



**Public Advisory Committee (PAC)
Policy Working Group (PWG) Meeting #2
May 3, 2012 / 2 – 4 pm
Development Services Building, Room 301**

DRAFT SUMMARY

Attendees

PAC Members: Charlene DeBruin, Tom Civiletti, Paul Edgar, Thomas Eskridge, Mike Foley, Elizabeth Graser-Lindsey, Chips Janger, Glenn Koehrsen, Rachel Summer, Laurie Swanson-Freeman

County Staff and Consultants: Catherine Comer, Mike Bezner, Karen Buehrig, Larry Conrad, Shari Gilevich (Clackamas County); Marc Butorac and Susie Wright (Kittelsohn & Associates); Joe Dills (OTAK), Alisha Dishaw (Cogan Owens Cogan)

Unable to Attend: Ben Horner-Johnson, Michael Wagner

Members of the Public: Linda Eskridge, Geneva Eskridge

[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, welcomed participants and members of the public. She advised this was the first time this group will be working through the policies, and we will see how it works and make adjustments as needed. She said the consultant team worked with County staff to develop the document for this meeting. After the meeting, PWG suggestions will be incorporated and the TAC will review it.

Agenda Overview

Karen reviewed the agenda, purpose and anticipated outcomes of this meeting:

- **Primary Purpose:** To review and discuss existing and proposed County-wide policies related to economic development and freight.
- **Outcomes:** Comments from the PAC Policy Working Group on the existing and proposed County-wide policies related to economic development and freight.

Economic Development in Clackamas County

Catherine Comer, Business and Economic Development Manager with Clackamas County, discussed how movement of goods and services is important to every aspect of economic development. A critical focus right now in Clackamas County is on exporting and freight, and they are looking at opportunities both national and international. Catherine reviewed the Port of Portland Marine Division presentation and Clackamas County's *Economic Landscape for Trucking and Distribution* handouts, which can be viewed on the project website: <http://clackamascountytsp.com/websites/1/pages/6>. She also invited everyone to attend the *Exporting Clackamas County* forum to be held on May 17.

What is the percentage of dependence on freight mobility to jobs in Clackamas County?

- We are collecting that data now to show the necessity of freight.

Is it rail or truck freight and do you distinguish?

- We plan to start tracking this type of information. We also had a Business Oregon meeting on importing / exporting. We can provide you with that PowerPoint presentation. It outlines where our goods are going, what is being shipped and what the potential markets are.

Metro conducted a study in 2006 on the cost of delay; it would be good for everyone to read. It shows the cost of doing business and negative effects of delay.

Catherine also explained that the County is tracking the capacity of the Port to handle current business and their plans for expansion. She advised that the Economic Landscape handout reflects that the County is really successful when you look at the numbers compared to the region. Clackamas County has a higher propensity of getting business here that is tied to freight mobility. The handout can be viewed on the project website: <http://clackamascountytsp.com/websites/1/pages/6>.

There is a choke point between Abernethy Bridge and Stafford that prevents trucks coming up / going north on I-205. We need to prioritize correcting this. It prevents us from expanding economic development in Clackamas County. How do we change the prioritization?

- That will be part of a later discussion on prioritization of projects.

Overview of How We Will Work Through the Policies

Marc Butorac discussed the proposed format for this and the next seven meetings. The County and consultant team will present the current policies, what the proposals are for any changes, deletions and new policies, and then ask the PWG about concerns that surfaced. He will then open it up to additional questions / concerns. Marc introduced Joe Dills from OTAK, a policy expert who will attend these meetings.

Which part of the freight system is County-owned or, if a private party owns it, who are they?

- It is owned by multiple parties. Most of the facilities are state facilities (indicated in red on the maps); there are some that are public utility with private ownership of the line. All rail lines are quasi public / private partnership/ownership.

What about 20-foot plus loads?

- They are required to have special permits and there are restrictions on particular roads.

Does 172nd go through?

- When we build the 172nd / 190th corridor, it will be a freight corridor.

In principal this is a policy group. We have to comply with the Oregon Freight Plan which projects 3.1% continued growth, but we haven't seen that type of growth in a while. Are we creating policy based upon numbers that are not realistic?

- If we want to change to state- or regional-mandated policy, we can suggest, but we can't change.

Can you explain how policies are actually used?

- Policies are the play book. The policies are what we have to comply with, like guiding principles.

Does the County have a person designated to focus on freight mobility? To be a sustainable effective economy, we need to have somebody assigned to this.

- No, but the County does have a weighmaster whose job is to coordinate with the truckers. Beyond that we have people who look at these policies as part of their jobs.

Policy Language – Key Questions

The consultant team prepared six questions for the PWG to work through during the discussion. The PWG responses and suggestions were used to update Document A – Policy Review table. Marc explained the goal was to answer the six questions and then provide any additional comments. The group agreed that this is not a word-smithing exercise, but rather a chance to discuss what is most important to the PWG and what is missing.

Question #1: We currently have one “freight trucking” policy in chapter 5. Does the proposal to expand the number of policies adequately address the Vision, Goals and Objectives, and did we miss something from the freight standpoint?

Existing Policy: Maintain a truck circulation plan, as shown in Map V-10, for movements of freight on arterial roads where minimum impact will occur to neighborhoods, and industrial areas will have the service they need.

New policies: ID # 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 33, 34

Re: “Through freight / truck route systems.” -- people moving through Clackamas County have different movement and attitudes than those originating in and going elsewhere. Group agreed to remove “through.”

Nothing is reflected about shifting trucking to the rail system. Obviously rail needs improvements, but there is nothing to suggest that it would be efficient.

- This would be good to include under rail policies -- keep and grow the freight equally in trucking, rail and water. Or you could encourage truck to rail or rail to truck. Thoughts?

The Port of Vancouver wants 80% of freight to be by rail in the next five years. My opinion is that we should not abandon the historic rail rights-of-way and make sure they can be used in the future.

We are competing against a lot of other people for business. Many people are switching to rail and we don’t want to be left behind. We have to move to long-term rail.

We operate our economy on a free market model, based on the idea that businesses will make self-interested choices which will make the economy successful. That fails in long-term policy. We know that energy will continue to become more expensive. Water and rail transportation are considerably more efficient at moving freight. It is up to public bodies to explore / identify opportunities to increase more efficient freight movement via rail and water.

We also have to establish trucking routes because they carry freight from the rails. They must work in concert with each other.

- We will consider expanding the rail section in Document A.

Would farm equipment come into question here?

- Farm equipment movement will be addressed during the rural meeting.

Question #2: ID #6A-6C; which policy best addresses the goals?

Marc asked the group to think about each option and consider which one they would pick:

A: 2

B: 0
C: 5

The problem with C is “help retain and grow the county job base.” How will you grow?

If we have good freight movement, they will be able to get to the factories better. This is fundamental to us surviving.

- Freight to and from places where there is vacant land will attract development.

Emphasis on transportation system investments should be based on County goals. If we want to talk about retaining and increasing the job base rather than stimulating economic development, that is fine.

We know we have to diversify our job opportunities. This might require some very visionary stimulus to make economic clusters.

Companies seem to have a problem with shovel-ready land and choose to go elsewhere. Need to have flexibility to react quickly.

- These last two points are talking about tools, but they need policy to help us go in that direction.

How do we recapture some of the freight routes that we have lost, i.e., rail that is lost or has been dedicated to other uses? We have cut off places like Estacada from economic development that could have used rail and have no access to industrial otherwise.

- We do some combining of 6A and 6C and look at potential policy language on recapturing lost freight systems.

It would be helpful for our economy to have access to short haul rail in addition to long haul.

Question #3: ID #7A-7D: Which policy best addresses the equity goals? Is there additional or other language to help define health and livability impacts?

7A: hospitals, parks and affordable housing. Why affordable and not all housing?

7B: need to remove “communities of color.” Also, shouldn’t we be protecting all populations not just disadvantaged populations?

There should be equal treatment; no community should be impacted more drastically or negatively. This is trying to make sure that disadvantaged are treated the same.

Are you saying we should have rail lines through the richest part of town because we have a policy that we cannot put them through the poor part of town? I think we should put them through the place that makes the most sense for safety, accessibility, etc. Policies shouldn't have things like this in them.

This is almost opposite what we had before. Why doesn't it just state residential neighborhoods instead of affordable housing?

- We could remove affordable housing from the definition of sensitive land uses and have it considered with just neighborhoods. The reason these are pointed out is that these areas are most disproportionately affected.

We're operating in a bit of a vacuum because we haven't discussed why equity is important to point out for low income areas. Land is cheaper and people tend to have less political power and are disproportionately adversely impacted. If we don't have the historical framing, then we don't have the context.

We have adopted as a committee the vision, goals and objectives which include a section on equity. This is bringing equity into policy.

What about “no rail lines are situated near sensitive land uses” rather than “no new sensitive land uses are sited near rail lines.”

- More likely that we would create new land uses rather than build new rail lines.

Can we leave it neutral?

- Yes.

What about protecting areas like parks, etc. for quality of life? There are adverse impacts to people and populations, but we have animals, trees and plants to consider as well. This should be added to 7C.

Marc asked the group for a straw poll:

7A: 4.5

B: 0

C: 3.5

D: 0

Suggest taking the last line from 7A and attach to 7C.

- If we took the parenthesis from both 7A and 7C, are there any differences or is it what’s in the parenthesis that is causing the problem?

If somebody were to refer back to this, does it need to be specific like you have it? If you leave it out the argument could go many directions.

Concerns with 7A, whenever you see something that starts “minimize” what does that mean? Would recommend 7C’s “ensure” instead. It’s more positive.

On 7C, when it uses disproportionately seems to not really consider where it needs to go. Sounds like you would have to meander.

- We will work to meld 7A and 7C together based on this conversation.

Question #4: ID #7C: Is there additional or other language recommended to help define “impact sensitive land uses?”

Preserving natural habitat should be in there.

Should be reasonable, don’t want words that preclude certain things.

So that it’s considered, include to avoid putting freight through an environmentally sensitive area.

7 deals with equity in freight and land use impacts. It seems this should be another heading. Equity deals with effects on people; this talks about natural rural and should be a separate piece.

- We will work with this to find a better way to frame it.

Question 5: ID #9: The map will be modified through the TSP update process. Does this definition better define the existing Freight Route maps?

Marc asked if there were any other comments besides striking the word “through.”

- *I don’t think we can prohibit roads from local delivery.*

Question 6: Are there any specific questions or comments about the Rail, Airport, Pipeline, Water Transportation and ITS policies?

Marc asked if there were any other policy numbers the group would like to discuss.

#27 has nothing about preserving habitat for salmon and others when talking about waterways.

- There will be policies to protect the waterways that are in a different part of the plan.

#25, the way that this policy is worded assumes the County will be positive all the time on pipelines, but there is a lot of controversy on pipelines. It should not be presumed that it will always be done, but will include public interest.

- Originally just said “work with pipeline companies.” We can adjust to “work with state, federal agencies, affected communities and pipeline companies.”

Would support adding “environmentally sensitive” to #25. The group supported this.

Why is the wording struck on policy #33?

- We moved the language to ID #9. We split up the policies to avoid policies trying to do more than one thing.

Next Steps

The next PWG meeting, which is focused on rural roads, is Thursday July 12, and the following meeting will be Thursday, August 30th. Materials will be supplied to the PWG at least a week in advance. Marc thanked everyone for reading through the documents before today’s meeting and said Alisha and Susie will update Document A based on the discussion today. The updated document will be distributed to PWG members for review and final comment by May 24th.

Karen noted the first round of Geographic Area Project working group meetings will be in mid June.

Meeting adjourned at 4 pm.