Tualatin Road and 115th Ave. in last few years and many seem to be cars from industrial park.
Alread many cars from industrial park use Tualatin Road instead of Leveton Drive and worse many cars turn into 115th and connect to Hazelbrook Road making short cut to 99W.

Many car driving through 115th Ave. exceeding the speed limit is also my concern in residential area and Hazelbrook Middle School nearby.
Safety of children in residential are and school student in also major concern.

Leveton Drive, on the other hand, was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available.

Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus, but the proposed site expansion would eliminate that driveway.
This is unacceptable.
Lam's new site plan needs to include a usable driveway that connects their main parking lots directly to Leveton Drive.

The last thing Tualatin Road needs is a thousand more cars per day, especially when a better alternative already exists.
We are asking the City Council and City Staff to get creative and find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road.
Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road.

Thank You for listening to my concern and I understand that many other neighbors in Tualatin share same concern

Sincerely,
Kazuki Minato
11445 SW Roberts Ct.
Tualatin, OR 97062

From: A Micheals <amichaels68@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2024 7:08 PM
To: Ext - Planning
Subject: Save Tualatin road

Dear Tualatin City Council and Tualatin Planning Department:

I am strongly opposed to Lam Research adding a new entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue. Tualatin Road provides the main access to our residential neighborhoods and is already overloaded with cut-through commuter traffic. Leveton Drive, on the other hand, was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available.

Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus, but the proposed site expansion would eliminate that driveway. This is unacceptable. Lam's new site plan needs to include a usable driveway that connects their main parking lots directly to Leveton Drive.

The last thing Tualatin Road needs is a thousand more cars per day, especially when a better alternative already exists. We are asking the City Council and City Staff to get creative and find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road.

Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road.

Thank You!

From: chdwckk@aol.com
Sent: Saturday, October 26, 2024 2:53 PM
To: Council; Ext - Planning
Subject: Save Tualatin Road

Dear Tualatin City Council and Tualatin Planning Department:

I am strongly opposed to Lam Research adding a new entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue. Tualatin Road provides the main access to our residential neighborhoods and is already overloaded with cut-through commuter traffic. Leveton Drive, on the other hand, was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available.

Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus, but the proposed site expansion would eliminate that driveway. This is unacceptable. Lam's new site plan needs to include a usable driveway that connects their main parking lots directly to Leveton Drive.

The last thing Tualatin Road needs is a thousand more cars per day, especially when a better alternative already exists. We are asking the City Council and City Staff to get creative and find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road.

Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road.

Thank You!

From: Arva Bartos <arva41@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 31, 2024 11:56 AM
To: Council; Ext - Planning

To: Tualatin City Council: council@tualatin.gov
To: Tualatin Planning Department: planning@tualatin.gov

Dear Tualatin City Council and Tualatin Planning Department:

I am strongly opposed to Lam Research adding a new entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue. Tualatin Road provides the main access to our residential neighborhoods and is already overloaded with cut-through commuter traffic. Leveton Drive, on the other hand, was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available.

Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus, but the proposed site expansion would eliminate that driveway. This is unacceptable. Lam's new site plan must include a usable driveway connecting their main parking lots directly to Leveton Drive.

The last thing Tualatin Road needs is a thousand more cars per day, especially when a better alternative already exists. We are asking the City Council and City Staff to get creative and find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road.

Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road.

Sincerely,

Arva Bartos, 17750 SW Chippewa Trail, Tualatin

From: Michael Gallardo <gallardo.mike@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 30, 2024 11:28 AM
To: Council; Ext - Planning
Subject: Save Tualatin Road

Dear Tualatin City Council and Tualatin Planning Department:

I am strongly opposed to Lam Research adding a new entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue. Tualatin Road provides the main access to our residential neighborhoods and is already overloaded with cut-through commuter traffic. Leveton Drive, on the other hand, was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available.

Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus, but the proposed site expansion would eliminate that driveway. This is unacceptable. Lam's new site plan needs to include a usable driveway that connects their main parking lots directly to Leveton Drive.

The last thing Tualatin Road needs is a thousand more cars per day, especially when a better alternative already exists. We are asking the City Council and City Staff to get creative and find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road.

Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road.

Thank You!

Sincerely,

Mike (A resident & homeowner of the Riverpark neighborhood)

From: Phil Vincent <pdvpdx@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 29, 2024 2:59 PM
To: Council
Cc: Ext - Planning
Subject: Save Tualatin Road

Dear Tualatin City Council and Tualatin Planning Department:

I am strongly opposed to Lam Research adding a new entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue. Tualatin Road provides the main access to our residential neighborhoods and is already overloaded with cut-through commuter traffic. Leveton Drive, on the other hand, was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available.

Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus, but the proposed site expansion would eliminate that driveway. This is unacceptable. Lam's new site plan needs to include a usable driveway that connects their main parking lots directly to Leveton Drive.

The last thing Tualatin Road needs is a thousand more cars per day, especially when a better alternative already exists. We are asking the City Council and City Staff to get creative and find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road.

Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road.

Thank You!

Phil Vincent

17240 SW 108th Ave

Tualatin, OR 97062

Sent from my iPhone

From: Sara Miele <saramiele101@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 30, 2024 11:27 AM
To: Council; Ext - Planning
Subject: Save Tualatin Road

Dear Tualatin City Council and Tualatin Planning Department:

I am strongly opposed to Lam Research adding a new entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue. Tualatin Road provides the main access to our residential neighborhoods and is already overloaded with cut-through commuter traffic. Leveton Drive, on the other hand, was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available.

Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus, but the proposed site expansion would eliminate that driveway. This is unacceptable. Lam's new site plan needs to include a usable driveway that connects their main parking lots directly to Leveton Drive.

The last thing Tualatin Road needs is a thousand more cars per day, especially when a better alternative already exists. We are asking the City Council and City Staff to get creative and find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road.

Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road.

Thank You!

Sincerely,

Sara (A resident & homeowner of the Riverpark neighborhood)

From: Sean Begley <begleysm@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 29, 2024 12:41 PM
To: Council; Ext - Planning
Subject: Save Tualatin Road

Dear Tualatin City Council and Tualatin Planning Department:

I oppose Lam Research adding a new entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue. Tualatin Road provides the main access to many residential neighborhoods and is already overloaded with cut-through commuter traffic. Leveton Drive, on the other hand, was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available.

Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus, but the proposed site expansion would eliminate that driveway. This is unacceptable. Lam's new site plan needs to include a usable driveway that connects their main parking lots directly to Leveton Drive.

The last thing Tualatin Road needs is a thousand more cars per day, especially when a better alternative already exists. We are asking the City Council and City Staff to get creative and find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road.

Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road.

Thank You!

--
Sean Michael Begley

From: Stephanie Griffith <stephgriffith12@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 30, 2024 4:56 PM
To: Council; Ext - Planning
Subject: Tualatin Road should not be for Truck Traffic!!

Dear Tualatin City Council and Tualatin Planning Department:

I am strongly opposed to Lam Research adding a new entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue. Tualatin Road provides the main access to our residential neighborhoods and is already overloaded with cut-through commuter traffic. Leveton Drive, on the other hand, was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available.

Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus, but the proposed site expansion would eliminate that driveway. This is unacceptable. Lam's new site plan needs to include a usable driveway that connects their main parking lots directly to Leveton Drive.

The last thing Tualatin Road needs is a thousand more cars per day, especially when a better alternative already exists. We are asking the City Council and City Staff to get creative and find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road.

Wasn't the purpose of building Leveton and 124th to ease the traffic in downtown Tualatin? Wasn't the purpose to provide a bypass for truck traffic (and other cars) who just want to get to the freeway from 99? Those roads are large and able to handle large trucks and lots of traffic. Tualatin Road is not. It makes no sense to route truck traffic on a residential road that was not meant for that number of cars.

My elderly mom lives in the condo complex across from the Police Department, and walks daily through all parts of Tualatin, including Tualatin Road. This would make her route unsafe due to the increase in cars/trucks, and the noise would be terrible. Please reconsider this plan and do not allow LAM to use Tualatin Road as their new entrance!

Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road!

Thank You!

Stephanie Griffith

Tualatin resident/homeowner since 2003

From: Molly Phillips <mollykphillips@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 8, 2024 2:36 PM
To: Council; Ext - Planning
Subject: Save Tualatin Road- please!

Dear Tualatin City Council and Tualatin Planning Department:

I am strongly opposed to Lam Research adding a new entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue. Tualatin Road provides the main access to our residential neighborhoods and is already overloaded with cut-through commuter traffic. Leveton Drive, on the other hand, was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available.

Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus, but the proposed site expansion would eliminate that driveway. This is unacceptable. Lam's new site plan needs to include a usable driveway that connects their main parking lots directly to Leveton Drive.

The last thing Tualatin Road needs is a thousand more cars per day, especially when a better alternative already exists. We are asking the City Council and City Staff to get creative and find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road.

Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road.

Thank You!

Sent from my iPhone

From: J Hidalgo <hibarrios@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 10, 2024 1:49 PM
To: Ext - Planning
Subject: Save Tualatin Rd



I am strongly opposed to Lam Research adding a new entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue. Tualatin Road provides the main access to our residential neighborhoods and is already overloaded with cut-through commuter traffic. Leveton Drive, on the other hand, was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available.

Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus, but the proposed site expansion would eliminate that driveway. This is unacceptable. Lam's new site plan needs to include a usable driveway that connects their main parking lots directly to Leveton Drive.

The last thing Tualatin Road needs is a thousand more cars per day, especially when a better alternative already exists. We are asking the City Council and City Staff to get creative and find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road.

Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road.

Thank You!

From: Drew R <drew.riverman@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 13, 2024 11:48 AM
To: Council; Ext - Planning
Subject: Save Tualatin Road

Dear Tualatin City Council and Tualatin Planning Department:

I am strongly opposed to Lam Research adding a new entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue. Tualatin Road provides the main access to our residential neighborhoods and is already overloaded with cut-through commuter traffic. Leveton Drive, on the other hand, was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available.

Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus, but the proposed site expansion would eliminate that driveway. This is unacceptable. Lam's new site plan needs to include a usable driveway that connects their main parking lots directly to Leveton Drive.

The last thing Tualatin Road needs is a thousand more cars per day, especially when a better alternative already exists. We are asking the City Council and City Staff to get creative and find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road.

Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road.

Thank You!

From: Jared J <janssen.jared@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 12, 2024 12:17 PM
To: Council; Ext - Planning
Subject: Lam Tux Projects & Tualatin Rd Traffic Concerns

Dear Tualatin City Council and Tualatin Planning Department

As a Tualatin resident that lives north of Tualatin Rd, I am reaching out today to express my concern and opposition with Lam Research's proposed new entrance on Tualatin Rd. at SW 115th. Avenue. Primarily my concern is that an adequate road fit for their needs, Leveton Drive, is being largely abandoned in favor of using a local collector road (Tualatin Rd.) for the majority of employee/contractor transportation, according to the latest IMP.

Based on reviewing meeting minutes and previous discussions, I know others have touched on this same concern. I don't think a new entrance is entirely a bad idea, but it seems like facility location dictated everything from Lam's perspective -- each IMP is maximizing setback, building height, etc. -- in an attempt to get the most building on the lot.

I have over nearly a decade of experience in Civil/Consultant Engineering including traffic signal controls as an electrical engineer. All that to say that I have some experience reviewing supporting documentation on these exact types of projects. If I may, something I don't think has been properly addressed by either the City of Tualatin or Lam:

From OORPT-City of Tualatin-Industrial Master Plan-240708

(5) Approval Criteria.

(a) Public facilities and services, including transportation, existing or planned, for the area affected by the use are capable of supporting the proposed development or will be made capable by the time development is completed.

Response: The subject property is an existing developed site that is served by adequate public facilities and services. The effect of this IMP is to allow alternative setbacks, building height, and parking lot landscaping standards, as described above. These changes will not affect the availability of public facilities and services. This standard is met.

When reviewing the TUX Project Transportation Analysis document, its final recommendation is merely a traffic signal and some vegetation clearing; however, the report acknowledges EXISTING problems while supplying figures that show they are only adding to them. See Page

19 of this Analysis for full:

At the intersection of OR 99W with SW 124th Avenue, the westbound left turn lanes on OR 99W are expected to have queues that exceed the existing storage lengths.

With the increase in stie trips added to the Tualatin Road approach to SW 124th Avenue, queues are expected to exceed the storage for both the left and right turn lanes. Queues will then back into the through lane and the existing center left turn lane.

During analysis, it was found that the queuing calculation for the SW Hazelbrook Road/OR 99W intersection was unreliable, showing the westbound right turn onto the highway as over capacity even in existing conditions. A review of the traffic count video recording shows driver behavior at the right turn currently operates similar to a Yield sign, with multiple vehicles entering without stopping at the stop sign when a long gap is available. Therefore, the intersection was modeled with a Yield control to more accurately mimic current operation for purposes of estimating queues. The reported queues still exceed the observed condition in the afternoon peak hour.

I would argue that these proposed changes would make the Approval Criteria response false by 2027 Phase 1 of this project.

Taking a step back: The project aims to reduce commuter traffic on Leveton Dr, and increase commuter traffic on Tualatin Rd. It acknowledges the problems are at Hazelbrook/99 and 99/124, specifically queueing to enter 99 off hazelbrook and making two lefts off of 99 to Tualatin Rd.

Approving as Lam Research wants = Immediate, more apparent issues with traffic at 124th/Tualatin Rd turn lane and the disparity in traffic volume between the left-hand left-turn lane and the right-hand left-turn lane on 99 **AND** more commuter traffic shortcutting a new light and queued traffic by cutting through a school zone which also borders homes with livestock. The consultant's data supports this. It is human nature - once people learn it's faster for them to cut straight across Tualatin Rd and go to Hazelbrook/99, that is what they will do.
Approving most but keeping Leveton the primary = 124th, Leveton, and Herman can all support more commuter, business, and industrial traffic AS PLANNED. The consultant's data supports this as well. Maybe this 'entrance' would be well-suited for unidirectional traffic as a compromise. What does that data look like?

What will happen if a light is put in at 115 and employees no longer use Leveton drive is traffic will get backed up on Tualatin Rd., people coming east to west will turn on Jurgens, and we will have people going 35-40mph next to a playground and school zone. The data collected for Hazelbrook was done on June 11, the last day of school - is that also the most realistic data? (I truly do not know)

I recognize this is a lot, so if you've taken the time to read all of that I do appreciate it. My hope is that some of these points are ready to be discussed because I can say that talking with people in the area is that this is the one and only concern. We are all for business growth and development in Tualatin, but we ask that Lam and the City recognize the idyllic beautiful area we call home and do their part in maintaining that for everyone.

Thank you very much,

Jared Janssen
971-381-9018

From: Lynda Wright <momiswright@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, November 15, 2024 4:13 PM
To: Ext - Planning
Subject: Tualatin Rod



Dear Tualatin City Council and Tualatin Planning Department:

I am strongly opposed to Lam Research adding a new entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue. Tualatin Road provides the main access to our residential neighborhoods and is already overloaded with cut-through commuter traffic. Leveton Drive, on the other hand, was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available.

Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus, but the proposed site expansion would eliminate that driveway. This is unacceptable. Lam's new site plan needs to include a usable driveway that connects their main parking lots directly to Leveton Drive.

The last thing Tualatin Road needs is a thousand more cars per day, especially when a better alternative already exists. We are asking the City Council and City Staff to get creative and find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road.

Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road.

I used the sample letter, but I would like to give a personal plea also. It can be so hard getting onto Tualatin Road from a side street, especially if you are turning left. It is much worse during high traffic time. I have seen multiple drivers turn right from Teton onto Tualatin Road, then turn left at 106th in order together into the neighborhood. There are multiple school buses on Tualatin Road also, which have schedules to keep and it could delay them. Please consider the driveway being on Leveto Road which has only local business traffic.

I appreciate your consideration on this important matter.

Thank you,

Lynda Wright

Sent from my iPad

From: Comcast <ba53@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, November 18, 2024 9:11 AM
To: Keith Leonard
Subject: Re: SAVE Tualatin Road

Good Morning Keith.

I would also like to have noted on our comments, that both Jurgen and Hazelbrook, also have added school bus traffic. Along with parents dropping off and picking up their children from Hazelbrook School. Thank You, for reviewing our comments.

William and Julie Arata.

Sent from my iPad

> On Nov 18, 2024, at 8:15 AM, Keith Leonard <kleonard@tualatin.gov> wrote:
>
> Dear William Julie Arata,
>
> We have received your comments. I have read over your comment and will forward them to our Engineering Division and supervisors. We take your comments seriously. We will add your comments to the public record for the proposed Lam Research expansion. Thank you for taking part in the public process! Have a good day.
>
> Keith Leonard, AICP
> Associate Planner
> Phone: 503.691.3029
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Comcast <ba53@comcast.net>
> Sent: Sunday, November 17, 2024 1:02 PM
> To: Ext - Planning <Planning@tualatin.gov>
> Subject: SAVE Tualatin Road
>
>
> To whom it may concerns:
> My wife and I have lived on the corner of Jurgen and Tawasa Ct for over the past 9 years. And over that time my wife and I have complained to Tualatin Police about people speeding on both Jurgen and Hazelbrook roads, especially between 2:30 and 6:00 pm, when people are getting off work in the surrounding areas. We have asked why isn't the speed limit reduce to 25mph, since it a residential area? And have been told it's a county road(not true). And since there not very many driveways adjacent to these roads it allowed to be 35mph. Also been told an officer that they don't like to give tickets to people that live in the neighborhood(I guess it okay if they speed) Also talk with a motorcycle officer who was on Tualatin Road about using radar on these 2 street, and more less blew me off. So, all that being said, we have received nothing but lip service from the City of Tualatin. Both Jurgen and Hazelbrook roads are long very long stretches of road. And both should be 25mph with speed bumps.

And now there's a chance with added traffic, think about what impact that's going to do on these 2 roads. Hopefully, whoever the person is that reads our comments above. Will take in consideration about the quality of life, along with the safety of our neighbor.
> Thank You.
> William and Julie Arata.
> Sent from my IPad
>

From: Ryan Parker <ryanparker2985@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, November 21, 2024 9:00 AM

To: Ext - Planning

Subject: Tualatin Road

Dear Tualatin City Council and Tualatin Planning Department:

I am strongly opposed to Lam Research adding a new entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue. Tualatin Road provides the main access to our residential neighborhoods and is already overloaded with cut-through commuter traffic. Leveton Drive, on the other hand, was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available.

Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus, but the proposed site expansion would eliminate that driveway. This is unacceptable. Lam's new site plan needs to include a usable driveway that connects their main parking lots directly to Leveton Drive.

The last thing Tualatin Road needs is a thousand more cars per day, especially when a better alternative already exists. We are asking the City Council and City Staff to get creative and find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road.

Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road.

Thank You!

From: Amy Swanson <130.amy@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 27, 2024 9:23 PM
To: Council; Ext - Planning
Subject: Save Tualatin road

Dear Tualatin City Council and Tualatin Planning Department:

I am strongly opposed to Lam Research adding a new entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue. Tualatin Road provides the main access to our residential neighborhoods and is already overloaded with cut-through commuter traffic. Leveton Drive, on the other hand, was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available.

Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus, but the proposed site expansion would eliminate that driveway. This is unacceptable. Lam's new site plan needs to include a usable driveway that connects their main parking lots directly to Leveton Drive.

The last thing Tualatin Road needs is a thousand more cars per day, especially when a better alternative already exists. We are asking the City Council and City Staff to get creative and find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road.

Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road.

Thank You!

From: Annelise Petersen <annelisempetersen@outlook.com>
Sent: Monday, December 2, 2024 8:05 AM
To: Ext - Planning
Subject: Fw: Lam Research

From: Annelise Petersen <annelisempetersen@outlook.com>
Sent: Monday, December 2, 2024 8:04 AM
To: council@tualatin.gov <council@tualatin.gov>
Subject: Lam Research

Dear Tualatin City Council and Tualatin Planning Department:

I am strongly opposed to Lam Research adding a new entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue. Tualatin Road provides the main access to our residential neighborhoods and is already overloaded with cut-through commuter traffic. Leveton Drive, on the other hand, was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available.

Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus, but the proposed site expansion would eliminate that driveway. This is unacceptable. Lam's new site plan needs to include a usable driveway that connects their main parking lots directly to Leveton Drive.

The last thing Tualatin Road needs is a thousand more cars per day, especially when a better alternative already exists. We are asking the City Council and City Staff to get creative and find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road.

I also do not support tax payer money funding private companies for profit.

My child attends Hazelbrook MS and if you spent a morning at the school, you would quickly understand why this expansion would cause much more harm and potential safety and logistical concerns. The benefits do not outweigh the risks here.

Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road.

Thank You!

Annelise P.

Get Outlook for iOS

From: ï»¿Paul Morrissey <vp.morrissey@frontier.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 3, 2024 7:33 AM
To: Keith Leonard
Subject: Re: Tualatin Road

Good morning
After reviewing the site plan and reading other comments, I too am very concerned about projected traffic on Tualatin Road.

1. It's already a challenge to get onto the road via Jurgens Rd which we use frequently. Often we have to make a right turn and then turn left to proceed to Herman Rd.
The sight lines at Jurgens are limited and made worse when school buses are arriving or departing. There will be a bad accident someday and all this will be made worse with increased LAM traffic.

2. I was shocked to see the parking layout for the LAM expansion. With no internal driveway between Tualatin Road and Leveton, employees will have to travel on TR.
I support a revision that would provide a reasonable option for employees and direct more traffic and definitely commercial trucks to Leveton Rd.

Thank you for your consideration

Paul Morrissey
17924 SW 105th Ct.

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPad

On Monday, December 2, 2024, 8:38 AM, Keith Leonard <kleonard@tualatin.gov> wrote:

> Good morning Paul,
>
> We did not receive a comment, just what is displayed below. If you wish to provide a public comment then please send an emailed comment. I typically do not click on links that I don't recognize.
>
> **Keith Leonard, AICP**
> Associate Planner
> **Phone**: 503.691.3029
>
> ---
>
> **From:** ï»¿Paul Morrissey <vp.morrissey@frontier.com>
> **Sent:** Sunday, December 1, 2024 4:54 PM
> **To:** Ext - Planning <Planning@tualatin.gov>
> **Subject:** Tualatin Road

http://www.tualatinroad.org/sampleletter

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPad

From: Abigail Frainey <abigailfrainey@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 9, 2024 5:39 PM
To: Council; Ext - Planning; Ext - Engineering Exterrnal Email
Subject: LAM traffic project

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

To: Tualatin City Council
To: Tualatin Planning Department
To: Tualatin Engineering Department

Dear City of Tualatin,

While researching the traffic impacts from Lam's TUX project, members of the community have discovered that Lam's proposal is not compatible with the Tualatin Comprehensive Plan 2040, and it would violate the Tualatin Development Code, both in spirit and letter.

For the reasons outlined below, we are asking the Tualatin Planning Department to consider Lam's proposed entrance on Tualatin Road to not be approvable, and we ask the City Manager to use her authority to have the proposed entrance removed from the TUX project site plan so that alternative access can be designed.

SITE CIRCULATION

Existing driveways provide sufficient access points to the Lam Campus as a whole. Lam currently has 6 other access points. 3 on 108th and 3 on Leveton Drive. Adding a new access point on Tualatin Road is unnecessary.

Lam is responsible for designing reasonable site circulation. A lack of good site circulation is not a valid reason to add an additional driveway onto the street network.

The Tualatin Comprehensive Plan 2040 strongly supports the use of existing access points, rather than creating new ones, especially when a new access point would have negative impacts to the community. "Consider transportation options that make the best use of the existing network" (Goal 8.7)

SPIRIT OF THE LAW

Tualatin Road is currently functioning as an arterial, it was previously classified as an arterial, and it has the traffic volume of an arterial. Leveton Drive is currently functioning as a collector, it was previously classified as a collector, and it has the current traffic volume of a collector.

During the 2012-14 TSP update, the functional classifications of these streets were reversed in a failed attempt by the city to reduce the amount of traffic on Tualatin Road and encourage more trips to use Leveton Drive. While we appreciate the intent of this reversal, the impact is now exactly opposite of what was intended, and we ask that this reversal be deemed a mistake. We ask the city to remedy this mistake by restoring the correct functional classifications to their appropriate streets. Lam should not be allowed to rely on a classification error to put a new entrance on a road that, based on current conditions, should not have a new entrance.

If the streets were classified correctly, Lam Research would not be able to add an employee entrance on Tualatin Road because it would be an arterial. "No new driveways or streets on arterial roadways within the City, except where noted in the TDC, usually when no alternative access is available." (TCP 2040 POLICY 8.10.1)

LETTER OF THE LAW

The Tualatin Development Code says "Lots that front on more than one street may be required to locate motor vehicle accesses on the street with the lower functional classification as determined by the City Manager." TDC 75.040 (5) Currently the TSP shows 108th classified as a minor collector and Tualatin Road a major collector. Based on this, access should be provided from 108th not Tualatin Road.

Lam's proposed entrance on Tualatin Road fails four of the new driveway approach criteria in TDC 75.020.5: "(d)(ii) Takes access from the lowest classification of street abutting the property … (g) The proposed driveway approach does not result in significant adverse impacts to the vicinity; (h) The proposed driveway approach minimizes impact to the functionality of adjacent streets and intersections; and (i) The proposed driveway approach balances the adverse impacts to residentially zoned property and the functionality of adjacent streets."

Tualatin Development Code 75.140.15 (a) grants the specific locations for Lam's three driveways on the north side of Leveton Drive. The applicant's

proposal to relocate one of the three driveways is not compliant with the development code.

No matter which way you slice it, Tualatin Road is the worst option for carrying Lam's new entrance and additional traffic volume. We ask the City Manager to use her discretion and require access from the most appropriate road which, by any metric, is Leveton Drive.

PROPOSED TRAFFIC SIGNAL

The proposed entrance on Tualatin Road would create the need for a new traffic signal on Tualatin Road which would have many negative impacts on the community. These impacts justify rejection of the proposed access. If Lam were to take access from Leveton Drive, no new traffic signal would be needed.

The community provided overwhelming feedback during the TSP update this summer about this issue and we asked that the proposed traffic signal be removed from the TSP. The city should take this feedback into account and "Conduct the planning process with adequate input and feedback from citizens in each affected neighborhood" (TCP 2040 Goal 8.7)

CONSIDER SAFETY

The Tualatin TSP Existing Conditions Report shows Tualatin Road and 115th Ave having higher Pedestrian Level of Traffic Stress than Leveton Drive and 108th Ave. (Figure 23) Adding more traffic to Tualatin Road and 115th Ave will degrade pedestrian safety even further.

Tualatin Road between 124th and 115th has higher concentration of collisions than Leveton and 108th, with a history of serious injury collision while Leveton does not. (Figure 31) Adding more traffic onto Tualatin Road and 115th will increase the traffic exposure and likely result in worse safety outcomes.

Tualatin Road has a history of collisions involving pedestrians and bicycles while Leveton and 108th do not. (Figure 32) Adding more traffic to Tualatin Road will likely make this safety issue worse.

Converting a driveway to full access or signalizing a driveway would likely increase traffic crashes. Per CMF ClearingHouse, changing driveway type to full access has a crash modification factor (CMF) of 2.25, and signalizing a driveway has a CMF of 3.98, which means that the two measures will likely increase traffic crashes by a factor of 2.25 and 3.98 respectively.

Lam’s traffic study also does not identify the locations of school bus routes at Hazelbrook Middle School or the potential impacts to school bus traffic. Student safety is one of the most important issues in our community, but so far it has been ignored in this process.

Also, the safety and congestion impacts from Lam’s proposal would be most concentrated on Tualatin Road between 115th and 124th which abuts a residential area with traditionally disadvantaged demographics and income limited apartments. This is not equitable.

BYPASS ROUTE

The route from Hazelbrook Road going west and turning right onto Hwy 99W is a "hidden" route that can bypass the traffic congestion at the west end of Tualatin Road. Adding a signal at 115th and Tualatin Road will encourage more cars to take this bypass. The potential impact of this new traffic pattern imposes significant safety concerns to communities all along the route. These impacts were not addressed in the traffic study.

SUMMARY

We urge the city to consider all the above concerns and require the applicant (Lam) to revise their site development plan accordingly. We believe that the current proposal does not meet Tualatin’s planning rules, and that the City Manager should use her authority to bring Lam’s proposal into compliance. No new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank You,

Abigail Frainey’s

Concerned resident of Tualatin

503-550-4703

From: Arva Bartos <arva41@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 9, 2024 3:27 PM
To: Ext - Planning
Subject: Rethink LAM's Proposal for Tualatin Road

City Council council@tualatin.gov
Planning Department planning@tualatin.gov
Engineering engineering@tualatin.gov

Dear City of Tualatin,

While researching the traffic impacts from Lam's TUX project, members of the community have discovered that Lam's proposal is not compatible with the Tualatin Comprehensive Plan 2040, and it would violate the Tualatin Development Code, both in spirit and letter.

For the reasons outlined below, we are asking the Tualatin Planning Department to consider Lam's proposed entrance on Tualatin Road to not be approvable, and we ask the City Manager to use her authority to have the proposed entrance removed from the TUX project site plan so that alternative access can be designed.

SITE CIRCULATION

Existing driveways provide sufficient access points to the Lam Campus as a whole. Lam currently has 6 other access points. 3 on 108th and 3 on Leveton Drive. Adding a new access point on Tualatin Road is unnecessary.

Lam is responsible for designing reasonable site circulation. A lack of good site circulation is not a valid reason to add an additional driveway onto the street network.

The Tualatin Comprehensive Plan 2040 strongly supports the use of existing access points, rather than creating new ones, especially when a new access point would have negative impacts to the community. "Consider transportation options that make the best use of the existing network" (Goal 8.7)

SPIRIT OF THE LAW

Tualatin Road is currently functioning as an arterial, it was previously classified as an arterial, and it has the traffic volume of an arterial. Leveton Drive is currently functioning as a collector, it was previously classified as a collector, and it has the current traffic volume of a collector.

During the 2012-14 TSP update, the functional classifications of these streets were reversed in a failed attempt by the city to reduce the amount of traffic on Tualatin Road

and encourage more trips to use Leveton Drive. While we appreciate the intent of this reversal, the impact is now exactly opposite of what was intended, and we ask that this reversal be deemed a mistake. We ask the city to remedy this mistake by restoring the correct functional classifications to their appropriate streets. Lam should not be allowed to rely on a classification error to put a new entrance on a road that, based on current conditions, should not have a new entrance.

If the streets were classified correctly, Lam Research would not be able to add an employee entrance on Tualatin Road because it would be an arterial. “No new driveways or streets on arterial roadways within the City, except where noted in the TDC, usually when no alternative access is available.” (TCP 2040 POLICY 8.10.1)

LETTER OF THE LAW

The Tualatin Development Code says “Lots that front on more than one street may be required to locate motor vehicle accesses on the street with the lower functional classification as determined by the City Manager.” TDC 75.040 (5) Currently the TSP shows 108th classified as a minor collector and Tualatin Road a major collector. Based on this, access should be provided from 108th not Tualatin Road.

Lam’s proposed entrance on Tualatin Road fails four of the new driveway approach criteria in TDC 75.020.5: "(d)(ii) Takes access from the lowest classification of street abutting the property … (g) The proposed driveway approach does not result in significant adverse impacts to the vicinity; (h) The proposed driveway approach minimizes impact to the functionality of adjacent streets and intersections; and (i) The proposed driveway approach balances the adverse impacts to residentially zoned property and the functionality of adjacent streets."

Tualatin Development Code 75.140.15 (a) grants the specific locations for Lam's three driveways on the north side of Leveton Drive. The applicant's proposal to relocate one of the three driveways is not compliant with the development code.

No matter which way you slice it, Tualatin Road is the worst option for carrying Lam’s new entrance and additional traffic volume. We ask the City Manager to use her discretion and require access from the most appropriate road which, by any metric, is Leveton Drive.

PROPOSED TRAFFIC SIGNAL

The proposed entrance on Tualatin Road would create the need for a new traffic signal on Tualatin Road which would have many negative impacts on the community. These impacts justify rejection of the proposed access. If Lam were to take access from Leveton Drive, no new traffic signal would be needed.

The community provided overwhelming feedback during the TSP update this summer about this issue and we asked that the proposed traffic signal be removed from the

TSP. The city should take this feedback into account and "Conduct the planning process with adequate input and feedback from citizens in each affected neighborhood" (TCP 2040 Goal 8.7)

CONSIDER SAFETY

The Tualatin TSP Existing Conditions Report shows Tualatin Road and 115th Ave having higher Pedestrian Level of Traffic Stress than Leveton Drive and 108th Ave. (Figure 23) Adding more traffic to Tualatin Road and 115th Ave will degrade pedestrian safety even further.

Tualatin Road between 124th and 115th has higher concentration of collisions than Leveton and 108th, with a history of serious injury collision while Leveton does not. (Figure 31) Adding more traffic onto Tualatin Road and 115th will increase the traffic exposure and likely result in worse safety outcomes.

Tualatin Road has a history of collisions involving pedestrians and bicycles while Leveton and 108th do not. (Figure 32) Adding more traffic to Tualatin Road will likely make this safety issue worse.

Converting a driveway to full access or signalizing a driveway would likely increase traffic crashes. Per CMF ClearingHouse, changing driveway type to full access has a crash modification factor (CMF) of 2.25, and signalizing a driveway has a CMF of 3.98, which means that the two measures will likely increase traffic crashes by a factor of 2.25 and 3.98 respectively.

Lam's traffic study also does not identify the locations of school bus routes at Hazelbrook Middle School or the potential impacts to school bus traffic. Student safety is one of the most important issues in our community, but so far it has been ignored in this process.

Also, the safety and congestion impacts from Lam's proposal would be most concentrated on Tualatin Road between 115th and 124th which abuts a residential area with traditionally disadvantaged demographics and income limited apartments. This is not equitable.

BYPASS ROUTE

The route from Hazelbrook Road going west and turning right onto Hwy 99W is a "hidden" route that can bypass the traffic congestion at the west end of Tualatin Road. Adding a signal at 115th and Tualatin Road will encourage more cars to take this bypass. The potential impact of this new traffic pattern imposes significant safety concerns to communities all along the route. These impacts were not addressed in the traffic study.

SUMMARY

We urge the city to consider all the above concerns and require the applicant (Lam) to revise their site development plan accordingly. We believe that the current proposal does not meet Tualatin's planning rules, and that the City Manager should use her authority to bring Lam's proposal into compliance. No new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank You.
Arva & Paul Bartos
17750 SW Chippewa Trl.
Tualatin 97062

From: Brett Hamilton <brett@simple.be>
Sent: Monday, December 9, 2024 3:16 PM
To: Sherilyn Lombos; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; Ext - Engineering Exterrnal Email
Subject: Lam's Proposal and Tualatin Code

Dear City of Tualatin,

While researching the traffic impacts from Lam's TUX project, members of the community have discovered that Lam's proposal is not compatible with the Tualatin Comprehensive Plan 2040, and it would violate the Tualatin Development Code, both in spirit and letter.

For the reasons outlined below, we are asking the Tualatin Planning Department to consider Lam's proposed entrance on Tualatin Road to not be approvable, and we ask the City Manager to use her authority to have the proposed entrance removed from the TUX project site plan so that alternative access can be designed.

SITE CIRCULATION

Existing driveways provide sufficient access points to the Lam Campus as a whole. Lam currently has 6 other access points. 3 on 108th and 3 on Leveton Drive. Adding a new access point on Tualatin Road is unnecessary.

Lam is responsible for designing reasonable site circulation. A lack of good site circulation is not a valid reason to add an additional driveway onto the street network.

The Tualatin Comprehensive Plan 2040 strongly supports the use of existing access points, rather than creating new ones, especially when a new access point would have negative impacts to the community. "Consider transportation options that make the best use of the existing network" (Goal 8.7)

SPIRIT OF THE LAW

Tualatin Road is currently functioning as an arterial, it was previously classified as an arterial, and it has the traffic volume of an arterial. Leveton Drive is currently functioning as a collector, it was previously classified as a collector, and it has the current traffic volume of a collector.

During the 2012-14 TSP update, the functional classifications of these streets were reversed in a failed attempt by the city to reduce the amount of traffic on Tualatin Road and encourage more trips to use Leveton Drive. While we appreciate the intent of this reversal, the impact is now exactly opposite of what was intended, and we ask that this reversal be deemed a mistake. We ask the city to remedy this mistake by restoring the correct functional classifications to their appropriate streets. Lam should not be allowed to rely on a classification error to put a new entrance on a road that, based on current conditions, should not have a new entrance.

If the streets were classified correctly, Lam Research would not be able to add an employee entrance on Tualatin Road because it would be an arterial. "No new driveways or streets on arterial roadways within the City, except where noted in the TDC, usually when no alternative access is available." (TCP 2040 POLICY 8.10.1)

LETTER OF THE LAW

The Tualatin Development Code says “Lots that front on more than one street may be required to locate motor vehicle accesses on the street with the lower functional classification as determined by the City Manager.” TDC 75.040 (5) Currently the TSP shows 108th classified as a minor collector and Tualatin Road a major collector. Based on this, access should be provided from 108th not Tualatin Road.

Lam’s proposed entrance on Tualatin Road fails four of the new driveway approach criteria in TDC 75.020.5: "(d)(ii) Takes access from the lowest classification of street abutting the property … (g) The proposed driveway approach does not result in significant adverse impacts to the vicinity; (h) The proposed driveway approach minimizes impact to the functionality of adjacent streets and intersections; and (i) The proposed driveway approach balances the adverse impacts to residentially zoned property and the functionality of adjacent streets."

Tualatin Development Code 75.140.15 (a) grants the specific locations for Lam's three driveways on the north side of Leveton Drive. The applicant's proposal to relocate one of the three driveways is not compliant with the development code.

No matter which way you slice it, Tualatin Road is the worst option for carrying Lam’s new entrance and additional traffic volume. We ask the City Manager to use her discretion and require access from the most appropriate road which, by any metric, is Leveton Drive.

PROPOSED TRAFFIC SIGNAL

The proposed entrance on Tualatin Road would create the need for a new traffic signal on Tualatin Road which would have many negative impacts on the community. These impacts justify rejection of the proposed access. If Lam were to take access from Leveton Drive, no new traffic signal would be needed.

The community provided overwhelming feedback during the TSP update this summer about this issue and we asked that the proposed traffic signal be removed from the TSP. The city should take this feedback into account and "Conduct the planning process with adequate input and feedback from citizens in each affected neighborhood” (TCP 2040 Goal 8.7)

CONSIDER SAFETY

The Tualatin TSP Existing Conditions Report shows Tualatin Road and 115th Ave having higher Pedestrian Level of Traffic Stress than Leveton Drive and 108th Ave. (Figure 23) Adding more traffic to Tualatin Road and 115th Ave will degrade pedestrian safety even further.

Tualatin Road between 124th and 115th has higher concentration of collisions than Leveton and 108th, with a history of serious injury collision while Leveton does not. (Figure 31) Adding more traffic onto Tualatin Road and 115th will increase the traffic exposure and likely result in worse safety outcomes.

Tualatin Road has a history of collisions involving pedestrians and bicycles while Leveton and 108th do not. (Figure 32) Adding more traffic to Tualatin Road will likely make this safety issue worse.

Converting a driveway to full access or signalizing a driveway would likely increase traffic crashes. Per CMF ClearingHouse, changing driveway type to full access has a crash modification factor (CMF) of 2.25, and signalizing a driveway has a CMF of 3.98, which means that the two measures will likely increase traffic crashes by a factor of 2.25 and 3.98 respectively.

Lam's traffic study also does not identify the locations of school bus routes at Hazelbrook Middle School or the potential impacts to school bus traffic. Student safety is one of the most important issues in our community, but so far it has been ignored in this process.

Also, the safety and congestion impacts from Lam's proposal would be most concentrated on Tualatin Road between 115th and 124th which abuts a residential area with traditionally disadvantaged demographics and income limited apartments. This is not equitable.

BYPASS ROUTE

The route from Hazelbrook Road going west and turning right onto Hwy 99W is a "hidden" route that can bypass the traffic congestion at the west end of Tualatin Road. Adding a signal at 115th and Tualatin Road will encourage more cars to take this bypass. The potential impact of this new traffic pattern imposes significant safety concerns to communities all along the route. These impacts were not addressed in the traffic study.

SUMMARY

We urge the city to consider all the above concerns and require the applicant (Lam) to revise their site development plan accordingly. We believe that the current proposal does not meet Tualatin's planning rules, and that the City Manager should use her authority to bring Lam's proposal into compliance. No new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank You,
Brett Hamilton

From: Brian Craker <crakerb@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, December 9, 2024 5:42 PM
To: Council; Ext - Planning; Ext - Engineering Exterrnal Email
Subject: Lam Proposal Code Non-Compliance

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged



Dear City of Tualatin,

While researching the traffic impacts from Lam's TUX project, *members of our community living close to the Lam campus have discovered that their proposal is not compatible with the Tualatin Comprehensive Plan 2040, and it would violate the Tualatin Development Code, both in spirit and letter.*

For the reasons outlined below, we are asking the Tualatin Planning Department to consider Lam's proposed entrance on Tualatin Road to not be approvable, and we ask the City Manager to use her authority to have the proposed entrance removed from the TUX project site plan so that alternative access can be designed.

SITE CIRCULATION

Existing driveways provide sufficient access points to the Lam Campus as a whole. Lam currently has 6 other access points. 3 on 108th and 3 on Leveton Drive. Adding a new access point on Tualatin Road is unnecessary.

Lam is responsible for designing reasonable site circulation. A lack of good site circulation is not a valid reason to add an additional driveway onto the street network.

The Tualatin Comprehensive Plan 2040 strongly supports the use of existing access points, rather than creating new ones, especially when a new access point would have negative impacts to the community. "Consider transportation options that make the best use of the existing network" (Goal 8.7)

SPIRIT OF THE LAW

Tualatin Road is currently functioning as an arterial, it was previously classified as an arterial, and it has the traffic volume of an arterial. Leveton Drive is currently functioning as a collector, it was previously classified as a collector, and it has the current traffic volume of a collector.

During the 2012-14 TSP update, the functional classifications of these streets were reversed in a failed attempt by the city to reduce the amount of traffic on Tualatin Road and encourage more trips to use Leveton Drive. While we appreciate the intent of this reversal, the impact is now exactly opposite of what was intended, and we ask that this reversal be deemed a mistake. We ask the city to remedy this mistake by restoring the correct functional classifications to their appropriate streets. Lam should not be allowed to rely on a classification error to put a new entrance on a road that, based on current conditions, should not have a new entrance.

If the streets were classified correctly, Lam Research would not be able to add an employee entrance on Tualatin Road because it would be an arterial. “No new driveways or streets on arterial roadways within the City, except where noted in the TDC, usually when no alternative access is available.” (TCP 2040 POLICY 8.10.1)

LETTER OF THE LAW

The Tualatin Development Code says “Lots that front on more than one street may be required to locate motor vehicle accesses on the street with the lower functional classification as determined by the City Manager.” TDC 75.040 (5) Currently the TSP shows 108th classified as a minor collector and Tualatin Road a major collector. Based on this, access should be provided from 108th not Tualatin Road.

Lam’s proposed entrance on Tualatin Road fails four of the new driveway approach criteria in TDC 75.020.5: "(d)(ii) Takes access from the lowest classification of street abutting the property … (g) The proposed driveway approach does not result in significant adverse impacts to the vicinity; (h) The proposed driveway approach minimizes impact to the functionality of adjacent streets and intersections; and (i) The proposed driveway approach balances the adverse impacts to residentially zoned property and the functionality of adjacent streets."

Tualatin Development Code 75.140.15 (a) grants the specific locations for Lam's three driveways on the north side of Leveton Drive. The applicant's proposal to relocate one of the three driveways is not compliant with the development code.

No matter which way you slice it, Tualatin Road is the worst option for carrying Lam’s new entrance and additional traffic volume. We ask the City Manager to use her discretion and require access from the most appropriate road which, by any metric, is Leveton Drive.

PROPOSED TRAFFIC SIGNAL

The proposed entrance on Tualatin Road would create the need for a new traffic signal on Tualatin Road which would have many negative impacts on the community. These impacts justify rejection of the proposed access. If Lam were to take access from Leveton Drive, no new traffic signal would be needed.

The community provided overwhelming feedback during the TSP update this summer about this issue and we asked that the proposed traffic signal be removed from the TSP. The city should take this feedback into account and "Conduct the planning process with adequate input and feedback from citizens in each affected neighborhood” (TCP 2040 Goal 8.7)

CONSIDER SAFETY

The Tualatin TSP Existing Conditions Report shows Tualatin Road and 115th Ave having higher Pedestrian Level of Traffic Stress than Leveton Drive and 108th Ave. (Figure 23) Adding more traffic to Tualatin Road and 115th Ave will degrade pedestrian safety even further.

Tualatin Road between 124th and 115th has higher concentration of collisions than Leveton and 108th, with a history of serious injury collision while Leveton does not. (Figure 31) Adding more traffic onto Tualatin Road and 115th will increase the traffic exposure and likely result in worse safety outcomes.

Tualatin Road has a history of collisions involving pedestrians and bicycles while Leveton and 108th do not. (Figure 32) Adding more traffic to Tualatin Road will likely make this safety issue worse.

Converting a driveway to full access or signalizing a driveway would likely increase traffic crashes. Per CMF ClearingHouse, changing driveway type to full access has a crash modification factor (CMF) of 2.25, and signalizing a driveway has a CMF of 3.98, which means that the two measures will likely increase traffic crashes by a factor of 2.25 and 3.98 respectively.

Lam's traffic study also does not identify the locations of school bus routes at Hazelbrook Middle School or the potential impacts to school bus traffic. Student safety is one of the most important issues in our community, but so far it has been ignored in this process.

Also, the safety and congestion impacts from Lam's proposal would be most concentrated on Tualatin Road between 115th and 124th which abuts a residential area with traditionally disadvantaged demographics and income limited apartments. This is not equitable.

BYPASS ROUTE

The route from Hazelbrook Road going west and turning right onto Hwy 99W is a "hidden" route that can bypass the traffic congestion at the west end of Tualatin Road. Adding a signal at 115th and Tualatin Road will encourage more cars to take this bypass. The potential impact of this new traffic pattern imposes significant safety concerns to communities all along the route. These impacts were not addressed in the traffic study.

SUMMARY

We urge the city to consider all the above concerns and require the applicant (Lam) to revise their site development plan accordingly. We believe that the current proposal does not meet Tualatin's planning rules, and that the City Manager should use her authority to bring Lam's proposal into compliance. No new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for taking the time to receive and review these comments, and thank you for your continued work for our great city!

Brian & Alison Craker
17395 SW 106th Ct.
Tualatin, OR 97062

From: Steve Koper
Sent: Monday, December 9, 2024 5:15 PM
To: Keith Leonard
Subject: FW: Lams

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

-----Original Message-----
From: Sherilyn Lombos <slombos@tualatin.gov>
Sent: Monday, December 9, 2024 5:10 PM
To: Steve Koper <skoper@tualatin.gov>; Mike McCarthy <mmccarthy@tualatin.gov>; Kim McMillan <kmcmillan@tualatin.gov>
Subject: FW: Lams

Forwarding these along; no response required, although you may want to put it in the file.

Sherilyn Lombos
City Manager
Phone: 503.691.3010

-----Original Message-----
From: John Phillips <jphillips4994@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, December 09, 2024 5:03 PM
To: Council <council@tualatin.gov>
Subject: Lams

Dear City of Tualatin,

While researching the traffic impacts from Lam's TUX project, members of the community have discovered that Lam's proposal is not compatible with the Tualatin Comprehensive Plan 2040, and it would violate the Tualatin Development Code, both in spirit and letter.

For the reasons outlined below, we are asking the Tualatin Planning Department to consider Lam's proposed entrance on Tualatin Road to not be approvable, and we ask the City Manager to use her authority to have the proposed entrance removed from the TUX project site plan so that alternative access can be designed.

SITE CIRCULATION

Existing driveways provide sufficient access points to the Lam Campus as a whole. Lam currently has 6 other access points. 3 on 108th and 3 on Leveton Drive. Adding a new access point on Tualatin Road is unnecessary.

Lam is responsible for designing reasonable site circulation. A lack of good site circulation is not a valid reason to add an additional driveway onto the street network.

The Tualatin Comprehensive Plan 2040 strongly supports the use of existing access points, rather than creating new ones, especially when a new access point would have negative impacts to the community. "Consider transportation options that make the best use of the existing network" (Goal 8.7)

SPIRIT OF THE LAW

Tualatin Road is currently functioning as an arterial, it was previously classified as an arterial, and it has the traffic volume of an arterial. Leveton Drive is currently functioning as a collector, it was previously classified as a collector, and it has the current traffic volume of a collector.

During the 2012-14 TSP update, the functional classifications of these streets were reversed in a failed attempt by the city to reduce the amount of traffic on Tualatin Road and encourage more trips to use Leveton Drive. While we appreciate the intent of this reversal, the impact is now exactly opposite of what was intended, and we ask that this reversal be deemed a mistake. We ask the city to remedy this mistake by restoring the correct functional classifications to their appropriate streets. Lam should not be allowed to rely on a classification error to put a new entrance on a road that, based on current conditions, should not have a new entrance.

If the streets were classified correctly, Lam Research would not be able to add an employee entrance on Tualatin Road because it would be an arterial. “No new driveways or streets on arterial roadways within the City, except where noted in the TDC, usually when no alternative access is available.” (TCP 2040 POLICY 8.10.1)

LETTER OF THE LAW

The Tualatin Development Code says “Lots that front on more than one street may be required to locate motor vehicle accesses on the street with the lower functional classification as determined by the City Manager.” TDC 75.040 (5) Currently the TSP shows 108th classified as a minor collector and Tualatin Road a major collector. Based on this, access should be provided from 108th not Tualatin Road.

Lam’s proposed entrance on Tualatin Road fails four of the new driveway approach criteria in TDC 75.020.5: "(d)(ii) Takes access from the lowest classification of street abutting the property … (g) The proposed driveway approach does not result in significant adverse impacts to the vicinity; (h) The proposed driveway approach minimizes impact to the functionality of adjacent streets and intersections; and (i) The proposed driveway approach balances the adverse impacts to residentially zoned property and the functionality of adjacent streets."

Tualatin Development Code 75.140.15 (a) grants the specific locations for Lam's three driveways on the north side of Leveton Drive. The applicant's proposal to relocate one of the three driveways is not compliant with the development code.

No matter which way you slice it, Tualatin Road is the worst option for carrying Lam’s new entrance and additional traffic volume. We ask the City Manager to use her discretion and require access from the most appropriate road which, by any metric, is Leveton Drive.

PROPOSED TRAFFIC SIGNAL

The proposed entrance on Tualatin Road would create the need for a new traffic signal on Tualatin Road which would have many negative impacts on the community. These impacts justify rejection of the proposed access. If Lam were to take access from Leveton Drive, no new traffic signal would be needed.

The community provided overwhelming feedback during the TSP update this summer about this issue and we asked that the proposed traffic signal be removed from the TSP. The city should take this feedback into account and "Conduct the planning process with adequate input and feedback from citizens in each affected neighborhood" (TCP 2040 Goal 8.7)

CONSIDER SAFETY

The Tualatin TSP Existing Conditions Report shows Tualatin Road and 115th Ave having higher Pedestrian Level of Traffic Stress than Leveton Drive and 108th Ave. (Figure 23) Adding more traffic to Tualatin Road and 115th Ave will degrade pedestrian safety even further.

Tualatin Road between 124th and 115th has higher concentration of collisions than Leveton and 108th, with a history of serious injury collision while Leveton does not. (Figure 31) Adding more traffic onto Tualatin Road and 115th will increase the traffic exposure and likely result in worse safety outcomes.

Tualatin Road has a history of collisions involving pedestrians and bicycles while Leveton and 108th do not. (Figure 32) Adding more traffic to Tualatin Road will likely make this safety issue worse.

Converting a driveway to full access or signalizing a driveway would likely increase traffic crashes. Per CMF ClearingHouse, changing driveway type to full access has a crash modification factor (CMF) of 2.25, and signalizing a driveway has a CMF of 3.98, which means that the two measures will likely increase traffic crashes by a factor of 2.25 and 3.98 respectively.

Lam's traffic study also does not identify the locations of school bus routes at Hazelbrook Middle School or the potential impacts to school bus traffic. Student safety is one of the most important issues in our community, but so far it has been ignored in this process.

Also, the safety and congestion impacts from Lam's proposal would be most concentrated on Tualatin Road between 115th and 124th which abuts a residential area with traditionally disadvantaged demographics and income limited apartments. This is not equitable.

BYPASS ROUTE

The route from Hazelbrook Road going west and turning right onto Hwy 99W is a "hidden" route that can bypass the traffic congestion at the west end of Tualatin Road. Adding a signal at 115th and Tualatin Road will encourage more cars to take this bypass. The potential impact of this new traffic pattern imposes significant safety concerns to communities all along the route. These impacts were not addressed in the traffic study.

SUMMARY

We urge the city to consider all the above concerns and require the applicant (Lam) to revise their site development plan accordingly. We believe that the current proposal does not meet Tualatin's planning

rules, and that the City Manager should use her authority to bring Lam's proposal into compliance. No new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank You.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Kim Devers <kimldevers@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 9, 2024 3:50 PM
To: Council; Ext - Planning; Ext - Engineering Exterrnal Email
Subject: Tualatin Road and City Code

Dear City of Tualatin,

While researching the traffic impacts from Lam's TUX project, members of the community have discovered that Lam's proposal is not compatible with the Tualatin Comprehensive Plan 2040, and it would violate the Tualatin Development Code, both in spirit and letter.

For the reasons outlined below, we are asking the Tualatin Planning Department to consider Lam's proposed entrance on Tualatin Road to not be approvable, and we ask the City Manager to use her authority to have the proposed entrance removed from the TUX project site plan so that alternative access can be designed.

SITE CIRCULATION

Existing driveways provide sufficient access points to the Lam Campus as a whole. Lam currently has 6 other access points. 3 on 108th and 3 on Leveton Drive. Adding a new access point on Tualatin Road is unnecessary.

Lam is responsible for designing reasonable site circulation. A lack of good site circulation is not a valid reason to add an additional driveway onto the street network.

The Tualatin Comprehensive Plan 2040 strongly supports the use of existing access points, rather than creating new ones, especially when a new access point would have negative impacts to the community. "Consider transportation options that make the best use of the existing network" (Goal 8.7)

SPIRIT OF THE LAW

Tualatin Road is currently functioning as an arterial, it was previously classified as an arterial, and it has the traffic volume of an arterial. Leveton Drive is currently functioning as a collector, it was previously classified as a collector, and it has the current traffic volume of a collector.

During the 2012-14 TSP update, the functional classifications of these streets were reversed in a failed attempt by the city to reduce the amount of traffic on Tualatin Road and encourage more trips to use Leveton Drive. While we appreciate the intent of this reversal, the impact is now exactly opposite of what was intended, and we ask that this reversal be deemed a mistake. We ask the city to remedy this mistake by restoring the correct functional classifications to their appropriate streets. Lam should not be allowed to rely on a classification error to put a new entrance on a road that, based on current conditions, should not have a new entrance.

If the streets were classified correctly, Lam Research would not be able to add an employee

entrance on Tualatin Road because it would be an arterial. “No new driveways or streets on arterial roadways within the City, except where noted in the TDC, usually when no alternative access is available.” (TCP 2040 POLICY 8.10.1)

LETTER OF THE LAW

The Tualatin Development Code says “Lots that front on more than one street may be required to locate motor vehicle accesses on the street with the lower functional classification as determined by the City Manager.” TDC 75.040 (5) Currently the TSP shows 108th classified as a minor collector and Tualatin Road a major collector. Based on this, access should be provided from 108th not Tualatin Road.

Lam’s proposed entrance on Tualatin Road fails four of the new driveway approach criteria in TDC 75.020.5: "(d)(ii) Takes access from the lowest classification of street abutting the property … (g) The proposed driveway approach does not result in significant adverse impacts to the vicinity; (h) The proposed driveway approach minimizes impact to the functionality of adjacent streets and intersections; and (i) The proposed driveway approach balances the adverse impacts to residentially zoned property and the functionality of adjacent streets."

Tualatin Development Code 75.140.15 (a) grants the specific locations for Lam's three driveways on the north side of Leveton Drive. The applicant's proposal to relocate one of the three driveways is not compliant with the development code.

No matter which way you slice it, Tualatin Road is the worst option for carrying Lam’s new entrance and additional traffic volume. We ask the City Manager to use her discretion and require access from the most appropriate road which, by any metric, is Leveton Drive.

PROPOSED TRAFFIC SIGNAL

The proposed entrance on Tualatin Road would create the need for a new traffic signal on Tualatin Road which would have many negative impacts on the community. These impacts justify rejection of the proposed access. If Lam were to take access from Leveton Drive, no new traffic signal would be needed.

The community provided overwhelming feedback during the TSP update this summer about this issue and we asked that the proposed traffic signal be removed from the TSP. The city should take this feedback into account and "Conduct the planning process with adequate input and feedback from citizens in each affected neighborhood” (TCP 2040 Goal 8.7)

CONSIDER SAFETY

The Tualatin TSP Existing Conditions Report shows Tualatin Road and 115th Ave having higher Pedestrian Level of Traffic Stress than Leveton Drive and 108th Ave. (Figure 23) Adding more traffic to Tualatin Road and 115th Ave will degrade pedestrian safety even further.

Tualatin Road between 124th and 115th has higher concentration of collisions than Leveton and

108th, with a history of serious injury collision while Leveton does not. (Figure 31) Adding more traffic onto Tualatin Road and 115th will increase the traffic exposure and likely result in worse safety outcomes.

Tualatin Road has a history of collisions involving pedestrians and bicycles while Leveton and 108th do not. (Figure 32) Adding more traffic to Tualatin Road will likely make this safety issue worse.

Converting a driveway to full access or signalizing a driveway would likely increase traffic crashes. Per CMF ClearingHouse, changing driveway type to full access has a crash modification factor (CMF) of 2.25, and signalizing a driveway has a CMF of 3.98, which means that the two measures will likely increase traffic crashes by a factor of 2.25 and 3.98 respectively.

Lam's traffic study also does not identify the locations of school bus routes at Hazelbrook Middle School or the potential impacts to school bus traffic. Student safety is one of the most important issues in our community, but so far it has been ignored in this process.

Also, the safety and congestion impacts from Lam's proposal would be most concentrated on Tualatin Road between 115th and 124th which abuts a residential area with traditionally disadvantaged demographics and income limited apartments. This is not equitable.

BYPASS ROUTE

The route from Hazelbrook Road going west and turning right onto Hwy 99W is a "hidden" route that can bypass the traffic congestion at the west end of Tualatin Road. Adding a signal at 115th and Tualatin Road will encourage more cars to take this bypass. The potential impact of this new traffic pattern imposes significant safety concerns to communities all along the route. These impacts were not addressed in the traffic study.

SUMMARY

We urge the city to consider all the above concerns and require the applicant (Lam) to revise their site development plan accordingly. We believe that the current proposal does not meet Tualatin's planning rules, and that the City Manager should use her authority to bring Lam's proposal into compliance. No new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank You.
Kim Devers

From: kminato4sin@gmail.com
Sent: Monday, December 9, 2024 11:20 PM
To: Council; Ext - Planning; Ext - Engineering Exterrnal Email
Subject: Traffic Impact concern to LAM TUX Project

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

To Tualatin City Council, Engineering and Planning Department,

Dear City of Tualatin,

Hello my name is Kazuki and Yuko Minato and we live on 11445 SW Roberts Court in Tualatin. In recent years we have noticed significant amount of traffic increase in 115th Avenue and Tualatin Road.
Specially around afternoon commuting time I have seen significant increase on Tualatin Road and 115th Avenue have been my concern.
Also many cars seems to driving fast above speed limit.

Because of this traffic increase made us following closely to Lam's TUX Project and gained information that traffic impact study have several concern.

While researching the traffic impacts from Lam's TUX project, members of the community have discovered that Lam's proposal is not compatible with the Tualatin Comprehensive Plan 2040, and it would violate the Tualatin Development Code, both in spirit and letter.

For the reasons outlined below, we are asking the Tualatin Planning Department to consider Lam's proposed entrance on Tualatin Road to not be approvable, and we ask the City Manager to use her authority to have the proposed entrance removed from the TUX project site plan so that alternative access can be designed.

SITE CIRCULATION

Existing driveways provide sufficient access points to the Lam Campus as a whole. Lam currently has 6 other access points. 3 on 108th and 3 on Leveton Drive. Adding a new access point on Tualatin Road is unnecessary.

Lam is responsible for designing reasonable site circulation. A lack of good site circulation is not a valid reason to add an additional driveway onto the street network.

The Tualatin Comprehensive Plan 2040 strongly supports the use of existing access points, rather than creating new ones, especially when a new access point would have negative impacts to the community. "Consider transportation options that make the best use of the existing network" (Goal 8.7)

SPIRIT OF THE LAW

Tualatin Road is currently functioning as an arterial, it was previously classified as an arterial, and it has the traffic volume of an arterial. Leveton Drive is currently functioning as a collector, it was previously classified as a collector, and it has the current traffic volume of a collector.

During the 2012-14 TSP update, the functional classifications of these streets were reversed in a failed attempt by the city to reduce the amount of traffic on Tualatin Road and encourage more trips to use Leveton Drive. While we appreciate the intent of this reversal, the impact is now exactly opposite of what was intended, and we ask that this reversal be deemed a mistake. We ask the city to remedy this mistake by restoring the correct functional classifications to their appropriate streets. Lam should not be allowed to rely on a classification error to put a new entrance on a road that, based on current conditions, should not have a new entrance.

If the streets were classified correctly, Lam Research would not be able to add an employee entrance on Tualatin Road because it would be an arterial. “No new driveways or streets on arterial roadways within the City, except where noted in the TDC, usually when no alternative access is available.” (TCP 2040 POLICY 8.10.1)

LETTER OF THE LAW

The Tualatin Development Code says “Lots that front on more than one street may be required to locate motor vehicle accesses on the street with the lower functional classification as determined by the City Manager.” TDC 75.040 (5) Currently the TSP shows 108th classified as a minor collector and Tualatin Road a major collector. Based on this, access should be provided from 108th not Tualatin Road.

Lam’s proposed entrance on Tualatin Road fails four of the new driveway approach criteria in TDC 75.020.5: "(d)(ii) Takes access from the lowest classification of street abutting the property … (g) The proposed driveway approach does not result in significant adverse impacts to the vicinity; (h) The proposed driveway approach minimizes impact to the functionality of adjacent streets and intersections; and (i) The proposed driveway approach balances the adverse impacts to residentially zoned property and the functionality of adjacent streets."

Tualatin Development Code 75.140.15 (a) grants the specific locations for Lam's three driveways on the north side of Leveton Drive. The applicant's proposal to relocate one of the three driveways is not compliant with the development code.

No matter which way you slice it, Tualatin Road is the worst option for carrying Lam’s new entrance and additional traffic volume. We ask the City Manager to use her discretion and require access from the most appropriate road which, by any metric, is Leveton Drive.

PROPOSED TRAFFIC SIGNAL

The proposed entrance on Tualatin Road would create the need for a new traffic signal on Tualatin Road which would have many negative impacts on the community. These impacts justify rejection of the proposed access. If Lam were to take access from Leveton Drive, no new traffic signal would be needed.

The community provided overwhelming feedback during the TSP update this summer about this issue and we asked that the proposed traffic signal be removed from the TSP. The city should take this feedback into account and "Conduct the planning process with adequate input and feedback from citizens in each affected neighborhood” (TCP 2040 Goal 8.7)

CONSIDER SAFETY

The Tualatin TSP Existing Conditions Report shows Tualatin Road and 115th Ave having higher Pedestrian Level of Traffic Stress than Leveton Drive and 108th Ave. (Figure 23) Adding more traffic to Tualatin Road and 115th Ave will degrade pedestrian safety even further.

Tualatin Road between 124th and 115th has higher concentration of collisions than Leveton and 108th, with a history of serious injury collision while Leveton does not. (Figure 31) Adding more traffic onto Tualatin Road and 115th will increase the traffic exposure and likely result in worse safety outcomes.

Tualatin Road has a history of collisions involving pedestrians and bicycles while Leveton and 108th do not. (Figure 32) Adding more traffic to Tualatin Road will likely make this safety issue worse.

Converting a driveway to full access or signalizing a driveway would likely increase traffic crashes. Per CMF ClearingHouse, changing driveway type to full access has a crash modification factor (CMF) of 2.25, and signalizing a driveway has a CMF of 3.98, which means that the two measures will likely increase traffic crashes by a factor of 2.25 and 3.98 respectively.

Lam's traffic study also does not identify the locations of school bus routes at Hazelbrook Middle School or the potential impacts to school bus traffic. Student safety is one of the most important issues in our community, but so far it has been ignored in this process.

Also, the safety and congestion impacts from Lam's proposal would be most concentrated on Tualatin Road between 115th and 124th which abuts a residential area with traditionally disadvantaged demographics and income limited apartments. This is not equitable.

BYPASS ROUTE

The route from Hazelbrook Road going west and turning right onto Hwy 99W is a "hidden" route that can bypass the traffic congestion at the west end of Tualatin Road. Adding a signal at 115th and Tualatin Road will encourage more cars to take this bypass. The potential impact of this new traffic pattern imposes significant safety concerns to communities all along the route. These impacts were not addressed in the traffic study.

SUMMARY

We urge the city to consider all the above concerns and require the applicant (Lam) to revise their site development plan accordingly. We believe that the current proposal does not meet Tualatin's planning rules, and that the City Manager should use her authority to bring Lam's proposal into compliance. No new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank You.

From: Lexi Howell <alexaehowell@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 9, 2024 3:50 PM
To: Ext - Planning
Subject: Tualatin Code

Dear City of Tualatin,

While researching the traffic impacts from Lam's TUX project, members of the community have discovered that Lam's proposal is not compatible with the Tualatin Comprehensive Plan 2040, and it would violate the Tualatin Development Code, both in spirit and letter.

For the reasons outlined below, we are asking the Tualatin Planning Department to consider Lam's proposed entrance on Tualatin Road to not be approvable, and we ask the City Manager to use her authority to have the proposed entrance removed from the TUX project site plan so that alternative access can be designed.

SITE CIRCULATION

Existing driveways provide sufficient access points to the Lam Campus as a whole. Lam currently has 6 other access points. 3 on 108th and 3 on Leveton Drive. Adding a new access point on Tualatin Road is unnecessary.

Lam is responsible for designing reasonable site circulation. A lack of good site circulation is not a valid reason to add an additional driveway onto the street network.

The Tualatin Comprehensive Plan 2040 strongly supports the use of existing access points, rather than creating new ones, especially when a new access point would have negative impacts to the community. "Consider transportation options that make the best use of the existing network" (Goal 8.7)

SPIRIT OF THE LAW

Tualatin Road is currently functioning as an arterial, it was previously classified as an arterial, and it has the traffic volume of an arterial. Leveton Drive is currently functioning as a collector, it was previously classified as a collector, and it has the current traffic volume of a collector.

During the 2012-14 TSP update, the functional classifications of these streets were reversed in a failed attempt by the city to reduce the amount of traffic on Tualatin Road and encourage more trips to use Leveton Drive. While we appreciate the intent of this reversal, the impact is now exactly opposite of what was intended, and we ask that this reversal be deemed a mistake. We ask the city to remedy this mistake by restoring the correct functional classifications to their appropriate streets. Lam should not be allowed to rely on a classification error to put a new entrance on a road that, based on current conditions, should not have a new entrance.

If the streets were classified correctly, Lam Research would not be able to add an employee

entrance on Tualatin Road because it would be an arterial. “No new driveways or streets on arterial roadways within the City, except where noted in the TDC, usually when no alternative access is available.” (TCP 2040 POLICY 8.10.1)

LETTER OF THE LAW

The Tualatin Development Code says “Lots that front on more than one street may be required to locate motor vehicle accesses on the street with the lower functional classification as determined by the City Manager.” TDC 75.040 (5) Currently the TSP shows 108th classified as a minor collector and Tualatin Road a major collector. Based on this, access should be provided from 108th not Tualatin Road.

Lam’s proposed entrance on Tualatin Road fails four of the new driveway approach criteria in TDC 75.020.5: "(d)(ii) Takes access from the lowest classification of street abutting the property … (g) The proposed driveway approach does not result in significant adverse impacts to the vicinity; (h) The proposed driveway approach minimizes impact to the functionality of adjacent streets and intersections; and (i) The proposed driveway approach balances the adverse impacts to residentially zoned property and the functionality of adjacent streets."

Tualatin Development Code 75.140.15 (a) grants the specific locations for Lam's three driveways on the north side of Leveton Drive. The applicant's proposal to relocate one of the three driveways is not compliant with the development code.

No matter which way you slice it, Tualatin Road is the worst option for carrying Lam’s new entrance and additional traffic volume. We ask the City Manager to use her discretion and require access from the most appropriate road which, by any metric, is Leveton Drive.

PROPOSED TRAFFIC SIGNAL

The proposed entrance on Tualatin Road would create the need for a new traffic signal on Tualatin Road which would have many negative impacts on the community. These impacts justify rejection of the proposed access. If Lam were to take access from Leveton Drive, no new traffic signal would be needed.

The community provided overwhelming feedback during the TSP update this summer about this issue and we asked that the proposed traffic signal be removed from the TSP. The city should take this feedback into account and "Conduct the planning process with adequate input and feedback from citizens in each affected neighborhood” (TCP 2040 Goal 8.7)

CONSIDER SAFETY

The Tualatin TSP Existing Conditions Report shows Tualatin Road and 115th Ave having higher Pedestrian Level of Traffic Stress than Leveton Drive and 108th Ave. (Figure 23) Adding more traffic to Tualatin Road and 115th Ave will degrade pedestrian safety even further.

Tualatin Road between 124th and 115th has higher concentration of collisions than Leveton and

108th, with a history of serious injury collision while Leveton does not. (Figure 31) Adding more traffic onto Tualatin Road and 115th will increase the traffic exposure and likely result in worse safety outcomes.

Tualatin Road has a history of collisions involving pedestrians and bicycles while Leveton and 108th do not. (Figure 32) Adding more traffic to Tualatin Road will likely make this safety issue worse.

Converting a driveway to full access or signalizing a driveway would likely increase traffic crashes. Per CMF ClearingHouse, changing driveway type to full access has a crash modification factor (CMF) of 2.25, and signalizing a driveway has a CMF of 3.98, which means that the two measures will likely increase traffic crashes by a factor of 2.25 and 3.98 respectively.

Lam's traffic study also does not identify the locations of school bus routes at Hazelbrook Middle School or the potential impacts to school bus traffic. Student safety is one of the most important issues in our community, but so far it has been ignored in this process.

Also, the safety and congestion impacts from Lam's proposal would be most concentrated on Tualatin Road between 115th and 124th which abuts a residential area with traditionally disadvantaged demographics and income limited apartments. This is not equitable.

BYPASS ROUTE

The route from Hazelbrook Road going west and turning right onto Hwy 99W is a "hidden" route that can bypass the traffic congestion at the west end of Tualatin Road. Adding a signal at 115th and Tualatin Road will encourage more cars to take this bypass. The potential impact of this new traffic pattern imposes significant safety concerns to communities all along the route. These impacts were not addressed in the traffic study.

SUMMARY

We urge the city to consider all the above concerns and require the applicant (Lam) to revise their site development plan accordingly. We believe that the current proposal does not meet Tualatin's planning rules, and that the City Manager should use her authority to bring Lam's proposal into compliance. No new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank You.

--

Lexi Howell
(541) 921-7992 | alexaehowell@gmail.com | linkedin.com/in/alexa-howell/

From: Patti Atkins <patti@prpatti.com>
Sent: Monday, December 9, 2024 5:39 PM
To: Council; Ext - Planning; Ext - Engineering Exterrnal Email
Subject: Tualatin Road

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

City Council council@tualatin.gov
Planning Department planning@tualatin.gov
Engineering engineering@tualatin.gov

Dear City of Tualatin,

While researching the traffic impacts from Lam's TUX project, members of the community have discovered that Lam's proposal is not compatible with the Tualatin Comprehensive Plan 2040, and it would violate the Tualatin Development Code, both in spirit and letter.

For the reasons outlined below, we are asking the Tualatin Planning Department to consider Lam's proposed entrance on Tualatin Road to not be approvable, and we ask the City Manager to use her authority to have the proposed entrance removed from the TUX project site plan so that alternative access can be designed.

SITE CIRCULATION

Existing driveways provide sufficient access points to the Lam Campus as a whole. Lam currently has 6 other access points. 3 on 108th and 3 on Leveton Drive. Adding a new access point on Tualatin Road is unnecessary.

Lam is responsible for designing reasonable site circulation. A lack of good site circulation is not a valid reason to add an additional driveway onto the street network.

The Tualatin Comprehensive Plan 2040 strongly supports the use of existing access points, rather than creating new ones, especially when a new access point would have negative impacts to the community. "Consider transportation

options that make the best use of the existing network" (Goal 8.7)

SPIRIT OF THE LAW

Tualatin Road is currently functioning as an arterial, it was previously classified as an arterial, and it has the traffic volume of an arterial. Leveton Drive is currently functioning as a collector, it was previously classified as a collector, and it has the current traffic volume of a collector.

During the 2012-14 TSP update, the functional classifications of these streets were reversed in a failed attempt by the city to reduce the amount of traffic on Tualatin Road and encourage more trips to use Leveton Drive. While we appreciate the intent of this reversal, the impact is now exactly opposite of what was intended, and we ask that this reversal be deemed a mistake. We ask the city to remedy this mistake by restoring the correct functional classifications to their appropriate streets. Lam should not be allowed to rely on a classification error to put a new entrance on a road that, based on current conditions, should not have a new entrance.

If the streets were classified correctly, Lam Research would not be able to add an employee entrance on Tualatin Road because it would be an arterial. “No new driveways or streets on arterial roadways within the City, except where noted in the TDC, usually when no alternative access is available.” (TCP 2040 POLICY 8.10.1)

LETTER OF THE LAW

The Tualatin Development Code says “Lots that front on more than one street may be required to locate motor vehicle accesses on the street with the lower functional classification as determined by the City Manager.” TDC 75.040 (5) Currently the TSP shows 108th classified as a minor collector and Tualatin Road a major collector. Based on this, access should be provided from 108th not Tualatin Road.

Lam’s proposed entrance on Tualatin Road fails four of the new driveway approach criteria in TDC 75.020.5: "(d)(ii) Takes access from the lowest classification of street abutting the property … (g) The proposed driveway approach does not result in significant adverse impacts to the vicinity; (h) The

proposed driveway approach minimizes impact to the functionality of adjacent streets and intersections; and (i) The proposed driveway approach balances the adverse impacts to residentially zoned property and the functionality of adjacent streets."

Tualatin Development Code 75.140.15 (a) grants the specific locations for Lam's three driveways on the north side of Leveton Drive. The applicant's proposal to relocate one of the three driveways is not compliant with the development code.

No matter which way you slice it, Tualatin Road is the worst option for carrying Lam's new entrance and additional traffic volume. We ask the City Manager to use her discretion and require access from the most appropriate road which, by any metric, is Leveton Drive.

PROPOSED TRAFFIC SIGNAL

The proposed entrance on Tualatin Road would create the need for a new traffic signal on Tualatin Road which would have many negative impacts on the community. These impacts justify rejection of the proposed access. If Lam were to take access from Leveton Drive, no new traffic signal would be needed.

The community provided overwhelming feedback during the TSP update this summer about this issue and we asked that the proposed traffic signal be removed from the TSP. The city should take this feedback into account and "Conduct the planning process with adequate input and feedback from citizens in each affected neighborhood" (TCP 2040 Goal 8.7)

CONSIDER SAFETY

The Tualatin TSP Existing Conditions Report shows Tualatin Road and 115th Ave having higher Pedestrian Level of Traffic Stress than Leveton Drive and 108th Ave. (Figure 23) Adding more traffic to Tualatin Road and 115th Ave will degrade pedestrian safety even further.

Tualatin Road between 124th and 115th has higher concentration of collisions than Leveton and 108th, with a history of serious injury collision while Leveton does not. (Figure 31) Adding more traffic onto Tualatin Road and 115th will

increase the traffic exposure and likely result in worse safety outcomes.

Tualatin Road has a history of collisions involving pedestrians and bicycles while Leveton and 108th do not. (Figure 32) Adding more traffic to Tualatin Road will likely make this safety issue worse.

Converting a driveway to full access or signalizing a driveway would likely increase traffic crashes. Per CMF ClearingHouse, changing driveway type to full access has a crash modification factor (CMF) of 2.25, and signalizing a driveway has a CMF of 3.98, which means that the two measures will likely increase traffic crashes by a factor of 2.25 and 3.98 respectively.

Lam's traffic study also does not identify the locations of school bus routes at Hazelbrook Middle School or the potential impacts to school bus traffic. Student safety is one of the most important issues in our community, but so far it has been ignored in this process.

Also, the safety and congestion impacts from Lam's proposal would be most concentrated on Tualatin Road between 115th and 124th which abuts a residential area with traditionally disadvantaged demographics and income limited apartments. This is not equitable.

BYPASS ROUTE

The route from Hazelbrook Road going west and turning right onto Hwy 99W is a "hidden" route that can bypass the traffic congestion at the west end of Tualatin Road. Adding a signal at 115th and Tualatin Road will encourage more cars to take this bypass. The potential impact of this new traffic pattern imposes significant safety concerns to communities all along the route. These impacts were not addressed in the traffic study.

SUMMARY

We urge the city to consider all the above concerns and require the applicant (Lam) to revise their site development plan accordingly. We believe that the current proposal does not meet Tualatin's planning rules, and that the City Manager should use her authority to bring Lam's proposal into compliance. No new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank You.
Patricia Atkins
17745 SW Chippewa Trail, Tualatin, OR 97062

From: Reba Tobey <rtdoglover@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, December 9, 2024 4:18 PM
To: Council; Ext - Planning; Ext - Engineering Exterrnal Email
Subject: Lamm's proposed new direct access onto SW Tualatin Rd

Dear City of Tualatin,

While researching the traffic impacts from Lam's TUX project, members of the community have discovered that Lam's proposal is not compatible with the Tualatin Comprehensive Plan 2040, and it would violate the Tualatin Development Code, both in spirit and letter.

For the reasons outlined below, we are asking the Tualatin Planning Department to consider Lam's proposed entrance on Tualatin Road to not be approvable, and we ask the City Manager to use her authority to have the proposed entrance removed from the TUX project site plan so that alternative access can be designed.

SITE CIRCULATION

Existing driveways provide sufficient access points to the Lam Campus as a whole. Lam currently has 6 other access points. 3 on 108th and 3 on Leveton Drive. Adding a new access point on Tualatin Road is unnecessary.

Lam is responsible for designing reasonable site circulation. A lack of good site circulation is not a valid reason to add an additional driveway onto the street network.

The Tualatin Comprehensive Plan 2040 strongly supports the use of existing access points, rather than creating new ones, especially when a new access point would have negative impacts to the community. "Consider transportation options that make the best use of the existing network" (Goal 8.7)

SPIRIT OF THE LAW

Tualatin Road is currently functioning as an arterial, it was previously classified as an arterial, and it has the traffic volume of an arterial. Leveton Drive is currently functioning as a collector, it was previously classified as a collector, and it has the current traffic volume of a collector.

During the 2012-14 TSP update, the functional classifications of these streets were reversed in a failed attempt by the city to reduce the amount of traffic on Tualatin Road and encourage more trips to use Leveton Drive. While we appreciate the intent of this reversal, the impact is now exactly opposite of what was intended, and we ask that this reversal be deemed a mistake. We ask the city to remedy this mistake by restoring the correct functional classifications to their appropriate streets. Lam should not be allowed to rely on a classification error to put a new entrance on a road that, based on current conditions, should not have a new entrance.

If the streets were classified correctly, Lam Research would not be able to add an employee entrance on Tualatin Road because it would be an arterial. "No new driveways or streets on arterial roadways within the City, except where noted in the TDC, usually when no alternative access is available." (TCP 2040 POLICY 8.10.1)

LETTER OF THE LAW

The Tualatin Development Code says “Lots that front on more than one street may be required to locate motor vehicle accesses on the street with the lower functional classification as determined by the City Manager.” TDC 75.040 (5) Currently the TSP shows 108th classified as a minor collector and Tualatin Road a major collector. Based on this, access should be provided from 108th not Tualatin Road.

Lam’s proposed entrance on Tualatin Road fails four of the new driveway approach criteria in TDC 75.020.5: "(d)(ii) Takes access from the lowest classification of street abutting the property … (g) The proposed driveway approach does not result in significant adverse impacts to the vicinity; (h) The proposed driveway approach minimizes impact to the functionality of adjacent streets and intersections; and (i) The proposed driveway approach balances the adverse impacts to residentially zoned property and the functionality of adjacent streets."

Tualatin Development Code 75.140.15 (a) grants the specific locations for Lam's three driveways on the north side of Leveton Drive. The applicant's proposal to relocate one of the three driveways is not compliant with the development code.

No matter which way you slice it, Tualatin Road is the worst option for carrying Lam’s new entrance and additional traffic volume. We ask the City Manager to use her discretion and require access from the most appropriate road which, by any metric, is Leveton Drive.

PROPOSED TRAFFIC SIGNAL

The proposed entrance on Tualatin Road would create the need for a new traffic signal on Tualatin Road which would have many negative impacts on the community. These impacts justify rejection of the proposed access. If Lam were to take access from Leveton Drive, no new traffic signal would be needed.

The community provided overwhelming feedback during the TSP update this summer about this issue and we asked that the proposed traffic signal be removed from the TSP. The city should take this feedback into account and "Conduct the planning process with adequate input and feedback from citizens in each affected neighborhood” (TCP 2040 Goal 8.7)

CONSIDER SAFETY

The Tualatin TSP Existing Conditions Report shows Tualatin Road and 115th Ave having higher Pedestrian Level of Traffic Stress than Leveton Drive and 108th Ave. (Figure 23) Adding more traffic to Tualatin Road and 115th Ave will degrade pedestrian safety even further.

Tualatin Road between 124th and 115th has higher concentration of collisions than Leveton and 108th, with a history of serious injury collision while Leveton does not. (Figure 31) Adding more traffic onto Tualatin Road and 115th will increase the traffic exposure and likely result in worse safety outcomes.

Tualatin Road has a history of collisions involving pedestrians and bicycles while Leveton and 108th do not. (Figure 32) Adding more traffic to Tualatin Road will likely make this safety issue worse.

Converting a driveway to full access or signalizing a driveway would likely increase traffic crashes. Per CMF ClearingHouse, changing driveway type to full access has a crash modification factor (CMF) of 2.25,

and signalizing a driveway has a CMF of 3.98, which means that the two measures will likely increase traffic crashes by a factor of 2.25 and 3.98 respectively.

Lam's traffic study also does not identify the locations of school bus routes at Hazelbrook Middle School or the potential impacts to school bus traffic. Student safety is one of the most important issues in our community, but so far it has been ignored in this process.

Also, the safety and congestion impacts from Lam's proposal would be most concentrated on Tualatin Road between 115th and 124th which abuts a residential area with traditionally disadvantaged demographics and income limited apartments. This is not equitable.

BYPASS ROUTE

The route from Hazelbrook Road going west and turning right onto Hwy 99W is a "hidden" route that can bypass the traffic congestion at the west end of Tualatin Road. Adding a signal at 115th and Tualatin Road will encourage more cars to take this bypass. The potential impact of this new traffic pattern imposes significant safety concerns to communities all along the route. These impacts were not addressed in the traffic study.

SUMMARY

We urge the city to consider all the above concerns and require the applicant (Lam) to revise their site development plan accordingly. We believe that the current proposal does not meet Tualatin's planning rules, and that the City Manager should use her authority to bring Lam's proposal into compliance. No new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you,

Reba Tobey
Tualatin Resident

17815 SW Cheyenne Way
Tualatin , Oregon 97062
503-449-8123

From: Steve Koper
Sent: Monday, December 9, 2024 5:16 PM
To: Keith Leonard
Subject: FW: Save Tualatin Road

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

From: Sherilyn Lombos <slombos@tualatin.gov>
Sent: Monday, December 9, 2024 5:14 PM
To: Steve Koper <skoper@tualatin.gov>; Mike McCarthy <mmccarthy@tualatin.gov>; Kim McMillan <kmcmillan@tualatin.gov>
Subject: FW: Save Tualatin Road

Sherilyn Lombos
City Manager
Phone: 503.691.3010

From: baumann12@frontier.com <baumann12@frontier.com>
Sent: Monday, December 09, 2024 4:00 PM
To: Council <council@tualatin.gov>
Subject: Save Tualatin Road

Dear City of Tualatin,

While researching the traffic impacts from Lam's TUX project, members of the community have discovered that Lam's proposal is not compatible with the Tualatin Comprehensive Plan 2040, and it would violate the Tualatin Development Code, both in spirit and letter.

For the reasons outlined below, we are asking the Tualatin Planning Department to consider Lam's proposed entrance on Tualatin Road to not be approvable, and we ask the City Manager to use her authority to have the proposed entrance removed from the TUX project site plan so that alternative access can be designed.

SITE CIRCULATION

Existing driveways provide sufficient access points to the Lam Campus as a whole. Lam currently has 6 other access points. 3 on 108th and 3 on Leveton Drive. Adding a new access point on Tualatin Road is unnecessary.

Lam is responsible for designing reasonable site circulation. A lack of good site circulation is not a valid reason to add an additional driveway onto the street network.

The Tualatin Comprehensive Plan 2040 strongly supports the use of existing access points, rather than creating new ones, especially when a new access point would have negative impacts to the community. "Consider transportation options that make the best use of the existing network" (Goal 8.7)

SPIRIT OF THE LAW

Tualatin Road is currently functioning as an arterial, it was previously classified as an arterial, and it has the traffic volume of an arterial. Leveton Drive is currently functioning as a collector, it was previously classified as a collector, and it has the current traffic volume of a collector.

During the 2012-14 TSP update, the functional classifications of these streets were reversed in a failed attempt by the city to reduce the amount of traffic on Tualatin Road and encourage more trips to use Leveton Drive. While we appreciate the intent of this reversal, the impact is now exactly opposite of what was intended, and we ask that this reversal be deemed a mistake. We ask the city to remedy this mistake by restoring the correct functional classifications to their appropriate streets. Lam should not be allowed to rely on a classification error to put a new entrance on a road that, based on current conditions, should not have a new entrance.

If the streets were classified correctly, Lam Research would not be able to add an employee entrance on Tualatin Road because it would be an arterial. “No new driveways or streets on arterial roadways within the City, except where noted in the TDC, usually when no alternative access is available.” (TCP 2040 POLICY 8.10.1)

LETTER OF THE LAW

The Tualatin Development Code says “Lots that front on more than one street may be required to locate motor vehicle accesses on the street with the lower functional classification as determined by the City Manager.” TDC 75.040 (5) Currently the TSP shows 108th classified as a minor collector and Tualatin Road a major collector. Based on this, access should be provided from 108th not Tualatin Road.

Lam’s proposed entrance on Tualatin Road fails four of the new driveway approach criteria in TDC 75.020.5: "(d)(ii) Takes access from the lowest classification of street abutting the property … (g) The proposed driveway approach does not result in significant adverse impacts to the vicinity; (h) The proposed driveway approach minimizes impact to the functionality of adjacent streets and intersections; and (i) The proposed driveway approach balances the adverse impacts to residentially zoned property and the functionality of adjacent streets."

Tualatin Development Code 75.140.15 (a) grants the specific locations for Lam's three driveways on the north side of Leveton Drive. The applicant's proposal to relocate one of the three driveways is not compliant with the development code.

No matter which way you slice it, Tualatin Road is the worst option for carrying Lam's new entrance and additional traffic volume. We ask the City Manager to use her discretion and require access from the most appropriate road which, by any metric, is Leveton Drive.

PROPOSED TRAFFIC SIGNAL

The proposed entrance on Tualatin Road would create the need for a new traffic signal on Tualatin Road which would have many negative impacts on the community. These impacts justify rejection of the proposed access. If Lam were to take access from Leveton Drive, no new traffic signal would be needed.

The community provided overwhelming feedback during the TSP update this summer about this issue and we asked that the proposed traffic signal be removed from the TSP. The city should take this feedback into account and "Conduct the planning process with adequate input and feedback from citizens in each affected neighborhood" (TCP 2040 Goal 8.7)

CONSIDER SAFETY

The Tualatin TSP Existing Conditions Report shows Tualatin Road and 115th Ave having higher Pedestrian Level of Traffic Stress than Leveton Drive and 108th Ave. (Figure 23) Adding more traffic to Tualatin Road and 115th Ave will degrade pedestrian safety even further.

Tualatin Road between 124th and 115th has higher concentration of collisions than Leveton and 108th, with a history of serious injury collision while Leveton does not. (Figure 31) Adding more traffic onto Tualatin Road and 115th will increase the traffic exposure and likely result in worse safety outcomes.

Tualatin Road has a history of collisions involving pedestrians and bicycles while Leveton and 108th do not. (Figure 32) Adding more traffic to Tualatin Road will likely make this safety issue worse.

Converting a driveway to full access or signalizing a driveway would likely increase traffic crashes. Per CMF ClearingHouse, changing driveway type to full access has a crash modification factor (CMF) of 2.25, and signalizing a driveway has a CMF of 3.98, which means that the two measures will likely increase traffic crashes by a factor of 2.25 and 3.98 respectively.

Lam's traffic study also does not identify the locations of school bus routes at Hazelbrook Middle School or the potential impacts to school bus traffic. Student safety

is one of the most important issues in our community, but so far it has been ignored in this process.

Also, the safety and congestion impacts from Lam's proposal would be most concentrated on Tualatin Road between 115th and 124th which abuts a residential area with traditionally disadvantaged demographics and income limited apartments. This is not equitable.

BYPASS ROUTE

The route from Hazelbrook Road going west and turning right onto Hwy 99W is a "hidden" route that can bypass the traffic congestion at the west end of Tualatin Road. Adding a signal at 115th and Tualatin Road will encourage more cars to take this bypass. The potential impact of this new traffic pattern imposes significant safety concerns to communities all along the route. These impacts were not addressed in the traffic study.

SUMMARY

We urge the city to consider all the above concerns and require the applicant (Lam) to revise their site development plan accordingly. We believe that the current proposal does not meet Tualatin's planning rules, and that the City Manager should use her authority to bring Lam's proposal into compliance. No new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank You.

Rosemarie Drake-Baumann

From: Hazen <hazenhyland@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 10, 2024 2:51 PM
To: Ext - Planning
Subject: LAM Study omissions

Dear City of Tualatin,

While researching the traffic impacts from Lam's TUX project, members of the community have discovered that Lam's proposal is not compatible with the Tualatin Comprehensive Plan 2040, and it would violate the Tualatin Development Code, both in spirit and letter.

This impacts the Hazelbrook neighborhood and Hazelbrook Middle School more than meets the eye.

For the reasons outlined below, we are asking the Tualatin Planning Department to consider Lam's proposed entrance on Tualatin Road to not be approvable, and we ask the City Manager to use her authority to have the proposed entrance removed from the TUX project site plan so that alternative access can be designed.

SITE CIRCULATION

Existing driveways provide sufficient access points to the Lam Campus as a whole. Lam currently has 6 other access points. 3 on 108th and 3 on Leveton Drive. Adding a new access point on Tualatin Road is unnecessary.

Lam is responsible for designing reasonable site circulation. A lack of good site circulation is not a valid reason to add an additional driveway onto the street network.

The Tualatin Comprehensive Plan 2040 strongly supports the use of existing access points, rather than creating new ones, especially when a new access point would have negative impacts to the community. "Consider transportation options that make the best use of the existing network" (Goal 8.7)

SPIRIT OF THE LAW

Tualatin Road is currently functioning as an arterial, it was previously classified as an arterial, and it has the traffic volume of an arterial. Leveton Drive is currently functioning as a collector, it was previously classified as a collector, and it has the current traffic volume of a collector.

During the 2012-14 TSP update, the functional classifications of these streets were reversed in a failed attempt by the city to reduce the amount of traffic on Tualatin Road and encourage more trips to use Leveton Drive. While we appreciate the intent of this reversal, the impact is now exactly opposite of what was intended, and we ask that this reversal be deemed a mistake. We ask the city to remedy this mistake by restoring the correct functional classifications to their

appropriate streets. Lam should not be allowed to rely on a classification error to put a new entrance on a road that, based on current conditions, should not have a new entrance.

If the streets were classified correctly, Lam Research would not be able to add an employee entrance on Tualatin Road because it would be an arterial. “No new driveways or streets on arterial roadways within the City, except where noted in the TDC, usually when no alternative access is available.” (TCP 2040 POLICY 8.10.1)

LETTER OF THE LAW

The Tualatin Development Code says “Lots that front on more than one street may be required to locate motor vehicle accesses on the street with the lower functional classification as determined by the City Manager.” TDC 75.040 (5) Currently the TSP shows 108th classified as a minor collector and Tualatin Road a major collector. Based on this, access should be provided from 108th not Tualatin Road.

Lam’s proposed entrance on Tualatin Road fails four of the new driveway approach criteria in TDC 75.020.5: "(d)(ii) Takes access from the lowest classification of street abutting the property … (g) The proposed driveway approach does not result in significant adverse impacts to the vicinity; (h) The proposed driveway approach minimizes impact to the functionality of adjacent streets and intersections; and (i) The proposed driveway approach balances the adverse impacts to residentially zoned property and the functionality of adjacent streets."

Tualatin Development Code 75.140.15 (a) grants the specific locations for Lam's three driveways on the north side of Leveton Drive. The applicant's proposal to relocate one of the three driveways is not compliant with the development code.

No matter which way you slice it, Tualatin Road is the worst option for carrying Lam’s new entrance and additional traffic volume. We ask the City Manager to use her discretion and require access from the most appropriate road which, by any metric, is Leveton Drive.

PROPOSED TRAFFIC SIGNAL

The proposed entrance on Tualatin Road would create the need for a new traffic signal on Tualatin Road which would have many negative impacts on the community. These impacts justify rejection of the proposed access. If Lam were to take access from Leveton Drive, no new traffic signal would be needed.

The community provided overwhelming feedback during the TSP update this summer about this issue and we asked that the proposed traffic signal be removed from the TSP. The city should take this feedback into account and "Conduct the planning process with adequate input and feedback from citizens in each affected neighborhood” (TCP 2040 Goal 8.7)

CONSIDER SAFETY

The Tualatin TSP Existing Conditions Report shows Tualatin Road and 115th Ave having higher Pedestrian Level of Traffic Stress than Leveton Drive and 108th Ave. (Figure 23) Adding more traffic to Tualatin Road and 115th Ave will degrade pedestrian safety even further.

Tualatin Road between 124th and 115th has higher concentration of collisions than Leveton and 108th, with a history of serious injury collision while Leveton does not. (Figure 31) Adding more traffic onto Tualatin Road and 115th will increase the traffic exposure and likely result in worse safety outcomes.

Tualatin Road has a history of collisions involving pedestrians and bicycles while Leveton and 108th do not. (Figure 32) Adding more traffic to Tualatin Road will likely make this safety issue worse.

Converting a driveway to full access or signalizing a driveway would likely increase traffic crashes. Per CMF ClearingHouse, changing driveway type to full access has a crash modification factor (CMF) of 2.25, and signalizing a driveway has a CMF of 3.98, which means that the two measures will likely increase traffic crashes by a factor of 2.25 and 3.98 respectively.

Lam's traffic study also does not identify the locations of school bus routes at Hazelbrook Middle School or the potential impacts to school bus traffic. Student safety is one of the most important issues in our community, but so far it has been ignored in this process.

Also, the safety and congestion impacts from Lam's proposal would be most concentrated on Tualatin Road between 115th and 124th which abuts a residential area with traditionally disadvantaged demographics and income limited apartments. This is not equitable.

BYPASS ROUTE

The route from Hazelbrook Road going west and turning right onto Hwy 99W is a "hidden" route that can bypass the traffic congestion at the west end of Tualatin Road. Adding a signal at 115th and Tualatin Road will encourage more cars to take this bypass. The potential impact of this new traffic pattern imposes significant safety concerns to communities all along the route. These impacts were not addressed in the traffic study.

SUMMARY

We urge the city to consider all the above concerns and require the applicant (Lam) to revise their site development plan accordingly. We believe that the current proposal does not meet Tualatin's planning rules, and that the City Manager should use her authority to bring Lam's proposal into compliance. No new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank You.

From: Jeremy Howell <jmhowell11@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 9, 2024 3:51 PM
To: Ext - Planning
Subject: Tualatin Code

Dear City of Tualatin,

While researching the traffic impacts from Lam's TUX project, members of the community have discovered that Lam's proposal is not compatible with the Tualatin Comprehensive Plan 2040, and it would violate the Tualatin Development Code, both in spirit and letter.

For the reasons outlined below, we are asking the Tualatin Planning Department to consider Lam's proposed entrance on Tualatin Road to not be approvable, and we ask the City Manager to use her authority to have the proposed entrance removed from the TUX project site plan so that alternative access can be designed.

SITE CIRCULATION

Existing driveways provide sufficient access points to the Lam Campus as a whole. Lam currently has 6 other access points. 3 on 108th and 3 on Leveton Drive. Adding a new access point on Tualatin Road is unnecessary.

Lam is responsible for designing reasonable site circulation. A lack of good site circulation is not a valid reason to add an additional driveway onto the street network.

The Tualatin Comprehensive Plan 2040 strongly supports the use of existing access points, rather than creating new ones, especially when a new access point would have negative impacts to the community. "Consider transportation options that make the best use of the existing network" (Goal 8.7)

SPIRIT OF THE LAW

Tualatin Road is currently functioning as an arterial, it was previously classified as an arterial, and it has the traffic volume of an arterial. Leveton Drive is currently functioning as a collector, it was previously classified as a collector, and it has the current traffic volume of a collector.

During the 2012-14 TSP update, the functional classifications of these streets were reversed in a failed attempt by the city to reduce the amount of traffic on Tualatin Road and encourage more trips to use Leveton Drive. While we appreciate the intent of this reversal, the impact is now exactly opposite of what was intended, and we ask that this reversal be deemed a mistake. We ask the city to remedy this mistake by restoring the correct functional classifications to their appropriate streets. Lam should not be allowed to rely on a classification error to put a new entrance on a road that, based on current

conditions, should not have a new entrance.

If the streets were classified correctly, Lam Research would not be able to add an employee entrance on Tualatin Road because it would be an arterial. “No new driveways or streets on arterial roadways within the City, except where noted in the TDC, usually when no alternative access is available.” (TCP 2040 POLICY 8.10.1)

LETTER OF THE LAW

The Tualatin Development Code says “Lots that front on more than one street may be required to locate motor vehicle accesses on the street with the lower functional classification as determined by the City Manager.” TDC 75.040 (5) Currently the TSP shows 108th classified as a minor collector and Tualatin Road a major collector. Based on this, access should be provided from 108th not Tualatin Road.

Lam’s proposed entrance on Tualatin Road fails four of the new driveway approach criteria in TDC 75.020.5: "(d)(ii) Takes access from the lowest classification of street abutting the property … (g) The proposed driveway approach does not result in significant adverse impacts to the vicinity; (h) The proposed driveway approach minimizes impact to the functionality of adjacent streets and intersections; and (i) The proposed driveway approach balances the adverse impacts to residentially zoned property and the functionality of adjacent streets."

Tualatin Development Code 75.140.15 (a) grants the specific locations for Lam's three driveways on the north side of Leveton Drive. The applicant's proposal to relocate one of the three driveways is not compliant with the development code.

No matter which way you slice it, Tualatin Road is the worst option for carrying Lam’s new entrance and additional traffic volume. We ask the City Manager to use her discretion and require access from the most appropriate road which, by any metric, is Leveton Drive.

PROPOSED TRAFFIC SIGNAL

The proposed entrance on Tualatin Road would create the need for a new traffic signal on Tualatin Road which would have many negative impacts on the community. These impacts justify rejection of the proposed access. If Lam were to take access from Leveton Drive, no new traffic signal would be needed.

The community provided overwhelming feedback during the TSP update this summer about this issue and we asked that the proposed traffic signal be removed from the TSP. The city should take this feedback into account and "Conduct the planning process with adequate input and feedback from citizens in each affected neighborhood” (TCP 2040 Goal 8.7)

CONSIDER SAFETY

The Tualatin TSP Existing Conditions Report shows Tualatin Road and 115th Ave having higher Pedestrian Level of Traffic Stress than Leveton Drive and 108th Ave. (Figure 23) Adding more traffic to Tualatin Road and 115th Ave will degrade pedestrian safety even further.

Tualatin Road between 124th and 115th has higher concentration of collisions than Leveton and 108th, with a history of serious injury collision while Leveton does not. (Figure 31) Adding more traffic onto Tualatin Road and 115th will increase the traffic exposure and likely result in worse safety outcomes.

Tualatin Road has a history of collisions involving pedestrians and bicycles while Leveton and 108th do not. (Figure 32) Adding more traffic to Tualatin Road will likely make this safety issue worse.

Converting a driveway to full access or signalizing a driveway would likely increase traffic crashes. Per CMF ClearingHouse, changing driveway type to full access has a crash modification factor (CMF) of 2.25, and signalizing a driveway has a CMF of 3.98, which means that the two measures will likely increase traffic crashes by a factor of 2.25 and 3.98 respectively.

Lam's traffic study also does not identify the locations of school bus routes at Hazelbrook Middle School or the potential impacts to school bus traffic. Student safety is one of the most important issues in our community, but so far it has been ignored in this process.

Also, the safety and congestion impacts from Lam's proposal would be most concentrated on Tualatin Road between 115th and 124th which abuts a residential area with traditionally disadvantaged demographics and income limited apartments. This is not equitable.

BYPASS ROUTE

The route from Hazelbrook Road going west and turning right onto Hwy 99W is a "hidden" route that can bypass the traffic congestion at the west end of Tualatin Road. Adding a signal at 115th and Tualatin Road will encourage more cars to take this bypass. The potential impact of this new traffic pattern imposes significant safety concerns to communities all along the route. These impacts were not addressed in the traffic study.

SUMMARY

We urge the city to consider all the above concerns and require the applicant (Lam) to revise their site development plan accordingly. We believe that the current proposal does not meet Tualatin's planning rules, and that the City Manager should use her authority to bring Lam's proposal into compliance. No new roadway access on Tualatin

Road.

Thank You.

From: Joanne Santee <jojo10k@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 10, 2024 8:38 AM
To: Council; Ext - Planning; Ext - Engineering Exterrnal Email
Subject: Save Tualatin Road Please!!!



Dear City of Tualatin,

While researching the traffic impacts from Lam's TUX project, members of the community have discovered that Lam's proposal is not compatible with the Tualatin Comprehensive Plan 2040, and it would violate the Tualatin Development Code, both in spirit and letter.

For the reasons outlined below, we are asking the Tualatin Planning Department to consider Lam's proposed entrance on Tualatin Road to not be approvable, and we ask the City Manager to use her authority to have the proposed entrance removed from the TUX project site plan so that alternative access can be designed.

SITE CIRCULATION

Existing driveways provide sufficient access points to the Lam Campus as a whole. Lam currently has 6 other access points. 3 on 108th and 3 on Leveton Drive. Adding a new access point on Tualatin Road is unnecessary.

Lam is responsible for designing reasonable site circulation. A lack of good site circulation is not a valid reason to add an additional driveway onto the street network.

The Tualatin Comprehensive Plan 2040 strongly supports the use of existing access points, rather than creating new ones, especially when a new access point would have negative impacts to the community. "Consider transportation options that make the best use of the existing network" (Goal 8.7)

SPIRIT OF THE LAW

Tualatin Road is currently functioning as an arterial, it was previously classified as an arterial, and it has the traffic volume of an arterial. Leveton Drive is currently functioning as a collector, it was previously classified as a collector, and it has the current traffic volume of a collector.

During the 2012-14 TSP update, the functional classifications of these streets were reversed in a failed attempt by the city to reduce the amount of traffic on Tualatin Road and encourage more trips to use Leveton Drive. While we appreciate the intent of this reversal, the impact is now exactly opposite of what was intended, and we ask that this reversal be deemed a mistake. We ask the city to remedy this mistake by restoring the correct functional classifications to their appropriate streets. Lam should not be allowed to rely on a classification error to put a new entrance on a road that, based on current conditions, should not have a new entrance.

If the streets were classified correctly, Lam Research would not be able to add an employee entrance on Tualatin Road because it would be an arterial. "No new driveways or streets on arterial roadways within the City, except where noted in the TDC, usually when no alternative access is available." (TCP 2040 POLICY 8.10.1)

LETTER OF THE LAW

The Tualatin Development Code says "Lots that front on more than one street may be required to locate motor vehicle accesses on the street with the lower functional classification as determined by the City Manager." TDC 75.040 (5) Currently the TSP shows 108th classified as a minor collector and Tualatin Road a major collector. Based on this, access should be provided from 108th not Tualatin Road.

Lam's proposed entrance on Tualatin Road fails four of the new driveway approach criteria in TDC 75.020.5: "(d)(ii) Takes access from the lowest classification of street abutting the property … (g) The proposed driveway approach does not result in significant adverse impacts to the vicinity; (h) The proposed driveway approach minimizes impact to the functionality of adjacent streets and intersections; and (i)

The proposed driveway approach balances the adverse impacts to residentially zoned property and the functionality of adjacent streets."

Tualatin Development Code 75.140.15 (a) grants the specific locations for Lam's three driveways on the north side of Leveton Drive. The applicant's proposal to relocate one of the three driveways is not compliant with the development code.

No matter which way you slice it, Tualatin Road is the worst option for carrying Lam's new entrance and additional traffic volume. We ask the City Manager to use her discretion and require access from the most appropriate road which, by any metric, is Leveton Drive.

PROPOSED TRAFFIC SIGNAL

The proposed entrance on Tualatin Road would create the need for a new traffic signal on Tualatin Road which would have many negative impacts on the community. These impacts justify rejection of the proposed access. If Lam were to take access from Leveton Drive, no new traffic signal would be needed.

The community provided overwhelming feedback during the TSP update this summer about this issue and we asked that the proposed traffic signal be removed from the TSP. The city should take this feedback into account and "Conduct the planning process with adequate input and feedback from citizens in each affected neighborhood" (TCP 2040 Goal 8.7)

CONSIDER SAFETY

The Tualatin TSP Existing Conditions Report shows Tualatin Road and 115th Ave having higher Pedestrian Level of Traffic Stress than Leveton Drive and 108th Ave. (Figure 23) Adding more traffic to Tualatin Road and 115th Ave will degrade pedestrian safety even further.

Tualatin Road between 124th and 115th has higher concentration of collisions than Leveton and 108th, with a history of serious injury collision while Leveton does not. (Figure 31) Adding more traffic onto Tualatin Road and 115th will increase the traffic exposure and likely result in worse safety outcomes.

Tualatin Road has a history of collisions involving pedestrians and bicycles while Leveton and 108th do not. (Figure 32) Adding more traffic to Tualatin Road will likely make this safety issue worse.

Converting a driveway to full access or signalizing a driveway would likely increase traffic crashes. Per CMF ClearingHouse, changing driveway type to full access has a crash modification factor (CMF) of 2.25, and signalizing a driveway has a CMF of 3.98, which means that the two measures will likely increase traffic crashes by a factor of 2.25 and 3.98 respectively.

Lam's traffic study also does not identify the locations of school bus routes at Hazelbrook Middle School or the potential impacts to school bus traffic. Student safety is one of the most important issues in our community, but so far it has been ignored in this process.

Also, the safety and congestion impacts from Lam's proposal would be most concentrated on Tualatin Road between 115th and 124th which abuts a residential area with traditionally disadvantaged demographics and income limited apartments. This is not equitable.

BYPASS ROUTE

The route from Hazelbrook Road going west and turning right onto Hwy 99W is a "hidden" route that can bypass the traffic congestion at the west end of Tualatin Road. Adding a signal at 115th and Tualatin Road will encourage more cars to take this bypass. The potential impact of this new traffic pattern imposes significant safety concerns to communities all along the route. These impacts were not addressed in the traffic study.

SUMMARY

We urge the city to consider all the above concerns and require the applicant (Lam) to revise their site development plan accordingly. We believe that the current proposal does not meet Tualatin's planning rules, and that the City Manager should use her authority to bring Lam's proposal into compliance. No new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank You.

Joanne & Roger Schenk
10555 SW Lucas Ct.
Tualatin, OR

From: Patrice Dugan <duganfamily4@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, December 13, 2024 12:26 PM
To: Ext - Planning
Subject: Lam expansion/traffic impacts

I recently attended the meeting with city employees and concerned citizens. Please see the updated information below as it relates to Lams plans to add additional traffic to Tualatin Road

Thank you
Patrice Dugan

> Dear City of Tualatin,
>
> While researching the traffic impacts from Lam's TUX project, members of the community have discovered that Lam's proposal is not compatible with the Tualatin Comprehensive Plan 2040, and it would violate the Tualatin Development Code, both in spirit and letter.
>
> For the reasons outlined below, we are asking the Tualatin Planning Department to consider Lam's proposed entrance on Tualatin Road to not be approvable, and we ask the City Manager to use her authority to have the proposed entrance removed from the TUX project site plan so that alternative access can be designed.
>
> SITE CIRCULATION
>
> Existing driveways provide sufficient access points to the Lam Campus as a whole. Lam currently has 6 other access points. 3 on 108th and 3 on Leveton Drive. Adding a new access point on Tualatin Road is unnecessary.
>
> Lam is responsible for designing reasonable site circulation. A lack of good site circulation is not a valid reason to add an additional driveway onto the street network.
>
> The Tualatin Comprehensive Plan 2040 strongly supports the use of existing access points, rather than creating new ones, especially when a new access point would have negative impacts to the community. "Consider transportation options that make the best use of the existing network" (Goal 8.7)
>
> SPIRIT OF THE LAW
>
> Tualatin Road is currently functioning as an arterial, it was previously classified as an arterial, and it has the traffic volume of an arterial. Leveton Drive is currently functioning as a collector, it was previously classified as a collector, and it has the current traffic volume of a collector.
>
> During the 2012-14 TSP update, the functional classifications of these streets were reversed in a failed attempt by the city to reduce the amount of traffic on Tualatin Road and encourage more trips to use Leveton Drive. While we appreciate the intent of this reversal, the impact is now exactly opposite of what was intended, and we ask that this reversal be deemed a mistake. We ask the city to remedy this mistake by restoring the correct functional classifications to their appropriate streets. Lam should not be allowed to rely on a classification error to put a new entrance on a road that, based on current conditions, should not have a new entrance.

>
> If the streets were classified correctly, Lam Research would not be able to add an employee entrance on Tualatin Road because it would be an arterial. “No new driveways or streets on arterial roadways within the City, except where noted in the TDC, usually when no alternative access is available.” (TCP 2040 POLICY 8.10.1)
>
> LETTER OF THE LAW
>
> The Tualatin Development Code says “Lots that front on more than one street may be required to locate motor vehicle accesses on the street with the lower functional classification as determined by the City Manager.” TDC 75.040 (5) Currently the TSP shows 108th classified as a minor collector and Tualatin Road a major collector. Based on this, access should be provided from 108th not Tualatin Road.
>
> Lam’s proposed entrance on Tualatin Road fails four of the new driveway approach criteria in TDC 75.020.5: "(d)(ii) Takes access from the lowest classification of street abutting the property … (g) The proposed driveway approach does not result in significant adverse impacts to the vicinity; (h) The proposed driveway approach minimizes impact to the functionality of adjacent streets and intersections; and (i) The proposed driveway approach balances the adverse impacts to residentially zoned property and the functionality of adjacent streets."
>
> Tualatin Development Code 75.140.15 (a) grants the specific locations for Lam's three driveways on the north side of Leveton Drive. The applicant's proposal to relocate one of the three driveways is not compliant with the development code.
>
> No matter which way you slice it, Tualatin Road is the worst option for carrying Lam’s new entrance and additional traffic volume. We ask the City Manager to use her discretion and require access from the most appropriate road which, by any metric, is Leveton Drive.
>
> PROPOSED TRAFFIC SIGNAL
>
> The proposed entrance on Tualatin Road would create the need for a new traffic signal on Tualatin Road which would have many negative impacts on the community. These impacts justify rejection of the proposed access. If Lam were to take access from Leveton Drive, no new traffic signal would be needed.
>
> The community provided overwhelming feedback during the TSP update this summer about this issue and we asked that the proposed traffic signal be removed from the TSP. The city should take this feedback into account and "Conduct the planning process with adequate input and feedback from citizens in each affected neighborhood” (TCP 2040 Goal 8.7)
>
> CONSIDER SAFETY
>
> The Tualatin TSP Existing Conditions Report shows Tualatin Road and 115th Ave having higher Pedestrian Level of Traffic Stress than Leveton Drive and 108th Ave. (Figure 23) Adding more traffic to Tualatin Road and 115th Ave will degrade pedestrian safety even further.
>
> Tualatin Road between 124th and 115th has higher concentration of collisions than Leveton and 108th, with a history of serious injury collision while Leveton does not. (Figure 31) Adding more traffic

onto Tualatin Road and 115th will increase the traffic exposure and likely result in worse safety outcomes.
>
> Tualatin Road has a history of collisions involving pedestrians and bicycles while Leveton and 108th do not. (Figure 32) Adding more traffic to Tualatin Road will likely make this safety issue worse.
>
> Converting a driveway to full access or signalizing a driveway would likely increase traffic crashes. Per CMF ClearingHouse, changing driveway type to full access has a crash modification factor (CMF) of 2.25, and signalizing a driveway has a CMF of 3.98, which means that the two measures will likely increase traffic crashes by a factor of 2.25 and 3.98 respectively.
>
> Lam's traffic study also does not identify the locations of school bus routes at Hazelbrook Middle School or the potential impacts to school bus traffic. Student safety is one of the most important issues in our community, but so far it has been ignored in this process.
>
> Also, the safety and congestion impacts from Lam's proposal would be most concentrated on Tualatin Road between 115th and 124th which abuts a residential area with traditionally disadvantaged demographics and income limited apartments. This is not equitable.
>
> BYPASS ROUTE
>
> The route from Hazelbrook Road going west and turning right onto Hwy 99W is a "hidden" route that can bypass the traffic congestion at the west end of Tualatin Road. Adding a signal at 115th and Tualatin Road will encourage more cars to take this bypass. The potential impact of this new traffic pattern imposes significant safety concerns to communities all along the route. These impacts were not addressed in the traffic study.
>
> SUMMARY
>
> We urge the city to consider all the above concerns and require the applicant (Lam) to revise their site development plan accordingly. We believe that the current proposal does not meet Tualatin's planning rules, and that the City Manager should use her authority to bring Lam's proposal into compliance. No new roadway access on Tualatin Road.
>
> Thank You.
>
Sent from my iPhone

Against

Submitted from 12/16/24 through 7/20/25

From: Larry Melton <lmelton63@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2024 4:36 PM
To: Council; Ext - Planning; Ext - Engineering Exterrnal Email
Subject: LAM Proposal re: Tualatin Rd driveway

Dear City of Tualatin,

My name is Larry Melton. I've lived with my wife and daughters in the Fox Run Neighborhood off of Tualatin Rd for 31 years. We continue to see a troubling increase in traffic along Tualatin Rd at the access to our neighborhood. The thought of increasing that even more with an entrance to LAM at 115th is very troubling. The remainder of this email is a reiteration of more formal thoughts and concerns from the neighborhood, but information I hope you will give serious weight to during this decision process.

I'm writing to express my concerns about Lam Research's proposed TUX project expansion and the plan to add a new entrance on Tualatin Road. After reviewing the project details and researching the potential impacts, it's clear this proposal isn't in line with Tualatin's Comprehensive Plan 2040 or the Development Code.

I ask the Planning Department to consider the proposed entrance on Tualatin Road unworkable and urge the City Manager to require its removal from the site plan, allowing Lam to explore alternative access points.

Site Access and Circulation
Lam Research already has six access points—three on 108th and three on Leveton Drive—which should be more than adequate. Adding another driveway onto Tualatin Road seems unnecessary, especially since the Comprehensive Plan encourages making the best use of the current transportation network. Good site circulation within the campus is Lam's responsibility, and it shouldn't require adding a new entrance.

Traffic Classification and Safety
Although the streets were reclassified during a past TSP update, Tualatin Road functions like an arterial and carries heavy traffic, while Leveton Drive operates as a collector. The reversal of these classifications seems to have backfired, and it's causing unintended issues. If the classifications reflected the actual conditions, no new access would be allowed on Tualatin Road.

Adding an entrance here would also increase congestion and negatively affect safety. Data from the Tualatin TSP shows that Tualatin Road has a higher risk of crashes, especially involving pedestrians and cyclists, compared to Leveton. Encouraging more traffic on Tualatin Road would only make these issues worse.

Equity and Community Impact
The proposed entrance would have the biggest impact on the stretch of Tualatin Road adjacent to

residential areas, including income-limited apartments. It feels inequitable to concentrate traffic and safety risks in this area, especially when viable alternatives exist.

Proposed Traffic Signal
Installing a new traffic signal at 115th and Tualatin Road could create unintended traffic patterns, encouraging cars to bypass congestion by cutting through smaller neighborhoods. These potential impacts weren't addressed in Lam's traffic study but should be carefully considered.

Student and Pedestrian Safety
It's also concerning that the traffic study didn't evaluate impacts on school bus routes or pedestrian safety near Hazelbrook Middle School. Protecting students and pedestrians should be a top priority, and the current proposal seems to fall short here.

Final Thoughts
I urge the city to require Lam Research to revise their plans and remove the proposed entrance on Tualatin Road. This addition doesn't align with our city's planning rules, and it risks creating significant safety, equity, and traffic concerns for the community.

Thank you for considering these concerns as part of your review.

Sincerely,

From: Keith Leonard
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2024 4:23 PM
To: Keith Leonard
Subject: FW: Protect Tualatin Road

-----Original Message-----
From: Stephanie <stephimelton@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2024 8:26 AM
To: Council <council@tualatin.gov>; Ext - Planning <Planning@tualatin.gov>; Ext - Engineering Exterrnal Email <engineering@tualatin.gov>
Subject: Protect Tualatin Road

Dear City of Tualatin,

While researching the traffic impacts from Lam's TUX project, members of the community have discovered that Lam's proposal is not compatible with the Tualatin Comprehensive Plan 2040, and it would violate the Tualatin Development Code, both in spirit and letter.

For the reasons outlined below, we are asking the Tualatin Planning Department to consider Lam's proposed entrance on Tualatin Road to not be approvable, and we ask the City Manager to use her authority to have the proposed entrance removed from the TUX project site plan so that alternative access can be designed.

SITE CIRCULATION

Existing driveways provide sufficient access points to the Lam Campus as a whole. Lam currently has 6 other access points. 3 on 108th and 3 on Leveton Drive. Adding a new access point on Tualatin Road is unnecessary.

Lam is responsible for designing reasonable site circulation. A lack of good site circulation is not a valid reason to add an additional driveway onto the street network.

The Tualatin Comprehensive Plan 2040 strongly supports the use of existing access points, rather than creating new ones, especially when a new access point would have negative impacts to the community. "Consider transportation options that make the best use of the existing network" (Goal 8.7)

SPIRIT OF THE LAW

Tualatin Road is currently functioning as an arterial, it was previously classified as an arterial, and it has the traffic volume of an arterial. Leveton Drive is currently functioning as a collector, it was previously classified as a collector, and it has the current traffic volume of a collector.

During the 2012-14 TSP update, the functional classifications of these streets were reversed in a failed attempt by the city to reduce the amount of traffic on Tualatin Road and encourage more trips to use Leveton Drive. While we appreciate the intent of this reversal, the impact is now exactly opposite of what was intended, and we ask that this reversal be deemed a mistake. We ask the city to remedy this mistake by restoring the correct functional classifications to their appropriate streets. Lam should not be

allowed to rely on a classification error to put a new entrance on a road that, based on current conditions, should not have a new entrance.

If the streets were classified correctly, Lam Research would not be able to add an employee entrance on Tualatin Road because it would be an arterial. “No new driveways or streets on arterial roadways within the City, except where noted in the TDC, usually when no alternative access is available.” (TCP 2040 POLICY 8.10.1)

LETTER OF THE LAW

The Tualatin Development Code says “Lots that front on more than one street may be required to locate motor vehicle accesses on the street with the lower functional classification as determined by the City Manager.” TDC 75.040 (5) Currently the TSP shows 108th classified as a minor collector and Tualatin Road a major collector. Based on this, access should be provided from 108th not Tualatin Road.

Lam’s proposed entrance on Tualatin Road fails four of the new driveway approach criteria in TDC 75.020.5: "(d)(ii) Takes access from the lowest classification of street abutting the property … (g) The proposed driveway approach does not result in significant adverse impacts to the vicinity; (h) The proposed driveway approach minimizes impact to the functionality of adjacent streets and intersections; and (i) The proposed driveway approach balances the adverse impacts to residentially zoned property and the functionality of adjacent streets."

Tualatin Development Code 75.140.15 (a) grants the specific locations for Lam's three driveways on the north side of Leveton Drive. The applicant's proposal to relocate one of the three driveways is not compliant with the development code.

No matter which way you slice it, Tualatin Road is the worst option for carrying Lam’s new entrance and additional traffic volume. We ask the City Manager to use her discretion and require access from the most appropriate road which, by any metric, is Leveton Drive.

PROPOSED TRAFFIC SIGNAL

The proposed entrance on Tualatin Road would create the need for a new traffic signal on Tualatin Road which would have many negative impacts on the community. These impacts justify rejection of the proposed access. If Lam were to take access from Leveton Drive, no new traffic signal would be needed.

The community provided overwhelming feedback during the TSP update this summer about this issue and we asked that the proposed traffic signal be removed from the TSP. The city should take this feedback into account and "Conduct the planning process with adequate input and feedback from citizens in each affected neighborhood” (TCP 2040 Goal 8.7)

CONSIDER SAFETY

The Tualatin TSP Existing Conditions Report shows Tualatin Road and 115th Ave having higher Pedestrian Level of Traffic Stress than Leveton Drive and 108th Ave. (Figure 23) Adding more traffic to Tualatin Road and 115th Ave will degrade pedestrian safety even further.

Tualatin Road between 124th and 115th has higher concentration of collisions than Leveton and 108th, with a history of serious injury collision while Leveton does not. (Figure 31) Adding more traffic onto Tualatin Road and 115th will increase the traffic exposure and likely result in worse safety outcomes.

Tualatin Road has a history of collisions involving pedestrians and bicycles while Leveton and 108th do not. (Figure 32) Adding more traffic to Tualatin Road will likely make this safety issue worse.

Converting a driveway to full access or signalizing a driveway would likely increase traffic crashes. Per CMF ClearingHouse, changing driveway type to full access has a crash modification factor (CMF) of 2.25, and signalizing a driveway has a CMF of 3.98, which means that the two measures will likely increase traffic crashes by a factor of 2.25 and 3.98 respectively.

Lam's traffic study also does not identify the locations of school bus routes at Hazelbrook Middle School or the potential impacts to school bus traffic. Student safety is one of the most important issues in our community, but so far it has been ignored in this process.

Also, the safety and congestion impacts from Lam's proposal would be most concentrated on Tualatin Road between 115th and 124th which abuts a residential area with traditionally disadvantaged demographics and income limited apartments. This is not equitable.

BYPASS ROUTE

The route from Hazelbrook Road going west and turning right onto Hwy 99W is a "hidden" route that can bypass the traffic congestion at the west end of Tualatin Road. Adding a signal at 115th and Tualatin Road will encourage more cars to take this bypass. The potential impact of this new traffic pattern imposes significant safety concerns to communities all along the route. These impacts were not addressed in the traffic study.

SUMMARY

We urge the city to consider all the above concerns and require the applicant (Lam) to revise their site development plan accordingly. We believe that the current proposal does not meet Tualatin's planning rules, and that the City Manager should use her authority to bring Lam's proposal into compliance. No new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank You.

Stephanie Melton

Resident of Fox Run Neighborhood

From: Michelle Stevie <michelleystevie@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 19, 2024 5:37 PM
To: Ext - Planning
Subject: LAM Proposed new entry off Tualatin Rd

Dear City of Tualatin,

While researching the traffic impacts from Lam's TUX project, members of the community have discovered that Lam's proposal is not compatible with the Tualatin Comprehensive Plan 2040, and it would violate the Tualatin Development Code, both in spirit and letter.

For the reasons outlined below, we are asking the Tualatin Planning Department to consider Lam's proposed entrance on Tualatin Road to not be approvable, and we ask the City Manager to use her authority to have the proposed entrance removed from the TUX project site plan so that alternative access can be designed.

SITE CIRCULATION

Existing driveways provide sufficient access points to the Lam Campus as a whole. Lam currently has 6 other access points. 3 on 108th and 3 on Leveton Drive. Adding a new access point on Tualatin Road is unnecessary.

Lam is responsible for designing reasonable site circulation. A lack of good site circulation is not a valid reason to add an additional driveway onto the street network.

The Tualatin Comprehensive Plan 2040 strongly supports the use of existing access points, rather than creating new ones, especially when a new access point would have negative impacts to the community. "Consider transportation options that make the best use of the existing network" (Goal 8.7)

SPIRIT OF THE LAW

Tualatin Road is currently functioning as an arterial, it was previously classified as an arterial, and it has the traffic volume of an arterial. Leveton Drive is currently functioning as a collector, it was previously classified as a collector, and it has the current traffic volume of a collector.

During the 2012-14 TSP update, the functional classifications of these streets were reversed in a failed attempt by the city to reduce the amount of traffic on Tualatin Road and encourage more trips to use Leveton Drive. While we appreciate the intent of this reversal, the impact is now exactly opposite of what was intended, and we ask that this reversal be deemed a mistake. We ask the city to remedy this mistake by restoring the correct functional classifications to their appropriate streets. Lam should not be allowed to rely on a classification error to put a new entrance on a road that, based on current conditions, should not have a new entrance.

If the streets were classified correctly, Lam Research would not be able to add an employee

entrance on Tualatin Road because it would be an arterial. “No new driveways or streets on arterial roadways within the City, except where noted in the TDC, usually when no alternative access is available.” (TCP 2040 POLICY 8.10.1)

LETTER OF THE LAW

The Tualatin Development Code says “Lots that front on more than one street may be required to locate motor vehicle accesses on the street with the lower functional classification as determined by the City Manager.” TDC 75.040 (5) Currently the TSP shows 108th classified as a minor collector and Tualatin Road a major collector. Based on this, access should be provided from 108th not Tualatin Road.

Lam’s proposed entrance on Tualatin Road fails four of the new driveway approach criteria in TDC 75.020.5: "(d)(ii) Takes access from the lowest classification of street abutting the property … (g) The proposed driveway approach does not result in significant adverse impacts to the vicinity; (h) The proposed driveway approach minimizes impact to the functionality of adjacent streets and intersections; and (i) The proposed driveway approach balances the adverse impacts to residentially zoned property and the functionality of adjacent streets."

Tualatin Development Code 75.140.15 (a) grants the specific locations for Lam's three driveways on the north side of Leveton Drive. The applicant's proposal to relocate one of the three driveways is not compliant with the development code.

No matter which way you slice it, Tualatin Road is the worst option for carrying Lam’s new entrance and additional traffic volume. We ask the City Manager to use her discretion and require access from the most appropriate road which, by any metric, is Leveton Drive.

PROPOSED TRAFFIC SIGNAL

The proposed entrance on Tualatin Road would create the need for a new traffic signal on Tualatin Road which would have many negative impacts on the community. These impacts justify rejection of the proposed access. If Lam were to take access from Leveton Drive, no new traffic signal would be needed.

The community provided overwhelming feedback during the TSP update this summer about this issue and we asked that the proposed traffic signal be removed from the TSP. The city should take this feedback into account and "Conduct the planning process with adequate input and feedback from citizens in each affected neighborhood” (TCP 2040 Goal 8.7)

CONSIDER SAFETY

The Tualatin TSP Existing Conditions Report shows Tualatin Road and 115th Ave having higher Pedestrian Level of Traffic Stress than Leveton Drive and 108th Ave. (Figure 23) Adding more traffic to Tualatin Road and 115th Ave will degrade pedestrian safety even further.

Tualatin Road between 124th and 115th has higher concentration of collisions than Leveton and

108th, with a history of serious injury collision while Leveton does not. (Figure 31) Adding more traffic onto Tualatin Road and 115th will increase the traffic exposure and likely result in worse safety outcomes.

Tualatin Road has a history of collisions involving pedestrians and bicycles while Leveton and 108th do not. (Figure 32) Adding more traffic to Tualatin Road will likely make this safety issue worse.

Converting a driveway to full access or signalizing a driveway would likely increase traffic crashes. Per CMF ClearingHouse, changing driveway type to full access has a crash modification factor (CMF) of 2.25, and signalizing a driveway has a CMF of 3.98, which means that the two measures will likely increase traffic crashes by a factor of 2.25 and 3.98 respectively.

Lam's traffic study also does not identify the locations of school bus routes at Hazelbrook Middle School or the potential impacts to school bus traffic. Student safety is one of the most important issues in our community, but so far it has been ignored in this process.

Also, the safety and congestion impacts from Lam's proposal would be most concentrated on Tualatin Road between 115th and 124th which abuts a residential area with traditionally disadvantaged demographics and income limited apartments. This is not equitable.

BYPASS ROUTE

The route from Hazelbrook Road going west and turning right onto Hwy 99W is a "hidden" route that can bypass the traffic congestion at the west end of Tualatin Road. Adding a signal at 115th and Tualatin Road will encourage more cars to take this bypass. The potential impact of this new traffic pattern imposes significant safety concerns to communities all along the route. These impacts were not addressed in the traffic study.

SUMMARY

We urge the city to consider all the above concerns and require the applicant (Lam) to revise their site development plan accordingly. We believe that the current proposal does not meet Tualatin's planning rules, and that the City Manager should use her authority to bring Lam's proposal into compliance. No new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for hearing your constituents' concerns and taking the time to ensure the best decision is made in this matter.

MIchelle Stevie, Concerned Tualatin Resident

From: Lalaina Serres <lalaina.serres@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 25, 2024 2:47 PM
To: Ext - Engineering Exterrnal Email
Cc: Ext - Planning; Council
Subject: Tualatin Roads

Dear City of Tualatin,

While researching the traffic impacts from Lam's TUX project, members of the community have discovered that Lam's proposal is not compatible with the Tualatin Comprehensive Plan 2040, and it would violate the Tualatin Development Code, both in spirit and letter.

For the reasons outlined below, we are asking the Tualatin Planning Department to consider Lam's proposed entrance on Tualatin Road to not be approvable, and we ask the City Manager to use her authority to have the proposed entrance removed from the TUX project site plan so that alternative access can be designed.

SITE CIRCULATION

Existing driveways provide sufficient access points to the Lam Campus as a whole. Lam currently has 6 other access points. 3 on 108th and 3 on Leveton Drive. Adding a new access point on Tualatin Road is unnecessary.

Lam is responsible for designing reasonable site circulation. A lack of good site circulation is not a valid reason to add an additional driveway onto the street network.

The Tualatin Comprehensive Plan 2040 strongly supports the use of existing access points, rather than creating new ones, especially when a new access point would have negative impacts to the community. "Consider transportation options that make the best use of the existing network" (Goal 8.7)

SPIRIT OF THE LAW

Tualatin Road is currently functioning as an arterial, it was previously classified as an arterial, and it has the traffic volume of an arterial. Leveton Drive is currently functioning as a collector, it was previously classified as a collector, and it has the current traffic volume of a collector.

During the 2012-14 TSP update, the functional classifications of these streets were reversed in a failed attempt by the city to reduce the amount of traffic on Tualatin Road and encourage more trips to use Leveton Drive. While we appreciate the intent of this reversal, the impact is now exactly opposite of what was intended, and we ask that this reversal be deemed a mistake. We ask the city to remedy this mistake by restoring the correct functional classifications to their appropriate streets. Lam should not be allowed

to rely on a classification error to put a new entrance on a road that, based on current conditions, should not have a new entrance.

If the streets were classified correctly, Lam Research would not be able to add an employee entrance on Tualatin Road because it would be an arterial. "No new driveways or streets on arterial roadways within the City, except where noted in the TDC, usually when no alternative access is available." (TCP 2040 POLICY 8.10.1)

LETTER OF THE LAW

The Tualatin Development Code says "Lots that front on more than one street may be required to locate motor vehicle accesses on the street with the lower functional classification as determined by the City Manager." TDC 75.040 (5) Currently the TSP shows 108th classified as a minor collector and Tualatin Road a major collector. Based on this, access should be provided from 108th not Tualatin Road.

Lam's proposed entrance on Tualatin Road fails four of the new driveway approach criteria in TDC 75.020.5: "(d)(ii) Takes access from the lowest classification of street abutting the property … (g) The proposed driveway approach does not result in significant adverse impacts to the vicinity; (h) The proposed driveway approach minimizes impact to the functionality of adjacent streets and intersections; and (i) The proposed driveway approach balances the adverse impacts to residentially zoned property and the functionality of adjacent streets."

Tualatin Development Code 75.140.15 (a) grants the specific locations for Lam's three driveways on the north side of Leveton Drive. The applicant's proposal to relocate one of the three driveways is not compliant with the development code.

No matter which way you slice it, Tualatin Road is the worst option for carrying Lam's new entrance and additional traffic volume. We ask the City Manager to use her discretion and require access from the most appropriate road which, by any metric, is Leveton Drive.

PROPOSED TRAFFIC SIGNAL

The proposed entrance on Tualatin Road would create the need for a new traffic signal on Tualatin Road which would have many negative impacts on the community. These impacts justify rejection of the proposed access. If Lam were to take access from Leveton Drive, no new traffic signal would be needed.

The community provided overwhelming feedback during the TSP update this summer about this issue and we asked that the proposed traffic signal be removed from the TSP. The city should take this feedback into account and "Conduct the planning process with adequate input and feedback from citizens in each affected neighborhood" (TCP 2040 Goal 8.7)

CONSIDER SAFETY

The Tualatin TSP Existing Conditions Report shows Tualatin Road and 115th Ave having higher Pedestrian Level of Traffic Stress than Leveton Drive and 108th Ave. (Figure 23) Adding more traffic to Tualatin Road and 115th Ave will degrade pedestrian safety even further.

Tualatin Road between 124th and 115th has higher concentration of collisions than Leveton and 108th, with a history of serious injury collision while Leveton does not. (Figure 31) Adding more traffic onto Tualatin Road and 115th will increase the traffic exposure and likely result in worse safety outcomes.

Tualatin Road has a history of collisions involving pedestrians and bicycles while Leveton and 108th do not. (Figure 32) Adding more traffic to Tualatin Road will likely make this safety issue worse.

Converting a driveway to full access or signalizing a driveway would likely increase traffic crashes. Per CMF ClearingHouse, changing driveway type to full access has a crash modification factor (CMF) of 2.25, and signalizing a driveway has a CMF of 3.98, which means that the two measures will likely increase traffic crashes by a factor of 2.25 and 3.98 respectively.

Lam's traffic study also does not identify the locations of school bus routes at Hazelbrook Middle School or the potential impacts to school bus traffic. Student safety is one of the most important issues in our community, but so far it has been ignored in this process.

Also, the safety and congestion impacts from Lam's proposal would be most concentrated on Tualatin Road between 115th and 124th which abuts a residential area with traditionally disadvantaged demographics and income limited apartments. This is not equitable.

BYPASS ROUTE

The route from Hazelbrook Road going west and turning right onto Hwy 99W is a "hidden" route that can bypass the traffic congestion at the west end of Tualatin Road. Adding a signal at 115th and Tualatin Road will encourage more cars to take this bypass. The potential impact of this new traffic pattern imposes significant safety concerns to communities all along the route. These impacts were not addressed in the traffic study.

SUMMARY

We urge the city to consider all the above concerns and require the applicant (Lam) to revise their site development plan accordingly. We believe that the current proposal does not meet Tualatin's planning rules, and that the City Manager should use her authority to bring Lam's proposal into compliance. No new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank You.

From: RCB <g4rl1c5@proton.me>
Sent: Friday, December 27, 2024 3:04 PM
To: Council; Ext - Planning; Ext - Engineering Exterrnal Email
Subject: Lam - City Code Concerns - Save Tualatin Road

Dear City of Tualatin,

While researching the traffic impacts from Lam's TUX project, members of the community have discovered that Lam's proposal is not compatible with the Tualatin Comprehensive Plan 2040, and it would violate the Tualatin Development Code, both in spirit and letter.

For the reasons outlined below, we are asking the Tualatin Planning Department to consider Lam's proposed entrance on Tualatin Road to not be approvable, and we ask the City Manager to use her authority to have the proposed entrance removed from the TUX project site plan so that alternative access can be designed.

SITE CIRCULATION

Existing driveways provide sufficient access points to the Lam Campus as a whole. Lam currently has 6 other access points. 3 on 108th and 3 on Leveton Drive. Adding a new access point on Tualatin Road is unnecessary.

Lam is responsible for designing reasonable site circulation. A lack of good site circulation is not a valid reason to add an additional driveway onto the street network.

The Tualatin Comprehensive Plan 2040 strongly supports the use of existing access points, rather than creating new ones, especially when a new access point would have negative impacts to the community. "Consider transportation options that make the best use of the existing network" (Goal 8.7)

SPIRIT OF THE LAW

Tualatin Road is currently functioning as an arterial, it was previously classified as an arterial, and it has the traffic volume of an arterial. Leveton Drive is currently functioning as a collector, it was previously classified as a collector, and it has the current traffic volume of a collector.

During the 2012-14 TSP update, the functional classifications of these streets were reversed in a failed attempt by the city to reduce the amount of traffic on Tualatin Road and encourage more trips to use Leveton Drive. While we appreciate the intent of this reversal, the impact is now exactly opposite of what was intended, and we ask that this reversal be deemed a mistake. We ask the city to remedy this mistake by restoring the correct functional classifications to their appropriate streets. Lam should not be allowed to rely on a classification error to put a new entrance on a road that, based on current conditions, should not have a new entrance.

If the streets were classified correctly, Lam Research would not be able to add an employee entrance on Tualatin Road because it would be an arterial. "No new driveways or streets on arterial roadways within the City, except where noted in the TDC, usually when no alternative access is available." (TCP 2040 POLICY 8.10.1)

LETTER OF THE LAW

The Tualatin Development Code says “Lots that front on more than one street may be required to locate motor vehicle accesses on the street with the lower functional classification as determined by the City Manager.” TDC 75.040 (5) Currently the TSP shows 108th classified as a minor collector and Tualatin Road a major collector. Based on this, access should be provided from 108th not Tualatin Road.

Lam’s proposed entrance on Tualatin Road fails four of the new driveway approach criteria in TDC 75.020.5: "(d)(ii) Takes access from the lowest classification of street abutting the property … (g) The proposed driveway approach does not result in significant adverse impacts to the vicinity; (h) The proposed driveway approach minimizes impact to the functionality of adjacent streets and intersections; and (i) The proposed driveway approach balances the adverse impacts to residentially zoned property and the functionality of adjacent streets."

Tualatin Development Code 75.140.15 (a) grants the specific locations for Lam's three driveways on the north side of Leveton Drive. The applicant's proposal to relocate one of the three driveways is not compliant with the development code.

No matter which way you slice it, Tualatin Road is the worst option for carrying Lam’s new entrance and additional traffic volume. We ask the City Manager to use her discretion and require access from the most appropriate road which, by any metric, is Leveton Drive.

PROPOSED TRAFFIC SIGNAL

The proposed entrance on Tualatin Road would create the need for a new traffic signal on Tualatin Road which would have many negative impacts on the community. These impacts justify rejection of the proposed access. If Lam were to take access from Leveton Drive, no new traffic signal would be needed.

The community provided overwhelming feedback during the TSP update this summer about this issue and we asked that the proposed traffic signal be removed from the TSP. The city should take this feedback into account and "Conduct the planning process with adequate input and feedback from citizens in each affected neighborhood” (TCP 2040 Goal 8.7)

CONSIDER SAFETY

The Tualatin TSP Existing Conditions Report shows Tualatin Road and 115th Ave having higher Pedestrian Level of Traffic Stress than Leveton Drive and 108th Ave. (Figure 23) Adding more traffic to Tualatin Road and 115th Ave will degrade pedestrian safety even further.

Tualatin Road between 124th and 115th has higher concentration of collisions than Leveton and 108th, with a history of serious injury collision while Leveton does not. (Figure 31) Adding more traffic onto Tualatin Road and 115th will increase the traffic exposure and likely result in worse safety outcomes.

Tualatin Road has a history of collisions involving pedestrians and bicycles while Leveton and 108th do not. (Figure 32) Adding more traffic to Tualatin Road will likely make this safety issue worse.

Converting a driveway to full access or signalizing a driveway would likely increase traffic crashes. Per CMF ClearingHouse, changing driveway type to full access has a crash modification factor (CMF) of 2.25, and signalizing a driveway has a CMF of 3.98, which means that the two measures will likely increase traffic crashes by a factor of 2.25 and 3.98 respectively.

Lam’s traffic study also does not identify the locations of school bus routes at Hazelbrook Middle School or the potential impacts to school bus traffic. Student safety is one of the most important issues in our community, but so far it has been ignored in this process.

Also, the safety and congestion impacts from Lam’s proposal would be most concentrated on Tualatin Road between 115th and 124th which abuts a residential area with traditionally disadvantaged demographics and income limited apartments. This is not equitable.

BYPASS ROUTE

The route from Hazelbrook Road going west and turning right onto Hwy 99W is a "hidden" route that can bypass the traffic congestion at the west end of Tualatin Road. Adding a signal at 115th and Tualatin Road will encourage more cars to take this bypass. The potential impact of this new traffic pattern imposes significant safety concerns to communities all along the route. These impacts were not addressed in the traffic study.

SUMMARY

We urge the city to consider all the above concerns and require the applicant (Lam) to revise their site development plan accordingly. We believe that the current proposal does not meet Tualatin’s planning rules, and that the City Manager should use her authority to bring Lam’s proposal into compliance. No new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank You.

Riley Bartel - Citizen of Tualatin

From: T. Carrasco <tntand@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 15, 2025 11:37 AM
To: Council; Ext - Planning; Ext - Engineering Exterrnal Email
Cc: len carrasco
Subject: Tualatin Rd traffic, etc

Dear City of Tualatin

LAM's TUX project proposal would violate the Tualatin Development Code, both in spirit and letter.

Wer'e asking the Tualatin Planning Department to consider **Lam's proposed entrance on Tualatin Road to NOT BE APPROVED**, and City Manager use authority to removed the proposed Tualatin Rd. entrance from the TUX project site plan so that alternative access can be designed.

SITE CIRCULATION

Existing driveways provide sufficient access points to the LAM Campus as a whole. LAM currently has 6 other access points. 3 on 108th and 3 on Leveton Drive. **Adding a new access point on Tualatin Road is unnecessary and will be deleterious to Tualatin residents**. This would not be in line with LAM's mission to **Act with purpose for a better world.**

Lam is responsible for designing reasonable site circulation. A lack of good site circulation is not a valid reason to add an additional driveway onto the street network.

Tualatin Road is currently functioning as an arterial, it was previously classified as an arterial, and it has the traffic volume of an arterial. Leveton Drive is currently functioning as a collector, it

was previously classified as a collector, and it has the current traffic volume of a collector.

We ask the **city to remedy mistaken reclassifications of Tualatin Rd**. and Leveton by restoring the correct functional classifications to their appropriate streets. LAM should not be allowed to rely on a classification error to put a new entrance on a road that, based on current conditions, should not have a new entrance.

If the streets were classified correctly, LAM research would not be able to add an employee entrance on Tualatin Road because it would be an arterial. "**No new driveways or streets on arterial roadways** within the City, except where noted in the TDC, usually when no alternative access is available." (TCP 2040 POLICY 8.10.1)

We urge the city to consider all the above concerns and require the applicant (LAM) to revise their site development plan accordingly. We believe that the current proposal does not meet Tualatin's planning rules, and that the City Manager should bring LAM's proposal into compliance. No new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Please update all residents about these decisions and continue to represent us completely. Thank You for consideration of these many requests by the citizens of Tualatin.

Toni and Leonard Carrasco

17790 SW Cheyenne Way

Tualatin 97062

cc: Several Neighbors (PLEASE SHARE with other neighbors on your street and reply all with comments)

From: Kristen McCormick <sushik10@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 16, 2025 7:12 PM
To: Council; Ext - Planning; Ext - Engineering Exterrnal Email
Subject: Save Tualatin Road!

December 16, 2024

To: Tualatin City Council council@tualatin.gov
To: Tualatin Planning Department planning@tualatin.gov
To: Tualatin Engineering Department engineering@tualatin.gov

Dear City of Tualatin,

While researching the traffic impacts from Lam's TUX project, members of the community have discovered that Lam's proposal is not compatible with the Tualatin Comprehensive Plan 2040, and it would violate the Tualatin Development Code, both in spirit and letter.

For the reasons outlined below, we are asking the Tualatin Planning Department to consider Lam's proposed entrance on Tualatin Road to not be approvable, and we ask the City Manager to use her authority to have the proposed entrance removed from the TUX project site plan so that alternative access can be designed.

SITE CIRCULATION

Existing driveways provide sufficient access points to the Lam Campus as a whole. Lam currently has 6 other access points. 3 on 108th and 3 on Leveton Drive. Adding a new access point on Tualatin Road is unnecessary.

Lam is responsible for designing reasonable site circulation. A lack of good site circulation is not a valid reason to add an additional driveway onto the street network.

The Tualatin Comprehensive Plan 2040 strongly supports the use of existing access points, rather than creating new ones, especially when a new access point would have negative impacts to the community. "Consider transportation options that make the best use of the existing network" (Goal 8.7)

SPIRIT OF THE LAW

Tualatin Road is currently functioning as an arterial, it was previously classified as an arterial, and it has the traffic volume of an arterial. Leveton Drive is currently functioning as a collector, it was previously classified as a collector, and it has the current traffic volume of a collector.

During the 2012-14 TSP update, the functional classifications of these streets were reversed in a failed attempt by the city to reduce the amount of traffic on Tualatin Road and encourage more trips to use Leveton Drive. While we appreciate the intent of this reversal, the impact is now

exactly opposite of what was intended, and we ask that this reversal be deemed a mistake. We ask the city to remedy this mistake by restoring the correct functional classifications to their appropriate streets. Lam should not be allowed to rely on a classification error to put a new entrance on a road that, based on current conditions, should not have a new entrance.

If the streets were classified correctly, Lam Research would not be able to add an employee entrance on Tualatin Road because it would be an arterial. “No new driveways or streets on arterial roadways within the City, except where noted in the TDC, usually when no alternative access is available.” (TCP 2040 POLICY 8.10.1)

LETTER OF THE LAW

The Tualatin Development Code says “Lots that front on more than one street may be required to locate motor vehicle accesses on the street with the lower functional classification as determined by the City Manager.” TDC 75.040 (5) Currently the TSP shows 108th classified as a minor collector and Tualatin Road a major collector. Based on this, access should be provided from 108th not Tualatin Road.

Lam’s proposed entrance on Tualatin Road fails four of the new driveway approach criteria in TDC 75.020.5: "(d)(ii) Takes access from the lowest classification of street abutting the property … (g) The proposed driveway approach does not result in significant adverse impacts to the vicinity; (h) The proposed driveway approach minimizes impact to the functionality of adjacent streets and intersections; and (i) The proposed driveway approach balances the adverse impacts to residentially zoned property and the functionality of adjacent streets."

Tualatin Development Code 75.140.15 (a) grants the specific locations for Lam's three driveways on the north side of Leveton Drive. The applicant's proposal to relocate one of the three driveways is not compliant with the development code.

No matter which way you slice it, Tualatin Road is the worst option for carrying Lam’s new entrance and additional traffic volume. We ask the City Manager to use her discretion and require access from the most appropriate road which, by any metric, is Leveton Drive.

PROPOSED TRAFFIC SIGNAL

The proposed entrance on Tualatin Road would create the need for a new traffic signal on Tualatin Road which would have many negative impacts on the community. These impacts justify rejection of the proposed access. If Lam were to take access from Leveton Drive, no new traffic signal would be needed.

The community provided overwhelming feedback during the TSP update this summer about this issue and we asked that the proposed traffic signal be removed from the TSP. The city should take this feedback into account and "Conduct the planning process with adequate input and feedback from citizens in each affected neighborhood” (TCP 2040 Goal 8.7)

CONSIDER SAFETY

The Tualatin TSP Existing Conditions Report shows Tualatin Road and 115th Ave having higher Pedestrian Level of Traffic Stress than Leveton Drive and 108th Ave. (Figure 23) Adding more traffic to Tualatin Road and 115th Ave will degrade pedestrian safety even further.

Tualatin Road between 124th and 115th has higher concentration of collisions than Leveton and 108th, with a history of serious injury collision while Leveton does not. (Figure 31) Adding more traffic onto Tualatin Road and 115th will increase the traffic exposure and likely result in worse safety outcomes.

Tualatin Road has a history of collisions involving pedestrians and bicycles while Leveton and 108th do not. (Figure 32) Adding more traffic to Tualatin Road will likely make this safety issue worse.

Converting a driveway to full access or signalizing a driveway would likely increase traffic crashes. Per CMF ClearingHouse, changing driveway type to full access has a crash modification factor (CMF) of 2.25, and signalizing a driveway has a CMF of 3.98, which means that the two measures will likely increase traffic crashes by a factor of 2.25 and 3.98 respectively.

Lam's traffic study also does not identify the locations of school bus routes at Hazelbrook Middle School or the potential impacts to school bus traffic. Student safety is one of the most important issues in our community, but so far it has been ignored in this process.

Also, the safety and congestion impacts from Lam's proposal would be most concentrated on Tualatin Road between 115th and 124th which abuts a residential area with traditionally disadvantaged demographics and income limited apartments. This is not equitable.

BYPASS ROUTE

The route from Hazelbrook Road going west and turning right onto Hwy 99W is a "hidden" route that can bypass the traffic congestion at the west end of Tualatin Road. Adding a signal at 115th and Tualatin Road will encourage more cars to take this bypass. The potential impact of this new traffic pattern imposes significant safety concerns to communities all along the route. These impacts were not addressed in the traffic study.

SUMMARY

We urge the city to consider all the above concerns and require the applicant (Lam) to revise their site development plan accordingly. We believe that the current proposal does not meet Tualatin's planning rules, and that the City Manager should use her authority to bring Lam's proposal into compliance. No new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank You

Kristen McCormick

From: jfurnash@protonmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, January 21, 2025 8:34 PM
To: Ext - Planning
Subject: Tualatin road



Dear City of Tualatin,

While researching the traffic impacts from Lam's TUX project, members of the community have discovered that Lam's proposal is not compatible with the Tualatin Comprehensive Plan 2040, and it would violate the Tualatin Development Code, both in spirit and letter.

For the reasons outlined below, we are asking the Tualatin Planning Department to consider Lam's proposed entrance on Tualatin Road to not be approvable, and we ask the City Manager to use her authority to have the proposed entrance removed from the TUX project site plan so that alternative access can be designed.

SITE CIRCULATION

Existing driveways provide sufficient access points to the Lam Campus as a whole. Lam currently has 6 other access points. 3 on 108th and 3 on Leveton Drive. Adding a new access point on Tualatin Road is unnecessary.

Lam is responsible for designing reasonable site circulation. A lack of good site circulation is not a valid reason to add an additional driveway onto the street network.

The Tualatin Comprehensive Plan 2040 strongly supports the use of existing access points, rather than creating new ones, especially when a new access point would have negative impacts to the community. "Consider transportation options that make the best use of the existing network" (Goal 8.7)

SPIRIT OF THE LAW

Tualatin Road is currently functioning as an arterial, it was previously classified as an arterial, and it has the traffic volume of an arterial. Leveton Drive is currently functioning as a collector, it was previously classified as a collector, and it has the current traffic volume of a collector.

During the 2012-14 TSP update, the functional classifications of these streets were reversed in a failed attempt by the city to reduce the amount of traffic on Tualatin Road and encourage more trips to use Leveton Drive. While we appreciate the intent of this reversal, the impact is now exactly opposite of what was intended, and we ask that this reversal be deemed a mistake. We ask the city to remedy this mistake by restoring the correct functional classifications to their appropriate streets. Lam should not be allowed to rely on a classification error to put a new entrance on a road that, based on current conditions, should not have a new entrance.

If the streets were classified correctly, Lam Research would not be able to add an employee entrance on Tualatin Road because it would be an arterial. “No new driveways or streets on arterial roadways within the City, except where noted in the TDC, usually when no alternative access is available.” (TCP 2040 POLICY 8.10.1)

LETTER OF THE LAW

The Tualatin Development Code says “Lots that front on more than one street may be required to locate motor vehicle accesses on the street with the lower functional classification as determined by the City Manager.” TDC 75.040 (5) Currently the TSP shows 108th classified as a minor collector and Tualatin Road a major collector. Based on this, access should be provided from 108th not Tualatin Road.

Lam’s proposed entrance on Tualatin Road fails four of the new driveway approach criteria in TDC 75.020.5: "(d)(ii) Takes access from the lowest classification of street abutting the property … (g) The proposed driveway approach does not result in significant adverse impacts to the vicinity; (h) The proposed driveway approach minimizes impact to the functionality of adjacent streets and intersections; and (i) The proposed driveway approach balances the adverse impacts to residentially zoned property and the functionality of adjacent streets."

Tualatin Development Code 75.140.15 (a) grants the specific locations for Lam's three driveways on the north side of Leveton Drive. The applicant's proposal to relocate one of the three driveways is not compliant with the development code.

No matter which way you slice it, Tualatin Road is the worst option for carrying Lam’s new entrance and additional traffic volume. We ask the City Manager to use her discretion and require access from the most appropriate road which, by any metric, is Leveton Drive.

PROPOSED TRAFFIC SIGNAL

The proposed entrance on Tualatin Road would create the need for a new traffic signal on Tualatin Road which would have many negative impacts on the community. These impacts justify rejection of the proposed access. If Lam were to take access from Leveton Drive, no new traffic signal would be needed.

The community provided overwhelming feedback during the TSP update this summer about this issue and we asked that the proposed traffic signal be removed from the TSP. The city should

take this feedback into account and "Conduct the planning process with adequate input and feedback from citizens in each affected neighborhood" (TCP 2040 Goal 8.7)

CONSIDER SAFETY

The Tualatin TSP Existing Conditions Report shows Tualatin Road and 115th Ave having higher Pedestrian Level of Traffic Stress than Leveton Drive and 108th Ave. (Figure 23) Adding more traffic to Tualatin Road and 115th Ave will degrade pedestrian safety even further.

Tualatin Road between 124th and 115th has higher concentration of collisions than Leveton and 108th, with a history of serious injury collision while Leveton does not. (Figure 31) Adding more traffic onto Tualatin Road and 115th will increase the traffic exposure and likely result in worse safety outcomes.

Tualatin Road has a history of collisions involving pedestrians and bicycles while Leveton and 108th do not. (Figure 32) Adding more traffic to Tualatin Road will likely make this safety issue worse.

Converting a driveway to full access or signalizing a driveway would likely increase traffic crashes. Per CMF ClearingHouse, changing driveway type to full access has a crash modification factor (CMF) of 2.25, and signalizing a driveway has a CMF of 3.98, which means that the two measures will likely increase traffic crashes by a factor of 2.25 and 3.98 respectively.

Lam's traffic study also does not identify the locations of school bus routes at Hazelbrook Middle School or the potential impacts to school bus traffic. Student safety is one of the most important issues in our community, but so far it has been ignored in this process.

Also, the safety and congestion impacts from Lam's proposal would be most concentrated on Tualatin Road between 115th and 124th which abuts a residential area with traditionally disadvantaged demographics and income limited apartments. This is not equitable.

BYPASS ROUTE

The route from Hazelbrook Road going west and turning right onto Hwy 99W is a "hidden" route that can bypass the traffic congestion at the west end of Tualatin Road. Adding a signal at 115th and Tualatin Road will encourage more cars to take this bypass. The potential impact of this new traffic pattern imposes significant safety concerns to communities all along the route. These impacts were not addressed in the traffic study.

SUMMARY

We urge the city to consider all the above concerns and require the applicant (Lam) to revise their site development plan accordingly. We believe that the current proposal does not meet Tualatin's planning rules, and that the City Manager should use her authority to bring Lam's proposal into compliance. No new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank You

From: Brett Hamilton <brett@simple.be>
Sent: Wednesday, January 29, 2025 8:25 AM
To: Council; Ext - Planning; Ext - Engineering Exterrnal Email
Cc: Sherilyn Lombos; Megan George; Steve Koper; Keith Leonard; Mike McCarthy
Subject: CIO Notice Requirement

Dear City of Tualatin,

A review of project documents reveals that Mackenzie/Lam did not notify any CIO representatives prior to the June 2024 neighborhood developer meeting, as required by Tualatin Development Code 32.120.5 (b)(iii). The code requires an applicant to send notice to CIO representatives via First Class Mail at least 14 days *before* the neighborhood developer meeting. This requirement was not met at the time, nor can it be met retroactively.

Lam and Mackenzie have been through the Tualatin land use review process before and they know the requirements. In 2022, Suzannah Stanley, Mackenzie Planner, demonstrated that she is very familiar with the CIO notification section. On pages 29-32 of Lam's IMP 22-0001 application, Ms. Stanley is on the record arguing that this notice requirement does not apply to Lam:

"We did not contact any City-recognized CIOs.
Please use this statement in your completeness checklist."
(Page 29) http://www.tualatinroad.org/files/LAM2022081201.pdf

If the City of Tualatin allows Mackenzie and Lam to repeatedly and flagrantly violate notice requirements, the legitimacy of the CIO program will be compromised.

At the June neighborhood developer meeting, Mackenzie said that "the project team is open to continue discussing topics of concern with neighbors" (see meeting minutes #13) however, repeated attempts by the community to open a dialogue with Lam and Mackenzie have been met with refusal and stonewalling. Lam's Chief Communication Officer, Steve Fine, clarified their position in his November 2024 email:

"We are committed to following the City's process to finalize a plan for our project that works for the City, the community, and Lam. In keeping with this approach, please address future communications about traffic considerations to the City of Tualatin."

Because Mackenzie and Lam have not followed proper notice procedure, we hereby ask the City of Tualatin to deny Lam's current land use application so that the applicant can reset and start over.

Thank you for your consideration.

-Brett Hamilton

From: Hazen Hyland <hazenhyland@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, January 29, 2025 8:06 AM

To: Ext - Planning

Subject: LAM

Dear City of Tualatin,

A review of project documents reveals that Mackenzie/Lam did not notify any CIO representatives prior to the June 2024 neighborhood developer meeting, as required by Tualatin Development Code 32.120.5 (b)(iii). The code requires an applicant to send notice to CIO representatives via First Class Mail at least 14 days *before* the neighborhood developer meeting. This requirement was not met at the time, nor can it be met retroactively.

Lam and Mackenzie have been through the Tualatin land use review process before and they know the requirements. In 2022, Suzannah Stanley, Mackenzie Planner, demonstrated that she is very familiar with the CIO notification section. On pages 29-32 of Lam's IMP 22-0001 application, Ms. Stanley is on the record arguing that this notice requirement does not apply to Lam:

"We did not contact any City-recognized CIOs.
Please use this statement in your completeness checklist."
(Page 29) http://www.tualatinroad.org/files/LAM2022081201.pdf

If the City of Tualatin allows Mackenzie and Lam to repeatedly and flagrantly violate notice requirements, the legitimacy of the CIO program will be compromised.

At the June neighborhood developer meeting, Mackenzie said that "the project team is open to continue discussing topics of concern with neighbors" (see meeting minutes #13) however, repeated attempts by the community to open a dialogue with Lam and Mackenzie have been met with refusal and stonewalling. Lam's Chief Communication Officer, Steve Fine, clarified their position in his November 2024 email:

"We are committed to following the City's process to finalize a plan for our project that works for the City, the community, and Lam. In keeping with this approach, please address future communications about traffic considerations to the City of Tualatin."

Because Mackenzie and Lam have not followed proper notice procedure, we hereby ask the City of Tualatin to deny Lam's current land use application so that the applicant can reset and start over.

Thank you for your consideration.

Hazen Hyland

From: Brett Hamilton <brett@simple.be>
Sent: Wednesday, January 29, 2025 9:02 AM
To: Keith Leonard
Subject: Re: CIO Notice Requirement
Attachments: LAM2024110701.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Thanks Keith,

I would also like to add to the record, my October 2024 email to Lam CEO Tim Archer, and the November 2024 response from Lam's Chief Communication Officer Steve Fine (attached together)

-Brett Hamilton

> On Jan 29, 2025, at 8:25 AM, Keith Leonard <kleonard@tualatin.gov> wrote:
>
> Good morning Brett,
>
> Thank you for providing additional comments pertaining to the Lam TUX application. I have added these comments to the public record. Thank you for participating in the public process. Have a good day.
>
> **Keith Leonard, AICP**
> Associate Planner
> **Phone**: 503.691.3029
>
> ---
>
> **From:** Brett Hamilton <brett@simple.be>
> **Sent:** Wednesday, January 29, 2025 8:25 AM
> **To:** Council <council@tualatin.gov>; Ext - Planning <Planning@tualatin.gov>; Ext - Engineering Exterrnal Email <engineering@tualatin.gov>
> **Cc:** Sherilyn Lombos <slombos@tualatin.gov>; Megan George <mgeorge@tualatin.gov>; Steve Koper <skoper@tualatin.gov>; Keith Leonard <kleonard@tualatin.gov>; Mike McCarthy <mmccarthy@tualatin.gov>
> **Subject:** CIO Notice Requirement
>
> Dear City of Tualatin,
>
> A review of project documents reveals that Mackenzie/Lam did not notify any

CIO representatives prior to the June 2024 neighborhood developer meeting, as required by Tualatin Development Code 32.120.5 (b)(iii). The code requires an applicant to send notice to CIO representatives via First Class Mail at least 14 days *before* the neighborhood developer meeting. This requirement was not met at the time, nor can it be met retroactively.

Lam and Mackenzie have been through the Tualatin land use review process before and they know the requirements. In 2022, Suzannah Stanley, Mackenzie Planner, demonstrated that she is very familiar with the CIO notification section. On pages 29-32 of Lam's IMP 22-0001 application, Ms. Stanley is on the record arguing that this notice requirement does not apply to Lam:

"We did not contact any City-recognized CIOs.
Please use this statement in your completeness checklist."
(Page 29) http://www.tualatinroad.org/files/LAM2022081201.pdf

If the City of Tualatin allows Mackenzie and Lam to repeatedly and flagrantly violate notice requirements, the legitimacy of the CIO program will be compromised.

At the June neighborhood developer meeting, Mackenzie said that "the project team is open to continue discussing topics of concern with neighbors" (see meeting minutes #13) however, repeated attempts by the community to open a dialogue with Lam and Mackenzie have been met with refusal and stonewalling. Lam's Chief Communication Officer, Steve Fine, clarified their position in his November 2024 email:

"We are committed to following the City's process to finalize a plan for our project that works for the City, the community, and Lam. In keeping with this approach, please address future communications about traffic considerations to the City of Tualatin."

Because Mackenzie and Lam have not followed proper notice procedure, we hereby ask the City of Tualatin to deny Lam's current land use application so that the applicant can reset and start over.

Thank you for your consideration.

-Brett Hamilton

From: Steve Fine
Subject: RE: Tualatin Road
Date: November 7, 2024 at 4:56:28 PM PST
To: Brett Hamilton

Dear Mr. Hamilton,

I received your e-mail below regarding the TUX project. We are excited to expand Lam Research's presence in Tualatin, bringing new jobs and economic impact to the community. We also recognize the importance of community feedback.

Thank you for sharing your input about Tualatin Road. We are currently working with the City of Tualatin and the Department of Transportation to address relevant traffic issues. There will be several public meetings in connection with Lam's land use application to capture feedback from the community.

I appreciate your acknowledgement of Lam's reputation as a good neighbor and responsible member of the community. We are committed to following the City's process to finalize a plan for our project that works for the City, the community, and Lam. In keeping with this approach, please address future communications about traffic considerations to the City of Tualatin.

Regards,
Steve Fine
Chief Communication Officer, Lam Research

From: Brett Hamilton
Sent: Thursday, October 24, 2024 2:54:59 PM
To: Archer, Tim CEO
Cc: Bettinger, Doug; Charles, Audrey; Fernandes, Neil; Fine, Steve; Gottscho, Richard; Harter, Ava; Hassett, Mary; Lord, Pat; Vahedi, Vahid; Varadarajan, Sesha
Subject: Tualatin Road

Dear Mr. Archer,

I live near the Lam Research campus in Tualatin Oregon, and on behalf of my neighbors, would like to ask for your assistance in resolving a problem posed by Lam's TUX expansion. We have not been able to resolve this issue locally.

Lam's proposal includes a new employee entrance on Tualatin Road, and this would add a significant amount of traffic to our local roadway network. The community is strongly opposed to this new entrance, and we have been asking Lam's planners for months to change the site layout to use Leveton Drive instead.

Leveton Drive, on the south side of Lam's campus, was built for industrial traffic, has plenty of unused capacity already available, and currently carries 3 entrances to Lam's campus. Lam's current proposal would eliminate the main driveway that connects Leveton Drive to the parking lots on the north side of campus. This is the crux of the issue.

Traffic is already the number one complaint for residents here in Tualatin, and Lam's proposal threatens to make this problem even worse. Historically, Lam has been a responsible member of our community and has a reputation for being a good neighbor, but the current proposal, and the way it is being pursued, puts that corporate reputation at risk. We believe that the current site plan is not in the best interests of either Lam's shareholders or the Tualatin community, and we ask that Lam change course in order to avoid a conflict.

Our community is highly motivated to find a solution that meets the needs of both Lam and the surrounding neighborhoods. We have outlined our concerns on the Save Tualatin Road website and would like an opportunity to work with Lam so that your expansion is a success.

http://www.tualatinroad.org/

Thank you for your consideration on this matter.

Brett Hamilton

From: Andrea Conner <andreawconner@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 29, 2025 10:01 AM
To: Council; Ext - Planning; Ext - Engineering Exterrnal Email
Subject: Long Time Resident Concerns

City of Tualatin,

I have lived in Tualatin most of my life. I went to Byrom, Hazelbrook, and graduated from TuHS. I moved back to Tualatin from Beaverton in 2016 to be closer to my parents when my kids were young. My parents have lived in Tualatin since 1990. I have two daughters who attend MITCH Charter and who are involved in local sports, activities, and call this city home.

I'm very disappointed in the LAM Research proposal to expand which affects Tualatin Road.

Having lived in Tualatin prior to LAM's presence, I'm at a loss as to what benefit their presence has added. To learn that tax dollars are potentially going to assist this company is very disappointing. Meanwhile, the schools in Tualatin have crumbled and parents are scrambling to move to private school or move out of the city (we are considering a move to move to West Linn or Sherwood). A potential move would be very disruptive to my children.

I believe the City of Tualatin needs to put residents first. If the Tualatin road project moves forward, there will be significant impacts to the residents.

Please consider this email to reflect that as a Tualatin taxpayer and voter, I will be watching the actions very closely and will vote accordingly.

Thank you,
Andrea Conner
10375 SW Rayborn Ct.
Tualatin, OR

From: Arva Bartos <arva41@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 29, 2025 1:20 PM
To: Ext - Planning
Subject: LAM code violations re Tualatin Road use...

"We did not contact any City-recognized CIOs.
Please use this statement in your completeness checklist."
(Page 29) http://www.tualatinroad.org/files/LAM2022081201.pdf

If the City of Tualatin allows Mackenzie and Lam to repeatedly and flagrantly violate notice requirements, the legitimacy of the CIO program will be compromised.

Please correct this situation.
Thank you,
Arva & Paul Bartos
17750 SW Chippewa Trail, Tualatin, OR 97062

From: Rick Cady <rcadycvelo@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 29, 2025 2:23 PM
To: Council; Ext - Planning; Ext - Engineering Exterrnal Email
Cc: Regina Chante; Brett Hamilton
Subject: Code violation by Lam

Dear City of Tualatin,

A review of project documents reveals that Mackenzie/Lam did not notify any CIO representatives prior to the June 2024 neighborhood developer meeting, as required by Tualatin Development Code 32.120.5 (b)(iii). The code requires an applicant to send notice to CIO representatives via First Class Mail at least 14 days *before* the neighborhood developer meeting. This requirement was not met at the time, nor can it be met retroactively.

Lam and Mackenzie have been through the Tualatin land use review process before and they know the requirements. In 2022, Suzannah Stanley, Mackenzie Planner, demonstrated that she is very familiar with the CIO notification section. On pages 29-32 of Lam's IMP 22-0001 application, Ms. Stanley is on the record arguing that this notice requirement does not apply to Lam:

"We did not contact any City-recognized CIOs.
Please use this statement in your completeness checklist."
(Page 29) http://www.tualatinroad.org/files/LAM2022081201.pdf

If the City of Tualatin allows Mackenzie and Lam to repeatedly and flagrantly violate notice requirements, the legitimacy of the CIO program will be compromised.

At the June neighborhood developer meeting, Mackenzie said that "the project team is open to continue discussing topics of concern with neighbors" (see meeting minutes #13) however, repeated attempts by the community to open a dialogue with Lam and Mackenzie have been met with refusal and stonewalling. Lam's Chief Communication Officer, Steve Fine, clarified their position in his November 2024 email:

"We are committed to following the City's process to finalize a plan for our project that works for the City, the community, and Lam. In keeping with this approach, please address future communications about traffic considerations to the City of Tualatin."

Because Mackenzie and Lam have not followed proper notice procedure, we hereby ask the City of Tualatin to deny Lam's current land use application so that the applicant can reset and start over.

Thank you for your consideration.

Rick Cady/Regina Chante
10230 SW Anderson Ct.

Tualatin, OR. 97062

From: Lexi Howell <alexaehowell@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 29, 2025 4:26 PM
To: Ext - Planning
Subject: Code Violation by Lam

Dear City of Tualatin,

A review of project documents reveals that Mackenzie/Lam did not notify any CIO representatives prior to the June 2024 neighborhood developer meeting, as required by Tualatin Development Code 32.120.5 (b)(iii). The code requires an applicant to send notice to CIO representatives via First Class Mail at least 14 days *before* the neighborhood developer meeting. This requirement was not met at the time, nor can it be met retroactively.

Lam and Mackenzie have been through the Tualatin land use review process before and they know the requirements. In 2022, Suzannah Stanley, Mackenzie Planner, demonstrated that she is very familiar with the CIO notification section. On pages 29-32 of Lam's IMP 22-0001 application, Ms. Stanley is on the record arguing that this notice requirement does not apply to Lam:

"We did not contact any City-recognized CIOs.
Please use this statement in your completeness checklist."
(Page 29) http://www.tualatinroad.org/files/LAM2022081201.pdf

If the City of Tualatin allows Mackenzie and Lam to repeatedly and flagrantly violate notice requirements, the legitimacy of the CIO program will be compromised.

At the June neighborhood developer meeting, Mackenzie said that "the project team is open to continue discussing topics of concern with neighbors" (see meeting minutes #13) however, repeated attempts by the community to open a dialogue with Lam and Mackenzie have been met with refusal and stonewalling. Lam's Chief Communication Officer, Steve Fine, clarified their position in his November 2024 email:

"We are committed to following the City's process to finalize a plan for our project that works for the City, the community, and Lam. In keeping with this approach, please address future communications about traffic considerations to the City of Tualatin."

Because Mackenzie and Lam have not followed proper notice procedure, we hereby ask the City of Tualatin to deny Lam's current land use application so that the applicant can reset and start over.

Thank you for your consideration.
--
Lexi Howell
(541) 921-7992 | alexaehowell@gmail.com | linkedin.com/in/alexa-howell/

From: Jessica Kraus <jessicaruthkraus@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 30, 2025 8:17 AM
To: Council; Ext - Planning; Ext - Engineering Exterrnal Email
Subject: Failure to send notice to CIO (Lam)

Dear City of Tualatin,

A review of project documents reveals that Mackenzie/Lam did not notify any CIO representatives prior to the June 2024 neighborhood developer meeting, as required by Tualatin Development Code 32.120.5 (b)(iii). The code requires an applicant to send notice to CIO representatives via First Class Mail at least 14 days *before* the neighborhood developer meeting. This requirement was not met at the time, nor can it be met retroactively.

Lam and Mackenzie have been through the Tualatin land use review process before and they know the requirements. In 2022, Suzannah Stanley, Mackenzie Planner, demonstrated that she is very familiar with the CIO notification section. On pages 29-32 of Lam's IMP 22-0001 application, Ms. Stanley is on the record arguing that this notice requirement does not apply to Lam:

"We did not contact any City-recognized CIOs.
Please use this statement in your completeness checklist."
(Page 29) http://www.tualatinroad.org/files/LAM2022081201.pdf

If the City of Tualatin allows Mackenzie and Lam to repeatedly and flagrantly violate notice requirements, the legitimacy of the CIO program will be compromised.

At the June neighborhood developer meeting, Mackenzie said that "the project team is open to continue discussing topics of concern with neighbors" (see meeting minutes #13) however, repeated attempts by the community to open a dialogue with Lam and Mackenzie have been met with refusal and stonewalling. Lam's Chief Communication Officer, Steve Fine, clarified their position in his November 2024 email:

"We are committed to following the City's process to finalize a plan for our project that works for the City, the community, and Lam. In keeping with this approach, please address future communications about traffic considerations to the City of Tualatin."

Because Mackenzie and Lam have not followed proper notice procedure, we hereby ask the City of Tualatin to deny Lam's current land use application so that the applicant can reset and start over.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jessica Kraus
10340 SW Rayborn Ct

Tualatin, OR 97062

From: ERIC SMITH <esscraigslist@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, January 31, 2025 12:04 PM
To: Ext - Planning

Dear City of Tualatin,

A review of project documents reveals that Mackenzie/Lam did not notify any CIO representatives prior to the June 2024 neighborhood developer meeting, as required by Tualatin Development Code 32.120.5 (b)(iii). The code requires an applicant to send notice to CIO representatives via First Class Mail at least 14 days *before* the neighborhood developer meeting. This requirement was not met at the time, nor can it be met retroactively.

Lam and Mackenzie have been through the Tualatin land use review process before and they know the requirements. In 2022, Suzannah Stanley, Mackenzie Planner, demonstrated that she is very familiar with the CIO notification section. On pages 29-32 of Lam's IMP 22-0001 application, Ms. Stanley is on the record arguing that this notice requirement does not apply to Lam:

"We did not contact any City-recognized CIOs.
Please use this statement in your completeness checklist."
(Page 29) http://www.tualatinroad.org/files/LAM2022081201.pdf

If the City of Tualatin allows Mackenzie and Lam to repeatedly and flagrantly violate notice requirements, the legitimacy of the CIO program will be compromised.

At the June neighborhood developer meeting, Mackenzie said that "the project team is open to continue discussing topics of concern with neighbors" (see meeting minutes #13) however, repeated attempts by the community to open a dialogue with Lam and Mackenzie have been met with refusal and stonewalling. Lam's Chief Communication Officer, Steve Fine, clarified their position in his November 2024 email:

"We are committed to following the City's process to finalize a plan for our project that works for the City, the community, and Lam. In keeping with this approach, please address future communications about traffic considerations to the City of Tualatin."

Because Mackenzie and Lam have not followed proper notice procedure, we hereby ask the City of Tualatin to deny Lam's current land use application so that the applicant can reset and start over.

Thank you for your consideration.
Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From: Stephanie Melton <stephimelton@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 4, 2025 2:24 PM
To: Ext - Planning
Subject: Evidence to Deny Lam's Land Use Application

Dear City of Tualatin,

A review of project documents reveals that Mackenzie/Lam did not notify any CIO representatives prior to the June 2024 neighborhood developer meeting, as required by Tualatin Development Code 32.120.5 (b)(iii). The code requires an applicant to send notice to CIO representatives via First Class Mail at least 14 days *before* the neighborhood developer meeting. This requirement was not met at the time, nor can it be met retroactively.

Lam and Mackenzie have been through the Tualatin land use review process before and they know the requirements. In 2022, Suzannah Stanley, Mackenzie Planner, demonstrated that she is very familiar with the CIO notification section. On pages 29-32 of Lam's IMP 22-0001 application, Ms. Stanley is on the record arguing that this notice requirement does not apply to Lam:

"We did not contact any City-recognized CIOs.
Please use this statement in your completeness checklist."
(Page 29) http://www.tualatinroad.org/files/LAM2022081201.pdf

If the City of Tualatin allows Mackenzie and Lam to repeatedly and flagrantly violate notice requirements, the legitimacy of the CIO program will be compromised.

At the June neighborhood developer meeting, Mackenzie said that "the project team is open to continue discussing topics of concern with neighbors" (see meeting minutes #13) however, repeated attempts by the community to open a dialogue with Lam and Mackenzie have been met with refusal and stonewalling. Lam's Chief Communication Officer, Steve Fine, clarified their position in his November 2024 email:

"We are committed to following the City's process to finalize a plan for our project that works for the City, the community, and Lam. In keeping with this approach, please address future communications about traffic considerations to the City of Tualatin."

Because Mackenzie and Lam have not followed proper notice procedure, we hereby ask the City of Tualatin to deny Lam's current land use application so that the applicant can reset and start over.

Thank you for your consideration.

Stephanie Melton

(503) 516-2163

From: Coy Lay <solarcoy@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 11, 2025 8:06 PM
To: Keith Leonard
Cc: barb@tigardlife.com; contact@tualatinroad.org; council@tualitin.gov; Ext - Planning; Ext - Engineering Exterrnal Email
Subject: LAM-Tualatin Rd

I drive Tualatin Rd several times a week. To create a new entrance for LAM and add a traffic light would seriously deteriorate my life. Tualatin Sherwood Road is already really loaded with commercial and industrial traffic. To channel large amounts of new traffic onto Tualatin Road will cost me a lot of time and significantly deterorate the local residential community. I want LAM to thrive but, I don't want the community to pay a big price for that to happen. A route using Leveton Drive and 124th Ave should be improved for their use instead.

If Tualatin Rd must be compromised, LAM could offer Tualatin something of significant value in addition to the addional tax revenue their expansion would generate. The tax revenues would, after all, be needed just to continue to provide municipal services for their operations.

For making my life a little worse, let them provide a place for community meetings, or perhaps some recreational park space, or a dog park on their grounds. Perhaps they could provide significat funds to support the Phol center, to upgrade the Jergens Dog Park, or raise the level of the Tualatin Dog Park so it isn't so soggy after rains, or some additional resourses for other city parks or facility.

Let them compensate the community for the deterioration in local life they propose, something more than just paying their tax levy to cover the expected expenses of their expansion.

From: T. Carrasco <tntand@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 10, 2025 8:22 PM
To: janine wilson; Keith Leonard; barb@tigardlife.com; Council
Subject: Protect Tualatin Road

I've received no reply to my letter of January 15 (below). I would like the council and LAM to make it part of the testimony record and request that all share this email far and wide with any concerned about our only and already congested neighborhood exit..

From: T. Carrasco <tntand@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 15, 2025 11:37 AM
To: council@tualatin.gov; planning@tualatin.gov; engineering@tualatin.gov
Cc: len carrasco <lenbobG3@gmail.com>
Subject: [EXT]Tualatin Rd traffic, etc

[redacted]

Dear City of Tualatin

LAM's TUX project proposal would violate the Tualatin Development Code, both in spirit and letter.

Wer'e asking the Tualatin Planning Department to consider **Lam's proposed entrance on Tualatin Road to NOT BE APPROVED**, and City Manager use authority to removed the proposed Tualatin Rd. entrance from the TUX project site plan so that alternative access can be designed.

SITE CIRCULATION

Existing driveways provide sufficient access points to the LAM Campus as a whole. LAM currently has 6 other access points. 3 on 108th and 3 on Leveton Drive. **Adding a new access point on Tualatin Road is unnecessary and will be deleterious to**

Tualatin residents. This would not be in line with LAM's mission to **Act with purpose for a better world.**

Lam is responsible for designing reasonable site circulation. A lack of good site circulation is not a valid reason to add an additional driveway onto the street network.

Tualatin Road is currently functioning as an arterial, it was previously classified as an arterial, and it has the traffic volume of an arterial. Leveton Drive is currently functioning as a collector, it was previously classified as a collector, and it has the current traffic volume of a collector.

We ask the **city to remedy mistaken reclassifications of Tualatin Rd**. and Leveton by restoring the correct functional classifications to their appropriate streets. LAM should not be allowed to rely on a classification error to put a new entrance on a road that, based on current conditions, should not have a new entrance.

If the streets were classified correctly, LAM research would not be able to add an employee entrance on Tualatin Road because it would be an arterial. "**No new driveways or streets on arterial roadways** within the City, except where noted in the TDC, usually when no alternative access is available." (TCP 2040 POLICY 8.10.1)

We urge the city to consider all the above concerns and require the applicant (LAM) to revise their site development plan accordingly. We believe that the current proposal does not meet Tualatin's planning rules, and that the City Manager should bring LAM's proposal into compliance. No new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Please update all residents about these decisions and continue to represent us completely. Thank You for consideration of these many requests by the citizens of Tualatin.

Toni and Leonard Carrasco

17790 SW Cheyenne Way

Tualatin 97062

cc: Several Neighbors (PLEASE SHARE with other neighbors on your street and reply all with comments

From: Keith Leonard
Sent: Thursday, January 16, 2025 8:10 AM
To: T. Carrasco
Subject: RE: Tualatin Rd traffic, etc

Good morning Toni and Leonard,

Thank you for providing public comments pertaining to the proposed Lam TUX development. I have added your comments to the public record. We appreciate you taking the time to take part in the public process. Have a great day!

Keith Leonard, AICP
Associate Planner
Phone: 503.691.3029

From: T. Carrasco <tntand@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 15, 2025 11:37 AM
To: Council <council@tualatin.gov>; Ext - Planning <Planning@tualatin.gov>; Ext - Engineering Exterrnal Email <engineering@tualatin.gov>
Cc: len carrasco <lenbobG3@gmail.com>
Subject: Tualatin Rd traffic, etc

[redacted]

Dear City of Tualatin

LAM's TUX project proposal would violate the Tualatin Development Code, both in spirit and letter.

Wer'e asking the Tualatin Planning Department to consider **Lam's proposed entrance on Tualatin Road to NOT BE APPROVED**, and City Manager use authority to removed the proposed Tualatin Rd. entrance from the TUX project site plan so that alternative access can be designed.

SITE CIRCULATION

Existing driveways provide sufficient access points to the LAM Campus as a whole. LAM currently has 6 other access points. 3 on 108th and 3 on Leveton Drive. **Adding a new access point on Tualatin Road is unnecessary and will be deleterious to Tualatin residents**. This would not be in line with LAM's mission to **Act with purpose for a better world.**

Lam is responsible for designing reasonable site circulation. A lack of good site circulation is not a valid reason to add an additional driveway onto the street network.

Tualatin Road is currently functioning as an arterial, it was previously classified as an arterial, and it has the traffic volume of an arterial. Leveton Drive is currently functioning as a collector, it was previously classified as a collector, and it has the current traffic volume of a collector.

We ask the **city to remedy mistaken reclassifications of Tualatin Rd**. and Leveton by restoring the correct functional classifications to their appropriate streets. LAM should not be allowed to rely on a classification error to put a new entrance on a road that, based on current conditions, should not have a new entrance.

If the streets were classified correctly, LAM research would not be able to add an employee entrance on Tualatin Road because it would be an arterial. "**No new driveways or streets on arterial roadways** within the City, except where noted in the TDC, usually when no alternative access is available." (TCP 2040 POLICY 8.10.1)

We urge the city to consider all the above concerns and require the applicant (LAM) to revise their site development plan accordingly. We believe that the current proposal does not meet Tualatin's planning rules, and that the City Manager should bring LAM's proposal into compliance. No new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Please update all residents about these decisions and continue to represent us completely. Thank You for consideration of these many requests by the citizens of Tualatin.

Toni and Leonard Carrasco

17790 SW Cheyenne Way

Tualatin 97062

cc: Several Neighbors (PLEASE SHARE with other neighbors on your street and reply all with comments)

From: Lexi Howell <alexaehowell@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 29, 2025 4:26 PM
To: Ext - Planning
Subject: Code Violation by Lam

Dear City of Tualatin,

A review of project documents reveals that Mackenzie/Lam did not notify any CIO representatives prior to the June 2024 neighborhood developer meeting, as required by Tualatin Development Code 32.120.5 (b)(iii). The code requires an applicant to send notice to CIO representatives via First Class Mail at least 14 days *before* the neighborhood developer meeting. This requirement was not met at the time, nor can it be met retroactively.

Lam and Mackenzie have been through the Tualatin land use review process before and they know the requirements. In 2022, Suzannah Stanley, Mackenzie Planner, demonstrated that she is very familiar with the CIO notification section. On pages 29-32 of Lam's IMP 22-0001 application, Ms. Stanley is on the record arguing that this notice requirement does not apply to Lam:

"We did not contact any City-recognized CIOs.
Please use this statement in your completeness checklist."
(Page 29) http://www.tualatinroad.org/files/LAM2022081201.pdf

If the City of Tualatin allows Mackenzie and Lam to repeatedly and flagrantly violate notice requirements, the legitimacy of the CIO program will be compromised.

At the June neighborhood developer meeting, Mackenzie said that "the project team is open to continue discussing topics of concern with neighbors" (see meeting minutes #13) however, repeated attempts by the community to open a dialogue with Lam and Mackenzie have been met with refusal and stonewalling. Lam's Chief Communication Officer, Steve Fine, clarified their position in his November 2024 email:

"We are committed to following the City's process to finalize a plan for our project that works for the City, the community, and Lam. In keeping with this approach, please address future communications about traffic considerations to the City of Tualatin."

Because Mackenzie and Lam have not followed proper notice procedure, we hereby ask the City of Tualatin to deny Lam's current land use application so that the applicant can reset and start over.

Thank you for your consideration.
--
Lexi Howell
(541) 921-7992 | alexaehowell@gmail.com | linkedin.com/in/alexa-howell/

From: Jessica Kraus <jessicaruthkraus@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 30, 2025 8:17 AM
To: Council; Ext - Planning; Ext - Engineering Exterrnal Email
Subject: Failure to send notice to CIO (Lam)

Dear City of Tualatin,

A review of project documents reveals that Mackenzie/Lam did not notify any CIO representatives prior to the June 2024 neighborhood developer meeting, as required by Tualatin Development Code 32.120.5 (b)(iii). The code requires an applicant to send notice to CIO representatives via First Class Mail at least 14 days *before* the neighborhood developer meeting. This requirement was not met at the time, nor can it be met retroactively.

Lam and Mackenzie have been through the Tualatin land use review process before and they know the requirements. In 2022, Suzannah Stanley, Mackenzie Planner, demonstrated that she is very familiar with the CIO notification section. On pages 29-32 of Lam's IMP 22-0001 application, Ms. Stanley is on the record arguing that this notice requirement does not apply to Lam:

"We did not contact any City-recognized CIOs.
Please use this statement in your completeness checklist."
(Page 29) http://www.tualatinroad.org/files/LAM2022081201.pdf

If the City of Tualatin allows Mackenzie and Lam to repeatedly and flagrantly violate notice requirements, the legitimacy of the CIO program will be compromised.

At the June neighborhood developer meeting, Mackenzie said that "the project team is open to continue discussing topics of concern with neighbors" (see meeting minutes #13) however, repeated attempts by the community to open a dialogue with Lam and Mackenzie have been met with refusal and stonewalling. Lam's Chief Communication Officer, Steve Fine, clarified their position in his November 2024 email:

"We are committed to following the City's process to finalize a plan for our project that works for the City, the community, and Lam. In keeping with this approach, please address future communications about traffic considerations to the City of Tualatin."

Because Mackenzie and Lam have not followed proper notice procedure, we hereby ask the City of Tualatin to deny Lam's current land use application so that the applicant can reset and start over.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jessica Kraus
10340 SW Rayborn Ct

Tualatin, OR 97062

From: ERIC SMITH <esscraigslist@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, January 31, 2025 12:04 PM
To: Ext - Planning

Dear City of Tualatin,

A review of project documents reveals that Mackenzie/Lam did not notify any CIO representatives prior to the June 2024 neighborhood developer meeting, as required by Tualatin Development Code 32.120.5 (b)(iii). The code requires an applicant to send notice to CIO representatives via First Class Mail at least 14 days *before* the neighborhood developer meeting. This requirement was not met at the time, nor can it be met retroactively.

Lam and Mackenzie have been through the Tualatin land use review process before and they know the requirements. In 2022, Suzannah Stanley, Mackenzie Planner, demonstrated that she is very familiar with the CIO notification section. On pages 29-32 of Lam's IMP 22-0001 application, Ms. Stanley is on the record arguing that this notice requirement does not apply to Lam:

"We did not contact any City-recognized CIOs.
Please use this statement in your completeness checklist."
(Page 29) http://www.tualatinroad.org/files/LAM2022081201.pdf

If the City of Tualatin allows Mackenzie and Lam to repeatedly and flagrantly violate notice requirements, the legitimacy of the CIO program will be compromised.

At the June neighborhood developer meeting, Mackenzie said that "the project team is open to continue discussing topics of concern with neighbors" (see meeting minutes #13) however, repeated attempts by the community to open a dialogue with Lam and Mackenzie have been met with refusal and stonewalling. Lam's Chief Communication Officer, Steve Fine, clarified their position in his November 2024 email:

"We are committed to following the City's process to finalize a plan for our project that works for the City, the community, and Lam. In keeping with this approach, please address future communications about traffic considerations to the City of Tualatin."

Because Mackenzie and Lam have not followed proper notice procedure, we hereby ask the City of Tualatin to deny Lam's current land use application so that the applicant can reset and start over.

Thank you for your consideration.
Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From: Stephanie Melton <stephimelton@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 4, 2025 2:24 PM
To: Ext - Planning
Subject: Evidence to Deny Lam's Land Use Application

Dear City of Tualatin,

A review of project documents reveals that Mackenzie/Lam did not notify any CIO representatives prior to the June 2024 neighborhood developer meeting, as required by Tualatin Development Code 32.120.5 (b)(iii). The code requires an applicant to send notice to CIO representatives via First Class Mail at least 14 days *before* the neighborhood developer meeting. This requirement was not met at the time, nor can it be met retroactively.

Lam and Mackenzie have been through the Tualatin land use review process before and they know the requirements. In 2022, Suzannah Stanley, Mackenzie Planner, demonstrated that she is very familiar with the CIO notification section. On pages 29-32 of Lam's IMP 22-0001 application, Ms. Stanley is on the record arguing that this notice requirement does not apply to Lam:

"We did not contact any City-recognized CIOs.
Please use this statement in your completeness checklist."
(Page 29) http://www.tualatinroad.org/files/LAM2022081201.pdf

If the City of Tualatin allows Mackenzie and Lam to repeatedly and flagrantly violate notice requirements, the legitimacy of the CIO program will be compromised.

At the June neighborhood developer meeting, Mackenzie said that "the project team is open to continue discussing topics of concern with neighbors" (see meeting minutes #13) however, repeated attempts by the community to open a dialogue with Lam and Mackenzie have been met with refusal and stonewalling. Lam's Chief Communication Officer, Steve Fine, clarified their position in his November 2024 email:

"We are committed to following the City's process to finalize a plan for our project that works for the City, the community, and Lam. In keeping with this approach, please address future communications about traffic considerations to the City of Tualatin."

Because Mackenzie and Lam have not followed proper notice procedure, we hereby ask the City of Tualatin to deny Lam's current land use application so that the applicant can reset and start over.

Thank you for your consideration.

Stephanie Melton

(503) 516-2163

From: Coy Lay <solarcoy@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 11, 2025 8:06 PM
To: Keith Leonard
Cc: barb@tigardlife.com; contact@tualatinroad.org; council@tualitin.gov; Ext - Planning; Ext - Engineering Exterrnal Email
Subject: LAM-Tualatin Rd

I drive Tualatin Rd several times a week. To create a new entrance for LAM and add a traffic light would seriously deteriorate my life. Tualatin Sherwood Road is already really loaded with commercial and industrial traffic. To channel large amounts of new traffic onto Tualatin Road will cost me a lot of time and significantly deterorate the local residential community. I want LAM to thrive but, I don't want the community to pay a big price for that to happen. A route using Leveton Drive and 124th Ave should be improved for their use instead.

If Tualatin Rd must be compromised, LAM could offer Tualatin something of significant value in addition to the addional tax revenue their expansion would generate. The tax revenues would, after all, be needed just to continue to provide municipal services for their operations.

For making my life a little worse, let them provide a place for community meetings, or perhaps some recreational park space, or a dog park on their grounds. Perhaps they could provide significat funds to support the Phol center, to upgrade the Jergens Dog Park, or raise the level of the Tualatin Dog Park so it isn't so soggy after rains, or some additional resourses for other city parks or facility.

Let them compensate the community for the deterioration in local life they propose, something more than just paying their tax levy to cover the expected expenses of their expansion.

From: T. Carrasco <tntand@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 10, 2025 8:22 PM
To: janine wilson; Keith Leonard; barb@tigardlife.com; Council
Subject: Protect Tualatin Road

I've received no reply to my letter of January 15 (below). I would like the council and LAM to make it part of the testimony record and request that all share this email far and wide with any concerned about our only and already congested neighborhood exit..

From: T. Carrasco <tntand@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 15, 2025 11:37 AM
To: council@tualatin.gov; planning@tualatin.gov; engineering@tualatin.gov
Cc: len carrasco <lenbobG3@gmail.com>
Subject: [EXT]Tualatin Rd traffic, etc

[redacted]

Dear City of Tualatin

LAM's TUX project proposal would violate the Tualatin Development Code, both in spirit and letter.

Wer'e asking the Tualatin Planning Department to consider **Lam's proposed entrance on Tualatin Road to NOT BE APPROVED**, and City Manager use authority to removed the proposed Tualatin Rd. entrance from the TUX project site plan so that alternative access can be designed.

SITE CIRCULATION

Existing driveways provide sufficient access points to the LAM Campus as a whole. LAM currently has 6 other access points. 3 on 108th and 3 on Leveton Drive. **Adding a new access point on Tualatin Road is unnecessary and will be deleterious to**

Tualatin residents. This would not be in line with LAM's mission to **Act with purpose for a better world.**

Lam is responsible for designing reasonable site circulation. A lack of good site circulation is not a valid reason to add an additional driveway onto the street network.

Tualatin Road is currently functioning as an arterial, it was previously classified as an arterial, and it has the traffic volume of an arterial. Leveton Drive is currently functioning as a collector, it was previously classified as a collector, and it has the current traffic volume of a collector.

We ask the **city to remedy mistaken reclassifications of Tualatin Rd**. and Leveton by restoring the correct functional classifications to their appropriate streets. LAM should not be allowed to rely on a classification error to put a new entrance on a road that, based on current conditions, should not have a new entrance.

If the streets were classified correctly, LAM research would not be able to add an employee entrance on Tualatin Road because it would be an arterial. "**No new driveways or streets on arterial roadways** within the City, except where noted in the TDC, usually when no alternative access is available." (TCP 2040 POLICY 8.10.1)

We urge the city to consider all the above concerns and require the applicant (LAM) to revise their site development plan accordingly. We believe that the current proposal does not meet Tualatin's planning rules, and that the City Manager should bring LAM's proposal into compliance. No new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Please update all residents about these decisions and continue to represent us completely. Thank You for consideration of these many requests by the citizens of Tualatin.

Toni and Leonard Carrasco

17790 SW Cheyenne Way

Tualatin 97062

cc: Several Neighbors (PLEASE SHARE with other neighbors on your street and reply all with comments

From: Keith Leonard
Sent: Thursday, January 16, 2025 8:10 AM
To: T. Carrasco
Subject: RE: Tualatin Rd traffic, etc

Good morning Toni and Leonard,

Thank you for providing public comments pertaining to the proposed Lam TUX development. I have added your comments to the public record. We appreciate you taking the time to take part in the public process. Have a great day!

Keith Leonard, AICP
Associate Planner
Phone: 503.691.3029

From: T. Carrasco <tntand@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 15, 2025 11:37 AM
To: Council <council@tualatin.gov>; Ext - Planning <Planning@tualatin.gov>; Ext - Engineering Exterrnal Email <engineering@tualatin.gov>
Cc: len carrasco <lenbobG3@gmail.com>
Subject: Tualatin Rd traffic, etc

[redacted]

Dear City of Tualatin

LAM's TUX project proposal would violate the Tualatin Development Code, both in spirit and letter.

Wer'e asking the Tualatin Planning Department to consider **Lam's proposed entrance on Tualatin Road to NOT BE APPROVED**, and City Manager use authority to removed the proposed Tualatin Rd. entrance from the TUX project site plan so that alternative access can be designed.

SITE CIRCULATION

Existing driveways provide sufficient access points to the LAM Campus as a whole. LAM currently has 6 other access points. 3 on 108th and 3 on Leveton Drive. **Adding a new access point on Tualatin Road is unnecessary and will be deleterious to Tualatin residents**. This would not be in line with LAM's mission to **Act with purpose for a better world.**

Lam is responsible for designing reasonable site circulation. A lack of good site circulation is not a valid reason to add an additional driveway onto the street network.

Tualatin Road is currently functioning as an arterial, it was previously classified as an arterial, and it has the traffic volume of an arterial. Leveton Drive is currently functioning as a collector, it was previously classified as a collector, and it has the current traffic volume of a collector.

We ask the **city to remedy mistaken reclassifications of Tualatin Rd**. and Leveton by restoring the correct functional classifications to their appropriate streets. LAM should not be allowed to rely on a classification error to put a new entrance on a road that, based on current conditions, should not have a new entrance.

If the streets were classified correctly, LAM research would not be able to add an employee entrance on Tualatin Road because it would be an arterial. "**No new driveways or streets on arterial roadways** within the City, except where noted in the TDC, usually when no alternative access is available." (TCP 2040 POLICY 8.10.1)

We urge the city to consider all the above concerns and require the applicant (LAM) to revise their site development plan accordingly. We believe that the current proposal does not meet Tualatin's planning rules, and that the City Manager should bring LAM's proposal into compliance. No new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Please update all residents about these decisions and continue to represent us completely. Thank You for consideration of these many requests by the citizens of Tualatin.

Toni and Leonard Carrasco

17790 SW Cheyenne Way

Tualatin 97062

cc: Several Neighbors (PLEASE SHARE with other neighbors on your street and reply all with comments)

From: Hayden Thornton <hrt0206@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 2, 2025 9:15 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Subject: Re: Lam TUX Project

Sorry I mean 118th as of 118th and leveton.

Thanks,

Hayden Thornton

On Sun, Mar 2, 2025 at 16:30 Hayden Thornton <hrt0206@gmail.com> wrote:

> Dear City of Tualatin,
>
> Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive
>
> NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.
>
> 115th seems perfect for it…
>
> Thank you for your consideration.
>
> Hayden Thornton

From: Javier Angelfernandez <janicearroyo@icloud.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 2, 2025 7:00 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.
-Janice Arroyo

Sent from my iPhone

From: Kendra Texta <kendra.texta@icloud.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 2, 2025 5:19 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Joshua Baggett <joshua.baggett4@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 2, 2025 5:24 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Joshua Baggett

Sent from my iPhone

From: Quentin Isenberg <qdi1996@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 2, 2025 4:56 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

From: Raisa Hawk <raisahoquejbd@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 2, 2025 4:27 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

From: Isaac Simmons <simmonsartistry888@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 2, 2025 4:26 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

From: bob jones <bobjones2398@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 2, 2025 3:17 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Bob

From: douglas kidwiler <dkidwiler@msn.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 2, 2025 1:50 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

No

From: Alexa Johnson <johnson.alexa@icloud.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 2, 2025 1:36 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Sam Engen <sam.p.engen@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 2, 2025 1:26 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Signed,
Sam Engen

From: Denise Means <misterylwork@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 2, 2025 1:26 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

From: Rosemarie Drake-Baumann <baumann12@icloud.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 2, 2025 11:22 AM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Rosemarie Baumann
10500 SW Kiowa St.
Tualatin, OR
Sent from my iPhone

From: Alexis Ramirez <alexrramirez2@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 2, 2025 8:12 AM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Jazmin Rodea Olvera <friendlyjaz79@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 1, 2025 5:22 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

From: Cidney Marshall <marshall.cidney@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 1, 2025 9:52 PM
To: Council; Ext - Planning
Subject: Save Tualatin Road

Dear Tualatin City Council and Tualatin Planning Department:

I am strongly opposed to Lam Research adding a new entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue. Tualatin Road provides the main access to our residential neighborhoods and is already overloaded with cut-through commuter traffic. Leveton Drive, on the other hand, was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available.

Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus, but the proposed site expansion would eliminate that driveway. This is unacceptable. Lam's new site plan needs to include a usable driveway that connects their main parking lots directly to Leveton Drive.

The last thing Tualatin Road needs is a thousand more cars per day, especially when a better alternative already exists. We are asking the City Council and City Staff to get creative and find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road.

Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road.

Thank You!

Cidney

From: Ellison Marks <ellison.marks27@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 1, 2025 9:50 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.
Ellison

Sent from my iPhone

From: Elizabeth Whalley <elizabethwhalley04@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 1, 2025 6:54 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am ABSOLUTELY against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Julianna Johnson <juliannaj230@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 1, 2025 6:19 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Miguel Rodea Olvera <zoologicoandante@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 1, 2025 5:25 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

From: Brianna Nelson <briannan90000@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 1, 2025 5:57 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Brianna Nelson

From: Jay Compton <zardoz503@icloud.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 1, 2025 2:04 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

From: Rick S <rspreng77@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 1, 2025 12:08 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

From: Don Johnson <djohnsona1@icloud.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 1, 2025 11:37 AM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin - I am really disappointed in our City for even considering allowing Lam Research traffic to exit onto Tualatin Rd. I understand the Tualatin Rd exit is one of three options, but it is not the favored option of local residents. Leveton drive makes greater sense and is the option supported by the majority of Tualatin residents. Please don't make the wrong decision for your constituents, when other, more favorable, options are available.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Beth Sethi <bethsethi@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 1, 2025 10:00 AM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Please don't let LAM ruin our neighborhood!

Dear Council Members, Mayor Bubenik, and City Staff,

Please do not allow LAM to add an entrance on Tualatin Road for their new TUX project. The neighborhood has been clear - as taxpayers, voters, and residents who love this city, there is a resounding voice OPPOSED to adding this unnecessary, problematic entrance.

LAM can continue to exit quite happily and successfully on to the lightly used Leveton Road, which was designed for industrial use and in my 20 years living in Tualatin has NEVER had a back up. Leveton is quiet even on the busiest days and nobody lives on Leveton.

In contrast, north of Tualatin Road is 100% residential. It is already difficult to turn onto, both right and left, from the Jurgens neighborhood exits during morning and evening commute time. Adding 1600 cars, including potentially trucks, will for certain make it impossible to turn left during busy times of day, and even turning right would be problematic. Tualatin Road hosts pedestrians and joggers, cyclists, and many school buses (including students waiting on corners abutting Tualatin Road for the bus). If anything, the city should be looking for ways to lighten traffic on Tualatin Road. Under no circumstances should the city be complicit in adding traffic to Tualatin Road, particularly when the neighborhood residents (who have been clear are not opposed to further development at LAM apart from this exit) have expressed such strong opposition.

We have an alternative. Use Leveton. Do not use Tualatin Road.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Beth Sethi
17552 SW Shasta Trail
20 year Tualatin resident, mother of 3 TTSD students, regular walker and cyclist

From: T B <baumanntk@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 28, 2025 7:40 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Tom Baumann

From: DeGay Harris <degaycheri@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 28, 2025 5:53 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best regards,
DeGay
Sent from my iPhone

From: Jen <jen.cameron86@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 28, 2025 3:00 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Thank you,

Jen

From: athomassen <athomassen@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, February 28, 2025 1:29 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From: Lauren Pyrch <lpyrch3@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 28, 2025 1:15 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Council
Subject: Opposition to Lam Research

Dear Tualatin City Council and Tualatin Planning Department:

I am strongly opposed to Lam Research adding a new entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue. Tualatin Road provides the main access to our residential neighborhoods and is already overloaded with cut-through commuter traffic. Leveton Drive, on the other hand, was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available.

Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus, but the proposed site expansion would eliminate that driveway. This is unacceptable. Lam's new site plan needs to include a usable driveway that connects their main parking lots directly to Leveton Drive.

The last thing Tualatin Road needs is a thousand more cars per day, especially when a better alternative already exists. We are asking the City Council and City Staff to get creative and find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road.

Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road.

Thank You!

Lauren

From: Laurel Strickler <topmanager2012@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, February 28, 2025 11:44 AM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Laurel Strickler

From: Michelle Lazoff <michellelazoff@icloud.com>
Sent: Friday, February 28, 2025 10:29 AM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Since moving to SW Chippewa Trail in 2015 - we have had no less than 4 severe crashes into the house on corner entry of our street or into the cemetery gates. When the original senior female owner was still in residence, a car crashed through the fence into her backyard and almost through her sliding glass door. Luckily, she was watching a movie at her neighbor's house. A fellow neighbor and I were woken up because it sounded like a car hit the house like a train and we ran to assist her. It is a horrible corner where people increase their speed for the fun of it. You can hear them rev the engines if it's nighttime. And the fact that you want to add more cars to the area and compound the issue, is literally another accident waiting to happen.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Michelle Lazoff
17900 SW Chippewa Trail

Sent from my iPhone

From: Jim Milne <jimkayaks@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, February 28, 2025 10:20 AM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

From: Jennifer Harper <jenjenharper2021@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 28, 2025 10:10 AM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Michael Ryan <bluesoxbb@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, February 28, 2025 10:05 AM
To: Ext - Planning
Subject: Tualatin rd

To Whom it may concern,
The idea of giving Lam Research new access to Tualatin Rd is horrible. It is already a road that has far to much traffic! With Lam adding another large building, which, of course, includes hundreds of more people with their cars, is fine for Lam. Just don't let them have access onto Tualatin Road. There is plenty of access for them on the south side of their campus.
Your idea of a traffic light to help regulate is just nonsense. If Lam gets access to Tualatin Road, the city might as well put a traffic light at Tualatin Rd and Teton, and one at 108th and Tualatin Rd.
For Christs sake, I moved into this neighborhood because of it being ideal for my family. Don't start eroding our neighborhood because of Lam's greed!
Mike Ryan
503-936-9744
11075 SW Wishram Ct

From: Lori Kellogg <lorilussierkellogg@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 28, 2025 7:28 AM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Lori

From: obidigbo obinna <obidigbobizil@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, February 28, 2025 6:41 AM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Michella Massaad <michamassaad@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2025 4:16 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Kelly Gallagher <kmoriartygallagher@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2025 2:26 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

From: David Chen <dchen369@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2025 1:36 PM
To: Ext - Planning
Subject: Save Tualatin Road - Tualatin Resident

Hi,

I am writing to express that I am saying NO to the new access on Tualatin Road. Please keep the lever on driveway for access.

Sincerely,

Concerned Tualatin Resident - David Chen

From: glo.consulting@comcast.net
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2025 1:06 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Greg Owen

Sent via the Samsung Galaxy S22 5G, an AT&T 5G smartphone
Get Outlook for Android

From: Geriann Courtney <gmcourtney@msn.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2025 12:51 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Geriann Courtney

Sent from my iPhone

From: Lynn Courtney <lynn.courtney@icloud.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2025 12:31 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Lynn & Geriann Courtney

From: Sally Hildebran <sallyhildebran@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2025 5:53 AM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Gary Green <garygreen97062@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2025 12:29 PM
To: Ext - Planning
Subject: Opposed to Lam driveway

Please add my opposition to those asking you to turn down Lam's petition for a new driveway accessing Tualatin Road.
I am already experiencing great difficulty pulling onto Tualatin Road from 106th and from Jurgens because of high traffic levels. The city has already constructed a road to carry truck traffic to the site and to separate business traffic from residential traffic. This proposal wastes that expenditure.
East/West traffic is a major problem throughout Tualatin because neighboring cities allowed the construction of barrier developments near freeway ramps in Tigard/Durham, Lake Grove, and especially Wilsonville. Tualatin needs to stop cooperating with these cities until they take their fair share of east/west traffic.

Sincerely yours,

Gary Green
10695 SW Kiowa Court

From: Kevin Wolley <batmute@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2025 12:53 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I live in the neighborhood immediately north of Tualatin Road at 11055 SW Wishram Court.

I am pleased to have Lam Research nearby, as they provide good jobs and are quiet neighbors. It's a good thing that their business is doing so well that they are expanding. So far their expansion has been done with consideration for the neighbors.

Now it seems Lam's expansion plans are losing their consideration for us neighbors. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. Surely it is not too much of an inconvenience for Lam personnel to enter and leave the Lam property via Leveton Drive, away from flow path of people coming and going from their homes north of Tualatin Road.

As a citizen and your constituent, I ask that the city require Lam to be good neighbors by limiting access to their property via Leveton Drive, and away from Tualatin Road.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road, please. Let's be considerate of one another.

Thank you,

Kevin Wolley

From: Janet Weber <weberjanet@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2025 11:37 AM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Samaneh Esfandiarpour <esfandiarpour@icloud.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2025 10:20 AM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project



,Dear City of Tualatin

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Frances Avery <franavery7@icloud.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2025 10:36 AM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Martin Bilitz <mebilitz@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2025 9:55 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Get Outlook for iOS

From: Kiki Goodwin <kikigoodwin@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2025 6:52 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kiki Goodwin
10631 SW Pueblo Ct

Sent from my iPhone

From: Vicki Tomaras <vicster529@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2025 6:15 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Tami Weitman <tntweitman@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2025 6:10 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: clint ackerman <hockey535353@outlook.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2025 4:45 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Donald Spencer <donaldwspencer@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2025 4:12 PM
To: Ext - Planning
Subject: LAM Tualatin Road Entrance

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

To Whom Makes Decisions:

Please, NO new entrance to LAM off of Tualatin Road.
I am not opposed to LAM increasing the number of buildings and employees on their property as they have been doing for years.

I walk the LAM property and appreciate their attentiveness to landscaping and noise pollution. LAM has been a good neighbor.

But LAM is not neighborly but asking its neighbors for another entrance and to increase traffic on Tualatin Road.
LAM presently has 5 entrances to its property.
Three on SW 108th and two on Leveton Drive

LAM cannot suggest they need direct access to Tualatin Road for trucks nor employees.

In the years I've lived across from LAM they and many other employers in the area have expanded and the traffic on Tualatin Road has greatly increased.

Please, NO new truck and employee access to the LAM property off of Tualatin Road.

Thank you. I do appreciate your work on the Planning Commission and the Review Board.

Don Spencer 503-539-3274

From: Wendy Morrell <imluvnlife2@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2025 3:26 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from Wendy"s iPhone

From: Adrienne McCullough <adrienneamac@icloud.com>
Sent: Monday, March 3, 2025 6:42 AM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Mark Edwards <mmmarkpdx@icloud.com>
Sent: Monday, March 3, 2025 9:36 AM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

Many of us living and working in the neighborhood across from the Lam campus are voicing our concerns about the challenges of pulling our vehicles out onto Tualatin road. It's becoming a danger to not only turn left at any of the exit points but also to cross the road on foot. The high speed of the traffic and disregard for the crosswalks can make it a challenge at many times during the day. This is without the proposed addition to increased traffic from the Lam project. Many of us are finding it easier to shop and eat in Sherwood and beyond just because of the difficulty of safely navigating towards Tualatin.

As a unified neighborhood voice we ask for no new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Mark Edwards
503.805.2200

From: Mary C. France <francemaryc@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 3, 2025 11:36 AM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.
Mary C. France
10570 SW Kiowa St, Tualatin, OR 97062

503 701 9065

From: David Brockway <DaveBpdx@outlook.com>
Sent: Monday, March 3, 2025 10:27 AM
To: Council; Ext - Planning
Cc: bluewave500@yahoo.com
Subject: Save Tualatin Road

Dear Tualatin City Council and Tualatin Planning Department:

Our family is opposed to Lam Research adding a new entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue. We live north of Tualatin Road. The only way to get to Tualatin is to make a left turn from our neighborhood on to Tualatin Road. With the large number of additional vehicles anticipated on Tualatin Road due to the Lam Research proposal, I feel it would be not only inconvenient but dangerous for us to get to Tualatin.

Why not use Leveton Drive? It seems to make so much more sense. It was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available.

Is the issue that Lam would have to spend a few extra bucks to route cars to Leveton? They are a for profit company and should be able to find a way to fund this solution. If they go ahead and add the Tualatin Road option, they will never be considered a good neighbor. Not only that, any council member that votes for this will not be in office when the election cycle happens. Something to think about.

The last thing Tualatin Road needs is a thousand more cars per day, especially when a better alternative already exists. We are asking the City Council and City Staff to get creative and find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road.

Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road.

Thank You!
Dave and Stephanie Brockway
108th pl,Tualatin

From: Drew Riverman <driv3n8@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 3, 2025 12:39 PM
To: Ext - Planning
Subject: Save Tualatin Road

Dear Tualatin City Council and Tualatin Planning Department:

My name is Drew, and I live at the Rivercrest Meadows Townhomes on Tualatin Road.

This is truly going to be an issue for myself and all other residents looking to travel to and from work each day.

I am strongly opposed to Lam Research adding a new entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue. Tualatin Road provides the main access to our residential neighborhoods and is already overloaded with cut-through commuter traffic. Leveton Drive, on the other hand, was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available.

Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus, but the proposed site expansion would eliminate that driveway. This is unacceptable. Lam's new site plan needs to include a usable driveway that connects their main parking lots directly to Leveton Drive.

The last thing Tualatin Road needs is a thousand more cars per day, especially when a better alternative already exists. We are asking the City Council and City Staff to get creative and find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road.

Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

From: Isabella Kreske <ickreske@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 3, 2025 3:06 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

From: Rachel Namdrik <bitolkiotak3@icloud.com>
Sent: Monday, March 3, 2025 3:38 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

No Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Daniel Flores <dany2142@icloud.com>
Sent: Monday, March 3, 2025 5:13 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: luckiecharm2001 <luckiecharm2001@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, March 3, 2025 5:35 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project



Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From: richard.lyons15@gmail.com
Sent: Monday, March 3, 2025 5:55 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPad

From: Joe Calzada <joecalzada87@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 3, 2025 5:56 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on

From: Saray <saraybieber94@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 3, 2025 5:59 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Saray Gonzales

From: Tami Richardson <trichardson.ccc@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 3, 2025 5:23 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project.

We are residents of Tualatin and live in a neighborhood off Tualatin Road on Winya Ct.

We are against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. We are asking that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

Please do not allow a new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Tualatin Road is already a busy road. We live active and involved lives here in Tualatin with our 4 children and have found it difficult and increasingly dangerous to turn out of our neighborhood when trying to take our kids to school, activities and sports practices during peak times. Having a LAM entrance on Tualatin Road would only add to this issue.

We love raising our family here in Tualatin and hope you take our quality of life into consideration. Thank you for your time.

Devin and Tami Richardson

From: John Phillips <jphillips4994@icloud.com>
Sent: Monday, March 3, 2025 6:24 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Wasayif Ahmed <wasayif00@icloud.com>
Sent: Monday, March 3, 2025 7:08 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project



,Dear City of Tualatin

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Janet Yee <jdyee@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, March 3, 2025 8:34 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Janet Yee
10400 SW Kiowa St
Tualatin, OR 97062

Sent from my iPhone

From: Heather Perin <perin.heather@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 4, 2025 5:59 AM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Heather Perin-Lake
Sent from my iPhone

From: Brenda Adams <space20k@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 4, 2025 2:40 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Brenda Adams

Sent from my iPhone

From: Jan Ohm <dsjohm@frontier.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 4, 2025 3:27 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Janine <jasuwi7@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 4, 2025 4:35 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Afreen Aen <afreenaen@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 4, 2025 5:51 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

,Dear City of Tualatin

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Kami Hamilton <kami@simple.be>
Sent: Tuesday, March 4, 2025 7:10 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kami Hamilton
11430 SW Kalispell St

Sent from my iPhone

From: Mary Thompson <mt_dwr@msn.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 4, 2025 7:18 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

From: Ethan Hutchison <ethanc.hutchison@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 4, 2025 7:37 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

As a long term resident, and part of the local community, I believe that we should put our financial or economic interests aside.

Thank you for your consideration.

From: HAWKE PACHECO <hawkepacheco28@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 4, 2025 8:46 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Hawke Pacheco

From: Katherine Garcia <katherinegarcia707@icloud.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 4, 2025 8:48 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Lola Achilova <achi2949@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 4, 2025 9:17 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: randy starks <notree87@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 4, 2025 9:01 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Randi
Sent from my iPhone

From: Mark Rieniets <Mark.Rieniets@ipaper.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 4, 2025 6:08 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from phone. Apologies for typing mistakes and autocorrect

From: Rebecca Phillips <beckyjean101@outlook.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 4, 2025 5:28 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project



Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am not in favor of the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city please require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Residents of:

17535 SW 111th Ave
Tualatin, OR 97062

From: Eli Puga <edpuga40@icloud.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 4, 2025 3:30 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Sharon Mitchell <sharon.fama@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 4, 2025 9:49 AM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sharon Mitchell

Sent from my iPhone

From: Shayna Baranek <shaynabaranek@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 3, 2025 5:21 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

It’s already hard to pull out onto the road as it is

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Sandra Maleta <gsmaleta@icloud.com>
Sent: Monday, March 3, 2025 1:53 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Greg Maleta
(Neighbor near by)

From: Sandy Maleta <gsmaleta@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 3, 2025 1:52 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

From: Joy Carlin Honodel <designcarlin@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 5, 2025 6:47 AM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Joy Honodel

From: Comcast <ba53@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, March 5, 2025 10:13 AM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPad

From: Katelyn Sasken <kafoiles@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 5, 2025 1:31 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Katelyn and Kellan Sasken

From: Vickie Gearhart <gearsmom@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 5, 2025 4:21 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Kat Gallagher <kmgallagher17@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 5, 2025 8:02 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO to new roadway access on Tualatin Road!

Thank you for your consideration,
Kathleen Gallagher

From: Jay Jaffee <jayjaffee@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 6, 2025 7:59 AM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

From: Caroline Jaffee <carolinejw8@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 6, 2025 10:03 AM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Caroline Jaffee

From: Scot Hale <m.scothale@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 5, 2025 8:11 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

From: Amy Johnson <johnsona@ohsu.edu>
Sent: Thursday, March 6, 2025 5:49 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

- Amy Johnson
17560 SW 111th Avenue
Tualatin, OR 97062
503.329.1952

From: Mary Milne <jsmilne@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, March 6, 2025 7:47 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Mary Milne

From: (null) jjporcello2 <jjporcello2@frontier.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 6, 2025 8:41 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project



Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

John Porcello
10780 SW Lucas Drive
Tualatin, Oregon 97062
(971)-344-1331

From: jsmilne@comcast.net
Sent: Friday, March 7, 2025 9:40 AM
To: Keith Leonard
Subject: RE: Lam TUX Project

Thanks Keith,

I would also like to emphasize that it is already difficult to turn left off our street (109th Ave.) onto Tualatin road at various times during the day. In addition, often while we try to turn left from 109th Ave., there are people across Tualatin Rd. trying to turn left off 108th Ave. from the area of LAM. Because 109th and 108th are so close, it makes turning even more challenging for us. Sometimes, you need to take a chance to make your turn instead of having to wait so long.

Thank you,
Mary Milne

-----Original Message-----
From: Keith Leonard <kleonard@tualatin.gov>
Sent: Friday, March 7, 2025 9:17 AM
To: Mary Milne <jsmilne@comcast.net>
Subject: RE: Lam TUX Project

Good morning Mary,

Thank you for submitting comments pertaining to the Lam TUX proposal. We have added your comments to the public record. Thank you for taking time out of your day to be part of the public review process.

Have a great day.

Keith Leonard, AICP
Associate Planner
Phone: 503.691.3029

-----Original Message-----
From: Mary Milne <jsmilne@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, March 6, 2025 7:47 PM
To: Ext - Planning <Planning@tualatin.gov>; Keith Leonard <kleonard@tualatin.gov>
Cc: Council <council@tualatin.gov>; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Mary Milne

11400 SW Elmer Court
Tualatin, OR 97062

March 3, 2025

Tualatin Planning Commission
10699 SW Herman Road
Tualatin, OR 97062

Re: Tualatin Road at 115th to provide an exit from Lam Research for hundreds of cars

We attended the first meeting regarding this issue last year. It was obvious to us that Lam Research and the City of Tualatin were surprised that the people attending were against the stoplight at 115th and Tualatin Road which would provide an exit from Lam. Lam currently has an adequate exit from their property on Leveton Drive. Leveton Drive currently has little or no traffic and has access to to SW 108th and 124th from either direction. This driveway has provided an exit from Lam sufficiently for years.

We are concerned that an exit from Lam directly to 115th and Tualatin Road would jam the roads with hundreds of cars. We live on Elmer Court off of 115th and with hundreds of additional cars moving across Tualatin Road down 115th to Hazelbrook Road to reach the shortcut to Highway 99, it would clog access to 115th from Kalispel, Roberts Court and Elmer Court from even being able to get on 115th. The span from Tualatin Road to Hazelbrook Road is about the length of a downtown city block. The backup at Lam would be horrendous.

Currently, there are issues at certain times of the day when cars are lined up on 115th going down to Hazelbrook Road. We don't want the traffic congestion to get worse.

Please consider that they have an exit on Leveton Drive and one at 115th and Tualatin Road would just cause added traffic congestion there,

Thank you.

Sincerely,

James and Mary Arbuckle

From: Carrie Mathis <swissmissthefirst@hotmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 8, 2025 10:19 AM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

I really appreciate your consideration.

Thank you!
Carrie Yoder

Sent from my iPhone

From: Adam Skach <adam.skach@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 8, 2025 3:29 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

From: Samantha Beem <samanthabeem@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 8, 2025 3:30 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Brett Hamilton <brett@simple.be>
Sent: Wednesday, March 5, 2025 9:15 PM
To: Council
Cc: Ext - Planning; Megan George; Keith Leonard; Steve Koper; Sherilyn Lombos
Subject: Lam Hearing Schedule

Dear City Council,

Over the past week, members of the community have been canvassing neighborhoods to get word out regarding Lam's upcoming hearings. Each day during our canvas we checked the city website to make sure the schedule had not changed. Today, we learned that Lam requested a postponement a week ago. This was not announced to the public and the city website has still not been updated. As a result, all the flyers we distributed have obsolete dates.

The first hearing was scheduled for two weeks from tonight. Many residents are still planning to attend based on that original date, and unfortunately we do not have an efficient way to reach all of them in time, but the City does.

We are asking the City of Tualatin to provide updates to the community right now explaining that the hearings have been postponed at the request of the applicant. There is no need to wait for new hearing dates to be confirmed before letting the public know that the old dates are now obsolete. Due to the short time frame, we believe that three methods will be necessary now to reach all interested parties in time:

1) Update the city website.
2) Send an email update to each person who has provided public comment.
3) Mail a postcard to every household in the Riverpark CIO.

We ask for your assistance in keeping the community up to date on this very important issue.

Sincerely,
Brett Hamilton

From: Alex Simpson <asimps33@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 13, 2025 2:32 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

From: Alisha Treider <a_415@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 17, 2025 8:56 AM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Get Outlook for iOS

From: Carol Plambeck <carol.plambeck@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 11, 2025 3:39 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear City of Tualatin decision makers:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I have lived in Tualatin (and paid taxes here) for 46 years.

I am totally opposed to the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. If that entrance is approved, we city residents who live north of Tualatin Road will have to wait even longer to leave our neighborhood (and the wait is plenty long already!) Please require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive. PLEASE do not permit ANY new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

At the very least, IF this entrance is approved—and I very much hope that it's NOT—please insist that Lam install a traffic light at that entrance.

Thank you.

carol.plambeck@gmail.com

From: Catie Jones <catiesybiljones@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2025 1:13 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best
Catharine Jones

From: cdacondo@gmail.com
Sent: Monday, March 17, 2025 5:18 PM
To: Council; Ext - Planning
Subject: Tualatin Road

September 7, 2024

To: Tualatin City Council: council@tualatin.gov
To: Tualatin Planning Department: planning@tualatin.gov

Dear Tualatin City Council and Tualatin Planning Department:

I am strongly opposed to Lam Research adding a new entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue. Tualatin Road provides the main access to our residential neighborhoods and is already overloaded with cut-through commuter traffic. Leveton Drive, on the other hand, was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available.

Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus, but the proposed site expansion would eliminate that driveway. This is unacceptable. Lam's new site plan needs to include a usable driveway that connects their main parking lots directly to Leveton Drive.

The last thing Tualatin Road needs is a thousand more cars per day, especially when a better alternative already exists. We are asking the City Council and City Staff to get creative and find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road.

Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road.

Thank You!

From: David Ney <davidn503@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, March 14, 2025 3:51 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,

David Ney
10235 SW Fulton Dr, Tualatin, OR 97062

From: Adam Dickinson <adambdickinson@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 24, 2025 12:16 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Adam Dickinson

From: Alisha Carlson <alishamcarlson91@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 22, 2025 2:40 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

From: Emy Loanzon <emmlcommerce@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 23, 2025 3:16 PM
To: Council; Ext - Planning
Subject: Save Tualatin Road

Dear Tualatin City Council and Tualatin Planning Department:

I am strongly opposed to Lam Research adding a new entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue. Tualatin Road provides the main access to our residential neighborhoods and is already overloaded with cut-through commuter traffic. Leveton Drive, on the other hand, was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available.

Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus, but the proposed site expansion would eliminate that driveway. This is unacceptable. Lam's new site plan needs to include a usable driveway that connects their main parking lots directly to Leveton Drive.

The last thing Tualatin Road needs is a thousand more cars per day, especially when a better alternative already exists. We are asking the City Council and City Staff to get creative and find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road.

Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road.

Thank You!

Emy Loanzon

From: John Phillips <jphillips4994@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, March 21, 2025 10:57 AM
To: Keith Leonard; Brett Hamilton
Subject: Fwd: Improving Tualatin's Public Notice Policy

Dear Tualatin City Council,

Thank you for being responsive to community input regarding the city's public notice policies. We are glad to see that the Council is considering adding apartments units to the public notice mailing lists, as this will improve equity and fairness in the land use review process. We would ask that the City Council also consider expanding the mailing radius beyond 1000 feet for large projects. We believe that the current mailing radius does not reach all of the residents who would be impacted by Lam's TUX proposal. Although 1000 ft is adequate for small projects, larger projects call for a larger mailing radius.

Thank you for your consideration, and for your efforts to improve our community!

Sent from my phone
>
>

From: Margo Strength <dgrahms@comcast.net>
Sent: Saturday, March 22, 2025 9:57 AM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Margo Strength (concerned resident)

Sent from my iPhone

From: Steven Agee <stevenagee724@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 22, 2025 3:48 PM
To: Council; Ext - Engineering Exterrnal Email; Ext - Planning
Subject: SAVE TUALATIN ROAD

Dear Tualatin City Council, Tualatin Engineering Department and Tualatin Planning Department:

I am strongly opposed to Lam Research adding a new entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Avenue. Tualatin Road provides the main access to our residential neighborhoods and is already overloaded with cut-through commuter traffic. Leveton Drive, on the other hand, was built for industrial traffic and has plenty of unused capacity already available.

Lam currently has a driveway that connects Leveton Drive straight to the parking lots on the north side of their campus, but the proposed site expansion would eliminate that driveway. This is unacceptable. Lam's new site plan needs to include a usable driveway that connects their main parking lots directly to Leveton Drive.

The last thing Tualatin Road needs is a thousand more cars per day, especially when a better alternative already exists. We are asking the City Council and City Staff to get creative and find a solution to this problem that does not involve adding more traffic to Tualatin Road.

Use Leveton Drive. Save Tualatin Road.

Thank You!

From: Steven Agee <stevenagee724@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, March 22, 2025 3:50 PM

To: Council; Ext - Planning; Ext - Engineering Exterrnal Email

Subject: SAVE TUALATIN ROAD

Dear City of Tualatin,

While researching the traffic impacts from Lam's TUX project, members of the community have discovered that Lam's proposal is not compatible with the Tualatin Comprehensive Plan 2040, and it would violate the Tualatin Development Code, both in spirit and letter.

For the reasons outlined below, we are asking the Tualatin Planning Department to consider Lam's proposed entrance on Tualatin Road to not be approvable, and we ask the City Manager to use her authority to have the proposed entrance removed from the TUX project site plan so that alternative access can be designed.

SITE CIRCULATION

Existing driveways provide sufficient access points to the Lam Campus as a whole. Lam currently has 6 other access points. 3 on 108th and 3 on Leveton Drive. Adding a new access point on Tualatin Road is unnecessary.

Lam is responsible for designing reasonable site circulation. A lack of good site circulation is not a valid reason to add an additional driveway onto the street network.

The Tualatin Comprehensive Plan 2040 strongly supports the use of existing access points, rather than creating new ones, especially when a new access point would have negative impacts to the community. "Consider transportation options that make the best use of the existing network" (Goal 8.7)

SPIRIT OF THE LAW

Tualatin Road is currently functioning as an arterial, it was previously classified as an arterial, and it has the traffic volume of an arterial. Leveton Drive is currently functioning as a collector, it was previously classified as a collector, and it has the current traffic volume of a collector.

During the 2012-14 TSP update, the functional classifications of these streets were reversed in a failed attempt by the city to reduce the amount of traffic on Tualatin Road and encourage more trips to use Leveton Drive. While we appreciate the intent of this reversal, the impact is now exactly opposite of what was intended, and we ask that this reversal be deemed a mistake. We ask the city to remedy this mistake by restoring the correct functional classifications to their appropriate streets. Lam should not be allowed to rely on a classification error to put a new entrance on a road that, based on current conditions, should not have a new entrance.

If the streets were classified correctly, Lam Research would not be able to add an employee entrance on Tualatin Road because it would be an arterial. “No new driveways or streets on arterial roadways within the City, except where noted in the TDC, usually when no alternative access is available.” (TCP 2040 POLICY 8.10.1)

LETTER OF THE LAW

The Tualatin Development Code says “Lots that front on more than one street may be required to locate motor vehicle accesses on the street with the lower functional classification as determined by the City Manager.” TDC 75.040 (5) Currently the TSP shows 108th classified as a minor collector and Tualatin Road a major collector. Based on this, access should be provided from 108th not Tualatin Road.

Lam’s proposed entrance on Tualatin Road fails four of the new driveway approach criteria in TDC 75.020.5: "(d)(ii) Takes access from the lowest classification of street abutting the property … (g) The proposed driveway approach does not result in significant adverse impacts to the vicinity; (h) The proposed driveway approach minimizes impact to the functionality of adjacent streets and intersections; and (i) The proposed driveway approach balances the adverse impacts to residentially zoned property and the functionality of adjacent streets."

Tualatin Development Code 75.140.15 (a) grants the specific locations for Lam's three driveways on the north side of Leveton Drive. The applicant's proposal to relocate one of the three driveways is not compliant with the development code.

No matter which way you slice it, Tualatin Road is the worst option for carrying Lam’s new entrance and additional traffic volume. We ask the City Manager to use her discretion and require access from the most appropriate road which, by any metric, is Leveton Drive.

PROPOSED TRAFFIC SIGNAL

The proposed entrance on Tualatin Road would create the need for a new traffic signal on Tualatin Road which would have many negative impacts on the community. These impacts justify rejection of the proposed access. If Lam were to take access from Leveton Drive, no new traffic signal would be needed.

The community provided overwhelming feedback during the TSP update this summer about this issue and we asked that the proposed traffic signal be removed from the TSP. The city should take this feedback into account and "Conduct the planning process with adequate input and feedback from citizens in each affected neighborhood” (TCP 2040 Goal 8.7)

CONSIDER SAFETY

The Tualatin TSP Existing Conditions Report shows Tualatin Road and 115th Ave having higher Pedestrian Level of Traffic Stress than Leveton Drive and 108th Ave. (Figure 23) Adding more traffic to Tualatin Road and 115th Ave will degrade pedestrian safety even further.

Tualatin Road between 124th and 115th has higher concentration of collisions than Leveton and 108th, with a history of serious injury collision while Leveton does not. (Figure 31) Adding more traffic onto Tualatin Road and 115th will increase the traffic exposure and likely result in worse safety outcomes.

Tualatin Road has a history of collisions involving pedestrians and bicycles while Leveton and 108th do not. (Figure 32) Adding more traffic to Tualatin Road will likely make this safety issue worse.

Converting a driveway to full access or signalizing a driveway would likely increase traffic crashes. Per CMF ClearingHouse, changing driveway type to full access has a crash modification factor (CMF) of 2.25, and signalizing a driveway has a CMF of 3.98, which means that the two measures will likely increase traffic crashes by a factor of 2.25 and 3.98 respectively.

Lam's traffic study also does not identify the locations of school bus routes at Hazelbrook Middle School or the potential impacts to school bus traffic. Student safety is one of the most important issues in our community, but so far it has been ignored in this process.

Also, the safety and congestion impacts from Lam's proposal would be most concentrated on Tualatin Road between 115th and 124th which abuts a residential area with traditionally disadvantaged demographics and income limited apartments. This is not equitable.

BYPASS ROUTE

The route from Hazelbrook Road going west and turning right onto Hwy 99W is a "hidden" route that can bypass the traffic congestion at the west end of Tualatin Road. Adding a signal at 115th and Tualatin Road will encourage more cars to take this bypass. The potential impact of this new traffic pattern imposes significant safety concerns to communities all along the route. These impacts were not addressed in the traffic study.

SUMMARY

We urge the city to consider all the above concerns and require the applicant (Lam) to revise their site development plan accordingly. We believe that the current proposal does not meet Tualatin's planning rules, and that the City Manager should use her authority to bring Lam's proposal into compliance. No new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank You

From: Steven Agee <stevenagee724@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 22, 2025 3:51 PM
To: Ext - Engineering Exterrnal Email; Ext - Planning; Council
Subject: SAVE TUALATIN ROAD

Dear City of Tualatin,

A review of project documents reveals that Mackenzie/Lam did not notify any CIO representatives prior to the June 2024 neighborhood developer meeting, as required by Tualatin Development Code 32.120.5 (b)(iii). The code requires an applicant to send notice to CIO representatives via First Class Mail at least 14 days *before* the neighborhood developer meeting. This requirement was not met at the time, nor can it be met retroactively.

Lam and Mackenzie have been through the Tualatin land use review process before and they know the requirements. In 2022, Suzannah Stanley, Mackenzie Planner, demonstrated that she is very familiar with the CIO notification section. On pages 29-32 of Lam's IMP 22-0001 application, Ms. Stanley is on the record arguing that this notice requirement does not apply to Lam:

"We did not contact any City-recognized CIOs.
Please use this statement in your completeness checklist."
(Page 29) http://www.tualatinroad.org/files/LAM2022081201.pdf

If the City of Tualatin allows Mackenzie and Lam to repeatedly and flagrantly violate notice requirements, the legitimacy of the CIO program will be compromised.

At the June neighborhood developer meeting, Mackenzie said that "the project team is open to continue discussing topics of concern with neighbors" (see meeting minutes #13) however, repeated attempts by the community to open a dialogue with Lam and Mackenzie have been met with refusal and stonewalling. Lam's Chief Communication Officer, Steve Fine, clarified their position in his November 2024 email:

"We are committed to following the City's process to finalize a plan for our project that works for the City, the community, and Lam. In keeping with this approach, please address future communications about traffic considerations to the City of Tualatin."

Because Mackenzie and Lam have not followed proper notice procedure, we hereby ask the City of Tualatin to deny Lam's current land use application so that the applicant can reset and start over.

Thank you for your consideration.

From: Steven Agee <stevenagee724@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 23, 2025 2:09 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Ext - Engineering Exterrnal Email; Council
Subject: SAVE TUALATIN ROAD

I do not currently live on Tualatin Road. I actually live in Tigard right across the bridge and grew up on Tualatin Road. I do not feel that the impact this project would have on commuters or on neighboring cities have been thought of enough as well as the people who would be affected around the expansion. If approved their expansion would increase commute times for people already taking 99W home and passing the shortcut people take off hazelbrook road to get to 99W. I feel that it could potentially lead to more accidents from people forcing their way on to 99W from the Hazelbrook stop sign and it could also create delays even further back on 99W due to congestion which is already bad enough as is. I feel that with an expansion of this size it should be required by law for Lam to bring this to the attention of the whole county it affects rather than just to the City of Tualatin as it would affect many more people than just Tualatin! I truly and whole-heartedly believe that a good amount of people from neighboring cities within the county who also would be affected would have some input about this which should be taken in to consideration as well!

Thank you

Steven Agee

Former Tualatin Resident for 15 years, current King City resident RIGHT across the bridge barely out of Tualatin!

From: Amy Williams <130.amy@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 27, 2025 6:11 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the proposed employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the city require Lam to keep their existing driveways on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

From: Kayla Gonzaga <kaygon1997@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2025 1:11 AM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Janessa Quintanilla <janessaq89@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 27, 2025 7:18 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Kimmarie Baranco <kimmarie@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 4, 2025 6:13 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kimmarie Baranco
503-927-9150

From: Carrie Knappenberger <carrie.knappenberger1@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 4, 2025 8:47 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Carrie

From: Gina Byers <oregongina@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 4, 2025 10:08 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

From: deborah anderson <deborah52557@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 4, 2025 10:31 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.
PLEASE DO NOT DO THIS. THERE ARE OTHER CHOICES. MANY PEOPLE WHO LIVE ON THIS STREET WILL BE NEGATIVELY IMPACTED FOR NO GOOD REASON.
Use 124 th for access. That's what's it was built for, to divert traffic from the residential area to the industrial area.
I appreciate all my neighbors, including the businesses, please appreciate me back!

Thank you for your consideration.
Deborah Anderson
Resident SW Tualatin RD

Sent from my iPhone

From: Chris Hein <ChrisH@osf.com>
Sent: Monday, May 5, 2025 1:16 PM
To: Transportation System Plan (TSP) distribution group; Ext - Planning; Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Cc: Chris Hein; Keith Leonard
Subject: RE: Tualatin Transportation System Plan

To: Tualatin TSP, Planning Department, City Council
cc: Outreach Tualatin Road.ORG

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Tualatin Transportation System Plan and I would also like my comments to be included in the Public Comments for the Lam Tux Proposal.

I would like to request the following changes be made to the draft TSP before it is considered for adoption:

1. Remove the proposed traffic signal at Tualatin Road and SW 115th Ave.
2. Reclassify Tualatin Road as an Arterial.
3. Reclassify Leveton Drive as a Collector.

Although this traffic signal has been proposed with good intentions, community members have identified a number of unintended consequences that would result from signalizing this intersection:

• Increased cut-through traffic in the surrounding neighborhoods
• Increased bypass traffic on Jurgens Ave and Hazelbrook Road
• Increased traffic in the School Zone at Hazelbrook Middle School
• Increased pedestrian risk to Hazelbrook Middle School students
• More brake dust, engine noise, car exhaust, and traffic collisions
• Increased air pollution in the areas downwind from this intersection
• Increased traffic congestion upstream from this intersection

The proposed traffic signal would do more harm than good, and the negative impacts would be detrimental to our community. We are opposed to this traffic signal, and we ask the City to remove it from the TSP.

Tualatin Road is currently functioning as an arterial, it was previously classified as an arterial,

and it has the traffic volume of an arterial. Leveton Drive is currently functioning as a collector, it was previously classified as a collector, and it has the current traffic volume of a collector. We ask that the functional classifications of these two roadways be restored to their correct category during the current TSP update.

Having lived in Tualatin for over 30 Years and having attended many proposal hearings about the development of the Novellus and now Lam Industries property the conversation had always been promoted about Leveton Drive as a collector to alleviate the traffic on Tualatin Road. You now have a chance to reconfirm the classifications to keep even more traffic off Tualatin road.

Thank you for your consideration,

Chris Hein

10975 SW Tunica
St.

Tualatin, Oregon 97062

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately by email and delete this email from your system

From: Fritz Weber <fritz@luminos.net>
Sent: Thursday, May 15, 2025 12:30 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

I am against a new employee entrance on Tualatin Road. They should keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

Thank you.

From: Gabriel Brown <gabebrown319377@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 20, 2025 8:51 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.
Sincerely a guy who lives in rivercrest meadows. The literal intersection they are asking to gang rape with their employees.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Dorothy Dorantes <dorothysamantha123@icloud.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 28, 2025 11:42 AM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Dorothy Dorantes
(971)727-0346
dorothysamantha123@icloud.com

From: William Lancaster <william.lancaster@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 29, 2025 8:09 AM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Tom Rymanowicz <tom@advantagetaxservices.com>
Sent: Monday, May 12, 2025 8:42 AM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

I live on SW Cheyenne Way. With the existing traffic we now have on Tualatin and Herman Roads where they intersect, it is very difficult to turn onto Tualatin Road from SW Cheyenne Way. Adding more traffic on Tualatin Road would only make my turn onto Tualatin Road more dangerous. It Lam is permitted to adding the entrance, I will to have the intersection of Herman and Tualatin re-configured to allow my safe turn onto Tualatin Road

Please - NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Thomas Rymanowicz
17500 SW Cheyenne Way
Tualatin, OR 97062

From: Lisa Godfrey <ljgodfrey@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 14, 2025 8:49 AM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Thanks,
Lisa

From: zach kuzens <zkuzens@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, June 6, 2025 1:01 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project



Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

From: hopecounselingservices <hopecounselingservices@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, June 12, 2025 3:39 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project



Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project.

I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.
Sonya Jones

Sent from my T-Mobile 5G Device

From: Karen Aiello <aiellok54@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 18, 2025 10:31 AM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent ka

From: Jorge Del Rio <jorgedelrio52@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 18, 2025 3:05 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Alaina Hailey <achailey16@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 18, 2025 3:22 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Alex Santucci <asantonio356@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 18, 2025 7:16 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: dave franceis <ps4davey@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, June 20, 2025 2:43 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project



Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best regards

From: Dave McKevitt <dmckevitt@silkinmanagementgroup.com>
Sent: Friday, June 20, 2025 12:46 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Tricia Bellavance <wildabundance17@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 25, 2025 10:02 AM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project



Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Tricia

From: Tricia Johnson <mynameistricia@icloud.com>
Sent: Friday, June 20, 2025 3:44 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

From: Hayden Oelke <hayds421@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 26, 2025 11:57 AM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Sabrina Juarez Fabela <sabrinamjuarezfabela@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 26, 2025 8:02 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project



Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

From: Marco Fabela <marcofabela1469@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 26, 2025 8:02 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project



Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

From: Sabrina Juarez Fabela <sabrinamjuarezfabela@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 26, 2025 8:02 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project



Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

From: Cheyenne Palmer <cheyenne0autumn@icloud.com>
Sent: Friday, June 27, 2025 2:01 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Meghan Rogers-Czarnecki <megczar@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, June 27, 2025 4:19 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Erica Flores <ericadelasflores@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 28, 2025 4:21 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project



Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Erica

From: mikaela stoner <mikaelastoner@icloud.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 28, 2025 6:42 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Wren Villicano <wren.villicano@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 30, 2025 2:45 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project



Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

From: Hannah Laudi <hannahlaudi@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 29, 2025 6:36 AM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Ashley Sexton <sextona94@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 1, 2025 1:59 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

From: Darrell Jones <drljones2@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 3:24 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Jenny Blodgett <jenny.blodgett32@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 11, 2025 3:16 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project



Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

From: Sheylinn Gano <shey_shey16@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 11:05 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project



Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my T-Mobile 5G Device
Get Outlook for Android

From: Renee Dempsey <naenae6392@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 17, 2025 12:30 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project



Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

From: Skye Allen <skyeallen97@icloud.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 20, 2025 2:28 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam TUX Project

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's proposed TUX project. I am against the addition of an employee entrance on Tualatin Road. I ask that the City require Lam to keep their existing access on Leveton Drive.

NO new roadway access on Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

Against

Submitted from 7/21/25 through 12:00 pm 8/13/25

From: Michael Crumley <mickcrumdog21@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 24, 2025 6:26 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Revised Lam TUX Site Plan



Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's updated TUX proposal. While I appreciate the work that has been done to eliminate the employee entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Ave and maintain the Leveton driveway, I am opposed to the addition of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Avenue.

NO new employee access on 108th
NO added traffic on Tualatin Road
Use Leveton Drive and Herman Road

Thank you for your consideration.

From: Phil Vincent <pdvpdx@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 25, 2025 12:15 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Revised Lam TUX Site Plan

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's updated TUX proposal. While I appreciate the work that has been done to eliminate the employee entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Ave and maintain the Leveton driveway, I am opposed to the addition of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Avenue.

NO new employee access on 108th
NO added traffic on Tualatin Road
Use Leveton Drive and Herman Road

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Amy Williams <130.amy@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2025 7:09 AM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Revised Lam TUX Site Plan



Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's updated TUX proposal. While I appreciate the work that has been done to eliminate the employee entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Ave and maintain the Leveton driveway, I am opposed to the addition of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Avenue, as it would increase peak traffic volumes on Tualatin Road.

NO new employee access on 108th
NO added traffic on Tualatin Road
Use Leveton Drive and Herman Road

Thank you for your consideration.

From: Ashley Isenberg <ashleymisenberg@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 28, 2025 5:12 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Revised Lam TUX Site Plan



Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's updated TUX proposal. While I appreciate the work that has been done to eliminate the employee entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Ave and maintain the Leveton driveway, I am opposed to the addition of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Avenue, as it would increase peak traffic volumes on Tualatin Road.

NO new employee access on 108th
NO added traffic on Tualatin Road
Use Leveton Drive and Herman Road

Thank you for your consideration.

From: Bob Anderson <banderson12@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2025 8:30 AM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Revised LAM TUX site plan



Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's updated TUX proposal. While I appreciate the work that has been done to eliminate the employee entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Ave and maintain the Leveton driveway, I am opposed to the addition of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Avenue, as it would increase peak traffic volumes on Tualatin Road.

NO new employee access on 108th
NO added traffic on Tualatin Road
Use Leveton Drive and Herman Road

Thank you for your consideration

Bob Anderson
101910 SW Bannoch St.
Tualatin, OR

From: clint ackerman <hockey535353@outlook.com>
Sent: Monday, July 28, 2025 8:01 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Revised Lam TUX Site Plan

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's updated TUX proposal. While I appreciate the work that has been done to eliminate the employee entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Ave and maintain the Leveton driveway, I am opposed to the addition of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Avenue, as it would increase peak traffic volumes on Tualatin Road.

NO new employee access on 108th
NO added traffic on Tualatin Road
Use Leveton Drive and Herman Road

Thank you for your consideratin

Think don't be like Trump and kiss the ass of big business. You elected to represent the will of the people.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Dave McKevitt <dmckevitt@silkinmanagementgroup.com>
Sent: Monday, July 28, 2025 8:45 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Revised Lam TUX Site Plan

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's updated TUX proposal. While I appreciate the work that has been done to eliminate the employee entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Ave and maintain the Leveton driveway, I am opposed to the addition of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Avenue, as it would increase peak traffic volumes on Tualatin Road.

NO new employee access on 108th
NO added traffic on Tualatin Road
Use Leveton Drive and Herman Road

Thank you for your consideration.

- Dave McKevitt

From: deborah anderson <deborah52557@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 30, 2025 9:46 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Revised Lam TUX Site Plan

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's updated TUX proposal. While I appreciate the work that has been done to eliminate the employee entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Ave and maintain the Leveton driveway, I am opposed to the addition of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Avenue, as it would increase peak traffic volumes on Tualatin Road.

NO new employee access on 108th
NO added traffic on Tualatin Road
Use Leveton Drive and Herman Road

As a long time resident living on SW Tualatin Rd, this is my ONLY access in and out. Your employees have other choices, please be a good neighbor and do the right thing. It would be such an easy fix to have your employees take Leveton Drive/Herman Road/124th.

Thank you for your consideration.

Deborah Anderson

Sent from my iPhone

From: Eric Smith <jetsmith777@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 28, 2025 5:50 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Revised Lam TUX Site Plan



Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's updated TUX proposal. While I appreciate the work that has been done to eliminate the employee entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Ave and maintain the Leveton driveway, I am opposed to the addition of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Avenue, as it would increase peak traffic volumes on Tualatin Road.

NO new employee access on 108th
NO added traffic on Tualatin Road
Use Leveton Drive and Herman Road

Thank you for your consideration.

From: Jay Compton <zardoz503@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 28, 2025 6:01 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Revised Lam TUX Site Plan

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's updated TUX proposal. While I appreciate the work that has been done to eliminate the employee entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Ave and maintain the Leveton driveway, I am opposed to the addition of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Avenue, as it would increase peak traffic volumes on Tualatin Road.

NO new employee access on 108th
NO added traffic on Tualatin Road
Use Leveton Drive and Herman Road

Thank you for your consideration.

From: jjporcello2@frontier.com
Sent: Monday, July 28, 2025 9:09 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Revised Lam TUX Site Plan



Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's updated TUX proposal. While we **greatly** appreciate the work that has been done to eliminate the employee entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Ave and maintain the Leveton driveway, we are nonetheless opposed to the addition of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Avenue, which would increase peak traffic volumes on Tualatin Road. Getting onto Tualatin Road from our neighborhood on the north side of Tualatin Road is already difficult and fraught with worry about getting into an accident due to difficult sight lines and speeding traffic. This will only make it worse. Specifically, here's what we request:

- NO new employee access on 108th
- NO added traffic on Tualatin Road
- All LAM traffic should use Leveton Drive and Herman Road to access the LAM campus

Thank you for your consideration.

John and Pam Porcello

10780 SW Lucas Drive

Tualatin, OR 97062

From: Keith Leonard
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2025 9:30 AM
To: 'John Phillips'
Subject: RE: Revised Lam TUX Site Plan

Good Morning John,

We've received your additional comments pertaining to the Lam development proposal. Your comments have been added to the public record. Thank you for taking the time out of your day to take part in the public review and comment process.

Have a good day.

Keith Leonard, AICP
Associate Planner
Phone: 503.691.3029

-----Original Message-----
From: John Phillips <jphillips4994@icloud.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2025 7:28 AM
To: Keith Leonard <kleonard@tualatin.gov>; Ext - Planning <Planning@tualatin.gov>
Cc: Council <council@tualatin.gov>; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Revised Lam TUX Site Plan

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's updated TUX proposal. While I appreciate the work that has been done to eliminate the employee entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Ave and maintain the Leveton driveway, I am opposed to the addition of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Avenue, as it would increase peak traffic volumes on Tualatin Road.

NO new employee access on 108th
NO added traffic on Tualatin Road
Use Leveton Drive and Herman Road

Thank you for your consideration.

John C Phillips
Shawnee Trail

Sent from my iPhone

From: Karen Aiello <aiellok54@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2025 8:31 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Revised Lam TUX Site Plan

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's updated TUX proposal. While I appreciate the work that has been done to eliminate the employee entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Ave and maintain the Leveton driveway, I am opposed to the addition of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Avenue, as it would increase peak traffic volumes on Tualatin Road.

NO new employee access on 108th
NO added traffic on Tualatin Road
Use Leveton Drive and Herman Road

Thank you for your consideration.
Respectfully,
Karen Aiello- long time resident of 106th and Tualatin road.

Sent ka

From: Kathleen Mahmoudi <katyvonne@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, July 28, 2025 6:00 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Revised Lam TUX Site Plan

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's updated TUX proposal. While I appreciate the work that has been done to eliminate the employee entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Ave and maintain the Leveton driveway, I am opposed to the addition of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Avenue, as it would increase peak traffic volumes on Tualatin Road.

NO new employee access on 108th
NO added traffic on Tualatin Road
Use Leveton Drive and Herman Road

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Katie H <pearson.katie.41@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2025 1:45 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Revised Lam TUX Site Plan



Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's updated TUX proposal. While I appreciate the work that has been done to eliminate the employee entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Ave and maintain the Leveton driveway, I am opposed to the addition of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Avenue, as it would increase peak traffic volumes on Tualatin Road.

There are already FREQUENT accidents along this stretch of road, and it would bring the increased safety concerns, congestion, and noise of the added traffic even closer to many residencial areas whose only access is Tualatin Rd. I have already witnessed people speeding around cars to pass illegally on Tualatin road, and have been subject to cars speeding, tailgating, and demonstrating a variety of other unsafe behaviors, often close to the intersection by SW 108th Ave. all while my toddler was in the car or when trying to walk to Juergen park from our neighborhood. Families live here, many with small children - myself included - and we strongly oppose the new employee entrance on SW 108th Ave.

NO new employee access on 108th
NO added traffic on Tualatin Road
Use Leveton Drive and Herman Road

Thank you for your consideration.

Katie Helms
(Resident and home owner in Tualatin)

From: Kim Devers <kimldevers@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2025 8:30 AM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Revised Lam TUX Site Plan



Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's updated TUX proposal. While I appreciate the work that has been done to eliminate the employee entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Ave and maintain the Leveton driveway, I am opposed to the addition of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Avenue, as it would increase peak traffic volumes on Tualatin Road.

NO new employee access on 108th
NO added traffic on Tualatin Road
Use Leveton Drive and Herman Road

Thank you for your consideration.

Kim Devers

PS -- My house is just one house away from Tualatin Road, on Chippewa Trail. The traffic noise and pollution is already significant. My neighbors who are on the corner have a toddler and an infant. I would hate for their children to be unable to play in their own yard due to additional fumes and/or noise.

From: Lindsay Krinke <lindsay.krinke@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 26, 2025 11:09 AM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Revised Lam TUX Site Plan

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's updated TUX proposal. While I appreciate the work that has been done to eliminate the employee entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Ave and maintain the Leveton driveway, I am opposed to the addition of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Avenue.

NO new employee access on 108th
NO added traffic on Tualatin Road
Use Leveton Drive and Herman Road

Thank you for your consideration.

Pecked on a mobile device. Please excuse errors.

From: Lisa Godfrey <ljgodfrey@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2025 5:43 PM
To: Ext - Planning; Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Revised Lam TUX Site Plan



Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's updated TUX proposal. While I appreciate the work that has been done to eliminate the employee entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Ave and maintain the Leveton driveway, I am opposed to the addition of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Avenue, as it would increase peak traffic volumes on Tualatin Road.

NO new employee access on 108th
NO added traffic on Tualatin Road
Use Leveton Drive and Herman Road

Thank you for your consideration.

Virus-free.www.avg.com

From: Louie Olivares <louieolivares@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2025 4:39 AM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Revised Site Plan

To whom it may concern,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's updated TUX proposal. While I appreciate the work that has been done to eliminate the employee entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Ave and maintain the Leveton driveway, I am opposed to the addition of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Avenue, as it would increase peak traffic volumes on Tualatin Road.

NO new employee access on 108th
NO added traffic on Tualatin Road
Use Leveton Drive and Herman Road

Thank you for your consideration.

Louie Olivares

From: lynda boatwright <lynda.boatwright@frontier.com>
Sent: Monday, July 28, 2025 10:35 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Revised Lam TUX Site Plan

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's updated TUX proposal. While I appreciate the work that has been done to eliminate the employee entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Ave and maintain the Leveton driveway, I am opposed to the addition of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Avenue, as it would increase peak traffic volumes on Tualatin Road.

NO new employee access on 108th
NO added traffic on Tualatin Road
Use Leveton Drive and Herman Road

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Marius Brisan <marlid16@frontier.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2025 6:19 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Revised Lam TUX Site Plan

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's updated TUX proposal. While I appreciate the work that has been done to eliminate the employee entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Ave and maintain the Leveton driveway, I am opposed to the addition of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Avenue, as it would increase peak traffic volumes on Tualatin Road.

NO new employee access on 108th
NO added traffic on Tualatin Road
Use Leveton Drive and Herman Road

Thank you for your consideration.

Marius Brisan
17850 SW 113th Ave
Tualatin, OR 97062

From: Matt Williams <matt.williams.rpi@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2025 12:53 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Revised Lam TUX Site Plan



Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's updated TUX proposal. While I appreciate the work that has been done to eliminate the employee entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Ave and maintain the Leveton driveway, I am opposed to the addition of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Avenue, as it would increase peak traffic volumes on Tualatin Road.

NO new employee access on 108th
NO added traffic on Tualatin Road
Use Leveton Drive and Herman Road

Thank you for your consideration.

--
Matt Williams
matt.williams.rpi@gmail.com

From: MD Aman <mdaman5455@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2025 3:48 AM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Revised Lam TUX Site Plan

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's updated TUX proposal. While I appreciate the work that has been done to eliminate the employee entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Ave and maintain the Leveton driveway, I am opposed to the addition of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Avenue, as it would increase peak traffic volumes on Tualatin Road.

NO new employee access on 108th
NO added traffic on Tualatin Road
Use Leveton Drive and Herman Road

Thank you for your consideration,
Mike and Debbie Aman

From: Regina Chante <reginachante@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 31, 2025 6:44 AM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Subject: Revised Lam TUX Site Plan



Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's updated TUX proposal. While I appreciate the work that has been done to eliminate the employee entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Ave and maintain the Leveton driveway, I am opposed to the addition of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Avenue, as it would increase peak traffic volumes on Tualatin Road.

NO new employee access on 108th
NO added traffic on Tualatin Road
Use Leveton Drive and Herman Road

Thank you for your consideration.

--
•••••••••
Regina Chante
www.ReginaChante.org

From: richard.lyons15@gmail.com
Sent: Monday, July 28, 2025 6:10 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Revised Lam TUX Site Plan

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's updated TUX proposal. While I appreciate the work that has been done to eliminate the employee entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Ave and maintain the Leveton driveway, I am opposed to the addition of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Avenue, as it would increase peak traffic volumes on Tualatin Road.

NO new employee access on 108th
NO added traffic on Tualatin Road
Use Leveton Drive and Herman Road

Thank you for your consideration.

Richard Lyons
Sent from my iPad

From: Rick Cady <rcadycvelo@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 28, 2025 8:09 PM
To: k.leonard@tualatin.gov; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Revised Lam TUX Site Plan

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's updated TUX proposal. While I appreciate the work that has been done to eliminate the employee entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Ave and maintain the Leveton driveway, I am opposed to the addition of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Avenue, as it would increase peak traffic volumes on Tualatin Road.

NO new employee access on 108th
NO added traffic on Tualatin Road
Use Leveton Drive and Herman Road

Thank you for your consideration.

Rick Cady
10230 SW Anderson Ct.
Tualatin, OR. 97062

From: Robert Dixon <rwdixon@pacbell.net>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2025 9:37 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Revised Lam TUX Site Plan

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's updated TUX proposal. While I appreciate the work that has been done to eliminate the employee entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Ave and maintain the Leveton driveway, I am opposed to the addition of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Avenue, as it would increase peak traffic volumes on Tualatin Road.

NO new employee access on 108th
NO added traffic on Tualatin Road
Use Leveton Drive and Herman Road

Thank you for your consideration.

Robert Dixon
17967 SW 110th Pl
Tualatin, OR 97062

From: Rosemarie Drake-Baumann <baumann12@icloud.com>
Sent: Monday, July 28, 2025 6:23 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Revised Lam TUX Site Plan

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's updated TUX proposal. While I appreciate the work that has been done to eliminate the employee entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Ave and maintain the Leveton driveway, I am opposed to the addition of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Avenue, as it would increase peak traffic volumes on Tualatin Road.

NO new employee access on 108th
NO added traffic on Tualatin Road
Use Leveton Drive and Herman Road

For those of us that use 106 Avenue to exit the neighborhood adding additional traffic at 108 avenue will make it more difficult.

Thank you for your consideration.

Rosemarie Drake-Baumann

Sent from my iPhone

From: Terri Renfro <teriyaki2go@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, July 28, 2025 5:18 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Revised Lam TUX Site Plan

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's updated TUX proposal. While I appreciate the work that has been done to eliminate the employee entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Ave and maintain the Leveton driveway, I am opposed to the addition of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Avenue, as it would increase peak traffic volumes on Tualatin Road.

NO new employee access on 108th
NO added traffic on Tualatin Road
Use Leveton Drive and Herman Road

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPad

From: Wendy Luikart <kickitin2016@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 1, 2025 2:14 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Revised Lam TUX Site Plan



Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's updated TUX proposal.
We are STRONGLY opposed to the addition of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Avenue.
There is already too much traffic and this will make the exit from our street ridiculously long.
Please take this into consideration!!!!

NO new employee access on 108th
NO added traffic on Tualatin Road
Their employees should use Leveton Drive and Herman Road!!!!

Thank you,

Wendy and Glen Luikart

From: Eric Smith <jetsmith777@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 8:56 AM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Revised Lam TUX Site Plan

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's updated TUX proposal. While I appreciate the work that has been done to eliminate the employee entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Ave and maintain the Leveton driveway, I am opposed to the addition of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Avenue, as it would increase peak traffic volumes on Tualatin Road.

NO new employee access on 108th
NO added traffic on Tualatin Road
Use Leveton Drive and Herman Road

Thank you for your consideration.

From: Joshua Wilson <wwwilsons.joshua@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 5:14 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Revised Lam TUX Site Plan



Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's updated TUX proposal. While I appreciate the work that has been done to eliminate the employee entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Ave and maintain the Leveton driveway, I am opposed to the addition of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Avenue, as it would increase peak traffic volumes on Tualatin Road.

NO new employee access on 108th
NO added traffic on Tualatin Road
Use Leveton Drive and Herman Road

Thank you for your consideration.

From: Lacy Jo Avera <lacyjoavera@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, August 3, 2025 8:38 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Revised Lam TUX Site Plan



Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's updated TUX proposal. While I appreciate the work that has been done to eliminate the employee entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Ave and maintain the Leveton driveway, I am opposed to the addition of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Avenue, as it would increase peak traffic volumes on Tualatin Road.

NO new employee access on 108th
NO added traffic on Tualatin Road
Use Leveton Drive and Herman Road

Thank you for your consideration.

From: NWS <nws.jn@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, August 7, 2025 1:20 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Revised Lam TUX Site Plan

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's updated TUX proposal. While I appreciate the work that has been done to eliminate the employee entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Ave and maintain the Leveton driveway, I am opposed to the addition of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Avenue, as it would increase peak traffic volumes on Tualatin Road.

NO new employee access on 108th
NO added traffic on Tualatin Road
Use Leveton Drive and Herman Road

The money spent to improve Herman Road and add SE 124th was to be used to help improve traffic flow for existing businesses and future growth.
Tualatin Road remained as with no traffic light additions, and no road improvements to address current traffic flows. Current traffic on Tualatin Road has increased substantially and that’s without the future anticipated LAM traffic.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Terri Renfro <teriyaki2go@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 6, 2025 5:58 AM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Revised Lam TUX Site Plan

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's updated TUX proposal. While I appreciate the work that has been done to eliminate the employee entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Ave and maintain the Leveton driveway, I am opposed to the addition of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Avenue, as it would increase peak traffic volumes on Tualatin Road.

NO new employee access on 108th
NO added traffic on Tualatin Road
Use Leveton Drive and Herman Road

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: tom@almy.us
Sent: Wednesday, August 6, 2025 11:46 AM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Revised Lam TUX Site Plan

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on Lam's revised TUX proposal. While I acknowledge the efforts made to eliminate the employee entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Ave and preserve the Leveton driveway, I express my opposition to the inclusion of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Ave. This addition would likely result in an increase in peak traffic volumes on Tualatin Road.

- NO new employee access on 108th
- NO added traffic on Tualatin Road
- Use Leveton Drive and Herman Road

Thank you for your consideration.

Tom Almy
Tualatin, Oregon USA
Internet: tom@almy.us
Website: almy.us

From: Sybil Latham-Nagata <nwssln@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, August 7, 2025 1:03 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Revised Lam TUX Site Plan

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's updated TUX proposal. While I appreciate the work that has been done to eliminate the employee entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Ave and maintain the Leveton driveway, I am opposed to the addition of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Avenue, as it would increase peak traffic volumes on Tualatin Road.

NO new employee access on 108th
NO added traffic on Tualatin Road
Use Leveton Drive and Herman Road

As a resident of Century Estates the addition of this traffic to the Hazelbrook School traffic is going to cause so much delay on Jurgens Rd. Please please don't add to the congestion!!! The city should be considering the addition of a stop light that would help Jurgens and Teton Roads.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sybil A. Latham-Nagata
10165 SW Sedlak CT
Tualatin, OR

Sent from my iPad

From: mm3soups <mm3soups@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 9, 2025 12:15 PM
To: Keith Leonard
Subject: Tualatin Road



Dear Mr. Leonard,

I am opposed to the addition of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Avenue, as it would increase peak traffic volumes on Tualatin Road.

My backyard is along Tualatin Road and the heavy traffic during peak times already makes it extremely difficult to turn left out of my neighborhood. An increase in traffic would also present the possibility of traffic cutting through my neighborhood, causing a dangerous situation for children playing in the area.

NO new employee access on 108th
NO added traffic on Tualatin Road
Use Leveton Drive and Herman Road

Regards,

Michele Campbell
11270 SW Apalachee St.

From: JL Friedman <hikergirl500@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 9, 2025 1:11 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Revised Lam TUX Site Plan

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's updated TUX proposal. While I appreciate the work that has been done to eliminate the employee entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Ave and maintain the Leveton driveway, I am opposed to the addition of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Avenue, as it would increase peak traffic volumes on Tualatin Road; the very thing we're trying to manage. Leveton Drive and Herman Road are the very best solutions to this issue for our neighborhood and traffic flows.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jl Friedman

From: Janet Weber <weberjanet@hotmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 9, 2025 2:31 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Revised Lam TUX Site Plan

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's updated TUX proposal. While I appreciate the work that has been done to eliminate the employee entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Ave and maintain the Leveton driveway, I am opposed to the addition of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Avenue, as it would increase peak traffic volumes on Tualatin Road.

NO new employee access on 108th!!!!
NO added traffic on Tualatin Road!!!!
Use Leveton Drive and Herman Road!!!

Thank you for your consideration.

Janet Weber
13 year Riverpark CIO resident

Sent from my iPhone

From: Kathy <k.vigil@frontier.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 9, 2025 3:45 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Revised Lam TUX Site Plan

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's updated TUX proposal. While I appreciate the work that has been done to eliminate the employee entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Ave and maintain the Leveton driveway, I am opposed to the addition of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Avenue, as it would increase peak traffic volumes on Tualatin Road.

NO new employee access on 108th
NO added traffic on Tualatin Road
Use Leveton Drive and Herman Road

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPad

From: Margo Strength <dgrahms@comcast.net>
Sent: Saturday, August 9, 2025 5:20 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Revised Lam TUX Site Plan

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's updated TUX proposal. While I appreciate the work that has been done to eliminate the employee entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Ave and maintain the Leveton driveway, I am opposed to the addition of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Avenue, as it would increase peak traffic volumes on Tualatin Road.

NO new employee access on 108th
NO added traffic on Tualatin Road
Use Leveton Drive and Herman Road

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Jenny Blodgett <jenny.blodgett32@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 9, 2025 10:03 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Revised Lam TUX Site Plan

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's updated TUX proposal. While I appreciate the work that has been done to eliminate the employee entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Ave and maintain the Leveton driveway, I am opposed to the addition of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Avenue, as it would increase peak traffic volumes on Tualatin Road.

NO new employee access on 108th
NO added traffic on Tualatin Road
Use Leveton Drive and Herman Road

Thank you for your consideration.

From: Joyce Atkins <uwdawggirl@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, August 10, 2025 7:00 AM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Revised Lam TUX Site Plan



Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's updated TUX proposal. While I appreciate the work that has been done to eliminate the employee entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Ave and maintain the Leveton driveway, I am opposed to the addition of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Avenue, as it would increase peak traffic volumes on Tualatin Road.

NO new employee access on 108th
NO added traffic on Tualatin Road
Use Leveton Drive and Herman Road

Thank you for your consideration.

Joyce Atkins
503-320-2440 (C)
uwdawggirl@gmail.com

From: Sally Hildebran <sallyhildebran@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, August 10, 2025 8:16 AM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Revised Lam TUX Site Plan

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's updated TUX proposal. While I appreciate the work that has been done to eliminate the employee entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Ave and maintain the Leveton driveway, I am opposed to the addition of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Avenue, as it would increase peak traffic volumes on Tualatin Road.

NO new employee access on 108th
NO added traffic on Tualatin Road
Use Leveton Drive and Herman Road

Thank you for your consideration.

Sally and Reed Hildebran

Sent from my iPhone

From: Kimberly Harrow <kimberly.harrow@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, August 10, 2025 9:17 AM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Revised Lam TUX Site Plan



Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's updated TUX proposal. While I appreciate the work that has been done to eliminate the employee entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Ave and maintain the Leveton driveway, I am opposed to the addition of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Avenue, as it would increase peak traffic volumes on Tualatin Road.

NO new employee access on 108th
NO added traffic on Tualatin Road
Use Leveton Drive and Herman Road

Thank you for your consideration.

From: Sybil Latham-Nagata <nwssln@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, August 7, 2025 1:03 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Revised Lam TUX Site Plan

Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's updated TUX proposal. While I appreciate the work that has been done to eliminate the employee entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Ave and maintain the Leveton driveway, I am opposed to the addition of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Avenue, as it would increase peak traffic volumes on Tualatin Road.

NO new employee access on 108th
NO added traffic on Tualatin Road
Use Leveton Drive and Herman Road

As a resident of Century Estates the addition of this traffic to the Hazelbrook School traffic is going to cause so much delay on Jurgens Rd. Please please don't add to the congestion!!! The city should be considering the addition of a stop light that would help Jurgens and Teton Roads.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sybil A. Latham-Nagata
10165 SW Sedlak CT
Tualatin, OR

Sent from my iPad

From: Dara Grey <grey.dara@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 11, 2025 12:53 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Comment on Revised Lam TUX Site Plan



Dear City of Tualatin,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's updated TUX proposal. Although I don't live in Tualatin, I've driven Tualatin road at different times over the years and definitely think that it does NOT need more traffic, especially during commute hours and especially since there's another path available for Lam's employee traffic instead (Leveton drive and Herman road). Please don't approve Lam's proposal to dump more congestion and pollution onto Tualatin road. It's unnecessary and will negatively impact Lam's local neighbors as well as anyone else trying to drive Tualatin road.

While I appreciate the work that has been done to eliminate the employee entrance on Tualatin road at SW 115th Ave and maintain the Leveton driveway, I add my voice to the community opposition to the addition of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Avenue, as it would increase peak traffic volumes on Tualatin road.

Thank you for your consideration,
Dara Grey
Newberg

From: Misty D Winkler <misty.d.winkler@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 9:42 AM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam Noise Impacts



Dear Tualatin Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board,

Thank you for your dedication and service to the community, and for your work to protect our quality of life. While development and corporate activities are essential to the vitality of our city, residential land uses must also be protected, both from an economic standpoint (property values) and from a quality of life standpoint (mental and physical health). In keeping with this mission, we are asking for your help in resolving Lam's noise pollution problem.

Multiple noise signatures have been identified emanating from Lam's campus, including clear tones that pulse, two-toned harmonics, and a low rumble that sounds like an old bomber airplane. The most distinctive sound is the high-frequency hiss from Lam's gas plant, clearly audible across Tualatin Road most nights.

We have brought this issue to the attention of the City Council, Police Department, Code Enforcement, Riverpark CIO, and Lam. Despite repeated requests for a solution, no meaningful changes have been made. When Tualatin's police officers have driven onto the Lam campus to investigate noise complaints, they have been chased down by Lam's security guards and asked to leave.

The Tualatin Noise Ordinance (1361-13) sets a city-wide limit of 50dB at night for residential areas, and the Tualatin Development Code (62.100) places even stricter limits on Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning, stating that "Such permitted uses must not cause objectionable noise". A noise study performed earlier this year at night by a licensed acoustical enginneer measured noise levels of 52dB at a private residence across the street from Lam's gas plant. Therefore, Lam's offsite noise impacts are in violation of both the Tualatin Development Code and the Tualatin Municipal Code.

Lam's noise pollution problem is not caused by daytime construction, backup beepers, or truck horns, but rather, by permanently-installed equipment that is part of Lam's physical plant. This equipment runs 24/7 and generates sound continuously. The sounds are most noticeable at night when background noise is low, and the location of sound impacts can vary depending on atmospheric conditions, especially temperature and wind direction. During southerly winds,

Lam's noise signature can be heard more than a mile away.

Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning serves as a buffer between heavy industry and residential areas. MP zoning calls for “limiting uses to those that are of a nature so as to not conflict with other industrial uses or surrounding residential areas.” (TDC 62.100) Please consider this letter as evidence that Lam's operations are, in fact, currently conflicting with surrounding residential areas.

In order to bring Lam's facility into compliance with the Tualatin Code, I request that Lam's off-site noise impacts be eliminated as part of the TUX project. It is absolutely critical to our quality of life that peace and quiet be restored to our neighborhoods. We ask the City of Tualatin to require Lam to prove their ability to eliminate offsite noise before approving the addition of any new noise sources on campus.

Thank you for your consideration.

Have a wonderful day,

Misty D Winkler
503.701.6168
OR Notary Public & Signing Agent
Attentive Mobile Notary Service, LLC
www.SigningAgent.com/profile/158004754
Commission # 1018914

IMPORTANT NOTICE: Never trust wiring instructions sent via email. Always independently confirm wiring instructions in person or via a telephone call to a trusted and verified phone number. Never wire money without double checking the wiring instructions are correct.
CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information protected by law. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message

From: Jazmin Rodea Olvera <friendlyjaz79@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 9:46 AM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam Noise Impacts



Dear Tualatin Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board,

Thank you for your dedication and service to the community, and for your work to protect our quality of life. While development and corporate activities are essential to the vitality of our city, residential land uses must also be protected, both from an economic standpoint (property values) and from a quality of life standpoint (mental and physical health). In keeping with this mission, we are asking for your help in resolving Lam's noise pollution problem.

Multiple noise signatures have been identified emanating from Lam's campus, including clear tones that pulse, two-toned harmonics, and a low rumble that sounds like an old bomber airplane. The most distinctive sound is the high-frequency hiss from Lam's gas plant, clearly audible across Tualatin Road most nights.

We have brought this issue to the attention of the City Council, Police Department, Code Enforcement, Riverpark CIO, and Lam. Despite repeated requests for a solution, no meaningful changes have been made. When Tualatin's police officers have driven onto the Lam campus to investigate noise complaints, they have been chased down by Lam's security guards and asked to leave.

The Tualatin Noise Ordinance (1361-13) sets a city-wide limit of 50dB at night for residential areas, and the Tualatin Development Code (62.100) places even stricter limits on Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning, stating that "Such permitted uses must not cause objectionable noise". A noise study performed earlier this year at night by a licensed acoustical enginneer measured noise levels of 52dB at a private residence across the street from Lam's gas plant. Therefore, Lam's offsite noise impacts are in violation of both the Tualatin Development Code and the Tualatin Municipal Code.

Lam's noise pollution problem is not caused by daytime construction, backup beepers, or truck horns, but rather, by permanently-installed equipment that is part of Lam's physical

plant. This equipment runs 24/7 and generates sound continuously. The sounds are most noticeable at night when background noise is low, and the location of sound impacts can vary depending on atmospheric conditions, especially temperature and wind direction. During southerly winds, Lam's noise signature can be heard more than a mile away.

Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning serves as a buffer between heavy industry and residential areas. MP zoning calls for “limiting uses to those that are of a nature so as to not conflict with other industrial uses or surrounding residential areas.” (TDC 62.100) Please consider this letter as evidence that Lam's operations are, in fact, currently conflicting with surrounding residential areas.

In order to bring Lam's facility into compliance with the Tualatin Code, I request that Lam's off-site noise impacts be eliminated as part of the TUX project. It is absolutely critical to our quality of life that peace and quiet be restored to our neighborhoods. We ask the City of Tualatin to require Lam to prove their ability to eliminate offsite noise before approving the addition of any new noise sources on campus.

Thank you for your consideration.

From: Patti Atkins <patti@prpatti.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 9:47 AM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam Noise Impacts

Dear Tualatin Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board,

Thank you for your dedication and service to the community, and for your work to protect our quality of life. While development and corporate activities are essential to the vitality of our city, residential land uses must also be protected, both from an economic standpoint (property values) and from a quality of life standpoint (mental and physical health). In keeping with this mission, we are asking for your help in resolving Lam's noise pollution problem.

Multiple noise signatures have been identified emanating from Lam's campus, including clear tones that pulse, two-toned harmonics, and a low rumble that sounds like an old bomber airplane. The most distinctive sound is the high-frequency hiss from Lam's gas plant, clearly audible across Tualatin Road most nights.

We have brought this issue to the attention of the City Council, Police Department, Code Enforcement, Riverpark CIO, and Lam. Despite repeated requests for a solution, no meaningful changes have been made. When Tualatin's police officers have driven onto the Lam campus to investigate noise complaints, they have been chased down by Lam's security guards and asked to leave.

The Tualatin Noise Ordinance (1361-13) sets a city-wide limit of 50dB at night for residential areas, and the Tualatin Development Code (62.100) places even stricter limits on Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning, stating that "Such permitted uses must not cause objectionable noise". A noise study performed earlier this year at night by a licensed acoustical enginneer measured noise levels of 52dB at a private residence across the street from Lam's gas plant. Therefore, Lam's offsite noise impacts are in violation of both the Tualatin Development Code and the Tualatin Municipal Code.

Lam's noise pollution problem is not caused by daytime construction, backup beepers, or truck horns, but rather, by permanently-installed equipment that is part of Lam's physical

plant. This equipment runs 24/7 and generates sound continuously. The sounds are most noticeable at night when background noise is low, and the location of sound impacts can vary depending on atmospheric conditions, especially temperature and wind direction. During southerly winds, Lam's noise signature can be heard more than a mile away.

Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning serves as a buffer between heavy industry and residential areas. MP zoning calls for “limiting uses to those that are of a nature so as to not conflict with other industrial uses or surrounding residential areas.” (TDC 62.100) Please consider this letter as evidence that Lam's operations are, in fact, currently conflicting with surrounding residential areas.

In order to bring Lam's facility into compliance with the Tualatin Code, I request that Lam's off-site noise impacts be eliminated as part of the TUX project. It is absolutely critical to our quality of life that peace and quiet be restored to our neighborhoods. We ask the City of Tualatin to require Lam to prove their ability to eliminate offsite noise before approving the addition of any new noise sources on campus.

Thank you for your consideration.
Patricia Atkins
17745 sw Chippewa Trail, Tualatin, OR 97062

From: Kumler Julie <julie@jkumler.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 9:51 AM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam Noise Impacts



Dear Tualatin Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board,

Thank you for your dedication and service to the community, and for your work to protect our quality of life. While development and corporate activities are essential to the vitality of our city, residential land uses must also be protected, both from an economic standpoint (property values) and from a quality of life standpoint (mental and physical health). In keeping with this mission, we are asking for your help in resolving Lam's noise pollution problem.

Multiple noise signatures have been identified emanating from Lam's campus, including clear tones that pulse, two-toned harmonics, and a low rumble that sounds like an old bomber airplane. The most distinctive sound is the high-frequency hiss from Lam's gas plant, clearly audible across Tualatin Road most nights.

We have brought this issue to the attention of the City Council, Police Department, Code Enforcement, Riverpark CIO, and Lam. Despite repeated requests for a solution, no meaningful changes have been made. When Tualatin's police officers have driven onto the Lam campus to investigate noise complaints, they have been chased down by Lam's security guards and asked to leave.

The Tualatin Noise Ordinance (1361-13) sets a city-wide limit of 50dB at night for residential areas, and the Tualatin Development Code (62.100) places even stricter limits on Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning, stating that "Such permitted uses must not cause objectionable noise". A noise study performed earlier this year at night by a licensed acoustical enginneer measured noise levels of 52dB at a private residence across the street from Lam's gas plant. Therefore, Lam's offsite noise impacts are in violation of both the Tualatin Development Code and the Tualatin Municipal Code.

Lam's noise pollution problem is not caused by daytime construction, backup beepers, or truck horns, but rather, by permanently-installed equipment that is part of Lam's physical plant. This equipment runs 24/7 and generates sound continuously. The sounds are most noticeable at night when background noise is low, and the location of sound impacts can vary depending on atmospheric conditions, especially temperature and wind direction. During southerly winds, Lam's noise signature can be heard more than a mile away.

Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning serves as a buffer between heavy industry and residential areas. MP zoning calls for "limiting uses to those that are of a nature so as to not conflict with other industrial uses or surrounding residential areas." (TDC 62.100) Please consider this letter as evidence that Lam's operations are, in fact, currently conflicting with surrounding residential areas.

In order to bring Lam's facility into compliance with the Tualatin Code, I request that Lam's off-site noise impacts be eliminated as part of the TUX project. It is absolutely critical to our quality of life that peace and quiet be restored to our neighborhoods. We ask the City of Tualatin to require Lam to prove their ability to eliminate offsite noise before approving the addition of any new noise sources on campus.

Thank you for your consideration.

With warm regards,

Julie Kumler
RE/MAX equity group Broker
Email: julie@jkumler.com
Cell: 503-680-1316
Fax: 503-495-3363
Website: WWW.equitygroup.com/Jkumler

From: Brett Hamilton <brett@simple.be>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 9:51 AM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; Outreach
Subject: Lam Noise Impacts

Dear Tualatin Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board,

Thank you for your dedication and service to the community, and for your work to protect our quality of life. While development and corporate activities are essential to the vitality of our city, residential land uses must also be protected, both from an economic standpoint (property values) and from a quality of life standpoint (mental and physical health). In keeping with this mission, we are asking for your help in resolving Lam's noise pollution problem.

Multiple noise signatures have been identified emanating from Lam's campus, including clear tones that pulse, two-toned harmonics, and a low rumble that sounds like an old bomber airplane. The most distinctive sound is the high-frequency hiss from Lam's gas plant, clearly audible across Tualatin Road most nights.

We have brought this issue to the attention of the City Council, Police Department, Code Enforcement, Riverpark CIO, and Lam. Despite repeated requests for a solution, no meaningful changes have been made. When Tualatin's police officers have driven onto the Lam campus to investigate noise complaints, they have been chased down by Lam's security guards and asked to leave.

The Tualatin Noise Ordinance (1361-13) sets a city-wide limit of 50dB at night for residential areas, and the Tualatin Development Code (62.100) places even stricter limits on Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning, stating that "Such permitted uses must not cause objectionable noise". A noise study performed earlier this year at night by a licensed acoustical enginneer measured noise levels of 52dB at a private residence across the street from Lam's gas plant. Therefore, Lam's offsite noise impacts are in violation of both the Tualatin Development Code and the Tualatin Municipal Code.

Lam's noise pollution problem is not caused by daytime construction, backup beepers, or truck horns, but rather, by permanently-installed equipment that is part of Lam's physical plant. This equipment runs 24/7 and generates sound continuously. The sounds are most noticeable at night when background noise is low, and the location of sound impacts can vary depending on atmospheric conditions, especially temperature and wind direction. During southerly winds, Lam's noise signature can be heard more than a mile away.

Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning serves as a buffer between heavy industry and residential areas. MP zoning calls for "limiting uses to those that are of a nature so as to not conflict with other industrial uses or surrounding residential areas." (TDC 62.100) Please consider this letter

as evidence that Lam's operations are, in fact, currently conflicting with surrounding residential areas.

In order to bring Lam's facility into compliance with the Tualatin Code, I request that Lam's off-site noise impacts be eliminated as part of the TUX project. It is absolutely critical to our quality of life that peace and quiet be restored to our neighborhoods. We ask the City of Tualatin to require Lam to prove their ability to eliminate offsite noise before approving the addition of any new noise sources on campus.

Thank you for your consideration,
Brett Hamilton

From: Eric Smith <jetsmith777@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 9:55 AM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam Noise Impacts



Dear Tualatin Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board,

Thank you for your dedication and service to the community, and for your work to protect our quality of life. While development and corporate activities are essential to the vitality of our city, residential land uses must also be protected, both from an economic standpoint (property values) and from a quality of life standpoint (mental and physical health). In keeping with this mission, we are asking for your help in resolving Lam's noise pollution problem.

Multiple noise signatures have been identified emanating from Lam's campus, including clear tones that pulse, two-toned harmonics, and a low rumble that sounds like an old bomber airplane. The most distinctive sound is the high-frequency hiss from Lam's gas plant, clearly audible across Tualatin Road most nights.

We have brought this issue to the attention of the City Council, Police Department, Code Enforcement, Riverpark CIO, and Lam. Despite repeated requests for a solution, no meaningful changes have been made. When Tualatin's police officers have driven onto the Lam campus to investigate noise complaints, they have been chased down by Lam's security guards and asked to leave.

The Tualatin Noise Ordinance (1361-13) sets a city-wide limit of 50dB at night for residential areas, and the Tualatin Development Code (62.100) places even stricter limits on Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning, stating that "Such permitted uses must not cause objectionable noise". A noise study performed earlier this year at night by a licensed acoustical enginneer measured noise levels of 52dB at a private residence across the street from Lam's gas plant. Therefore, Lam's offsite noise impacts are in violation of both the Tualatin Development Code and the Tualatin Municipal Code.

Lam's noise pollution problem is not caused by daytime construction, backup beepers, or truck horns, but rather, by permanently-installed equipment that is part of Lam's physical

plant. This equipment runs 24/7 and generates sound continuously. The sounds are most noticeable at night when background noise is low, and the location of sound impacts can vary depending on atmospheric conditions, especially temperature and wind direction. During southerly winds, Lam's noise signature can be heard more than a mile away.

Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning serves as a buffer between heavy industry and residential areas. MP zoning calls for “limiting uses to those that are of a nature so as to not conflict with other industrial uses or surrounding residential areas.” (TDC 62.100) Please consider this letter as evidence that Lam's operations are, in fact, currently conflicting with surrounding residential areas.

In order to bring Lam's facility into compliance with the Tualatin Code, I request that Lam's off-site noise impacts be eliminated as part of the TUX project. It is absolutely critical to our quality of life that peace and quiet be restored to our neighborhoods. We ask the City of Tualatin to require Lam to prove their ability to eliminate offsite noise before approving the addition of any new noise sources on campus.

Thank you for your consideration.

From: Kami Hamilton <kami@simple.be>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 10:14 AM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam Noise Impacts

Dear Tualatin Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board,

Thank you for your dedication and service to the community, and for your work to protect our quality of life. While development and corporate activities are essential to the vitality of our city, residential land uses must also be protected, both from an economic standpoint (property values) and from a quality of life standpoint (mental and physical health). In keeping with this mission, we are asking for your help in resolving Lam's noise pollution problem.

Multiple noise signatures have been identified emanating from Lam's campus, including clear tones that pulse, two-toned harmonics, and a low rumble that sounds like an old bomber airplane. The most distinctive sound is the high-frequency hiss from Lam's gas plant, clearly audible across Tualatin Road most nights.

We have brought this issue to the attention of the City Council, Police Department, Code Enforcement, Riverpark CIO, and Lam. Despite repeated requests for a solution, no meaningful changes have been made. When Tualatin's police officers have driven onto the Lam campus to investigate noise complaints, they have been chased down by Lam's security guards and asked to leave.

The Tualatin Noise Ordinance (1361-13) sets a city-wide limit of 50dB at night for residential areas, and the Tualatin Development Code (62.100) places even stricter limits on Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning, stating that "Such permitted uses must not cause objectionable noise". A noise study performed earlier this year at night by a licensed acoustical enginneer measured noise levels of 52dB at a private residence across the street from Lam's gas plant. Therefore, Lam's offsite noise impacts are in violation of both the Tualatin Development Code and the Tualatin Municipal Code.

Lam's noise pollution problem is not caused by daytime construction, backup beepers, or truck horns, but rather, by permanently-installed equipment that is part of Lam's physical plant. This equipment runs 24/7 and generates sound continuously. The sounds are most noticeable at night when background noise is low, and the location of sound impacts can vary depending on atmospheric conditions, especially temperature and wind direction. During southerly winds, Lam's noise signature can be heard more than a mile away.

Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning serves as a buffer between heavy industry and residential areas. MP zoning calls for "limiting uses to those that are of a nature so as to not conflict with other industrial uses or surrounding residential areas." (TDC 62.100) Please consider this letter

as evidence that Lam's operations are, in fact, currently conflicting with surrounding residential areas.

In order to bring Lam's facility into compliance with the Tualatin Code, I request that Lam's off-site noise impacts be eliminated as part of the TUX project. It is absolutely critical to our quality of life that peace and quiet be restored to our neighborhoods. We ask the City of Tualatin to require Lam to prove their ability to eliminate offsite noise before approving the addition of any new noise sources on campus.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Hazen Hyland <hazenhyland@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 10:23 AM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam Noise Impacts

Dear Tualatin Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board,

Thank you for your dedication and service to the community, and for your work to protect our quality of life. While development and corporate activities are essential to the vitality of our city, residential land uses must also be protected, both from an economic standpoint (property values) and from a quality of life standpoint (mental and physical health). In keeping with this mission, we are asking for your help in resolving Lam's noise pollution problem.

Multiple noise signatures have been identified emanating from Lam's campus, including clear tones that pulse, two-toned harmonics, and a low rumble that sounds like an old bomber airplane. The most distinctive sound is the high-frequency hiss from Lam's gas plant, clearly audible across Tualatin Road most nights.

We have brought this issue to the attention of the City Council, Police Department, Code Enforcement, Riverpark CIO, and Lam. Despite repeated requests for a solution, no meaningful changes have been made. When Tualatin's police officers have driven onto the Lam campus to investigate noise complaints, they have been chased down by Lam's security guards and asked to leave.

The Tualatin Noise Ordinance (1361-13) sets a city-wide limit of 50dB at night for residential areas, and the Tualatin Development Code (62.100) places even stricter limits on Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning, stating that "Such permitted uses must not cause objectionable noise". A noise study performed earlier this year at night by a licensed acoustical enginneer measured noise levels of 52dB at a private residence across the street from Lam's gas plant. Therefore, Lam's offsite noise impacts are in violation of both the Tualatin Development Code and the Tualatin Municipal Code.

Lam's noise pollution problem is not caused by daytime construction, backup beepers, or truck horns, but rather, by permanently-installed equipment that is part of Lam's physical plant. This equipment runs 24/7 and generates sound continuously. The sounds are most noticeable at night when background noise is low, and the location of sound impacts can vary depending on atmospheric conditions, especially temperature and wind direction. During southerly winds, Lam's noise signature can be heard more than a mile away.

Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning serves as a buffer between heavy industry and residential areas. MP zoning calls for "limiting uses to those that are of a nature so as to not conflict with other industrial uses or surrounding residential areas." (TDC 62.100) Please consider this letter

as evidence that Lam's operations are, in fact, currently conflicting with surrounding residential areas.

In order to bring Lam's facility into compliance with the Tualatin Code, I request that Lam's off-site noise impacts be eliminated as part of the TUX project. It is absolutely critical to our quality of life that peace and quiet be restored to our neighborhoods. We ask the City of Tualatin to require Lam to prove their ability to eliminate offsite noise before approving the addition of any new noise sources on campus.

Thank you for your consideration.

Hazen Hyland

From: Joanne Schenk <jojo10k@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 10:38 AM
To: Keith Leonard
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org; Ext - Planning
Subject: Lam Noise Impacts



Subject: Lam Noise Impacts

Dear Tualatin Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board,

Thank you for your dedication and service to the community, and for your work to protect our quality of life. While development and corporate activities are essential to the vitality of our city, residential land uses must also be protected, both from an economic standpoint (property values) and from a quality of life standpoint (mental and physical health). In keeping with this mission, we are asking for your help in resolving Lam's noise pollution problem.

Multiple noise signatures have been identified emanating from Lam's campus, including clear tones that pulse, two-toned harmonics, and a low rumble that sounds like an old bomber airplane. The most distinctive sound is the high-frequency hiss from Lam's gas plant, clearly audible across Tualatin Road most nights.

We have brought this issue to the attention of the City Council, Police Department, Code Enforcement, Riverpark CIO, and Lam. Despite repeated requests for a solution, no meaningful changes have been made. When Tualatin's police officers have driven onto the Lam campus to investigate noise complaints, they have been chased down by Lam's security guards and asked to leave.

The Tualatin Noise Ordinance (1361-13) sets a city-wide limit of 50dB at night for residential areas, and the Tualatin Development Code (62.100) places even stricter limits on Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning, stating that "Such permitted uses must not cause objectionable noise". A noise study performed earlier this year at night by a licensed acoustical enginneer measured noise levels of 52dB at a private residence across the street from Lam's gas plant. Therefore, Lam's offsite noise

impacts are in violation of both the Tualatin Development Code and the Tualatin Municipal Code.

Lam's noise pollution problem is not caused by daytime construction, backup beepers, or truck horns, but rather, by permanently-installed equipment that is part of Lam's physical plant. This equipment runs 24/7 and generates sound continuously. The sounds are most noticeable at night when background noise is low, and the location of sound impacts can vary depending on atmospheric conditions, especially temperature and wind direction. During southerly winds, Lam's noise signature can be heard more than a mile away.

Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning serves as a buffer between heavy industry and residential areas. MP zoning calls for "limiting uses to those that are of a nature so as to not conflict with other industrial uses or surrounding residential areas." (TDC 62.100) Please consider this letter as evidence that Lam's operations are, in fact, currently conflicting with surrounding residential areas.

In order to bring Lam's facility into compliance with the Tualatin Code, I request that Lam's off-site noise impacts be eliminated as part of the TUX project. It is absolutely critical to our quality of life that peace and quiet be restored to our neighborhoods. We ask the City of Tualatin to require Lam to prove their ability to eliminate offsite noise before approving the addition of any new noise sources on campus.

Thank you for your consideration.
Joanne & Roger Schenk

From: Elizabeth Ford <luckiecharm2001@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 10:56 AM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; Save Tualatin Road
Subject: Lam Noise Impacts



Dear Tualatin Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board,

Thank you for your dedication and service to the community, and for your work to protect our quality of life. While development and corporate activities are essential to the vitality of our city, residential land uses must also be protected, both from an economic standpoint (property values) and from a quality of life standpoint (mental and physical health). In keeping with this mission, we are asking for your help in resolving Lam's noise pollution problem.

Multiple noise signatures have been identified emanating from Lam's campus, including clear tones that pulse, two-toned harmonics, and a low rumble that sounds like an old bomber airplane. The most distinctive sound is the high-frequency hiss from Lam's gas plant, clearly audible across Tualatin Road most nights.

We have brought this issue to the attention of the City Council, Police Department, Code Enforcement, Riverpark CIO, and Lam. Despite repeated requests for a solution, no meaningful changes have been made. When Tualatin's police officers have driven onto the Lam campus to investigate noise complaints, they have been chased down by Lam's security guards and asked to leave.

The Tualatin Noise Ordinance (1361-13) sets a city-wide limit of 50dB at night for residential areas, and the Tualatin Development Code (62.100) places even stricter limits on Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning, stating that "Such permitted uses must not cause objectionable noise". A noise study performed earlier this year at night by a licensed acoustical enginneer measured noise levels of 52dB at a private residence across the street from Lam's gas plant. Therefore, Lam's offsite noise impacts are in violation of both the Tualatin Development Code and the Tualatin Municipal Code.

Lam's noise pollution problem is not caused by daytime construction, backup beepers, or truck horns, but rather, by permanently-installed equipment that is part of Lam's physical

plant. This equipment runs 24/7 and generates sound continuously. The sounds are most noticeable at night when background noise is low, and the location of sound impacts can vary depending on atmospheric conditions, especially temperature and wind direction. During southerly winds, Lam's noise signature can be heard more than a mile away.

Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning serves as a buffer between heavy industry and residential areas. MP zoning calls for “limiting uses to those that are of a nature so as to not conflict with other industrial uses or surrounding residential areas.” (TDC 62.100) Please consider this letter as evidence that Lam's operations are, in fact, currently conflicting with surrounding residential areas.

In order to bring Lam's facility into compliance with the Tualatin Code, I request that Lam's off-site noise impacts be eliminated as part of the TUX project. It is absolutely critical to our quality of life that peace and quiet be restored to our neighborhoods. We ask the City of Tualatin to require Lam to prove their ability to eliminate offsite noise before approving the addition of any new noise sources on campus.

Thank you for your consideration.

Elizabeth Ford

From: Susy Greene <susydgreene@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 10:56 AM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam Noise Impacts

Dear Tualatin Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board,

Thank you for your dedication and service to the community, and for your work to protect our quality of life. While development and corporate activities are essential to the vitality of our city, residential land uses must also be protected, both from an economic standpoint (property values) and from a quality of life standpoint (mental and physical health). In keeping with this mission, we are asking for your help in resolving Lam's noise pollution problem.

Multiple noise signatures have been identified emanating from Lam's campus, including clear tones that pulse, two-toned harmonics, and a low rumble that sounds like an old bomber airplane. The most distinctive sound is the high-frequency hiss from Lam's gas plant, clearly audible across Tualatin Road most nights.

We have brought this issue to the attention of the City Council, Police Department, Code Enforcement, Riverpark CIO, and Lam. Despite repeated requests for a solution, no meaningful changes have been made. When Tualatin's police officers have driven onto the Lam campus to investigate noise complaints, they have been chased down by Lam's security guards and asked to leave.

The Tualatin Noise Ordinance (1361-13) sets a city-wide limit of 50dB at night for residential areas, and the Tualatin Development Code (62.100) places even stricter limits on Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning, stating that "Such permitted uses must not cause objectionable noise". A noise study performed earlier this year at night by a licensed acoustical enginneer measured noise levels of 52dB at a private residence across the street from Lam's gas plant. Therefore, Lam's offsite noise impacts are in violation of both the Tualatin Development Code and the Tualatin Municipal Code.

Lam's noise pollution problem is not caused by daytime construction, backup beepers, or truck horns, but rather, by permanently-installed equipment that is part of Lam's physical plant. This equipment runs 24/7 and generates sound continuously. The sounds are most noticeable at night when background noise is low, and the location of sound impacts can vary depending on atmospheric conditions, especially temperature and wind direction. During southerly winds, Lam's noise signature can be heard more than a mile away.

Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning serves as a buffer between heavy industry and residential areas. MP zoning calls for "limiting uses to those that are of a nature so as to not conflict with other industrial uses or surrounding residential areas." (TDC 62.100) Please consider this letter

as evidence that Lam's operations are, in fact, currently conflicting with surrounding residential areas.

In order to bring Lam's facility into compliance with the Tualatin Code, I request that Lam's off-site noise impacts be eliminated as part of the TUX project. It is absolutely critical to our quality of life that peace and quiet be restored to our neighborhoods. We ask the City of Tualatin to require Lam to prove their ability to eliminate offsite noise before approving the addition of any new noise sources on campus.

Thank you for your consideration.

From: MD Aman <mdaman5455@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 11:01 AM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam Noise Impacts

Dear Tualatin Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board,

Thank you for your dedication and service to the community, and for your work to protect our quality of life. While development and corporate activities are essential to the vitality of our city, residential land uses must also be protected, both from an economic standpoint (property values) and from a quality of life standpoint (mental and physical health). In keeping with this mission, we are asking for your help in resolving Lam's noise pollution problem.

Multiple noise signatures have been identified emanating from Lam's campus, including clear tones that pulse, two-toned harmonics, and a low rumble that sounds like an old bomber airplane. The most distinctive sound is the high-frequency hiss from Lam's gas plant, clearly audible across Tualatin Road most nights.

We have brought this issue to the attention of the City Council, Police Department, Code Enforcement, Riverpark CIO, and Lam. Despite repeated requests for a solution, no meaningful changes have been made. When Tualatin's police officers have driven onto the Lam campus to investigate noise complaints, they have been chased down by Lam's security guards and asked to leave.

The Tualatin Noise Ordinance (1361-13) sets a city-wide limit of 50dB at night for residential areas, and the Tualatin Development Code (62.100) places even stricter limits on Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning, stating that "Such permitted uses must not cause objectionable noise". A noise study performed earlier this year at night by a licensed acoustical enginneer measured noise levels of 52dB at a private residence across the street from Lam's gas plant. Therefore, Lam's offsite noise impacts are in violation of both the Tualatin Development Code and the Tualatin Municipal Code.

Lam's noise pollution problem is not caused by daytime construction, backup beepers, or truck horns, but rather, by permanently-installed equipment that is part of Lam's physical plant. This equipment runs 24/7 and generates sound continuously. The sounds are most noticeable at night when background noise is low, and the location of sound impacts can vary depending on atmospheric conditions, especially temperature and wind direction. During southerly winds, Lam's noise signature can be heard more than a mile away.

Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning serves as a buffer between heavy industry and residential areas. MP zoning calls for "limiting uses to those that are of a nature so as to not conflict with other industrial uses or surrounding residential areas." (TDC 62.100) Please consider this letter

as evidence that Lam's operations are, in fact, currently conflicting with surrounding residential areas.

In order to bring Lam's facility into compliance with the Tualatin Code, I request that Lam's off-site noise impacts be eliminated as part of the TUX project. It is absolutely critical to our quality of life that peace and quiet be restored to our neighborhoods. We ask the City of Tualatin to require Lam to prove their ability to eliminate offsite noise before approving the addition of any new noise sources on campus.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPad

From: Karen Aiello <aiellok54@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 11:03 AM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam Noise Impacts

Dear Tualatin Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board,

Thank you for your dedication and service to the community, and for your work to protect our quality of life. While development and corporate activities are essential to the vitality of our city, residential land uses must also be protected, both from an economic standpoint (property values) and from a quality of life standpoint (mental and physical health). In keeping with this mission, we are asking for your help in resolving Lam's noise pollution problem.

Multiple noise signatures have been identified emanating from Lam's campus, including clear tones that pulse, two-toned harmonics, and a low rumble that sounds like an old bomber airplane. The most distinctive sound is the high-frequency hiss from Lam's gas plant, clearly audible across Tualatin Road most nights.

We have brought this issue to the attention of the City Council, Police Department, Code Enforcement, Riverpark CIO, and Lam. Despite repeated requests for a solution, no meaningful changes have been made. When Tualatin's police officers have driven onto the Lam campus to investigate noise complaints, they have been chased down by Lam's security guards and asked to leave.

The Tualatin Noise Ordinance (1361-13) sets a city-wide limit of 50dB at night for residential areas, and the Tualatin Development Code (62.100) places even stricter limits on Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning, stating that "Such permitted uses must not cause objectionable noise". A noise study performed earlier this year at night by a licensed acoustical enginneer measured noise levels of 52dB at a private residence across the street from Lam's gas plant. Therefore, Lam's offsite noise impacts are in violation of both the Tualatin Development Code and the Tualatin Municipal Code.

Lam's noise pollution problem is not caused by daytime construction, backup beepers, or truck horns, but rather, by permanently-installed equipment that is part of Lam's physical plant. This equipment runs 24/7 and generates sound continuously. The sounds are most noticeable at night when background noise is low, and the location of sound impacts can vary depending on atmospheric conditions, especially temperature and wind direction. During southerly winds, Lam's noise signature can be heard more than a mile away.

Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning serves as a buffer between heavy industry and residential areas. MP zoning calls for "limiting uses to those that are of a nature so as to not conflict with other industrial uses or surrounding residential areas." (TDC 62.100) Please consider this letter

as evidence that Lam's operations are, in fact, currently conflicting with surrounding residential areas.

In order to bring Lam's facility into compliance with the Tualatin Code, I request that Lam's off-site noise impacts be eliminated as part of the TUX project. It is absolutely critical to our quality of life that peace and quiet be restored to our neighborhoods. We ask the City of Tualatin to require Lam to prove their ability to eliminate offsite noise before approving the addition of any new noise sources on campus.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent ka

From: Isabella Kreske <ickreske@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 11:05 AM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam Noise Impacts

Dear Tualatin Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board,

Thank you for your dedication and service to the community, and for your work to protect our quality of life. While development and corporate activities are essential to the vitality of our city, residential land uses must also be protected, both from an economic standpoint (property values) and from a quality of life standpoint (mental and physical health). In keeping with this mission, we are asking for your help in resolving Lam's noise pollution problem.

Multiple noise signatures have been identified emanating from Lam's campus, including clear tones that pulse, two-toned harmonics, and a low rumble that sounds like an old bomber airplane. The most distinctive sound is the high-frequency hiss from Lam's gas plant, clearly audible across Tualatin Road most nights.

We have brought this issue to the attention of the City Council, Police Department, Code Enforcement, Riverpark CIO, and Lam. Despite repeated requests for a solution, no meaningful changes have been made. When Tualatin's police officers have driven onto the Lam campus to investigate noise complaints, they have been chased down by Lam's security guards and asked to leave.

The Tualatin Noise Ordinance (1361-13) sets a city-wide limit of 50dB at night for residential areas, and the Tualatin Development Code (62.100) places even stricter limits on Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning, stating that "Such permitted uses must not cause objectionable noise". A noise study performed earlier this year at night by a licensed acoustical enginneer measured noise levels of 52dB at a private residence across the street from Lam's gas plant. Therefore, Lam's offsite noise impacts are in violation of both the Tualatin Development Code and the Tualatin Municipal Code.

Lam's noise pollution problem is not caused by daytime construction, backup beepers, or truck horns, but rather, by permanently-installed equipment that is part of Lam's physical plant. This equipment runs 24/7 and generates sound continuously. The sounds are most noticeable at night when background noise is low, and the location of sound impacts can vary depending on atmospheric conditions, especially temperature and wind direction. During southerly winds, Lam's noise signature can be heard more than a mile away.

Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning serves as a buffer between heavy industry and residential areas. MP zoning calls for "limiting uses to those that are of a nature so as to not conflict with other industrial uses or surrounding residential areas." (TDC 62.100) Please consider this letter

as evidence that Lam's operations are, in fact, currently conflicting with surrounding residential areas.

In order to bring Lam's facility into compliance with the Tualatin Code, I request that Lam's off-site noise impacts be eliminated as part of the TUX project. It is absolutely critical to our quality of life that peace and quiet be restored to our neighborhoods. We ask the City of Tualatin to require Lam to prove their ability to eliminate offsite noise before approving the addition of any new noise sources on campus.

Thank you for your consideration.

Isabella

From: Robert Dixon <rwdixon@pacbell.net>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 11:22 AM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam Noise Impacts



Dear Tualatin Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board,

Thank you for your dedication and service to the community, and for your work to protect our quality of life. While development and corporate activities are essential to the vitality of our city, residential land uses must also be protected, both from an economic standpoint (property values) and from a quality of life standpoint (mental and physical health). In keeping with this mission, we are asking for your help in resolving Lam's noise pollution problem.

Multiple noise signatures have been identified emanating from Lam's campus, including clear tones that pulse, two-toned harmonics, and a low rumble that sounds like an old bomber airplane. The most distinctive sound is the high-frequency hiss from Lam’s gas plant, clearly audible across Tualatin Road most nights.

We have brought this issue to the attention of the City Council, Police Department, Code Enforcement, Riverpark CIO, and Lam. Despite repeated requests for a solution, no meaningful changes have been made. When Tualatin's police officers have driven onto the Lam campus to investigate noise complaints, they have been chased down by Lam’s security guards and asked to leave.

The Tualatin Noise Ordinance (1361-13) sets a city-wide limit of 50dB at night for residential areas, and the Tualatin Development Code (62.100) places even stricter limits on Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning, stating that “Such permitted uses must not cause objectionable noise”. A noise study performed earlier this year at

night by a licensed acoustical engineer measured noise levels of 52dB at a private residence across the street from Lam's gas plant. Therefore, Lam's offsite noise impacts are in violation of both the Tualatin Development Code and the Tualatin Municipal Code.

Lam's noise pollution problem is not caused by daytime construction, backup beepers, or truck horns, but rather, by permanently-installed equipment that is part of Lam's physical plant. This equipment runs 24/7 and generates sound continuously. The sounds are most noticeable at night when background noise is low, and the location of sound impacts can vary depending on atmospheric conditions, especially temperature and wind direction. During southerly winds, Lam's noise signature can be heard more than a mile away.

Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning serves as a buffer between heavy industry and residential areas. MP zoning calls for "limiting uses to those that are of a nature so as to not conflict with other industrial uses or surrounding residential areas." (TDC 62.100) Please consider this letter as evidence that Lam's operations are, in fact, currently conflicting with surrounding residential areas.

In order to bring Lam's facility into compliance with the Tualatin Code, I request that Lam's off-site noise impacts be eliminated as part of the TUX project. It is absolutely critical to our quality of life that peace and quiet be restored to our neighborhoods. We ask the City of Tualatin to require Lam to prove their ability to eliminate offsite noise before approving the addition of any new noise sources on campus.

Thank you for your consideration.

Robert Dixon
Tualatin, OR 97062

From: Brian Park Condos <brianparkcondos@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 11:23 AM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam Noise Impacts



Dear Tualatin Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board,

Thank you for your dedication and service to the community, and for your work to protect our quality of life. While development and corporate activities are essential to the vitality of our city, residential land uses must also be protected, both from an economic standpoint (property values) and from a quality of life standpoint (mental and physical health). In keeping with this mission, we are asking for your help in resolving Lam's noise pollution problem.

Multiple noise signatures have been identified emanating from Lam's campus, including clear tones that pulse, two-toned harmonics, and a low rumble that sounds like an old bomber airplane. The most distinctive sound is the high-frequency hiss from Lam's gas plant, clearly audible across Tualatin Road most nights.

We have brought this issue to the attention of the City Council, Police Department, Code Enforcement, Riverpark CIO, and Lam. Despite repeated requests for a solution, no meaningful changes have been made. When Tualatin's police officers have driven onto the Lam campus to investigate noise complaints, they have been chased down by Lam's security guards and asked to leave.

The Tualatin Noise Ordinance (1361-13) sets a city-wide limit of 50dB at night for residential areas, and the Tualatin Development Code (62.100) places even stricter limits on Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning, stating that "Such permitted uses must not cause objectionable noise". A noise study performed earlier this year at night by a licensed acoustical enginneer measured noise levels of 52dB at a private residence across the street from Lam's gas plant. Therefore, Lam's offsite noise impacts are in violation of both the Tualatin Development Code and the Tualatin Municipal Code.

Lam's noise pollution problem is not caused by daytime construction, backup beepers, or truck horns, but rather, by permanently-installed equipment that is part of Lam's physical

plant. This equipment runs 24/7 and generates sound continuously. The sounds are most noticeable at night when background noise is low, and the location of sound impacts can vary depending on atmospheric conditions, especially temperature and wind direction. During southerly winds, Lam's noise signature can be heard more than a mile away.

Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning serves as a buffer between heavy industry and residential areas. MP zoning calls for “limiting uses to those that are of a nature so as to not conflict with other industrial uses or surrounding residential areas.” (TDC 62.100) Please consider this letter as evidence that Lam's operations are, in fact, currently conflicting with surrounding residential areas.

In order to bring Lam's facility into compliance with the Tualatin Code, I request that Lam's off-site noise impacts be eliminated as part of the TUX project. It is absolutely critical to our quality of life that peace and quiet be restored to our neighborhoods. We ask the City of Tualatin to require Lam to prove their ability to eliminate offsite noise before approving the addition of any new noise sources on campus.

Thank you for your consideration.
Debra Rae

From: Matt Williams <matt.williams.rpi@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 11:35 AM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam Noise Impacts



Thank you for your dedication and service to the community, and for your work to protect our quality of life. While development and corporate activities are essential to the vitality of our city, residential land uses must also be protected, both from an economic standpoint (property values) and from a quality of life standpoint (mental and physical health). In keeping with this mission, we are asking for your help in resolving Lam's noise pollution problem.

Multiple noise signatures have been identified emanating from Lam's campus, including clear tones that pulse, two-toned harmonics, and a low rumble that sounds like an old bomber airplane. The most distinctive sound is the high-frequency hiss from Lam's gas plant, clearly audible across Tualatin Road most nights.

We have brought this issue to the attention of the City Council, Police Department, Code Enforcement, Riverpark CIO, and Lam. Despite repeated requests for a solution, no meaningful changes have been made. When Tualatin's police officers have driven onto the Lam campus to investigate noise complaints, they have been chased down by Lam's security guards and asked to leave.

The Tualatin Noise Ordinance (1361-13) sets a city-wide limit of 50dB at night for residential areas, and the Tualatin Development Code (62.100) places even stricter limits on Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning, stating that "Such permitted uses must not cause objectionable noise". A noise study performed earlier this year at night by a licensed acoustical engineer measured noise levels of 52dB at a private residence across the street from Lam's gas plant. Therefore, Lam's offsite noise impacts are in violation of both the Tualatin Development Code and the Tualatin Municipal Code.

Lam's noise pollution problem is not caused by daytime construction, backup beepers, or truck horns, but rather, by permanently-installed equipment that is part of Lam's physical plant. This equipment runs 24/7 and generates sound continuously. The sounds are most noticeable at night when background noise is low, and the location of sound impacts can vary depending on atmospheric conditions, especially temperature and wind direction. During southerly winds, Lam's noise signature can be heard more than a mile away.

Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning serves as a buffer between heavy industry and residential areas. MP zoning calls for “limiting uses to those that are of a nature so as to not conflict with other industrial uses or surrounding residential areas.” (TDC 62.100) Please consider this letter as evidence that Lam's operations are, in fact, currently conflicting with surrounding residential areas.

In order to bring Lam's facility into compliance with the Tualatin Code, I request that Lam's off-site noise impacts be eliminated as part of the TUX project. It is absolutely critical to our quality of life that peace and quiet be restored to our neighborhoods. We ask the City of Tualatin to require Lam to prove their ability to eliminate offsite noise before approving the addition of any new noise sources on campus.

Thank you for your consideration.

--
Matt Williams
10320 SW Kiowa St
matt.williams.rpi@gmail.com

From: Brett Hamilton <brett@simple.be>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 11:39 AM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council
Subject: Lam Noise Documentation
Attachments: WCC2025081201.pdf; STR2025081202.pdf

Dear Tualatin Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board,

Please find attached the following documentation for Lam's upcoming land use hearings:

1) Record of noise complaints that I reported to Washington County Non-Emergency dispatch during late 2024.

2) Text messages to and from Chad Oyler, Director of Environmental, Health, and Safety at Lam Research, Tualatin Oregon from January 2023 through February 2025.

Sincerely, Brett Hamilton

Text Message • SMS
Jan 27, 2023 at 4:17 PM

Hi Chad, Brett here (neighbor on Kalispell Street. The noise profile is pretty strong right now.

we've noticed it most nights this week. it's been pretty consistent.

Is it the ~500hz sound or the hissing?

the hissing and the low ~250hz are consistent. the ~500hz has been intermittent and mostly not present

500hz is audible now. comes and goes

512Hz very clearly audible now

Do you have an idea of about how long it lasts for? I have someone checking it out now.

This really helps so I appreciate the info!

i think it's all the time.

just depends on the wind if we hear it at the house or not

wind is out of the south at 5mph right now which seems ideal for the sound to carry

Got it. That helps too

thanks!

one more signature, the 512 Hz tone fades in and out at about 145 beats per minute. pulsing. maybe some kind or harmonic with an enclosure?

Jan 27, 2023 at 5:57 PM

That's quite a ripple. Our team has some things they are going to zero in on. Thank you. I'll check in with you next week. If anything changes, new sounds or

are going to zero in on. Thank you. I'll check in with you next week. If anything changes, new sounds or something let me know

Sounds good. Thanks to you and your team for working on this. Much appreciated. Will do. Have a great weekend.

Feb 9, 2023 at 9:00 AM

Ok I have an update. We are going to make a change to our nitrogen plant in the next 2 weeks. We believe this will quiet it down quite a bit. We are also going to be planting trees along our berm to grow into a sound barrier. I know that is a long term solution but everything helps.

I'll let you know when the plant modification is done and we'll monitor afterwards.

Feb 9, 2023 at 1:31 PM

Thanks Chad for the update that sounds great. Do you think the nitrogen plant is involved with all of the sounds we've ID'd or just the hissing?

Feb 9, 2023 at 3:20 PM

I'm hoping both. It is the only distinguishable sound we can detect.

Mar 2, 2023 at 9:54 AM

Good morning. The 512Hz sound has been pretty loud Tuesday night. and last night through to this morning.

i'm guessing due to cold temps and south wind

Mar 3, 2023 at 7:55 AM

Good morning. I wasn't able to meet with the facilities person in status of the work they have been doing. I should he able to connect with him today.

Mar 23, 2023 at 10:15 AM

Good Morning Chad. We've got a really solid noise

Good Morning Chad. We've got a really solid noise signature today. Probably due to wind from the south at 16 mph.

Mar 23, 2023 at 11:46 AM

Possibly. We are still working on the plant but I think the big noise improvements are done at this point. We still plan to do the additional trees but that'll is long term. I'll have facilities look into a sound wall where we generate nitrogen.

It does seem to be really tied to wind carrying sound though huh.

For today how long would you say?

I think it is just where we make nitrogen but if there are truck offloads happening we need to take different steps they only make elevated noise at the end of the offload for a few min.

Today I first noticed it around 9am. I think that was when the wind picked up this morning. It's been continuous since then. I don't think trees will reduce the impact if the source of the sound is up high like a roof top air handler. There are lots of trees between us and the facility. I think it's going over/through them.

But yes it seems very much a wind direction issue.

All of the sounds we're hearing from the facility seem to be continuously generated.

It's is possible at some point I'd love to pinpoint the source of the noise because it might not be what we think it is

The only way I can think to do that is, on a day when we can her the sound clearly, to turn off a suspected source and see if the sound stops or not.

if the sound continues then we know that wasn't the source. and can turn it back on right away

source. and can turn it back on right away

but i imagine some of the suspected sources are things that •need• to run all the time

Mar 23, 2023 at 3:50 PM

They do. air systems and the nitrogen plant are in part to support safety requirements. Shutting them down is a major thing.

Do you work typical business hours? Maybe we can meet to review together with our facilities manager.

Typical hours yes but I work from home and my schedule is very flexible.

I'd be glad to meet.

Ok. I'll see what works best on our end

Apr 12, 2023 at 9:06 AM

Hi Chad, We heard a new sound last night, a low frequency rumble. We first noticed it around 8pm. I took a midnight drive to locate it, and it's coming from Lam. Any equipment changes in the past few days that might explain it?

Nothing that I'm aware of. Was it more than a few minutes. I need to set up our meeting. I'll confirm time this week.

Thanks. For sure it was continuous from at 11:20pm till 12:30am when I fell asleep. We heard it earlier, just not sure if it was continuous then.

Apr 12, 2023 at 10:55 AM

Are you available at 1pm on monday?

at 1:10

Apr 12, 2023 at 2:34 PM

Ok. Let's plan to meet here at our lobby then. I'll

Ok. Let's plan to meet here at our lobby then. I'll confirm the time with our facilities manager.

Apr 12, 2023 at 4:03 PM

Sounds good. Thanks.

Apr 18, 2023 at 9:05 AM

Hi Chad, Thanks for meeting with my yesterday. I'm glad to get a better sense of what is going on. I was wrong about the beat frequency of the 512 Hz tone. I measured it last night, it's not 5 beats a second, but more like 1.95 Hz or 117 beats per minute.

Here's a tone I generated online that's pretty close to what we hear.



Not Delivered

Oh shoot. The audio file didn't go through. I'll upload it to the web and send you the URL

No worries. It will be interesting to hear what you hear at your house

turns out the audio file is really small, so i just attached it to an email.

Ok

Apr 26, 2023 at 3:02 PM

Hi Brett, we were able to idle our nitrogen plant today for a few days to do some work. Let me know if you hear the same sound. I'll let you know when it comes back on.

oh super. will do. thanks!

.

Apr 27, 2023 at 7:39 AM

Well that was a shorter time frame than I had expected. It is back up and running now.

ok. was it up amd running last night?

Yes it was back up around 10pm. I originally thought it would be offline for a few days.

that's consistent with what i heard. the wind was from the north yesterday eve so it was quiet at our house. i went out just after 10pm to drive downwind and take a listen. heard the same sounds as typical, but the scrubber fans were slightly higher freq than normally are.

thanka for letting me know about the idle

May 4, 2023 at 9:21 AM

Good Morning. We've had our windows open the past few days and have noticed a clean 520Hz tone with a beat frequency around once every two seconds. One time it was so loud my wife asked "Is that an alarm?"

Ok. I don't know of anything unusual over the past few days but I'll check.

Thanks. I'm guessing it's the scrubber fans running slightly faster than they have in the past?

May 14, 2023 at 11:19 PM

Hi Chad, Sorry to bug you at night. There is a new loud constant tone. About 350Hz. Sounds like by the nitrogen plant. Just started a few minutes ago

Loudest thing we've ever heard from Lam.

I think it stopped

May 15, 2023 at 5:45 AM

May 15, 2023 at 5:45 AM

I woke up at 5:30 to a different but similar noise 343Hz confirmed just now it's coming from the nitrogen plant area.

Interesting. I'll check what was going on last night.

Thanks

May 16, 2023 at 10:02 AM

We are putting in some noise mitigation next week. We'll see what it does. But I think every improvement helps.

That sounds great. Thank you!

Curious was there something different going on Sunday night, or was it just a bad night for sound?

May 18, 2023 at 6:35 AM

Good Morning. There's a super clear 522 Hz tone with a slow, irregular beat this morning. South wind 4mph. I think it woke me up. Windows are open. Surprised how loud it is in warm weather too. Sounds a bit like an alarm clock. Probably is the scrubber fans.

I'm going to head over through the neighborhood and see what I hear. Thanks for the heads up.

Thanks to you too!

interestingly it's easier to hear inside than outside. maybe because less background noise inside? for some reason the tone is less audible inside now than it was earlier.

I'm going to datalog the fans and N2 plant again now that we are through a bunch of work on the N2 system. I hear it. But I think given the intensity, it may still be the N2. When I get close to the scrubber fans then back out to the property line I can't hear them with my ears. Or maybe the N2 system is just drowning it out. I can

Or maybe the N2 system is just drowning it out. I can hear that anywhere on the north side.

Oh interesting. Thanks!

it's audible in my back yard intermittently. both the N2 sounds and the other tone

Jun 8, 2023 at 8:26 PM

We've got an audible 510 Hz tone with a beat in our backyard right now. Comes and goes. Plus some N2 sounds. The 510 tone was pretty loud last night and this morning.

Jun 8, 2023 at 9:34 PM

Ok I was going to check with you yesterday
Our newest N2 compressor has been down for a while. It just came back up yesterday.

We have new trees in around it. I'm looking at other effective sound dampening methods.

Interesting. Thanks.

Jun 23, 2023 at 10:00 AM

We have a clear 517Hz tone today with a beat. Audible upstairs, downstairs, and in the back yard.

Sep 11, 2023 at 8:30 AM

Hi Chad, as the weather cools down, the 520Hz tone with a beat is becoming louder again. We realized what it reminds us of: a digital beeping alarm clock. Not the kind of thing you want to hear at night when you are trying to go to sleep.

No it's not. I know it's not a fast solution but we are looking implementing more sound prevention to reduce as much sound from being heard off site as possible. We will improve this.

Sep 11, 2023 at 4:04 PM

Sep 11, 2023 at 4:04 PM

Thanks for your understanding and for your efforts towards improvements.

Dec 4, 2023 at 9:35 AM

Hi Chad, I hope you are well. We had a loud weekend here. Friday night especially so, wind was from the south over 10mph, so that doesn't help. There is a new primary frequency at 175Hz and a harmonic at 354Hz. The 175Hz seems louder than anything we've heard previously. I compared to the sounds onsite Sunday morning and they matched. Have there been any changes that could explain this?

Dec 4, 2023 at 11:47 AM

Hi Brett, Im not aware of any changes but will investigate. We are still planning improved sound reduction. Did you notice where it was strongest.

off the NE corner of building D

kinda lined up with that alley between buildings E and D

That is odd. We've modified our system a few months ago to minimize how much we run chillers. That should result in reduced noise, not more. How did the nitrogen gas plant sound?

Oh interesting. The 175Hz sound has been pretty constant since Friday, but not sure how much of that is due to a steady wind pattern. The nitrogen gas plant sounds like white noise when onsite, which is good, and I don't think it carries too far. I wasn't listening for it across the street tho, cuz it's not what we're hearing at our house. I'll give it a listen from our neighborhood entry next time I'm out.

Jan 19, 2024 at 1:49 PM

Hi Chad, The neighbors who live near Grimm's Fuel Compost are trying to get the word out about a Metro license renewal and a public comments period that is

license renewal and a public comments period that is open. Wondering if it would be possible for us to put up some yard signs on Lam property on 124th between Tualatin Road and Highway 99 until the end of the month?

Jan 19, 2024 at 3:54 PM

Hi Brett. That isn't our property it is owned by another company. We just lease a few floors.

Ok, Good to know! Thanks.

Mar 4, 2024 at 9:03 AM

Hi Chad, The sound has been loud the past few days. This weekend was probably the worst sofar. Could hear it throughout our house. The pulsing 350Hz tone woke me up both mornings. It was going day and night. Kept me awake last night. Wind was steady out of the south the whole time I think.

Hi Brett. It is amazing what wind does for sound. Aside from the trees planted, we are pulling sound protection into our construction designs. It is in progress but moves slowly.

Apr 25, 2024 at 5:04 PM

Hi Chad, Just a head's up that the 520 Hz tone is loud enough that I'm hearing it in my garage. Ground level, no windows.

Is it still happening or was it for a set period of time?

It was audible for most of the afternoon. I've got some water running right now so can't tell if it's still going or not.

It's still going now.

the sound that is.

Ok I'm investigating

Ok I'm investigating

Thanks.

Apr 30, 2024 at 9:48 AM

It's been loud over the weekend plus yesterday and today. Probably because the wind is steady from the south at 10+ mph and chilly?

Yeah the wind definitely affects it. I haven't found anything different. I will be happy when we get new sound screens uo

Up

Tue, Dec 3 at 9:32 AM

Hi Chad, We were hearing some new harmonics last night, including a really low frequency around 47Hz. I think it's the first time we've heard that low frequency. Wondering if anything has changed onsite that might explain this? There were four harmonics. Each was about one octave lower than the next. 347/170/84/47Hz

Tue, Dec 3 at 11:59 AM

That's interesting. How long did the low frequencies last for? No changes that would do that. I don't think we have anything big enough to push that low a frequency that far.

Not sure how long it lasted. We noticed it around 10:30pm until falling asleep around 11:15pm.

Any recent changes that could account for the other, higher, harmonic frequencies?

Tue, Dec 3 at 2:00 PM

I am checking to see if anything has happened that I'm not aware of. But nothing obvious or significant.

Ok. Thanks!

Thu, Jan 30 at 8:38 AM

Thu, Jan 30 at 8:38 AM

Hi Chad. We've noticed a major decrease in sound the past couple weeks but it's back last night and today. any changes onsite that could explain it, or just the weather?

Hi Brett. I've been traveling all week but am checking with the team on site.

Thu, Jan 30 at 11:55 AM

I think it might have been a wind shift. Wind has been N and NW recently (including last night) but today it's from the South. I wonder if the local actual wind last night was different than what the weather app said. Any clues from on site?

No, we haven't had any change in operations.

Ok thanks.

Fri, Jan 31 at 9:54 AM

Just an update. Today the wind is South 180° at 8 mph gusting to 26. The fan noise is so loud I can hear it in my garage with the doors closed.

Fri, Jan 31 at 3:37 PM

That's unusual. I'll ask facilities to see if something is changing. We have every parameter monitored so of something was off we would know right away.

Tue, Feb 4 at 8:52 AM

The low frequency 88Hz was back last night along with its 344Hz harmonic, both of which we have heard together before.

Tue, Feb 4 at 11:56 AM

Hmm. I did double check with facilities. They confirmed no changes and everything is running normally.

Washington County Consolidated Communications Agency
5900 NE Pinefarm Court, Hillsboro, Oregon 97124
503-690-4911 ext 3280

CERTIFICATE OF AUTHENTICITY

Pursuant to the State of Oregon public records laws and administrative rules, the following public records were compiled and/or reproduced on 12/27/2024 as requested by and released to:

Name: Brett Hamilton
Agency:
Street Address: 11430 SW Kalispell St
City, State Zip: Tualatin, OR 97062
Phone: 503 803 7609
Email: brett@simple.be

~ PUBLIC RECORDS ~

Request Type: Other Search Report
Delivery Method: Email - electronic pdf file & mp3
Reference #:

Record Type	CAD Incident# Search Criteria	Inc. Date	Audio Description	Begin Time/Date	End Time/Date	Search Results
Other Search Report	503 803 7609			10/27/2024	12/6/2024	6

1 - Total Records

The public records listed above are certified to be a true and accurate copy of the original. WCCCA is a public safety answering point (PSAP) for emergency calls originating within a 9-1-1 service area and recognized by the State of Oregon.

Regarding telephone calls: At the date and time reference above, a telephone call was processed by WCCCA or made by WCCCA. During the full duration of the call, the call was recorded by a digital logging recorder.

Regarding radio traffic: At the date and time referenced above, radio traffic was processed by WCCCA. The radio traffic was relayed via WCCCA's emergency communications radio system. During the full duration of the radio traffic, the radio traffic was recorded by a digital logging recorder.

The operator of the Equature DSS digital logging recorder was competent to transfer the recording to the format provided. If any redactions were made to the recordings to protect confidential data obtained from the Oregon Law Enforcement Data Systems (LEDS) or Protected Health Information, the redactions would be indicated by a steady digital tone placed on the recording. Otherwise, the public record provided accurately reflects the original call and no changes, additions, or deletions were made.

The public record provided is an accurate rendition of the telephone call and/or radio traffic placed at the time and date set forth above.

Date Received: 12/6/2024
Date Completed: 12/27/2024
Request Number: 24-2888
Request Status: COMPLETED

Processed By: Krista Tate

Phone History

Search Parameter: 5038037609

IncidentNumber	Problem	ResponseDate	CallerPhone	CallBackPhone	Address	City	Name	Disposition
WP243010290	NOI - NOISE COMPLAINT	10/27/2024 09:49:05		503-803-7609	11361 Sw Leveton Dr	TUALATIN	BRETT HAMILTON	W1 - ASSIGNMENT COMPLETED
WP243060035	NOI - NOISE COMPLAINT	11/01/2024 01:00:04		503-803-7609	11361 Sw Leveton Dr	TUALATIN	BRETT HAMILTON	W1 - ASSIGNMENT COMPLETED
WP243160888	NOI - NOISE COMPLAINT	11/11/2024 20:24:56		503-803-7609	11361 Sw Leveton Dr	TUALATIN	BRETT HAMILTON	W1 - ASSIGNMENT COMPLETED
WP243210830	NOI - NOISE COMPLAINT	11/16/2024 20:41:50		503-803-7609	11361 Sw Leveton Dr	TUALATIN	HAMILTON, BRETT	W1 - ASSIGNMENT COMPLETED
WP243220790	NOI - NOISE COMPLAINT	11/17/2024 20:57:11		503-803-7609	11361 Sw Leveton Dr	TUALATIN	BRETT HAMILTON	W1 - ASSIGNMENT COMPLETED
WP243220867	FOL - FOLLOW UP	11/17/2024 22:55:06		503 803 7609	11361 Sw Leveton Dr	TUALATIN	BRETT HAMILTON	W3 - PERSON ADVISED/REFERRED

From: Jorge Del Rio <jorgedelrio52@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 11:42 AM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam Noise Impacts

Dear Tualatin Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board,

Thank you for your dedication and service to the community, and for your work to protect our quality of life. While development and corporate activities are essential to the vitality of our city, residential land uses must also be protected, both from an economic standpoint (property values) and from a quality of life standpoint (mental and physical health). In keeping with this mission, we are asking for your help in resolving Lam's noise pollution problem.

Multiple noise signatures have been identified emanating from Lam's campus, including clear tones that pulse, two-toned harmonics, and a low rumble that sounds like an old bomber airplane. The most distinctive sound is the high-frequency hiss from Lam's gas plant, clearly audible across Tualatin Road most nights.

We have brought this issue to the attention of the City Council, Police Department, Code Enforcement, Riverpark CIO, and Lam. Despite repeated requests for a solution, no meaningful changes have been made. When Tualatin's police officers have driven onto the Lam campus to investigate noise complaints, they have been chased down by Lam's security guards and asked to leave.

The Tualatin Noise Ordinance (1361-13) sets a city-wide limit of 50dB at night for residential areas, and the Tualatin Development Code (62.100) places even stricter limits on Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning, stating that "Such permitted uses must not cause objectionable noise". A noise study performed earlier this year at night by a licensed acoustical enginneer measured noise levels of 52dB at a private residence across the street from Lam's gas plant. Therefore, Lam's offsite noise impacts are in violation of both the Tualatin Development Code and the Tualatin Municipal Code.

Lam's noise pollution problem is not caused by daytime construction, backup beepers, or truck horns, but rather, by permanently-installed equipment that is part of Lam's physical plant. This equipment runs 24/7 and generates sound continuously. The sounds are most noticeable at night when background noise is low, and the location of sound impacts can vary depending on atmospheric conditions, especially temperature and wind direction. During southerly winds, Lam's noise signature can be heard more than a mile away.

Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning serves as a buffer between heavy industry and residential areas. MP zoning calls for "limiting uses to those that are of a nature so as to not conflict with other industrial uses or surrounding residential areas." (TDC 62.100) Please consider this letter

as evidence that Lam's operations are, in fact, currently conflicting with surrounding residential areas.

In order to bring Lam's facility into compliance with the Tualatin Code, I request that Lam's off-site noise impacts be eliminated as part of the TUX project. It is absolutely critical to our quality of life that peace and quiet be restored to our neighborhoods. We ask the City of Tualatin to require Lam to prove their ability to eliminate offsite noise before approving the addition of any new noise sources on campus.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Ted Olson <noslotheo@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 11:42 AM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam Noise Impacts



Dear Tualatin Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board,

Thank you for your dedication and service to the community, and for your work to protect our quality of life. While development and corporate activities are essential to the vitality of our city, residential land uses must also be protected, both from an economic standpoint (property values) and from a quality of life standpoint (mental and physical health). In keeping with this mission, we are asking for your help in resolving Lam's noise pollution problem.

Multiple noise signatures have been identified emanating from Lam's campus, including clear tones that pulse, two-toned harmonics, and a low rumble that sounds like an old bomber airplane. The most distinctive sound is the high-frequency hiss from Lam's gas plant, clearly audible across Tualatin Road most nights.

We have brought this issue to the attention of the City Council, Police Department, Code Enforcement, Riverpark CIO, and Lam. Despite repeated requests for a solution, no meaningful changes have been made. When Tualatin's police officers have driven onto the Lam campus to investigate noise complaints, they have been chased down by Lam's security guards and asked to leave.

The Tualatin Noise Ordinance (1361-13) sets a city-wide limit of 50dB at night for residential areas, and the Tualatin Development Code (62.100) places even stricter limits on Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning, stating that "Such permitted uses must not cause objectionable noise". A noise study performed earlier this year at night by a licensed acoustical enginneer measured noise levels of 52dB at a private residence across the street from Lam's gas plant. Therefore, Lam's offsite noise impacts are in violation of both the Tualatin Development Code and the Tualatin Municipal Code.

Lam's noise pollution problem is not caused by daytime construction, backup beepers, or truck horns, but rather, by permanently-installed equipment that is part of Lam's physical

plant. This equipment runs 24/7 and generates sound continuously. The sounds are most noticeable at night when background noise is low, and the location of sound impacts can vary depending on atmospheric conditions, especially temperature and wind direction. During southerly winds, Lam's noise signature can be heard more than a mile away.

Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning serves as a buffer between heavy industry and residential areas. MP zoning calls for “limiting uses to those that are of a nature so as to not conflict with other industrial uses or surrounding residential areas.” (TDC 62.100) Please consider this letter as evidence that Lam's operations are, in fact, currently conflicting with surrounding residential areas.

In order to bring Lam's facility into compliance with the Tualatin Code, I request that Lam's off-site noise impacts be eliminated as part of the TUX project. It is absolutely critical to our quality of life that peace and quiet be restored to our neighborhoods. We ask the City of Tualatin to require Lam to prove their ability to eliminate offsite noise before approving the addition of any new noise sources on campus.

Thank you for your consideration.

Ted Olson
11435 SW Elmer Ct
Tualatin, OR 97062

From: Skye Allen <skyeallen97@icloud.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 11:45 AM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam Noise Impacts

Dear Tualatin Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board,

Thank you for your dedication and service to the community, and for your work to protect our quality of life. While development and corporate activities are essential to the vitality of our city, residential land uses must also be protected, both from an economic standpoint (property values) and from a quality of life standpoint (mental and physical health). In keeping with this mission, we are asking for your help in resolving Lam's noise pollution problem.

Multiple noise signatures have been identified emanating from Lam's campus, including clear tones that pulse, two-toned harmonics, and a low rumble that sounds like an old bomber airplane. The most distinctive sound is the high-frequency hiss from Lam's gas plant, clearly audible across Tualatin Road most nights.

We have brought this issue to the attention of the City Council, Police Department, Code Enforcement, Riverpark CIO, and Lam. Despite repeated requests for a solution, no meaningful changes have been made. When Tualatin's police officers have driven onto the Lam campus to investigate noise complaints, they have been chased down by Lam's security guards and asked to leave.

The Tualatin Noise Ordinance (1361-13) sets a city-wide limit of 50dB at night for residential areas, and the Tualatin Development Code (62.100) places even stricter limits on Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning, stating that "Such permitted uses must not cause objectionable noise". A noise study performed earlier this year at night by a licensed acoustical enginneer measured noise levels of 52dB at a private residence across the street from Lam's gas plant. Therefore, Lam's offsite noise impacts are in violation of both the Tualatin Development Code and the Tualatin Municipal Code.

Lam's noise pollution problem is not caused by daytime construction, backup beepers, or truck horns, but rather, by permanently-installed equipment that is part of Lam's physical plant. This equipment runs 24/7 and generates sound continuously. The sounds are most noticeable at night when background noise is low, and the location of sound impacts can vary depending on atmospheric conditions, especially temperature and wind direction. During southerly winds, Lam's noise signature can be heard more than a mile away.

Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning serves as a buffer between heavy industry and residential areas. MP zoning calls for "limiting uses to those that are of a nature so as to not conflict with other industrial uses or surrounding residential areas." (TDC 62.100) Please consider this letter

as evidence that Lam's operations are, in fact, currently conflicting with surrounding residential areas.

In order to bring Lam's facility into compliance with the Tualatin Code, I request that Lam's off-site noise impacts be eliminated as part of the TUX project. It is absolutely critical to our quality of life that peace and quiet be restored to our neighborhoods. We ask the City of Tualatin to require Lam to prove their ability to eliminate offsite noise before approving the addition of any new noise sources on campus.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: clint ackerman <hockey535353@outlook.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 11:49 AM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam Noise Impacts

Dear Tualatin Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board,

Thank you for your dedication and service to the community, and for your work to protect our quality of life. While development and corporate activities are essential to the vitality of our city, residential land uses must also be protected, both from an economic standpoint (property values) and from a quality of life standpoint (mental and physical health). In keeping with this mission, we are asking for your help in resolving Lam's noise pollution problem.

Multiple noise signatures have been identified emanating from Lam's campus, including clear tones that pulse, two-toned harmonics, and a low rumble that sounds like an old bomber airplane. The most distinctive sound is the high-frequency hiss from Lam's gas plant, clearly audible across Tualatin Road most nights.

We have brought this issue to the attention of the City Council, Police Department, Code Enforcement, Riverpark CIO, and Lam. Despite repeated requests for a solution, no meaningful changes have been made. When Tualatin's police officers have driven onto the Lam campus to investigate noise complaints, they have been chased down by Lam's security guards and asked to leave.

The Tualatin Noise Ordinance (1361-13) sets a city-wide limit of 50dB at night for residential areas, and the Tualatin Development Code (62.100) places even stricter limits on Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning, stating that "Such permitted uses must not cause objectionable noise". A noise study performed earlier this year at night by a licensed acoustical enginneer measured noise levels of 52dB at a private residence across the street from Lam's gas plant. Therefore, Lam's offsite noise impacts are in violation of both the Tualatin Development Code and the Tualatin Municipal Code.

Lam's noise pollution problem is not caused by daytime construction, backup beepers, or truck horns, but rather, by permanently-installed equipment that is part of Lam's physical plant. This equipment runs 24/7 and generates sound continuously. The sounds are most noticeable at night when background noise is low, and the location of sound impacts can vary depending on atmospheric conditions, especially temperature and wind direction. During southerly winds, Lam's noise signature can be heard more than a mile away.

Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning serves as a buffer between heavy industry and residential areas. MP zoning calls for "limiting uses to those that are of a nature so as to not conflict with other industrial uses or surrounding residential areas." (TDC 62.100) Please consider this letter

as evidence that Lam's operations are, in fact, currently conflicting with surrounding residential areas.

In order to bring Lam's facility into compliance with the Tualatin Code, I request that Lam's off-site noise impacts be eliminated as part of the TUX project. It is absolutely critical to our quality of life that peace and quiet be restored to our neighborhoods. We ask the City of Tualatin to require Lam to prove their ability to eliminate offsite noise before approving the addition of any new noise sources on campus.

Thank you for your consideration

DO THE JOB YOU WERE HIRED TO DO
DONT BE LIKE TRUMP

Sent from my iPhone

From: Fritz Weber <fritz@luminos.net>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 12:08 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam Noise Impacts

Dear Tualatin Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board,

Thank you for your dedication and service to the community, and for your work to protect our quality of life. While development and corporate activities are essential to the vitality of our city, residential land uses must also be protected, both from an economic standpoint (property values) and from a quality of life standpoint (mental and physical health). In keeping with this mission, we are asking for your help in resolving Lam's noise pollution problem.

Multiple noise signatures have been identified emanating from Lam's campus, including clear tones that pulse, two-toned harmonics, and a low rumble that sounds like an old bomber airplane. The most distinctive sound is the high-frequency hiss from Lam's gas plant, clearly audible across Tualatin Road most nights.

We have brought this issue to the attention of the City Council, Police Department, Code Enforcement, Riverpark CIO, and Lam. Despite repeated requests for a solution, no meaningful changes have been made. When Tualatin's police officers have driven onto the Lam campus to investigate noise complaints, they have been chased down by Lam's security guards and asked to leave.

The Tualatin Noise Ordinance (1361-13) sets a city-wide limit of 50dB at night for residential areas, and the Tualatin Development Code (62.100) places even stricter limits on Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning, stating that "Such permitted uses must not cause objectionable noise". A noise study performed earlier this year at night by a licensed acoustical enginneer measured noise levels of 52dB at a private residence across the street from Lam's gas plant. Therefore, Lam's offsite noise impacts are in violation of both the Tualatin Development Code and the Tualatin Municipal Code.

Lam's noise pollution problem is not caused by daytime construction, backup beepers, or truck horns, but rather, by permanently-installed equipment that is part of Lam's physical plant. This equipment runs 24/7 and generates sound continuously. The sounds are most noticeable at night when background noise is low, and the location of sound impacts can vary depending on atmospheric conditions, especially temperature and wind direction. During southerly winds, Lam's noise signature can be heard more than a mile away.

Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning serves as a buffer between heavy industry and residential areas. MP zoning calls for "limiting uses to those that are of a nature so as to not conflict with other industrial uses or surrounding residential areas." (TDC 62.100) Please consider this letter

as evidence that Lam's operations are, in fact, currently conflicting with surrounding residential areas.

In order to bring Lam's facility into compliance with the Tualatin Code, I request that Lam's off-site noise impacts be eliminated as part of the TUX project. It is absolutely critical to our quality of life that peace and quiet be restored to our neighborhoods. We ask the City of Tualatin to require Lam to prove their ability to eliminate offsite noise before approving the addition of any new noise sources on campus.

Thank you for your consideration.

From: Rick Cady <rcadycvelo@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 12:12 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam Noise impacts

Dear Tualatin Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board,

Thank you for your dedication and service to the community, and for your work to protect our quality of life. While development and corporate activities are essential to the vitality of our city, residential land uses must also be protected, both from an economic standpoint (property values) and from a quality of life standpoint (mental and physical health). In keeping with this mission, we are asking for your help in resolving Lam's noise pollution problem.

Multiple noise signatures have been identified emanating from Lam's campus, including clear tones that pulse, two-toned harmonics, and a low rumble that sounds like an old bomber airplane. The most distinctive sound is the high-frequency hiss from Lam’s gas plant, clearly audible across Tualatin Road most nights.

We have brought this issue to the attention of the City Council, Police Department, Code Enforcement, Riverpark CIO, and Lam. Despite repeated requests for a solution, no meaningful changes have been made. When Tualatin's police officers have driven onto the Lam campus to investigate noise complaints, they have been chased down by Lam’s security guards and asked to leave.

The Tualatin Noise Ordinance (1361-13) sets a city-wide limit of 50dB at night for residential areas, and the Tualatin Development Code (62.100) places even stricter limits on Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning, stating that “Such permitted uses must not cause objectionable noise”. A noise study performed earlier this year at night by a licensed acoustical enginneer measured noise levels of 52dB at a private residence across the street from Lam's gas plant. Therefore, Lam's offsite noise impacts are in violation of both the Tualatin Development Code and the Tualatin Municipal Code.

Lam's noise pollution problem is not caused by daytime construction, backup beepers, or truck horns, but rather, by permanently-installed equipment that is part of Lam's physical plant. This equipment runs 24/7 and generates sound continuously. The sounds are most noticeable at night when background noise is low, and the location of sound impacts can vary depending on atmospheric conditions, especially temperature and wind direction. During southerly winds, Lam's noise signature can be heard more than a mile away.

Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning serves as a buffer between heavy industry and residential areas. MP zoning calls for "limiting uses to those that are of a nature so as to not conflict with other industrial uses or surrounding residential areas." (TDC 62.100) Please consider this letter as evidence that Lam's operations are, in fact, currently conflicting with surrounding residential areas.

In order to bring Lam's facility into compliance with the Tualatin Code, I request that Lam's off-site noise impacts be eliminated as part of the TUX project. It is absolutely critical to our quality of life that peace and quiet be restored to our neighborhoods. We ask the City of Tualatin to require Lam to prove their ability to eliminate offsite noise before approving the addition of any new noise sources on campus.

Thank you for your consideration.

Rick Cady
10230 SW Anderson Ct.
Tualatin, OR. 97062

From: Hayden Thornton <hrt0206@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 12:16 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam Noise Impacts



Dear Tualatin Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board,

Thank you for your dedication and service to the community, and for your work to protect our quality of life. While development and corporate activities are essential to the vitality of our city, residential land uses must also be protected, both from an economic standpoint (property values) and from a quality of life standpoint (mental and physical health). In keeping with this mission, we are asking for your help in resolving Lam's noise pollution problem.

Multiple noise signatures have been identified emanating from Lam's campus, including clear tones that pulse, two-toned harmonics, and a low rumble that sounds like an old bomber airplane. The most distinctive sound is the high-frequency hiss from Lam's gas plant, clearly audible across Tualatin Road most nights.

We have brought this issue to the attention of the City Council, Police Department, Code Enforcement, Riverpark CIO, and Lam. Despite repeated requests for a solution, no meaningful changes have been made. When Tualatin's police officers have driven onto the Lam campus to investigate noise complaints, they have been chased down by Lam's security guards and asked to leave.

The Tualatin Noise Ordinance (1361-13) sets a city-wide limit of 50dB at night for residential areas, and the Tualatin Development Code (62.100) places even stricter limits on Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning, stating that "Such permitted uses must not cause objectionable noise". A noise study performed earlier this year at night by a licensed acoustical enginneer measured noise levels of 52dB at a private residence across the street from Lam's gas plant. Therefore, Lam's offsite noise impacts are in violation of both the Tualatin Development Code and the Tualatin Municipal Code.

Lam's noise pollution problem is not caused by daytime construction, backup beepers, or truck horns, but rather, by permanently-installed equipment that is part of Lam's physical

plant. This equipment runs 24/7 and generates sound continuously. The sounds are most noticeable at night when background noise is low, and the location of sound impacts can vary depending on atmospheric conditions, especially temperature and wind direction. During southerly winds, Lam's noise signature can be heard more than a mile away.

Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning serves as a buffer between heavy industry and residential areas. MP zoning calls for “limiting uses to those that are of a nature so as to not conflict with other industrial uses or surrounding residential areas.” (TDC 62.100) Please consider this letter as evidence that Lam's operations are, in fact, currently conflicting with surrounding residential areas.

In order to bring Lam's facility into compliance with the Tualatin Code, I request that Lam's off-site noise impacts be eliminated as part of the TUX project. It is absolutely critical to our quality of life that peace and quiet be restored to our neighborhoods. We ask the City of Tualatin to require Lam to prove their ability to eliminate offsite noise before approving the addition of any new noise sources on campus.

Thank you for your consideration.

Hayden Thornton

From: Alex Simpson <asimps33@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 12:16 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam Noise Impacts

Dear Tualatin Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board,

Thank you for your dedication and service to the community, and for your work to protect our quality of life. While development and corporate activities are essential to the vitality of our city, residential land uses must also be protected, both from an economic standpoint (property values) and from a quality of life standpoint (mental and physical health). In keeping with this mission, we are asking for your help in resolving Lam's noise pollution problem.

Multiple noise signatures have been identified emanating from Lam's campus, including clear tones that pulse, two-toned harmonics, and a low rumble that sounds like an old bomber airplane. The most distinctive sound is the high-frequency hiss from Lam's gas plant, clearly audible across Tualatin Road most nights.

We have brought this issue to the attention of the City Council, Police Department, Code Enforcement, Riverpark CIO, and Lam. Despite repeated requests for a solution, no meaningful changes have been made. When Tualatin's police officers have driven onto the Lam campus to investigate noise complaints, they have been chased down by Lam's security guards and asked to leave.

The Tualatin Noise Ordinance (1361-13) sets a city-wide limit of 50dB at night for residential areas, and the Tualatin Development Code (62.100) places even stricter limits on Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning, stating that "Such permitted uses must not cause objectionable noise". A noise study performed earlier this year at night by a licensed acoustical enginneer measured noise levels of 52dB at a private residence across the street from Lam's gas plant. Therefore, Lam's offsite noise impacts are in violation of both the Tualatin Development Code and the Tualatin Municipal Code.

Lam's noise pollution problem is not caused by daytime construction, backup beepers, or truck horns, but rather, by permanently-installed equipment that is part of Lam's physical plant. This equipment runs 24/7 and generates sound continuously. The sounds are most noticeable at night when background noise is low, and the location of sound impacts can vary depending on atmospheric conditions, especially temperature and wind direction. During southerly winds, Lam's noise signature can be heard more than a mile away.

Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning serves as a buffer between heavy industry and residential areas. MP zoning calls for "limiting uses to those that are of a nature so as to not conflict with other industrial uses or surrounding residential areas." (TDC 62.100) Please consider this letter

as evidence that Lam's operations are, in fact, currently conflicting with surrounding residential areas.

In order to bring Lam's facility into compliance with the Tualatin Code, I request that Lam's off-site noise impacts be eliminated as part of the TUX project. It is absolutely critical to our quality of life that peace and quiet be restored to our neighborhoods. We ask the City of Tualatin to require Lam to prove their ability to eliminate offsite noise before approving the addition of any new noise sources on campus.

Thank you for your consideration.

From: Jenny Blodgett <jenny.blodgett32@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 12:29 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam Noise Impacts

Dear Tualatin Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board,

Thank you for your dedication and service to the community, and for your work to protect our quality of life. While development and corporate activities are essential to the vitality of our city, residential land uses must also be protected, both from an economic standpoint (property values) and from a quality of life standpoint (mental and physical health). In keeping with this mission, we are asking for your help in resolving Lam's noise pollution problem.

Multiple noise signatures have been identified emanating from Lam's campus, including clear tones that pulse, two-toned harmonics, and a low rumble that sounds like an old bomber airplane. The most distinctive sound is the high-frequency hiss from Lam's gas plant, clearly audible across Tualatin Road most nights.

We have brought this issue to the attention of the City Council, Police Department, Code Enforcement, Riverpark CIO, and Lam. Despite repeated requests for a solution, no meaningful changes have been made. When Tualatin's police officers have driven onto the Lam campus to investigate noise complaints, they have been chased down by Lam's security guards and asked to leave.

The Tualatin Noise Ordinance (1361-13) sets a city-wide limit of 50dB at night for residential areas, and the Tualatin Development Code (62.100) places even stricter limits on Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning, stating that "Such permitted uses must not cause objectionable noise". A noise study performed earlier this year at night by a licensed acoustical enginneer measured noise levels of 52dB at a private residence across the street from Lam's gas plant. Therefore, Lam's offsite noise impacts are in violation of both the Tualatin Development Code and the Tualatin Municipal Code.

Lam's noise pollution problem is not caused by daytime construction, backup beepers, or truck horns, but rather, by permanently-installed equipment that is part of Lam's physical plant. This equipment runs 24/7 and generates sound continuously. The sounds are most noticeable at night when background noise is low, and the location of sound impacts can vary depending on atmospheric conditions, especially temperature and wind direction. During southerly winds, Lam's noise signature can be heard more than a mile away.

Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning serves as a buffer between heavy industry and residential areas. MP zoning calls for "limiting uses to those that are of a nature so as to not conflict

with other industrial uses or surrounding residential areas." (TDC 62.100) Please consider this letter as evidence that Lam's operations are, in fact, currently conflicting with surrounding residential areas.

In order to bring Lam's facility into compliance with the Tualatin Code, I request that Lam's off-site noise impacts be eliminated as part of the TUX project. It is absolutely critical to our quality of life that peace and quiet be restored to our neighborhoods. We ask the City of Tualatin to require Lam to prove their ability to eliminate offsite noise before approving the addition of any new noise sources on campus.

Thank you for your consideration.

From: Kim Devers <kimldevers@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 12:47 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam Noise Impacts



Dear Tualatin Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board,

Thank you for your dedication and service to the community, and for your work to protect our quality of life. While development and corporate activities are essential to the vitality of our city, residential land uses must also be protected, both from an economic standpoint (property values) and from a quality of life standpoint (mental and physical health). In keeping with this mission, we are asking for your help in resolving Lam's noise pollution problem.

Multiple noise signatures have been identified emanating from Lam's campus, including clear tones that pulse, two-toned harmonics, and a low rumble that sounds like an old bomber airplane. The most distinctive sound is the high-frequency hiss from Lam's gas plant, clearly audible across Tualatin Road most nights.

We have brought this issue to the attention of the City Council, Police Department, Code Enforcement, Riverpark CIO, and Lam. Despite repeated requests for a solution, no meaningful changes have been made. When Tualatin's police officers have driven onto the Lam campus to investigate noise complaints, they have been chased down by Lam's security guards and asked to leave.

The Tualatin Noise Ordinance (1361-13) sets a city-wide limit of 50dB at night for residential areas, and the Tualatin Development Code (62.100) places even stricter limits on Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning, stating that "Such permitted uses must not cause objectionable noise". A noise study performed earlier this year at night by a licensed acoustical enginneer measured noise levels of 52dB at a private residence across the street from Lam's gas plant. Therefore, Lam's offsite noise impacts are in violation of both the Tualatin Development Code and the Tualatin Municipal Code.

Lam's noise pollution problem is not caused by daytime construction, backup beepers, or truck horns, but rather, by permanently-installed equipment that is part of Lam's physical

plant. This equipment runs 24/7 and generates sound continuously. The sounds are most noticeable at night when background noise is low, and the location of sound impacts can vary depending on atmospheric conditions, especially temperature and wind direction. During southerly winds, Lam's noise signature can be heard more than a mile away.

Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning serves as a buffer between heavy industry and residential areas. MP zoning calls for “limiting uses to those that are of a nature so as to not conflict with other industrial uses or surrounding residential areas.” (TDC 62.100) Please consider this letter as evidence that Lam's operations are, in fact, currently conflicting with surrounding residential areas.

In order to bring Lam's facility into compliance with the Tualatin Code, I request that Lam's off-site noise impacts be eliminated as part of the TUX project. It is absolutely critical to our quality of life that peace and quiet be restored to our neighborhoods. We ask the City of Tualatin to require Lam to prove their ability to eliminate offsite noise before approving the addition of any new noise sources on campus.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kim Devers

From: richard.lyons15@gmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 1:22 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam Noise Impacts

Dear Tualatin Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board,

Thank you for your dedication and service to the community, and for your work to protect our quality of life. While development and corporate activities are essential to the vitality of our city, residential land uses must also be protected, both from an economic standpoint (property values) and from a quality of life standpoint (mental and physical health). In keeping with this mission, we are asking for your help in resolving Lam's noise pollution problem.

Multiple noise signatures have been identified emanating from Lam's campus, including clear tones that pulse, two-toned harmonics, and a low rumble that sounds like an old bomber airplane. The most distinctive sound is the high-frequency hiss from Lam's gas plant, clearly audible across Tualatin Road most nights.

My understanding is that this issue has been brought to the attention of the City Council, Police Department, Code Enforcement, Riverpark CIO, and Lam. Despite repeated requests for a solution, no meaningful changes have been made.

The Tualatin Noise Ordinance (1361-13) sets a city-wide limit of 50dB at night for residential areas, and the Tualatin Development Code (62.100) places even stricter limits on Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning, stating that "Such permitted uses must not cause objectionable noise". A noise study performed earlier this year at night by a licensed acoustical enginneer measured noise levels of 52dB at a private residence across the street from Lam's gas plant. Therefore, Lam's offsite noise impacts are in violation of both the Tualatin Development Code and the Tualatin Municipal Code.

Lam's noise pollution problem is not caused by daytime construction, backup beepers, or truck horns, but rather, by permanently-installed equipment that is part of Lam's physical plant. This equipment runs 24/7 and generates sound continuously. The sounds are most noticeable at night when background noise is low, and the location of sound impacts can vary depending on atmospheric conditions, especially temperature and wind direction. During southerly winds, Lam's noise signature can be heard more than a mile away.

Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning serves as a buffer between heavy industry and residential areas. MP zoning calls for "limiting uses to those that are of a nature so as to not conflict with other industrial uses or surrounding residential areas." (TDC 62.100) Please consider this letter as evidence that Lam's operations are, in fact, currently conflicting with surrounding residential areas.

In order to bring Lam's facility into compliance with the Tualatin Code, I request that Lam's off-site noise impacts be eliminated as part of the TUX project. It is absolutely critical to our quality of life that peace and quiet be restored to our neighborhoods. We ask the City of Tualatin to require Lam to prove their ability to eliminate offsite noise before approving the addition of any new noise sources on campus.

Thank you for your consideration.

Richard Lyons
Sent from my iPad

From: Nils Peuser <nils@peusers.org>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 2:00 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam Noise Impacts



Dear Tualatin Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board,

Thank you for your dedication and service to the community, and for your work to protect our quality of life. While development and corporate activities are essential to the vitality of our city, residential land uses must also be protected, both from an economic standpoint (property values) and from a quality of life standpoint (mental and physical health). In keeping with this mission, we are asking for your help in resolving Lam's noise pollution problem.

Multiple noise signatures have been identified emanating from Lam's campus, including clear tones that pulse, two-toned harmonics, and a low rumble that sounds like an old bomber airplane. The most distinctive sound is the high-frequency hiss from Lam's gas plant, clearly audible across Tualatin Road most nights.

We have brought this issue to the attention of the City Council, Police Department, Code Enforcement, Riverpark CIO, and Lam. Despite repeated requests for a solution, no meaningful changes have been made. When Tualatin's police officers have driven onto the Lam campus to investigate noise complaints, they have been chased down by Lam's security guards and asked to leave.

The Tualatin Noise Ordinance (1361-13) sets a city-wide limit of 50dB at night for residential areas, and the Tualatin Development Code (62.100) places even stricter limits on Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning, stating that "Such permitted uses must not cause objectionable noise". A noise study performed earlier this year at night by a licensed acoustical enginneer measured noise levels of 52dB at a private residence across the street from Lam's gas plant. Therefore, Lam's offsite noise impacts are in violation of both the Tualatin Development Code and the Tualatin Municipal Code.

Lam's noise pollution problem is not caused by daytime construction, backup beepers, or truck horns, but rather, by permanently-installed equipment that is part of Lam's physical plant. This equipment runs 24/7 and generates sound continuously. The sounds are most noticeable at night when background noise is low, and the location of sound impacts can

vary depending on atmospheric conditions, especially temperature and wind direction. During southerly winds, Lam's noise signature can be heard more than a mile away.

Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning serves as a buffer between heavy industry and residential areas. MP zoning calls for “limiting uses to those that are of a nature so as to not conflict with other industrial uses or surrounding residential areas.” (TDC 62.100) Please consider this letter as evidence that Lam's operations are, in fact, currently conflicting with surrounding residential areas.

In order to bring Lam's facility into compliance with the Tualatin Code, I request that Lam's off-site noise impacts be eliminated as part of the TUX project. It is absolutely critical to our quality of life that peace and quiet be restored to our neighborhoods. We ask the City of Tualatin to require Lam to prove their ability to eliminate offsite noise before approving the addition of any new noise sources on campus.

Thank you for your consideration.

~ Nils Peuser

From: Amy Williams <130.amy@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 1:46 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam Noise Impacts



Dear Tualatin Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board,

Thank you for your dedication and service to the community, and for your work to protect our quality of life. While development and corporate activities are essential to the vitality of our city, residential land uses must also be protected, both from an economic standpoint (property values) and from a quality of life standpoint (mental and physical health). In keeping with this mission, we are asking for your help in resolving Lam's noise pollution problem.

Multiple noise signatures have been identified emanating from Lam's campus, including clear tones that pulse, two-toned harmonics, and a low rumble that sounds like an old bomber airplane. The most distinctive sound is the high-frequency hiss from Lam's gas plant, clearly audible across Tualatin Road most nights.

We have brought this issue to the attention of the City Council, Police Department, Code Enforcement, Riverpark CIO, and Lam. Despite repeated requests for a solution, no meaningful changes have been made. When Tualatin's police officers have driven onto the Lam campus to investigate noise complaints, they have been chased down by Lam's security guards and asked to leave.

The Tualatin Noise Ordinance (1361-13) sets a city-wide limit of 50dB at night for residential areas, and the Tualatin Development Code (62.100) places even stricter limits on Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning, stating that "Such permitted uses must not cause objectionable noise". A noise study performed earlier this year at night by a licensed acoustical enginneer measured noise levels of 52dB at a private residence across the street from Lam's gas plant. Therefore, Lam's offsite noise impacts are in violation of both the Tualatin Development Code and the Tualatin Municipal Code.

Lam's noise pollution problem is not caused by daytime construction, backup beepers, or truck horns, but rather, by permanently-installed equipment that is part of Lam's physical

plant. This equipment runs 24/7 and generates sound continuously. The sounds are most noticeable at night when background noise is low, and the location of sound impacts can vary depending on atmospheric conditions, especially temperature and wind direction. During southerly winds, Lam's noise signature can be heard more than a mile away.

Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning serves as a buffer between heavy industry and residential areas. MP zoning calls for “limiting uses to those that are of a nature so as to not conflict with other industrial uses or surrounding residential areas.” (TDC 62.100) Please consider this letter as evidence that Lam's operations are, in fact, currently conflicting with surrounding residential areas.

In order to bring Lam's facility into compliance with the Tualatin Code, I request that Lam's off-site noise impacts be eliminated as part of the TUX project. It is absolutely critical to our quality of life that peace and quiet be restored to our neighborhoods. We ask the City of Tualatin to require Lam to prove their ability to eliminate offsite noise before approving the addition of any new noise sources on campus.

Thank you for your consideration.

From: Beth Sethi <beth@pdximmigration.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 2:01 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam Noise Impacts

Dear Tualatin Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board,

Thank you for your dedication and service to the community, and for your work to protect our quality of life. While development and corporate activities are essential to the vitality of our city, residential land uses must also be protected, both from an economic standpoint (property values) and from a quality of life standpoint (mental and physical health). In keeping with this mission, we are asking for your help in resolving Lam's noise pollution problem.

Multiple noise signatures have been identified emanating from Lam's campus, including clear tones that pulse, two-toned harmonics, and a low rumble that sounds like an old bomber airplane. The most distinctive sound is the high-frequency hiss from Lam's gas plant, clearly audible across Tualatin Road most nights.

We have brought this issue to the attention of the City Council, Police Department, Code Enforcement, Riverpark CIO, and Lam. Despite repeated requests for a solution, no meaningful changes have been made. When Tualatin's police officers have driven onto the Lam campus to investigate noise complaints, they have been chased down by Lam's security guards and asked to leave.

The Tualatin Noise Ordinance (1361-13) sets a city-wide limit of 50dB at night for residential areas, and the Tualatin Development Code (62.100) places even stricter limits on Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning, stating that "Such permitted uses must not cause objectionable noise". A noise study performed earlier this year at night by a licensed acoustical enginneer measured noise levels of 52dB at a private residence across the street from Lam's gas plant. Therefore, Lam's offsite noise impacts are in violation of both the Tualatin Development Code and the Tualatin Municipal Code.

Lam's noise pollution problem is not caused by daytime construction, backup beepers, or truck horns, but rather, by permanently-installed equipment that is part of Lam's physical

plant. This equipment runs 24/7 and generates sound continuously. The sounds are most noticeable at night when background noise is low, and the location of sound impacts can vary depending on atmospheric conditions, especially temperature and wind direction. During southerly winds, Lam's noise signature can be heard more than a mile away.

Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning serves as a buffer between heavy industry and residential areas. MP zoning calls for “limiting uses to those that are of a nature so as to not conflict with other industrial uses or surrounding residential areas.” (TDC 62.100) Please consider this letter as evidence that Lam's operations are, in fact, currently conflicting with surrounding residential areas.

In order to bring Lam's facility into compliance with the Tualatin Code, I request that Lam's off-site noise impacts be eliminated as part of the TUX project. It is absolutely critical to our quality of life that peace and quiet be restored to our neighborhoods. We ask the City of Tualatin to require Lam to prove their ability to eliminate offsite noise before approving the addition of any new noise sources on campus.

Thank you for your consideration.

Elisabeth Sethi, Attorney at Law
Portland Immigration Law LLC
520 SW 6th Ave., Suite 610
Portland, OR 97204
503-749-7700
beth@pdximmigration.com
pdximmigration.com

Know Your Rights
Conozca Sus Derechos

From: Sue Hein <suehein59@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 2:15 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam 108th Ave Proposed Entrance

Dear Tualatin Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's updated TUX proposal. While I appreciate the work that has been done to eliminate the employee entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Ave and maintain the Leveton driveway, I am opposed to the addition of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Avenue, as it would increase peak traffic volumes on Tualatin Road.

Lam's proposed entrance on 108th fails three of the new driveway approach criteria in TDC 75.020.5: "(g) The proposed driveway approach does not result in significant adverse impacts to the vicinity; (h) The proposed driveway approach minimizes impact to the functionality of adjacent streets and intersections; and (i) The proposed driveway approach balances the adverse impacts to residentially zoned property and the functionality of adjacent streets."

Lam's traffic study shows that the Hazelbrook Road onramp to Hwy 99W will fail to meet performance standards after adding the additional traffic volumes from this proposed 108th entrance.

Lam's traffic study also shows that the 108th / Tualatin Road intersection has 5X the crash rate of 115th / Tualatin Road despite carrying much less traffic. Adding more traffic at 108th will increase this crash rate even further.

NO new employee access on 108th
NO added traffic on Tualatin Road
Use Leveton Drive and Herman Road

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Sue Hein <suehein59@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 2:18 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam Noise Impacts

Dear Tualatin Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board,

Thank you for your dedication and service to the community, and for your work to protect our quality of life. While development and corporate activities are essential to the vitality of our city, residential land uses must also be protected, both from an economic standpoint (property values) and from a quality of life standpoint (mental and physical health). In keeping with this mission, we are asking for your help in resolving Lam's noise pollution problem.

Multiple noise signatures have been identified emanating from Lam's campus, including clear tones that pulse, two-toned harmonics, and a low rumble that sounds like an old bomber airplane. The most distinctive sound is the high-frequency hiss from Lam's gas plant, clearly audible across Tualatin Road most nights.

We have brought this issue to the attention of the City Council, Police Department, Code Enforcement, Riverpark CIO, and Lam. Despite repeated requests for a solution, no meaningful changes have been made. When Tualatin's police officers have driven onto the Lam campus to investigate noise complaints, they have been chased down by Lam's security guards and asked to leave.

The Tualatin Noise Ordinance (1361-13) sets a city-wide limit of 50dB at night for residential areas, and the Tualatin Development Code (62.100) places even stricter limits on Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning, stating that "Such permitted uses must not cause objectionable noise". A noise study performed earlier this year at night by a licensed acoustical enginneer measured noise levels of 52dB at a private residence across the street from Lam's gas plant. Therefore, Lam's offsite noise impacts are in violation of both the Tualatin Development Code and the Tualatin Municipal Code.

Lam's noise pollution problem is not caused by daytime construction, backup beepers, or truck horns, but rather, by permanently-installed equipment that is part of Lam's physical plant. This equipment runs 24/7 and generates sound continuously. The sounds are most noticeable at night when background noise is low, and the location of sound impacts can vary depending on atmospheric conditions, especially temperature and wind direction. During southerly winds, Lam's noise signature can be heard more than a mile away.

Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning serves as a buffer between heavy industry and residential areas. MP zoning calls for "limiting uses to those that are of a nature so as to not conflict with other industrial uses or surrounding residential areas." (TDC 62.100) Please consider this letter

as evidence that Lam's operations are, in fact, currently conflicting with surrounding residential areas.

In order to bring Lam's facility into compliance with the Tualatin Code, I request that Lam's off-site noise impacts be eliminated as part of the TUX project. It is absolutely critical to our quality of life that peace and quiet be restored to our neighborhoods. We ask the City of Tualatin to require Lam to prove their ability to eliminate offsite noise before approving the addition of any new noise sources on campus.

On a nice cool evening, sleeping with the window open isn’t possible with this noise.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Carrie Knappenberger <carrie.knappenberger1@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 2:25 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam Noise Impacts

Dear Tualatin Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board,

Thank you for your dedication and service to the community, and for your work to protect our quality of life. While development and corporate activities are essential to the vitality of our city, residential land uses must also be protected, both from an economic standpoint (property values) and from a quality of life standpoint (mental and physical health). In keeping with this mission, we are asking for your help in resolving Lam's noise pollution problem.

Multiple noise signatures have been identified emanating from Lam's campus, including clear tones that pulse, two-toned harmonics, and a low rumble that sounds like an old bomber airplane. The most distinctive sound is the high-frequency hiss from Lam's gas plant, clearly audible across Tualatin Road most nights.

We have brought this issue to the attention of the City Council, Police Department, Code Enforcement, Riverpark CIO, and Lam. Despite repeated requests for a solution, no meaningful changes have been made. When Tualatin's police officers have driven onto the Lam campus to investigate noise complaints, they have been chased down by Lam's security guards and asked to leave.

The Tualatin Noise Ordinance (1361-13) sets a city-wide limit of 50dB at night for residential areas, and the Tualatin Development Code (62.100) places even stricter limits on Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning, stating that "Such permitted uses must not cause objectionable noise". A noise study performed earlier this year at night by a licensed acoustical enginneer measured noise levels of 52dB at a private residence across the street from Lam's gas plant. Therefore, Lam's offsite noise impacts are in violation of both the Tualatin Development Code and the Tualatin Municipal Code.

Lam's noise pollution problem is not caused by daytime construction, backup beepers, or truck horns, but rather, by permanently-installed equipment that is part of Lam's physical plant. This equipment runs 24/7 and generates sound continuously. The sounds are most noticeable at night when background noise is low, and the location of sound impacts can vary depending on atmospheric conditions, especially temperature and wind direction. During southerly winds, Lam's noise signature can be heard more than a mile away.

Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning serves as a buffer between heavy industry and residential areas. MP zoning calls for "limiting uses to those that are of a nature so as to not conflict with other industrial uses or surrounding residential areas." (TDC 62.100) Please consider this letter

as evidence that Lam's operations are, in fact, currently conflicting with surrounding residential areas.

In order to bring Lam's facility into compliance with the Tualatin Code, I request that Lam's off-site noise impacts be eliminated as part of the TUX project. It is absolutely critical to our quality of life that peace and quiet be restored to our neighborhoods. We ask the City of Tualatin to require Lam to prove their ability to eliminate offsite noise before approving the addition of any new noise sources on campus.

Thank you for your consideration.

Carrie Knappenberger
10575 SW Lucas Ct
Tualatin, OR. 97062

From: Carrie Knappenberger <carrie.knappenberger1@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 2:26 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam 108th Ave Proposed Entrance

Dear Tualatin Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's updated TUX proposal. While I appreciate the work that has been done to eliminate the employee entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Ave and maintain the Leveton driveway, I am opposed to the addition of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Avenue, as it would increase peak traffic volumes on Tualatin Road.

Lam's proposed entrance on 108th fails three of the new driveway approach criteria in TDC 75.020.5: "(g) The proposed driveway approach does not result in significant adverse impacts to the vicinity; (h) The proposed driveway approach minimizes impact to the functionality of adjacent streets and intersections; and (i) The proposed driveway approach balances the adverse impacts to residentially zoned property and the functionality of adjacent streets."

Lam's traffic study shows that the Hazelbrook Road onramp to Hwy 99W will fail to meet performance standards after adding the additional traffic volumes from this proposed 108th entrance.

Lam's traffic study also shows that the 108th / Tualatin Road intersection has 5X the crash rate of 115th / Tualatin Road despite carrying much less traffic. Adding more traffic at 108th will increase this crash rate even further.

NO new employee access on 108th
NO added traffic on Tualatin Road
Use Leveton Drive and Herman Road

Thank you for your consideration.

Carrie Knappenberger
10575 SW Lucas CT.
Tualatin, OR. 97062

From: Tara and Tim Linn <taraandtim.house@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 4:08 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam Noise Impacts



Dear Tualatin Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board,

Thank you for your dedication and service to the community, and for your work to protect our quality of life. While development and corporate activities are essential to the vitality of our city, residential land uses must also be protected, both from an economic standpoint (property values) and from a quality of life standpoint (mental and physical health). In keeping with this mission, we are asking for your help in resolving Lam's noise pollution problem.

Multiple noise signatures have been identified emanating from Lam's campus, including clear tones that pulse, two-toned harmonics, and a low rumble that sounds like an old bomber airplane. The most distinctive sound is the high-frequency hiss from Lam's gas plant, clearly audible across Tualatin Road most nights.

We have brought this issue to the attention of the City Council, Police Department, Code Enforcement, Riverpark CIO, and Lam. Despite repeated requests for a solution, no meaningful changes have been made. When Tualatin's police officers have driven onto the Lam campus to investigate noise complaints, they have been chased down by Lam's security guards and asked to leave.

The Tualatin Noise Ordinance (1361-13) sets a city-wide limit of 50dB at night for residential areas, and the Tualatin Development Code (62.100) places even stricter limits on Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning, stating that "Such permitted uses must not cause objectionable noise". A noise study performed earlier this year at night by a licensed acoustical enginneer measured noise levels of 52dB at a private residence across the street from Lam's gas plant. Therefore, Lam's offsite noise impacts are in violation of both the Tualatin Development Code and the Tualatin Municipal Code.

Lam's noise pollution problem is not caused by daytime construction, backup beepers, or truck horns, but rather, by permanently-installed equipment that is part of Lam's physical

plant. This equipment runs 24/7 and generates sound continuously. The sounds are most noticeable at night when background noise is low, and the location of sound impacts can vary depending on atmospheric conditions, especially temperature and wind direction. During southerly winds, Lam's noise signature can be heard more than a mile away.

Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning serves as a buffer between heavy industry and residential areas. MP zoning calls for “limiting uses to those that are of a nature so as to not conflict with other industrial uses or surrounding residential areas.” (TDC 62.100) Please consider this letter as evidence that Lam's operations are, in fact, currently conflicting with surrounding residential areas.

In order to bring Lam's facility into compliance with the Tualatin Code, I request that Lam's off-site noise impacts be eliminated as part of the TUX project. It is absolutely critical to our quality of life that peace and quiet be restored to our neighborhoods. We ask the City of Tualatin to require Lam to prove their ability to eliminate offsite noise before approving the addition of any new noise sources on campus.

Thank you for your consideration.

From: Al Smith <al@earnestimages.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 10:59 AM
To: Ext - Planning; Frank Bubenik; Maria Reyes; Christen Sacco; Bridget Brooks; Cyndy Hillier; Octavio Gonzalez; Valerie Pratt
Subject: Tualatin Road



To Tualatin planning commission and all members of the Tualatin City Council,

My wife and live on SW Pawnee Path in the Riverpark CIO. We have been here for 40 years and have watched the traffic on Tualatin Road increase substantially over the years. We are concerned about the access to LAM from Tualatin Road. If you have measured the volume of traffic accessing Leveton from 125th in the last few years you have probably seen a big increase during the high traffic hours. We would prefer that this traffic not be directed onto Tualatin road.
While I understand that this request by LAM benefits LAM and their employees it does not benefit, in any way, the residents of our neighborhood. LAM has access from Herman and Leveton roads, the residents of Riverpark have only one access, Tualatin Road.

Thank you for your consideration.

Al Smith

From: Brett Hamilton <brett@simple.be>
Sent: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 11:02 AM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council
Subject: Lam Noise Study
Attachments: STR2025081301.pdf

Dear Tualatin Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board,

In preparation for the upcoming TUX project land use hearings, please find attached the acoustical engineer's report on the sound impact from Lam Research on a nearby residential property.

Sincerely, Brett Hamilton

A ACOUSTICS
9324 SW CAMILLE TER.
PORTLAND, OR. 97223 - 7043
(503) 977 - 2690
elki@aacoustics.com
www.acousticalengineering.net

August 13, 2025

Brett Hamilton
11430 SW Kalispell St
Tualatin OR 97062
Brett Hamilton <brett@simple.be>
503-803-7609

Re: Evaluation of sound impact from the Lam Research plant at Deborah Anderson Home located on 11045 SW Tualatin Road Tualatin Oregon 97062.

At the request of Brett Hamilton*, A Acoustics* visited the Deborah Anderson home on 10:00 PM March 30, 2025 to evaluate the plant noise. Please see Google site map below with the red dot showing the sound recording location.

Sound Pressure Level (SPL) Recording
The following instruments were used for the recordings:

- Precision sound level meter and analyzer, General Radio Precision Sound Level Meter (SLM) and analyzer (Type, I) Model 1982 Serial #0657982
- Sound level calibrator, ACO Pacific, Inc., Model 511E
- Marantz Professional Solid-State Recorder MPD660

The recording was made with General Radio and recorded in Marantz Recorder. The Sound Pressure level meter was calibrated on the site with a hand-held calibrator before the readings were made.

The sound data was analyzed using SpectraPlus-SC software.

During the recording it was drizzling with no wind. We analyze the data when there was no traffic on SW Tualatin Road.

Finding
The sound recorded was 52 dBA and there was sound peak at 175 Hz and 350 Hz.

Please call me if you have any question.

Sincerely,

A ACOUSTICS

EIki M. Lahav P.E.

Keith Leonard

From: Dan Wilson-Fey <dwilsonfey@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 11:32 AM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam Noise Impacts

Dear Tualatin Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board,

Thank you for your dedication and service to the community, and for your work to protect our quality of life. While development and corporate activities are essential to the vitality of our city, residential land uses must also be protected, both from an economic standpoint (property values) and from a quality of life standpoint (mental and physical health). In keeping with this mission, we are asking for your help in resolving Lam's noise pollution problem.

Multiple noise signatures have been identified emanating from Lam's campus, including clear tones that pulse, two-toned harmonics, and a low rumble that sounds like an old bomber airplane. The most distinctive sound is the high-frequency hiss from Lam's gas plant, clearly audible across Tualatin Road most nights.

We have brought this issue to the attention of the City Council, Police Department, Code Enforcement, Riverpark CIO, and Lam. Despite repeated requests for a solution, no meaningful changes have been made. When Tualatin's police officers have driven onto the Lam campus to investigate noise complaints, they have been chased down by Lam's security guards and asked to leave.

The Tualatin Noise Ordinance (1361-13) sets a city-wide limit of 50dB at night for residential areas, and the Tualatin Development Code (62.100) places even stricter limits on Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning, stating that "Such permitted uses must not cause objectionable noise". A noise study performed earlier this year at night by a licensed acoustical enginneer measured noise levels of 52dB at a private residence across the street from Lam's gas plant. Therefore, Lam's offsite noise impacts are in violation of both the Tualatin Development Code and the Tualatin Municipal Code.

Lam's noise pollution problem is not caused by daytime construction, backup beepers, or truck horns, but rather, by permanently-installed equipment that is part of Lam's physical plant. This equipment runs 24/7 and generates sound continuously. The sounds are most noticeable at night when background noise is low, and the location of sound impacts can vary depending on atmospheric conditions, especially temperature and wind direction. During southerly winds, Lam's noise signature can be heard more than a mile away.

Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning serves as a buffer between heavy industry and residential areas. MP zoning calls for "limiting uses to those that are of a nature so as to not conflict with other industrial uses or surrounding residential areas." (TDC 62.100) Please consider this letter as evidence that Lam's operations are, in fact, currently conflicting with surrounding residential areas.

In order to bring Lam's facility into compliance with the Tualatin Code, I request that Lam's off-site noise impacts be eliminated as part of the TUX project. It is absolutely critical to our quality of life that peace

and quiet be restored to our neighborhoods. We ask the City of Tualatin to require Lam to prove their ability to eliminate offsite noise before approving the addition of any new noise sources on campus.

Thank you for your consideration.

Dan Wilson-Fey
dwilsonfey@gmail.com
17640 SW Fulton Dr.
Tualatin, OR 97062

Keith Leonard

From: Dan Wilson-Fey <dwilsonfey@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 11:31 AM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam 108th Ave Proposed Entrance

Dear Tualatin Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lam's updated TUX proposal. While I appreciate the work that has been done to eliminate the employee entrance on Tualatin Road at SW 115th Ave and maintain the Leveton driveway, I am opposed to the addition of a new employee entrance on SW 108th Avenue, as it would increase peak traffic volumes on Tualatin Road.

Lam's proposed entrance on 108th fails three of the new driveway approach criteria in TDC 75.020.5: "(g) The proposed driveway approach does not result in significant adverse impacts to the vicinity; (h) The proposed driveway approach minimizes impact to the functionality of adjacent streets and intersections; and (i) The proposed driveway approach balances the adverse impacts to residentially zoned property and the functionality of adjacent streets."

Lam's traffic study shows that the Hazelbrook Road onramp to Hwy 99W will fail to meet performance standards after adding the additional traffic volumes from this proposed 108th entrance.

Lam's traffic study also shows that the 108th / Tualatin Road intersection has 5X the crash rate of 115th / Tualatin Road despite carrying much less traffic. Adding more traffic at 108th will increase this crash rate even further.

NO new employee access on 108th
NO added traffic on Tualatin Road
Use Leveton Drive and Herman Road

Thank you for your consideration.

Dan Wilson-Fey
dwilsonfey@gmail.com
17640 SW Fulton Dr.
Tualatin, OR 97062

From: deborah anderson <deborah52557@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 11:26 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam Noise Impacts

Dear Tualatin Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board,

Thank you for your dedication and service to the community, and for your work to protect our quality of life. While development and corporate activities are essential to the vitality of our city, residential land uses must also be protected, both from an economic standpoint (property values) and from a quality of life standpoint (mental and physical health). In keeping with this mission, we are asking for your help in resolving Lam's noise pollution problem.

Multiple noise signatures have been identified emanating from Lam's campus, including clear tones that pulse, two-toned harmonics, and a low rumble that sounds like an old bomber airplane. The most distinctive sound is the high-frequency hiss from Lam's gas plant, clearly audible across Tualatin Road most nights.

We have brought this issue to the attention of the City Council, Police Department, Code Enforcement, Riverpark CIO, and Lam. Despite repeated requests for a solution, no meaningful changes have been made. When Tualatin's police officers have driven onto the Lam campus to investigate noise complaints, they have been chased down by Lam's security guards and asked to leave.

The Tualatin Noise Ordinance (1361-13) sets a city-wide limit of 50dB at night for residential areas, and the Tualatin Development Code (62.100) places even stricter limits on Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning, stating that "Such permitted uses must not cause objectionable noise". A noise study performed earlier this year at night by a licensed acoustical enginneer measured noise levels of 52dB at a private residence across the street from Lam's gas plant. Therefore, Lam's offsite noise impacts are in violation of both the Tualatin Development Code and the Tualatin Municipal Code.

Lam's noise pollution problem is not caused by daytime construction, backup beepers, or truck horns, but rather, by permanently-installed equipment that is part of Lam's physical plant. This equipment runs 24/7 and generates sound continuously. The sounds are most noticeable at night when background noise is low, and the location of sound impacts can vary depending on atmospheric conditions, especially temperature and wind direction. During southerly winds, Lam's noise signature can be heard more than a mile away.

Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning serves as a buffer between heavy industry and residential areas. MP zoning calls for "limiting uses to those that are of a nature so as to not conflict with other industrial uses or surrounding residential areas." (TDC 62.100) Please consider this letter

as evidence that Lam's operations are, in fact, currently conflicting with surrounding residential areas.

In order to bring Lam's facility into compliance with the Tualatin Code, I request that Lam's off-site noise impacts be eliminated as part of the TUX project. It is absolutely critical to our quality of life that peace and quiet be restored to our neighborhoods. We ask the City of Tualatin to require Lam to prove their ability to eliminate offsite noise before approving the addition of any new noise sources on campus.

Thank you for your consideration.

Deborah Anderson
Resident SW Tualatin Rd
Sent from my iPhone

From: EnlightenedKing <simmonsmontrell88@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 6:24 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam Noise Impacts



Dear Tualatin Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board,

Thank you for your dedication and service to the community, and for your work to protect our quality of life. While development and corporate activities are essential to the vitality of our city, residential land uses must also be protected, both from an economic standpoint (property values) and from a quality of life standpoint (mental and physical health). In keeping with this mission, we are asking for your help in resolving Lam's noise pollution problem.

Multiple noise signatures have been identified emanating from Lam's campus, including clear tones that pulse, two-toned harmonics, and a low rumble that sounds like an old bomber airplane. The most distinctive sound is the high-frequency hiss from Lam's gas plant, clearly audible across Tualatin Road most nights.

We have brought this issue to the attention of the City Council, Police Department, Code Enforcement, Riverpark CIO, and Lam. Despite repeated requests for a solution, no meaningful changes have been made. When Tualatin's police officers have driven onto the Lam campus to investigate noise complaints, they have been chased down by Lam's security guards and asked to leave.

The Tualatin Noise Ordinance (1361-13) sets a city-wide limit of 50dB at night for residential areas, and the Tualatin Development Code (62.100) places even stricter limits on Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning, stating that "Such permitted uses must not cause objectionable noise". A noise study performed earlier this year at night by a licensed acoustical enginneer measured noise levels of 52dB at a private residence across the street from Lam's gas plant. Therefore, Lam's offsite noise impacts are in violation of both the Tualatin Development Code and the Tualatin Municipal Code.

Lam's noise pollution problem is not caused by daytime construction, backup beepers, or truck horns, but rather, by permanently-installed equipment that is part of Lam's physical

plant. This equipment runs 24/7 and generates sound continuously. The sounds are most noticeable at night when background noise is low, and the location of sound impacts can vary depending on atmospheric conditions, especially temperature and wind direction. During southerly winds, Lam's noise signature can be heard more than a mile away.

Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning serves as a buffer between heavy industry and residential areas. MP zoning calls for “limiting uses to those that are of a nature so as to not conflict with other industrial uses or surrounding residential areas.” (TDC 62.100) Please consider this letter as evidence that Lam's operations are, in fact, currently conflicting with surrounding residential areas.

In order to bring Lam's facility into compliance with the Tualatin Code, I request that Lam's off-site noise impacts be eliminated as part of the TUX project. It is absolutely critical to our quality of life that peace and quiet be restored to our neighborhoods. We ask the City of Tualatin to require Lam to prove their ability to eliminate offsite noise before approving the addition of any new noise sources on campus.

Thank you for your consideration.

From: Gayle Lutes <gayle@assuredseniorplacement.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 6:53 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam Noise Impacts



Dear Tualatin Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board,

Thank you for your dedication and service to the community, and for your work to protect our quality of life. While development and corporate activities are essential to the vitality of our city, residential land uses must also be protected, both from an economic standpoint (property values) and from a quality of life standpoint (mental and physical health). In keeping with this mission, we are asking for your help in resolving Lam's noise pollution problem.

Multiple noise signatures have been identified emanating from Lam's campus, including clear tones that pulse, two-toned harmonics, and a low rumble that sounds like an old bomber airplane. The most distinctive sound is the high-frequency hiss from Lam's gas plant, clearly audible across Tualatin Road most nights.

We have brought this issue to the attention of the City Council, Police Department, Code Enforcement, Riverpark CIO, and Lam. Despite repeated requests for a solution, no meaningful changes have been made. When Tualatin's police officers have driven onto the Lam campus to investigate noise complaints, they have been chased down by Lam's security guards and asked to leave.

The Tualatin Noise Ordinance (1361-13) sets a city-wide limit of 50dB at night for residential areas, and the Tualatin Development Code (62.100) places even stricter limits on Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning, stating that "Such permitted uses must not cause objectionable noise". A noise study performed earlier this year at night by a licensed acoustical enginneer measured noise levels of 52dB at a private residence across the street from Lam's gas plant. Therefore, Lam's offsite noise impacts are in violation of both the Tualatin Development Code and the Tualatin Municipal Code.

Lam's noise pollution problem is not caused by daytime construction, backup beepers, or truck horns, but rather, by permanently-installed equipment that is part of Lam's physical plant. This equipment runs 24/7 and generates sound continuously. The sounds are most noticeable at night when background noise is low, and the location of sound impacts can

vary depending on atmospheric conditions, especially temperature and wind direction. During southerly winds, Lam's noise signature can be heard more than a mile away.

Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning serves as a buffer between heavy industry and residential areas. MP zoning calls for “limiting uses to those that are of a nature so as to not conflict with other industrial uses or surrounding residential areas.” (TDC 62.100) Please consider this letter as evidence that Lam's operations are, in fact, currently conflicting with surrounding residential areas.

In order to bring Lam's facility into compliance with the Tualatin Code, I request that Lam's off-site noise impacts be eliminated as part of the TUX project. It is absolutely critical to our quality of life that peace and quiet be restored to our neighborhoods. We ask the City of Tualatin to require Lam to prove their ability to eliminate offsite noise before approving the addition of any new noise sources on campus.

Thank you for your consideration.

Gayle Lutes
Senior Housing Advisor - Owner
Oregon Senior Referral Agency Association - Associate Member
State Approved National COVID - Ready LTC Certification
Assured Senior Placement & Resources
(503)318-6466 - Mobile
gayle@assuredseniorplacement.com
https://www.assuredseniorplacement.com

From: JL Friedman <hikergirl500@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 9:08 AM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam Noise Impacts

Dear Tualatin Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board,

Thank you for your dedication and service to the community. While development and corporate activities are essential to the vitality of our city, residential land uses must also be protected, both from an economic standpoint (property values) and from a quality of life standpoint (mental and physical health). In keeping with this mission, we are asking for your help in resolving Lam's noise pollution problem.

Multiple noise signatures have been identified emanating from Lam's campus, including clear tones that pulse, two-toned harmonics, and a low rumble that sounds like an old bomber airplane. The most distinctive sound is the high-frequency hiss from Lam's gas plant, clearly audible across Tualatin Road most nights.

We have brought this issue to the attention of the City Council, Police Department, Code Enforcement, Riverpark CIO, and Lam. Despite repeated requests for a solution, no meaningful changes have been made. When Tualatin's police officers have driven onto the Lam campus to investigate noise complaints, they have been chased down by Lam's security guards and asked to leave.

The Tualatin Noise Ordinance (1361-13) sets a city-wide limit of 50dB at night for residential areas, and the Tualatin Development Code (62.100) places even stricter limits on Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning, stating that "Such permitted uses must not cause objectionable noise". A noise study performed earlier this year at night by a licensed acoustical enginneer measured noise levels of 52dB at a private residence across the street from Lam's gas plant. Therefore, Lam's offsite noise impacts are in violation of both the Tualatin Development Code and the Tualatin Municipal Code.

Lam's noise pollution problem is not caused by daytime construction, backup beepers, or truck horns, but rather, by permanently-installed equipment that is part of Lam's physical plant. This equipment runs 24/7 and generates sound continuously. The sounds are most noticeable at night when background noise is low, and the location of sound impacts can vary depending on atmospheric conditions, especially temperature and wind direction. During southerly winds, Lam's noise signature can be heard more than a mile away.

Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning serves as a buffer between heavy industry and residential areas. MP zoning calls for "limiting uses to those that are of a nature so as to not conflict with other industrial uses or surrounding residential areas." (TDC 62.100) Please consider this letter

as evidence that Lam's operations are, in fact, currently conflicting with surrounding residential areas.

In order to bring Lam's facility into compliance with the Tualatin Code, I request that Lam's off-site noise impacts be eliminated as part of the TUX project. It is absolutely critical to our quality of life that peace and quiet be restored to our neighborhoods. We ask the City of Tualatin to require Lam to prove their ability to eliminate offsite noise before approving the addition of any new noise sources on campus.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Jl Friedman

From: John Phillips <jphillips4994@icloud.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 4:48 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam Noise Impacts

Dear Tualatin Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board,

Thank you for your dedication and service to the community, and for your work to protect our quality of life. While development and corporate activities are essential to the vitality of our city, residential land uses must also be protected, both from an economic standpoint (property values) and from a quality of life standpoint (mental and physical health). In keeping with this mission, we are asking for your help in resolving Lam's noise pollution problem.

Multiple noise signatures have been identified emanating from Lam's campus, including clear tones that pulse, two-toned harmonics, and a low rumble that sounds like an old bomber airplane. The most distinctive sound is the high-frequency hiss from Lam's gas plant, clearly audible across Tualatin Road most nights.

We have brought this issue to the attention of the City Council, Police Department, Code Enforcement, Riverpark CIO, and Lam. Despite repeated requests for a solution, no meaningful changes have been made. When Tualatin's police officers have driven onto the Lam campus to investigate noise complaints, they have been chased down by Lam's security guards and asked to leave.

The Tualatin Noise Ordinance (1361-13) sets a city-wide limit of 50dB at night for residential areas, and the Tualatin Development Code (62.100) places even stricter limits on Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning, stating that "Such permitted uses must not cause objectionable noise". A noise study performed earlier this year at night by a licensed acoustical enginneer measured noise levels of 52dB at a private residence across the street from Lam's gas plant. Therefore, Lam's offsite noise impacts are in violation of both the Tualatin Development Code and the Tualatin Municipal Code.

Lam's noise pollution problem is not caused by daytime construction, backup beepers, or truck horns, but rather, by permanently-installed equipment that is part of Lam's physical plant. This equipment runs 24/7 and generates sound continuously. The sounds are most noticeable at night when background noise is low, and the location of sound impacts can vary depending on atmospheric conditions, especially temperature and wind direction. During southerly winds, Lam's noise signature can be heard more than a mile away.

Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning serves as a buffer between heavy industry and residential areas. MP zoning calls for "limiting uses to those that are of a nature so as to not conflict with other industrial uses or surrounding residential areas." (TDC 62.100) Please consider this letter

as evidence that Lam's operations are, in fact, currently conflicting with surrounding residential areas.

In order to bring Lam's facility into compliance with the Tualatin Code, I request that Lam's off-site noise impacts be eliminated as part of the TUX project. It is absolutely critical to our quality of life that peace and quiet be restored to our neighborhoods. We ask the City of Tualatin to require Lam to prove their ability to eliminate offsite noise before approving the addition of any new noise sources on campus.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Lisa Godfrey <lisagodfreyhomes@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 6:19 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam Noise Impacts

Dear Tualatin Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board,

Thank you for your dedication and service to the community, and for your work to protect our quality of life. While development and corporate activities are essential to the vitality of our city, residential land uses must also be protected, both from an economic standpoint (property values) and from a quality of life standpoint (mental and physical health). In keeping with this mission, we are asking for your help in resolving Lam's noise pollution problem.

Multiple noise signatures have been identified emanating from Lam's campus, including clear tones that pulse, two-toned harmonics, and a low rumble that sounds like an old bomber airplane. The most distinctive sound is the high-frequency hiss from Lam's gas plant, clearly audible across Tualatin Road most nights.

We have brought this issue to the attention of the City Council, Police Department, Code Enforcement, Riverpark CIO, and Lam. Despite repeated requests for a solution, no meaningful changes have been made. When Tualatin's police officers have driven onto the Lam campus to investigate noise complaints, they have been chased down by Lam's security guards and asked to leave.

The Tualatin Noise Ordinance (1361-13) sets a city-wide limit of 50dB at night for residential areas, and the Tualatin Development Code (62.100) places even stricter limits on Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning, stating that "Such permitted uses must not cause objectionable noise". A noise study performed earlier this year at night by a licensed acoustical enginneer measured noise levels of 52dB at a private residence across the street from Lam's gas plant. Therefore, Lam's offsite noise impacts are in violation of both the Tualatin Development Code and the Tualatin Municipal Code.

Lam's noise pollution problem is not caused by daytime construction, backup beepers, or truck horns, but rather, by permanently-installed equipment that is part of Lam's physical plant. This equipment runs 24/7 and generates sound continuously. The sounds are most noticeable at night when background noise is low, and the location of sound impacts can vary depending on atmospheric conditions, especially temperature and wind direction. During southerly winds, Lam's noise signature can be heard more than a mile away.

Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning serves as a buffer between heavy industry and residential areas. MP zoning calls for "limiting uses to those that are of a nature so as to not conflict with other industrial uses or surrounding residential areas." (TDC 62.100) Please consider

this letter as evidence that Lam's operations are, in fact, currently conflicting with surrounding residential areas.

In order to bring Lam's facility into compliance with the Tualatin Code, I request that Lam's off-site noise impacts be eliminated as part of the TUX project. It is absolutely critical to our quality of life that peace and quiet be restored to our neighborhoods. We ask the City of Tualatin to require Lam to prove their ability to eliminate offsite noise before approving the addition of any new noise sources on campus.

Thank you for your consideration.

Thanks,
Lisa Godfrey
Realtor OR/WA
RENE,GRI,MRP
MORE Realty, Inc

Realtor Oklahoma
Kelly Right
503-919-8188
www.lisagodfreyrealty.com

From: Michelle Lazoff <michellelazoff@icloud.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 5:18 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam Noise Impacts

Dear Tualatin Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board,

Thank you for your dedication and service to the community, and for your work to protect our quality of life. While development and corporate activities are essential to the vitality of our city, residential land uses must also be protected, both from an economic standpoint (property values) and from a quality of life standpoint (mental and physical health). In keeping with this mission, we are asking for your help in resolving Lam's noise pollution problem.

Multiple noise signatures have been identified emanating from Lam's campus, including clear tones that pulse, two-toned harmonics, and a low rumble that sounds like an old bomber airplane. The most distinctive sound is the high-frequency hiss from Lam's gas plant, clearly audible across Tualatin Road most nights.

We have brought this issue to the attention of the City Council, Police Department, Code Enforcement, Riverpark CIO, and Lam. Despite repeated requests for a solution, no meaningful changes have been made. When Tualatin's police officers have driven onto the Lam campus to investigate noise complaints, they have been chased down by Lam's security guards and asked to leave.

The Tualatin Noise Ordinance (1361-13) sets a city-wide limit of 50dB at night for residential areas, and the Tualatin Development Code (62.100) places even stricter limits on Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning, stating that "Such permitted uses must not cause objectionable noise". A noise study performed earlier this year at night by a licensed acoustical enginneer measured noise levels of 52dB at a private residence across the street from Lam's gas plant. Therefore, Lam's offsite noise impacts are in violation of both the Tualatin Development Code and the Tualatin Municipal Code.

Lam's noise pollution problem is not caused by daytime construction, backup beepers, or truck horns, but rather, by permanently-installed equipment that is part of Lam's physical plant. This equipment runs 24/7 and generates sound continuously. The sounds are most noticeable at night when background noise is low, and the location of sound impacts can vary depending on atmospheric conditions, especially temperature and wind direction. During southerly winds, Lam's noise signature can be heard more than a mile away.

Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning serves as a buffer between heavy industry and residential areas. MP zoning calls for "limiting uses to those that are of a nature so as to not conflict with other industrial uses or surrounding residential areas." (TDC 62.100) Please consider this letter

as evidence that Lam's operations are, in fact, currently conflicting with surrounding residential areas.

In order to bring Lam's facility into compliance with the Tualatin Code, I request that Lam's off-site noise impacts be eliminated as part of the TUX project. It is absolutely critical to our quality of life that peace and quiet be restored to our neighborhoods. We ask the City of Tualatin to require Lam to prove their ability to eliminate offsite noise before approving the addition of any new noise sources on campus.

Thank you for your consideration.

Michelle Lazoff

Sent from my iPhone

From: Nicole Ingram <niikingram@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 7:29 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam Noise Impacts



Dear Tualatin Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board,

Thank you for your dedication and service to the community, and for your work to protect our quality of life. While development and corporate activities are essential to the vitality of our city, residential land uses must also be protected, both from an economic standpoint (property values) and from a quality of life standpoint (mental and physical health). In keeping with this mission, we are asking for your help in resolving Lam's noise pollution problem.

Multiple noise signatures have been identified emanating from Lam's campus, including clear tones that pulse, two-toned harmonics, and a low rumble that sounds like an old bomber airplane. The most distinctive sound is the high-frequency hiss from Lam's gas plant, clearly audible across Tualatin Road most nights.

We have brought this issue to the attention of the City Council, Police Department, Code Enforcement, Riverpark CIO, and Lam. Despite repeated requests for a solution, no meaningful changes have been made. When Tualatin's police officers have driven onto the Lam campus to investigate noise complaints, they have been chased down by Lam's security guards and asked to leave.

The Tualatin Noise Ordinance (1361-13) sets a city-wide limit of 50dB at night for residential areas, and the Tualatin Development Code (62.100) places even stricter limits on Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning, stating that "Such permitted uses must not cause objectionable noise". A noise study performed earlier this year at night by a licensed acoustical enginneer measured noise levels of 52dB at a private residence across the street from Lam's gas plant. Therefore, Lam's offsite noise impacts are in violation of both the Tualatin Development Code and the Tualatin Municipal Code.

Lam's noise pollution problem is not caused by daytime construction, backup beepers, or truck horns, but rather, by permanently-installed equipment that is part of Lam's physical

plant. This equipment runs 24/7 and generates sound continuously. The sounds are most noticeable at night when background noise is low, and the location of sound impacts can vary depending on atmospheric conditions, especially temperature and wind direction. During southerly winds, Lam's noise signature can be heard more than a mile away.

Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning serves as a buffer between heavy industry and residential areas. MP zoning calls for “limiting uses to those that are of a nature so as to not conflict with other industrial uses or surrounding residential areas.” (TDC 62.100) Please consider this letter as evidence that Lam's operations are, in fact, currently conflicting with surrounding residential areas.

In order to bring Lam's facility into compliance with the Tualatin Code, I request that Lam's off-site noise impacts be eliminated as part of the TUX project. It is absolutely critical to our quality of life that peace and quiet be restored to our neighborhoods. We ask the City of Tualatin to require Lam to prove their ability to eliminate offsite noise before approving the addition of any new noise sources on campus.

Thank you for your consideration.

Nicole (Niik) Ingram

17725 SW Shawnee Trail, Tualatin, OR 97062

From: Phil Vincent <pdvpdx@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 5:58 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam Noise Impacts

Dear Tualatin Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board,

Thank you for your dedication and service to the community, and for your work to protect our quality of life. While development and corporate activities are essential to the vitality of our city, residential land uses must also be protected, both from an economic standpoint (property values) and from a quality of life standpoint (mental and physical health). In keeping with this mission, we are asking for your help in resolving Lam's noise pollution problem.

Multiple noise signatures have been identified emanating from Lam's campus, including clear tones that pulse, two-toned harmonics, and a low rumble that sounds like an old bomber airplane. The most distinctive sound is the high-frequency hiss from Lam's gas plant, clearly audible across Tualatin Road most nights.

We have brought this issue to the attention of the City Council, Police Department, Code Enforcement, Riverpark CIO, and Lam. Despite repeated requests for a solution, no meaningful changes have been made. When Tualatin's police officers have driven onto the Lam campus to investigate noise complaints, they have been chased down by Lam's security guards and asked to leave.

The Tualatin Noise Ordinance (1361-13) sets a city-wide limit of 50dB at night for residential areas, and the Tualatin Development Code (62.100) places even stricter limits on Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning, stating that "Such permitted uses must not cause objectionable noise". A noise study performed earlier this year at night by a licensed acoustical enginneer measured noise levels of 52dB at a private residence across the street from Lam's gas plant. Therefore, Lam's offsite noise impacts are in violation of both the Tualatin Development Code and the Tualatin Municipal Code.

Lam's noise pollution problem is not caused by daytime construction, backup beepers, or truck horns, but rather, by permanently-installed equipment that is part of Lam's physical plant. This equipment runs 24/7 and generates sound continuously. The sounds are most noticeable at night when background noise is low, and the location of sound impacts can vary depending on atmospheric conditions, especially temperature and wind direction. During southerly winds, Lam's noise signature can be heard more than a mile away.

Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning serves as a buffer between heavy industry and residential areas. MP zoning calls for "limiting uses to those that are of a nature so as to not conflict with other industrial uses or surrounding residential areas." (TDC 62.100) Please consider this letter

as evidence that Lam's operations are, in fact, currently conflicting with surrounding residential areas.

In order to bring Lam's facility into compliance with the Tualatin Code, I request that Lam's off-site noise impacts be eliminated as part of the TUX project. It is absolutely critical to our quality of life that peace and quiet be restored to our neighborhoods. We ask the City of Tualatin to require Lam to prove their ability to eliminate offsite noise before approving the addition of any new noise sources on campus.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Sara Z <sarazimmers@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 10:46 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam Noise Impacts

Dear Tualatin Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board,

Thank you for your dedication and service to the community, and for your work to protect our quality of life. While development and corporate activities are essential to the vitality of our city, residential land uses must also be protected, both from an economic standpoint (property values) and from a quality of life standpoint (mental and physical health). In keeping with this mission, we are asking for your help in resolving Lam's noise pollution problem.

Multiple noise signatures have been identified emanating from Lam's campus, including clear tones that pulse, two-toned harmonics, and a low rumble that sounds like an old bomber airplane. The most distinctive sound is the high-frequency hiss from Lam's gas plant, clearly audible across Tualatin Road most nights.

We have brought this issue to the attention of the City Council, Police Department, Code Enforcement, Riverpark CIO, and Lam. Despite repeated requests for a solution, no meaningful changes have been made. When Tualatin's police officers have driven onto the Lam campus to investigate noise complaints, they have been chased down by Lam's security guards and asked to leave.

The Tualatin Noise Ordinance (1361-13) sets a city-wide limit of 50dB at night for residential areas, and the Tualatin Development Code (62.100) places even stricter limits on Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning, stating that "Such permitted uses must not cause objectionable noise". A noise study performed earlier this year at night by a licensed acoustical enginneer measured noise levels of 52dB at a private residence across the street from Lam's gas plant. Therefore, Lam's offsite noise impacts are in violation of both the Tualatin Development Code and the Tualatin Municipal Code.

Lam's noise pollution problem is not caused by daytime construction, backup beepers, or truck horns, but rather, by permanently-installed equipment that is part of Lam's physical plant. This equipment runs 24/7 and generates sound continuously. The sounds are most noticeable at night when background noise is low, and the location of sound impacts can vary depending on atmospheric conditions, especially temperature and wind direction. During southerly winds, Lam's noise signature can be heard more than a mile away.

Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning serves as a buffer between heavy industry and residential areas. MP zoning calls for "limiting uses to those that are of a nature so as to not conflict with other industrial uses or surrounding residential areas." (TDC 62.100) Please consider this letter

as evidence that Lam's operations are, in fact, currently conflicting with surrounding residential areas.

In order to bring Lam's facility into compliance with the Tualatin Code, I request that Lam's off-site noise impacts be eliminated as part of the TUX project. It is absolutely critical to our quality of life that peace and quiet be restored to our neighborhoods. We ask the City of Tualatin to require Lam to prove their ability to eliminate offsite noise before approving the addition of any new noise sources on campus.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sara Zimmers, DVM, CVA
10340 Rayborn Court
Tualatin, OR 97062

Sent from my iPad

From: Wendy Luikart <kickitin2016@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 8:24 PM
To: Keith Leonard; Ext - Planning
Cc: Council; outreach@tualatinroad.org
Subject: Lam Noise Impacts

Dear Tualatin Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board,

Thank you for your dedication and service to the community, and for your work to protect our quality of life. While development and corporate activities are essential to the vitality of our city, residential land uses must also be protected, both from an economic standpoint (property values) and from a quality of life standpoint (mental and physical health). In keeping with this mission, we are asking for your help in resolving Lam's noise pollution problem.

Multiple noise signatures have been identified emanating from Lam's campus, including clear tones that pulse, two-toned harmonics, and a low rumble that sounds like an old bomber airplane. The most distinctive sound is the high-frequency hiss from Lam's gas plant, clearly audible across Tualatin Road most nights.

We have brought this issue to the attention of the City Council, Police Department, Code Enforcement, Riverpark CIO, and Lam. Despite repeated requests for a solution, no meaningful changes have been made. When Tualatin's police officers have driven onto the Lam campus to investigate noise complaints, they have been chased down by Lam's security guards and asked to leave.

The Tualatin Noise Ordinance (1361-13) sets a city-wide limit of 50dB at night for residential areas, and the Tualatin Development Code (62.100) places even stricter limits on Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning, stating that "Such permitted uses must not cause objectionable noise". A noise study performed earlier this year at night by a licensed acoustical enginneer measured noise levels of 52dB at a private residence across the street from Lam's gas plant. Therefore, Lam's offsite noise impacts are in violation of both the Tualatin Development Code and the Tualatin Municipal Code.

Lam's noise pollution problem is not caused by daytime construction, backup beepers, or truck horns, but rather, by permanently-installed equipment that is part of Lam's physical plant. This equipment runs 24/7 and generates sound continuously. The sounds are most noticeable at night when background noise is low, and the location of sound impacts can vary depending on atmospheric conditions, especially temperature and wind direction. During southerly winds, Lam's noise signature can be heard more than a mile away.

Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning serves as a buffer between heavy industry and residential areas. MP zoning calls for "limiting uses to those that are of a nature so as to not conflict with other industrial uses or surrounding residential areas." (TDC 62.100) Please consider this letter

as evidence that Lam's operations are, in fact, currently conflicting with surrounding residential areas.

In order to bring Lam's facility into compliance with the Tualatin Code, I request that Lam's off-site noise impacts be eliminated as part of the TUX project. It is absolutely critical to our quality of life that peace and quiet be restored to our neighborhoods. We ask the City of Tualatin to require Lam to prove their ability to eliminate offsite noise before approving the addition of any new noise sources on campus.

Thank you for your consideration.