



**Public Advisory Committee (PAC)
Policy Working Group (PWG) Meeting #1
April 5, 2012 / 2:00 – 4:00 pm
Development Services Building, Room 301**

DRAFT SUMMARY

Attendees

PAC Members: Thomas Eskridge, Mike Foley, Elizabeth Graser-Lindsey, Ben Horner-Johnson, Chips Janger, Glenn Koehrsen, Rachel Summer, Laurie Swanson-Freeman, Michael Wagner

County Staff and Consultants: Mike Bezner, Karen Buehrig, Shari Gilevich, Larry Conrad and Ellen Rogalin (Clackamas County); Marc Butorac and Susie Wright (Kittelson & Associates); Alisha Dishaw (Cogan Owens Cogan)

Unable to Attend: Tom Civiletti, Paul Edgar

Members of the Public: Teresa Christopherson, Christine Kosinski

[Discussion note: PWG member comments and questions are shown in *italics* followed by staff responses in regular text. Conversation has been organized by agenda item.]

Welcome / Introductions

Karen Buehrig, County Project Manager, opened the meeting and welcomed all participants and members of the public. Karen said the group is expected to meet 10 times and will need to be as efficient as possible to complete its work. She explained that Kirstin Greene, the PAC facilitator, will not be at these meetings. Alisha Dishaw is here to take notes, but these meetings will be less formal than the full PAC.

Agenda Overview

Karen reviewed the agenda, objectives, purpose and anticipated outcomes:

Policy Working Group Objectives:

1. Review and comment on existing County transportation-related policies and programs (Chapter 5 and 10 of the County Comprehensive Plan);
2. Identify and discuss transportation policies and programs for further consideration; and
3. Develop recommendations for full PAC on policies and programs.

Primary Purpose of Meeting #1: Review currently identified transportation system policy topics, identify potential missing policy topics, and prioritize policy topics.

Outcomes of Meeting #1: Prioritized list of policy topics and identified meeting times for future PWG meetings.

What are Policies and Programs?

Marc Butorac, Consultant Project Manager, reviewed the expected role of the PWG in the TSP process and described transportation policies and programs:

- General policies – state the County’s preference, provide overall guidance and establish County aspirations.
- Regulatory Policies – establish direction for regulatory documents that implement the Comprehensive Plan, e.g., Zoning and Development Ordinance (ZDO).
- Programs – ongoing non-regulatory activities intended to accomplish outcomes established by County policies, e.g., Traffic Safety Program.

When something is decided in the geographic meetings and a policy is talked about or discussed, how will the groups interact?

- Geographic groups will focus on specific projects and study needs as outcomes. A geographic working group may see the need for a policy to deal with a particular issue. They would document the need, but it would come to this group to review and vice-versa.

I believe we are all on geographic working groups which is another tie in.

Overview of Existing County Policies and Programs

Larry Conrad discussed the current TSP process guidance, existing County policies, and state and regional mandates such as the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR), Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP). The full presentation can be viewed on the project website at <http://www.clackamascountytsp.com/websites/1/pages/6> under “PAC Policy Working Group Meeting #1”.

Referring to the *Oregon Transportation Planning Hierarchy*, Larry said that major transit projects are decided on a regional level and we have to make provisions in County policies to do them.

Are there parts of Clackamas County that are not part of Metro?

- Yes, anything outside the Metro Urban Growth Boundary (UGB).

Do county roads have to meet State standards when they connect with a state highway? How much of the road is involved?

- Just the intersection. If it’s a State highway, it has to meet the State’s standards for operations. If our work touches their highway, we need a permit for it. If we go up to but stop short of it, then there are no requirements.

What about Braze Road in Mulino?

- We weren't involved with that. ODOT would build the intersection to their standards and might go to County standards. Whoever owns the road has the final say.

Highway 213 at Liberal – the intersection has been redone and is not working very well. Does the conversation need to be with the State?

- Yes. The State owns several the major roads in the county.

What are the County’s standards?

- We use Metro standards within the urban areas; outside the UGB we can adopt our own standards. This is something we can discuss in this process.

Where would an ACT fit in?

- The primary role of an ACT (Area Commission on Transportation) is to give advice to the Oregon Transportation Commission on issues related to state facilities. A Clackamas County ACT would be able to give advice to the top three levels on the hierarchy handout.

Are there any federal guidelines that we have to follow at the State or County level?

- Most of those are integrated in the State level, so we really only have to follow the State.

Review of Current Policy and Program Topics

Larry discussed current policy and program topics including two that will not be completed by the end of the TSP update process and therefore cannot be addressed by the TSP update:

- Oregon Sustainable Transportation Initiative (OSTI) and
- Climate Smart Communities.

Larry also discussed the handout on Comprehensive Plan Chapter 5 – existing outline. He said there has been a desire to centralize all Chapter 10 materials into Chapter 5 to consolidate all plans into one set of documents. Karen advised that Chapter 5 is the core of where this group is starting from.

Larry said the PWG's work is in unincorporated areas outside cities. The cities are responsible for planning all roads within cities including county roads. Larry said the County does coordinate with cities.

Karen advised the outcomes of our process will give direction to local jurisdictions on what they need to change in their Comprehensive Plans and TSPs to come into compliance.

Are we going to have any input or review after the Board of Commissioners determines all this and see the differences between our TSP and the final requirements? Keeping us informed will be important.

- There will be a County public involvement process. We will keep you informed of any progress or changes after the PAC completes its work.

How will things like the McLoughlin Area Plan be incorporated in the new TSP?

- This is our task for the next year.

Will that be part of the policy discussion? Do we need to ensure that projects are aligned with policy?

- Our job is to make sure you have the information you need to discuss. If we see a conflict, we will bring it to the group.

The McLoughlin Area Plan is a development plan for a whole community. It's been accepted by the BCC but has not yet been adopted. There is a lot of controversy surrounding it. Is there a way to get it accelerated?

- The County is working on pulling together a group or task force to look at next steps. The group being formed in the community will be the key group to get things moving. MAP will be folded into the TSP process, but the TSP update will not be able to move it faster.

Agreement on Policy Topics and Priorities

Marc reviewed the *Draft TSP Policy Working Group Discussion Topics and Meeting Schedule*. He said the plan is to review each topic area and note if we are missing anything. Then we will see if we have topics in the correct order. We will have only 20 hours to meet as a group, so it will be important to move through the topics efficiently and have higher priority items further up on the list.

PWG members reviewed the list and then has group discussion. Refer to the updated *Draft TSP Policy Working Group Discussion Topics and Meeting Schedule* to see the discussion results.

Other comments:

The interface with cities concerns me. How do we make sure our ideas and their ideas fit? How do we make sure roads systems between the cities work? County roads that lead to cities need to be accessible.

- There is a County representative in each city TSP update process. The Economic Development Commission also looks at issues countywide and works with the cities. We can talk about having someone at our next meeting or fold their input into our recommendations.

How much background will we get? A countywide freight map as well as countywide rail map would be helpful.

- We can get those for you.

Are these meetings public?

- They are open to the public, but are not official public meetings that we must publicize. We will publicize these meetings on the project website and through Clackamas County.

Will this group’s role include methodologies for setting priorities for the projects?

- The geographic project working groups will do that for projects. The consultant team will look at projects with the vision, goals and objectives and recommend project priorities, and bring them to the project working groups.

The group discussed topic priorities and the schedule. Marc asked members to remember that some topics / meetings may go longer and so others could potentially be left off. The group agreed:

- if a particular topic is not finished by the end of a meeting, the group will move on to the next topic as the schedule indicates.
- after a meeting, they will be given a specified amount of time to get comments to Alisha to be included.
- to leave rural issues first followed by urban, but moved road standards to the first rural meeting and first urban meeting topics.

Original Schedule Proposed by Project Team	Modified Schedule Agreed Upon by PWG
Meeting #1 – Working Group Process	Meeting #1 – Working Group Process
Meeting #2 – Countywide Policies	Meeting #2 – Countywide Policies
Meeting #3 – Rural Land Use and Transportation	Meeting #3 – Rural Roads and Other Rural
Meeting #4 – Rural Equity, Health and Sustainability	Meeting #4 – Rural Land Use and Transportation
Meeting #5 – Rural Roads and Other Rural	Meeting #5 – Rural Equity, Health and Sustainability
Meeting #6 – Urban Equity, Health and Sustainability	Meeting #6 – Urban Roads and Travel
Meeting #7 – Urban Land Use and Transportation	Meeting #7 – Urban Equity, Health and Sustainability
Meeting #8 – Urban Roads and Travel	Meeting #8 – Urban Land Use and Transportation
Meeting #9 – Funding and Other Countywide Policies	Meeting #9 – Funding and Other Countywide Policies
Meeting #10 - TBD	Meeting #10 - TBD

Suggested Process for Policy Working Group

Marc discussed expectations for PWG members and staff/consultants in this part of the process.

PWG members are expected to:

- Review current policies and programs related to upcoming topics.
- Review staff suggestions for revisions.
- Discuss current and suggested revisions, and propose other revisions, additions or deletions.
- Come to consensus on recommendations for the full PAC.

Staff / consultants are expected to:

- Review current policies and programs.
- Draft proposed revisions and rationale.
- Document PWG recommendations for PAC.

Next Steps

Marc discussed the proposed meeting dates and times. The group agreed that 2 – 4 pm on Thursday generally works for members.

Action Items

- PWG members to send any other comments on the meeting topics and schedule by end of the day Monday, April 9.
- Alisha to update the *Draft TSP Policy Working Group Discussion Topics and Meeting Schedule* based on feedback and suggestions from PWG members.
- Additional materials received during the meeting will be posted to the project website.

Meeting adjourned at 4 pm.