



Public Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting #3B
March 6, 2012 / 6:00 – 8:00 pm
Development Services Building, Room 115
150 Beaver Creek Road

Draft Summary

Attendees

PAC Members: Charlene DeBruin, Paul Edgar, Thomas Eskridge, Mike Foley, Elizabeth Graser-Lindsey, Ben Horner-Johnson, Alan Hull, Chips Janger, Glenn Koehrsen, Thomas Mack, Bob Reeves, Rachel Summer, Laurie Swanson-Freeman, Richard Swift, Michael Wagner, Dick Weber

County staff and Consultants: Karen Buehrig, Larry Conrad and Ellen Rogalin (Clackamas County); Marc Butorac and Erin Ferguson (Kittelton & Associates); Alisha Dishaw and Kirstin Greene (Cogan Owens Cogan)

Unable to Attend: Alfredo Camacho, Tom Civiletti, Jamie Damon, Walt Gamble, Al Levit, Ernie Platt, Leah Robbins (PAC Members), Susie Wright (Kittelton & Associates)

Members of the Public in attendance: Simon DeBruin

[Discussion note: A summary of PAC member comments and questions is shown in *italics* followed by staff responses in regular text. Conversation has been organized by agenda item.]

Call to Order -- Vice Chair Ben Horner-Johnson called the meeting to order.

Meeting Purpose and Outcomes -- Karen Buehrig welcomed the group and discussed the meeting purpose and desired outcomes:

- **Primary Meeting Purpose:** Collect final PAC comments on draft evaluation measures.
- **Desired Outcomes:** Understanding of PAC members' questions and suggestions regarding the draft evaluation measures; next steps in the TSP process.

Project Update

Karen reviewed the February 29 meeting with the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) to share and discuss the proposed Vision, Goals and Objectives. Several PAC members attended – Chips Janger, Mike Foley and Paul Edgar. Overall the BCC supported the Vision, Goals and Objectives the PAC helped develop and said they should be adopted by resolution. Karen underscored that this is an indication of the BCC's appreciation and trust in the work of the PAC and project team to date.

In talking with Commissioner Paul Savas, the term equity can be understood differently by different people.

In the readings that we have had about transportation system, it appears equity has become a “term of art” in the transportation world. In the 2040 Plan, the Metro Plan, etc equity means that the transportation system should represent everybody including those who in the past were under-represented or not represented.

Mike Bezner did a fine job clarifying the equity point at the BCC meeting.

Karen said the project team is comfortable that we have satisfactorily addressed equity in the Vision, Goals and Objectives. The PAC did a great job addressing all the topics. The project team recommends moving forward with the BCC formal adoption. PAC members agreed.

Comment: PAC members fought hard for equity in terms of geographic distribution. I do not see it in this version.

Response: The reference may have been inadvertently eliminated when we removed technical jargon; we will add it back.

Comment: I am concerned with the overriding implications by Metro requirements. An example is the light rail. We are writing a TSP based on Metro mandates and have an initiative that, if passed, totally rewrites what Clackamas County is capable of doing. Also, I have concerns about emissions standards. Metro’s proposed mandates seem to be quite overreaching in their impact while trying to have an economically competitive marketplace. Do people truly understand the implications in what they are mandating?

Response: We are working concurrently with these evolving initiatives. We have to work with the regulations we have now, and then address changes in the future. The greenhouse gas emission targets are not mandates.

Karen reviewed the project schedule and storyboard to remind members where we are in the process. She noted that we will go over this at the beginning of each meeting.

Kirstin Greene asked if there were any comments on the meeting summary (there were none) and reviewed the agenda.

Public Comment

Kirstin distributed four comments (attached) from the public regarding addressing equestrian use as part of the TSP. Kirstin advised all public comments received will be recorded. Ellen Rogalin will log and distribute a sheet at each meeting and all verbatim comments will be on the web.

The Trolley Trail was not provided equestrian areas. We need to consider putting interconnecting trails (bike and horse) away from roadways and do some community connecting. Currently code prevents us from doing that. We need to ask for modifications in code that will give us more latitude.

Wrapping up Discussion on Draft Evaluation Criteria

Marc Butorac said that the project team looked at the comments from the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC), PAC #3, individual PAC members and the website to update Tech Memo #6.1 Measures, Evaluation Criteria and Methodology for Implementation. Marc discussed in detail the handout “Revised Measures and Evaluation Criteria.” Comments were put into three categories: comments or questions that will be addressed or answered in upcoming TSP work; suggestions outside the scope of the TSP update; and suggestions or edits incorporated into the measures and evaluation criteria.

Comment: My detailed comments on the draft were not distributed to the whole PAC and I could not see easily how comments were reflected in the revised memo.

Response: Copies of the document outlining point by point how the comments were reviewed (attached) were given to PAC members. After working through most of the changes, the PAC voted to move on with the next discussion item.

The group discussed the measures by topic:

Bike / Pedestrian

- *Bike / pedestrian is not listed under the safety goal.*
- *We can expand on that to refer to different modes.*
- *I would like to see a map that shows where problems are happening.*
- *We will be using maps in up-coming meetings.*
- *When you look at cars and bicycles, you need different measures.*
- *Agree.*
- *Do we know how many accidents occur before a measure is put in place and then after?*
- *Yes, and we will be using it.*
- *The Highway Safety Manual shows if you widen X amount, then it will reduce crashes by Y.*
- *We need to be aware of unintended consequences or uses such as cars parking in wider bike lanes.*
- *We need information on how many people are biking in the evaluation criteria.*
- *This will be reflected in the existing conditions document.*
- *We have certain places in the county where we have constant pedestrian violations. It would be easy to keep a record of where these dangerous spots are.*

Funding

- *Comments on specific funding sources are listed under the future upcoming work section.*
- *Sources of funding should be equitable. People that use the modes of transportation should share in funding the system. Automobile drivers and truck drivers paying for everything is not equitable; bikes / equestrians should help as well.*
- *I am confused about where funds come from for different types of projects. There are certain funds that can only be used for maintenance and certain funds that can only be used for building. We need to be clear what monies can fund what.*
- *At the first brown bag it we were told we could not set aside 3-5% of the capital (building) funds for maintenance because capital funds have to be use for capital.*
- *There is an attempt being made to put fees on electric cars that would help for maintenance.*

- *Equitableness needs to be measured in the cost that is created for the system. Equity should be compared by mode and user.*
- *These will be addressed when we collect the data.*
- *One way to measure equity is to make sure that fares, fees and payments reflect actual cost. This would help the public determine impacts.*

Environment

- *Are alternative vehicles actually helping? There are no measures about that.*
- *The transportation emissions measure will address this.*
- *I would like to clarify the statement “substances that are harmful to humans and the environment” to reflect that if substances are harmful to the environment they are harmful to humans. I would suggest the word “human” be stricken.*
- *The group agreed.*
- *Why did we specify “reducing exposures to children and senior citizens”? Are the people in the middle not as important? Could it be changed to “vulnerable populations”?*
- *Children and senior citizens are more susceptible. We will run this by the health advisors.*

Capacity for Motorized Vehicles

- *Should vehicle weight be included?*
- *We would use weight in assessing funding elements.*
- *In level of service, I'm concerned about impediments / delays that occur outside of intersections.*
- *That is measured / evaluated under the travel time reliability measurement.*
- *We have gone 15 years in Clackamas County with a major capacity restraint (I-205) and we cannot seem to figure it out.*
- *Agree. It is more clearly stated in the level of service measurement.*
- *We can expand on the explanation of travel time reliability and average travel time.*
- *Could we state something about trying to reduce effects like turbulence, which is a capacity issue?*
- *Turbulence feeds into the performance measures / criteria for travel time reliability.*

Safety of the traveling public

- *We need to measure safety not just in terms of crashes but also in the condition of the roadway like rumble strips, miles of shoulder, fog lines, etc.*
- *This will be evaluated under the vehicle crashes measurement. We can clarify the purpose.*
- *In 4.2 under purpose, remove the extra “that”.*
- *What about overflowing onto neighborhood streets?*
- *That will be a derivative of delay and volume / capacity. This will be identified when you see travel time lower than expected.*
- *Could it be put into the safety section as we have impacts on children playing in the streets?*
- *It gets outside of the scope of the TSP to review neighborhood-specific issues.*
- *It could be put in both places –one to review travel time and one to review safety.*
- *We will look into this.*

Social Community

- *Add rural community equity into social community.*

- When you say rural it insinuates that something that is not equitable.
- *Maybe could go into the disadvantaged populations already on here.*
- Would not necessarily be used at this stage of the process when evaluating the system, but will come into play when we prioritize.
- *Do we have figures that show the incidents per population of unsafe roads in rural vs. urban?*
- We can get that to you. It will be in the existing conditions memo.

Transit

- *Suggest adding security (personal) for transit riders under infrastructure.*

PAC Process

Karen said one-on-one interviews were conducted with PAC members to get a sense of how they are feeling about the process and how it could be improved. Kirstin thanked all PAC members who participated and reiterated that the results are confidential. She reviewed the summary report (attached).

During the meeting with the BCC last week, the commissioners were very interested in what this group comes up with. I left the meeting feeling that the work we as a PAC are doing is very important.

I echo that. There was an amazing confirmation that what we are doing here is important to the BCC.

Karen said that from interviews we heard that we need to get back to the geographic areas, that it would be helpful to have work groups and that we need to make our full PAC meetings most efficient and effective.

Marc discussed the options for moving forward in the process: we can continue as we have been as a full PAC with everything reviewed and discussed or we can break into working groups for detailed review and discussion. Working groups would then present recommendations to the full PAC for consideration.

Marc said the project team proposes five project working groups by geographic area and one policy working group. Ideally, PAC members would participate in two groups and there would be at least three members in each group. (A full list of proposed working groups, topics and schedule are at www.clackamascountytsp.com under the Meeting #3B documents section.)

Karen said the project team wants to give the PAC, through working groups, the opportunity to be involved in developing the plan and come to the full PAC. With the Policy Working Group, members can choose which attend meetings to attend. This is an opportunity for PAC members to become as involved as they want to in specific issues.

Marc said the tech memos will be 500-600 pages long. If we break them up into geographic regions, they will be 50-60 pages long and will be more digestible. The full PAC will need to trust the working groups to share information with the full PAC, and the full PAC discuss and determine whether the working group is going in the right direction. The full PAC will not have the time to review topics at the same level of details as the working groups will.

- *This TSP is nothing like the previous TSP. There will be a lot of new pilot projects and many will not have evaluation criteria. Are we going to recommend these pilot projects?*
- *Yes, if we think they will achieve the goal.*
- *Could you give examples of projects that the working groups can evaluate against the criteria and compare that to how the project team evaluated them?*
- *Yes. That is exactly what we are going to do in the working groups.*
- *There will be a cost / benefit analysis, but are you taking into account the surrounding areas' emotional ties to the projects i.e., disrupting a neighborhood?*
- *Typically we will look at construction and life cycle costs, but not social impacts. The evaluation criteria will help filter those before funding comes into play.*
- *Right now we have no idea what the budget is. Is there going to be a price tag that comes with the projects?*
- *We will give cost estimates so you will have a relative sense, but the important thing is what projects are needed and when, and setting priorities within the needed projects. If this group identifies projects that are our outside of the budget, then we need to look for that funding. There are other funding sources out there.*
- *Can you define policy?*
- *Policy is the part of the TSP that provides direction, that give guidance for decision-making. They are the legal structure upon which the County works.*
- *PAC members have expressed concern about their ability to impact the process. These working groups will actually give us that opportunity. It will take more time, but will have a lot more impact than if we sit around like this and just discuss things. We know that we have a responsibility to the whole county. We all come from different backgrounds / demographics and need to figure out how to avoid the rural - urban competition. We want to be effective for all areas of the county.*
- *Each geographic area working group will come back with projects for the full PAC to review. The PAC will have to look at all projects a global level and balance the needs.*
- *If we separate the geographic areas, it will be harder for the full PAC to come to consensus on where funds need to be spent.*
- *That is exactly what we will have to do; that is the purpose of this group.*
- *I learn from others in the room and feel it's not a great idea to split up into groups.*
- *The working groups will have existing and future conditions data available. The memos will show problems, solutions and recommended actions. The working group will review these and see if they make sense. The meetings will not be scheduled on top of one another so you may attend as many as you wish. The materials will be available on the web.*
- *I disagree with the idea of small work groups. Our responsibility is to figure out diverse ideas between urban and rural in a large group to achieve consensus. If some folks want to talk at length, that is your job to limit the time. We learn from each other.*
- *This idea of working groups is to give time to refine our work in areas of our special interest. If some people have more input on a given area, they can get out the details in a smaller group. The intent is to be more productive, to vent and move on.*
- *I have been through a TSP before and agree that we should move into working groups. It worked really well -- everyone was on at least one work group and we trusted the people who were knowledgeable in certain areas to work through those topics and present to the PAC*

- *Smaller groups will squeeze out a lot of information. If we squeeze out the information and come back to the full group, it will be more efficient.*
- *I assume you (project team) know a lot more about how to structure this. If you think this is the way to go then let's do it.*
- *If you establish what the expectations are and what information you want us to come back with, then each group will address issues from the same level.*

A straw poll was taken; the majority of PAC members supported trying the small working group approach.

Karen said the first meeting of the Policy Working Group will put a little more form and definition into the process and how it moves forward.

Action Items

- Alisha will add Elizabeth's comments to the end of PAC #3 summary.
- All materials from PAC #3B will be posted to the website.
- Alisha will solicit the group for additional working group sign ups.
- PAC members who sign up for the Policy Working Group will be queried for availability.

Meeting adjourned at 8:30 pm.

March 1, 2012

To: Kirstin Greene kirstin.greene@coganowens.com
CC: Elizabeth Graser-Lindsey egraserlindsey@gmail.com

For distribution to the CC TSP TAC (technical committee) and the TSP PAC (citizen Committee)

To Whom it May Concern,

I would like to see the inclusion of Equestrians into the Clackamas County's Transportation System Plan.

I own and ride a horse. I board her just off the Springwater Corridor along with 11 other riders. We ride the Springwater Corridor Trail and the Powell Butte wilderness trails 2 or 3 times a week as they provide us a wonderful outdoor experience.

My reason for writing today is that a new sign was recently erected on the trail stating horse riders are to "scoop poop" left by their horses. I can understand the thought behind the sign, but there are reasons why this is neither possible nor safe. In my case I am disabled and require mounting blocks to get on and off my horse. Even under normal circumstances mounting and dismounting a horse is the most dangerous time for a rider. Mounting and dismounting also poses a dangerous time for the cyclist. I have experienced cyclists speed by and very close to my horse. One time my horse turned her head to look sideways and the cyclist came from behind within an inch of hitting her face with his handle bars. So while swinging my leg off and on I need more space, even while using the mounting block. Most are considerate when coming from behind and say "on your left" but many do not nor do they wait for a cyclist approaching to give space to pass. If the shoulder of the trail was bark dust or dirt and did not have a steep slope, I could ask my horse to walk there but the gravel hurts the tender spots (frog) in the hoof. Their weight causes them to slide on a slope.

Horse manure is not like dog or cat poop. Horse manure consists of organic material which quickly disintegrates and is washed or blown away. It is confined to a small space easily avoided by bike riders or walkers.

I am excited to have more trails/paths to ride my horse. I am especially glad to hear Clackamas County is looking for input from all types of users.

Thanks you for your time,

Julie Hancock
11015 SE Flavel St
Portland, Or 97266
503-819-1974
Julie.l.hancock@kp.org

Concentrates, Inc.

5505 SE International Way, Milwaukie. OR 97222
Phone: 503-234-7501 Fax: 503-234-7502 Toll Free: 800-388-4870
www.concentratesnw.com

February 29, 2012

TO: "Kirstin Greene" <kirstin.greene@coganowens.com>
CC: Elizabeth Graser-Lindsey egraserlindsey@gmail.com
CC: For distribution to the CC TSP TAC (technical committee) and the TSP PAC (citizen Committee)
FROM: Heather H.S. Havens, B.S. Ag

To Whom it May Concern,

I am writing because I would like to see the inclusion of Equestrians into the Clackamas County's Transportation System Plan (TSP).

I have a horse myself, and I board her adjacent to the Springwater Corridor, with approximately 10 other boarders, surrounded by many other boarding stables and homes with horses. All of us ride the Springwater Corridor Trail very regularly, as it is the only safe way that we have to get anywhere on horseback. I had a horse for 18 years in Canby & Oregon City also, and there was no way to safely ride on any of the roads near where I boarded in those communities, either. I also drive my horse, and I know many local people who farm with and drive their horses. I have a B.S. in Agriculture, with a Light Horse Production Emphasis, and I am General Manager of an Agricultural Supply Distribution Company in Milwaukie (Concentrates, Inc.), which sells horse feed and supplies, so I have a very good idea what horse owners are doing and need, in relation to their horses.

Recently users of the Springwater Corridor Trail were asked to complete a survey about the trail. Several of my fellow boarders completed the survey, but the rest of us found out about it too late. Recently there were signs added to the Springwater Trail demanding that Equestrians scoop their poop. I really wish that this were possible, but it is very dangerous or impossible to do in reality, and I am personally nervous that if we do leave poop on the trail, we will be barred from using this and other trails, which would frankly wreck my world. Mounting and dismounting are the most dangerous times while horse-back riding, and trying to do this while bicyclists are whizzing by is even more dangerous, including for the bicyclist. Many of us either have horses that are very tall, or we have disabilities, or both, so we can only mount and dismount with a mounting block at the stable (I am one of these people). Lastly, we would happily ride on the Springwater's shoulder, except the Springwater's shoulder is made of large, sharp gravel, which many horses simply cannot walk on (my horse is one of these). If the shoulders were dirt, bark dust, or pea-gravel, we would happily ride on the shoulders (as long as the shoulders didn't have steep slopes off of the edge of the trail).

I would also like to mention that horse-manure is merely decomposed plant material, it is compost, and it will safely wash or blow off the pavement in a short time. Horse manure is herbivore poop, which is

much safer and much more pleasant to be around than carnivore poop is (dog, cat, human). Horses also poop in a narrow strip, going in the same direction of traffic, and it is absolutely no trouble for a cyclist or walker to go around.

I know people whose horses live several blocks or miles from public trails, and they endure very unsafe conditions on the shoulders of busy roads (such as the stretch of SE Foster between SE 172nd and SE 145th) in order to get to public trails. I know a person who was riding on this part of Foster Rd. when a driver went by her so close that the vehicle's mirror hit her horse, the horse spooked, the woman went down on the road, and she almost got hit! Bicyclists expect bike lanes to make safe areas on the roads for them to ride, and we Equestrians expect the same thing. We would like to use these lanes and be safe. We also would like to feel free to ride and drive our horses safely on roads, just as cyclists, walkers, and dog-walkers are free to do on the roads and trails.

Clackamas County is one of the most Horse-populated counties in the Country, and horses create a lot of business in our economy, please don't forget that.

Thank you very much for considering the inclusion of Equestrians into the Clackamas County's Transportation System Plan (TSP).

Sincerely,

Heather Havens BS Ag
General Manager
Concentrates, Inc.
Organic Agriculture Specialists ~ Wholesale & Retail since 1938
5505 S.E. International Way, Milwaukie, OR 97222
503.234.7501 ph, 503.234.7502 fax, 800.388.4870 toll free
www.concentratesnw.com
Business Office Hours: 8 - 5:30 M - F, Closed Weekends.
Showroom Hours: 9 - 6 M - F, Saturdays 9 - 4 Spring - Fall.

Alisha Dishaw

From: Kirstin Greene
Sent: Thursday, March 01, 2012 5:47 PM
To: Alisha Dishaw; Rogalin, Ellen
Cc: 'Buehrig, Karen'; 'Erin Ferguson'; Susan Wright; Marc Butorac; Conrad, Larry
Subject: FW: Horse rider seeking open roads

KIRSTIN GREENE, AICP, Managing Principal P 503.278.3453 | D 503.278.3453 | www.coganowens.com

—Original Message—

From: Carol Lehman [<mailto:wridgefarm@peoplepc.com>]
Sent: Thursday, March 01, 2012 5:46 PM
To: Kirstin Greene
Subject: Horse rider seeking open roads

Kristin Greene;

My name is Carol Lehman and this message is in reference to the county's transportation system plan committees. I would be interested in having equestrians included in your plans for transportation as I am a long distance rider. I have always used my horse for transportation and have owned, trained, and competed with horses for over 50 years. I spent 10 years riding endurance, where horses carry their riders from 50 to 100 miles in one day. As a child I spent many hours riding on roads. My horse was my means of transportation to many adventures. I still ride on roads with my horse and enjoy the partnership and companionship of my horse while traveling. There is a very large group of equestrian riders who would be interested in being included in your plans.

PeoplePC Online
A better way to Internet
<http://www.peoplepc.com>

Alisha Dishaw

From: Kirstin Greene
Sent: Tuesday, March 06, 2012 3:50 PM
To: Alisha Dishaw
Cc: KarenB@co.clackamas.or.us; ellenrog@co.clackamas.or.us; LarryC@co.clackamas.or.us; 'Marc Butorac'; Susan Wright; Erin Ferguson
Subject: FW: Equestrian road use

KIRSTIN GREENE, AICP, Managing Principal P 503.278.3453 | D 503.278.3453 | www.coganowens.com

—Original Message—

From: Frances Bowersock [<mailto:beesock@colton.com>]
Sent: Sunday, March 04, 2012 7:38 PM
To: Kirstin Greene
Cc: Elizabeth Graser-Lindsey
Subject: Equestrian road use

I would like to urge the Clackamas County Transportation System Plan committees to seriously consider how best to insure the safe use of our County's road by equines. I have lived in Clackamas County for 11 years now and have, on many occasions, to have been on different roads while being on a horse drawn carriage. I have also been involved with some carriage driving events which required crossing a road to reach the competition areas. Although to date the cars I have encountered have been very respectful of our presence that is not to say that the same will remain true in the future. It would certainly ease my mind if the Plan would be able to bring the issue to the general public.

Thank you for your consideration of this issue.

Frances M. Bowersock