

**Greater Clackamas Regional Center/Industrial Area:
Geographic Area Projects (GAPS) Meeting #1**

June 18, 2012 / 7:30 – 9:30 am

Development Services Building, Room 119, 150 Beaver Creek Rd, Oregon City

MEETING SUMMARY

ATTENDANCE

GAPS members: Ben Horner-Johnson, TSP PAC; Chips Janger, TSP PAC; Cyndi Lewis-Wolfram, North Clackamas CPO; Martha Waldemar, Sunnyside United Neighbors CPO; Gordon Young, Economic Development Commission; Ken Itel, Clackamas County Development Agency (North Clackamas Revitalization Area); Dan Johnson, Clackamas County Development Agency (Clackamas Town Center Area)

Visitors: Michael Walter, City of Happy Valley; Kay Faure, A. Jones

Staff and Consultants: Larry Conrad, Sarah Abbott, Ellen Rogalin, Mike Bezner, Clackamas County; Marc Butorac and Susan Wright, Kittelson & Assoc.

PRESENTATION

Larry and Marc reviewed the meeting agenda and purpose:

- Confirm existing gaps and deficiencies
 - Gaps -- Missing facilities or connections in the sidewalk system, bicycle network and/or roadway connections, and densely populated areas without transit service.
 - Deficiencies -- Facilities that exist but do not perform up to defined standards, such as an intersection with too much delay and congestion, a sidewalk or bicycle lane that is too narrow or a roadway with a poor safety record.
- Gather initial comments on existing planned projects and other projects identified through the public process.

Marc walked the group through definitions and maps related to existing and projected future conditions, and low build and full build project lists in the Greater Clackamas Regional Center/Industrial Area. He explained that previously planned projects come from four sources:

- Current TSP
 - low-build projects (projects with funding available or identified)
 - full-build projects (all projects on list, even those without funding)
- Pedestrian Master Plan
- Bicycle Master Plan
- Public comments (from open houses and website)

He then asked GAPS members to spend some time reviewing the maps and writing comments about any gaps or deficiencies on sticky notes.

Comments/Questions

Q: If we want a project to go away, how does that happen?

A: If it's a project on the Metro Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), Metro has to approve the project being removed based on proposed alternatives that will address the issue or demonstrating that the project is no longer needed.

Q: How will we get to the point of actually prioritizing projects and having some drop off the list?

A: We will compare the need for projects with current standards (which are different than the standards in place when the last TSP was created) and with the TSP Vision, Goals and Objectives. Since the new standards allow for more congestion, it is likely some projects will come off the list just because they aren't needed anymore to meet standards. The County Commission will take the final action on what projects are removed, what projects are changed and what projects are added.

Q: Why is a project still on the list (Sunnybrook Ext W) that so many people have said they don't want?

A: Sunnybrook and five other projects are on the "low build list" -- a list of projects in the current County TSP that have funding available. As noted above, a project can only come off the list by coming up with alternatives or showing that it is no longer needed, followed by formal action by the Board of County Commissioners and, for a project on the Metro list, by Metro. Projects on the "full build list" -- a much longer list -- are in the current County TSP but do not have any funding available at this time.

COMMENTS ON MAPS

- Sidewalk here [Mather] is only on one side – sidewalk complete percentage seems high
- Viaduct width [Strawberry Lane & I-205]
- Signal at 82nd and Strawberry
- Signal? [I-205 northbound ramp to Highway 212]
- Connect bike lanes [Roots Road at I-205 ramp]
- Harmony Rd - avoid Three Creeks
- Harmony Rd -- connect to Toys R Us but avoid Three Creeks
- I-205 bike path disconnect [just south of Lake Rd]
- Show HU ped "path" system and public property of worship -- would allow you to assess alternatives other than street grid [north of Mather and south of Sunnybrook]
- Very important to complete Mather Rd bikeway between 97 and Summers Ln
- Carver boat ramp on weekends -- very congested during the summer weekends
- U123 -- sidewalks really needed on 129th (129th between Sunnyside and King)
- Monterey gap from Stevens to Schumacher
- Carver Rd overpass -- what happens to system if not constructed? [212 and 92nd]
- Fuller Rd/King and King/80th disconnect
- Johnson Creek Rd & I-205 and Johnson Creek Rd & Fuller intersections -- limits ability and access
- Fix lights; get left turn on Webster Rd [Lake and Webster]
- Should be continuous sidewalk from 224/Webster to south to Roots Rd
- Sidewalk here is only one side -- percentage seems high [97th Ave]
- Sidewalks needed on both sides of 132nd between Sunnyside and Hubbard
- Sidewalks needed on both sides of 132nd between Sunnyside and Hubbard
- Gap in north sidewalk between Hubbard/135th before 132nd

PUBLIC COMMENT

The Carver boat ramp on the south side has lots of congestion -- it's a major summertime problem.

NEXT STEPS

Marc asked GAPS members to continue to review the materials and submit any additional comments by the end of the day on Monday, June 25. Two more GAPS meetings are planned:

- Meeting #2 (late July/early August)

- Review remaining gaps and deficiencies (not addressed by previously planned projects)
 - Brainstorm alternatives to address the gaps and deficiencies
- Meeting #3 (mid-October)
 - Review alternatives analysis findings
 - Discuss draft preferred project list
 - Initial discussion on priorities

Other upcoming meetings:

- TSP Public Advisory Committee - July 17 and Sept. 25
- Public open houses/input opportunities -- mid-August through mid-September

**Public Advisory Council
Greater McLoughlin Area Geographic Projects Working Group (GAPS)**

Meeting #1

6:30-8:30 p.m., Monday, June 18, 2012
Development Services Building, Oregon City

MEETING SUMMARY

ATTENDANCE

GAPS: Chips Janger, TSP PAC; Bernhard Masterson, Oak Grove Community Council; Greg Smith, Jennings Lodge CPO; Kim Buchholz, TSP PAC; Tom Civiletti, TSP PAC; Mike Foley, TSP PAC; Ben Horner-Johnson, TSP PAC; Pat Russell, North Clackamas CPO

Staff and Consultants: Karen Buehrig, Ellen Rogalin, Shari Gilevich, Clackamas County; Marc Butorac, Erin Ferguson, Kittelson & Assoc.

Visitors: Jerry Foy, Gail Curtis, Elizabeth Graser-Lindsey

PRESENTATION

Karen and Marc reviewed the meeting agenda and purpose:

- Confirm existing gaps and deficiencies
 - Gaps -- Missing facilities or connections in the sidewalk system, bicycle network and/or roadway connections, and densely populated areas without transit service.
 - Deficiencies -- Facilities that exist but do not perform up to defined standards, such as an intersection with too much delay and congestion, a sidewalk or bicycle lane that is too narrow or a roadway with a poor safety record.
- Gather initial comments on existing planned projects and other projects identified through the public process.

Marc walked the group through definitions and maps related to existing and projected future conditions, and low build and full build project lists in the Greater McLoughlin Area. He explained that previously planned projects come from four sources:

- Current TSP
 - low-build projects (projects with funding available or identified)
 - full-build projects (all projects on list, even those without funding)
- Pedestrian Master Plan
- Bicycle Master Plan
- Public comments (from open houses and website)

He then asked GAPS members to spend some time reviewing the maps and writing comments about any gaps or deficiencies on sticky notes.

COMMENTS/QUESTIONS [responses in brackets]

- Does low-build equate to fiscally constrained? [Yes, pretty much. Low build may be even more fiscally constrained.]
- We can only take projects out of the RTP if we have alternatives and/or can prove there is no longer a need for the project. [To remove a project, things would have to go through the TSP,

then have BCC approval and be recommended to Metro, who also would have to approve it. The same process has to be gone through if we want to add a project to the TSP.]

- Are we looking at trending, forecast assumptions, traffic volumes, etc.? [This is the community's opportunity to raise these concerns and analyze alternatives. We will be analyzing alternatives, locally and globally.]
- Which assumptions are used for growth are significant. Assumptions that are even a little bit wrong can make a big difference. [We start with a base assumption and then drop back, e.g., to 80 percent and then to 50 percent. That shows what projects are still needed with lower projected growth and helps set priorities.]
- Both the low build and full build scenarios are build on the same population projections that haven't changed since the housing bubble burst. I'm concerned the numbers may not be even close to reality. There's a high probability this level of growth won't happen. [Even if we assume no growth, some projects will still be needed for safety and efficiency. If we estimate at 80 percent and 50 percent levels, some projects will drop off. However, we know there will be some growth, so some projects for added capacity are probably needed.]
- Some people think that the existing TSP isn't realistic, but the projects stay on the books anyway and developers are expected to meet the expectations of those unrealistic projects. [The TSP style used to be to come up with as many projects as possible to be able to compete for available funds. That's not the way we're doing it now.]
- One of our themes is protecting our neighborhoods, traffic calming, etc. We need to look at 24-hour traffic patterns, not just peak hour patterns. [Standards have changed. The Metro area is now willing to live with higher levels of congestion, and we can't afford less congestion.]
- We know a light rail station will be built at Park and McLoughlin, and that's not even acknowledged on the maps.
- Not many sidewalks are shown. [The sidewalk inventory was only done on streets identified in the Essential Pedestrian Network, not on all roads.]
- Was the bike network matched with prospective plans of the bike coalition in the area? [Both bike and ped networks come from projects with the County Ped/Bike Committee in 2004, which did an in-depth analysis and coordinates with Metro and other groups.]
- Are you keeping trails systems in mind? [Metro is identifying active transportation corridors – walking, biking and access to transit. We're participating in that project.]
- What is the density for transit? [Three households or four employees per acre.]
- There are no north-south transit connections. There are difficulties getting to transit, e.g., lack of sidewalks. [We can't control changes in services, especially with no local standards.]

COMMENTS ON MAPS

- How many more vehicle trips are anticipated on Concord in 2035? I live just off Concord and use it daily; seems like plenty of capacity exists.
- [Concord-McLoughlin] intersection will likely have issues once Walmart moves in
- Look at capacity [Aldercrest-Thiessen intersection] (2 comments)
- Roundabout? [Aldercrest-Thiessen intersection?] (2 comments)
- Thiessen and Aldercrest connections to Lake and Harmony are important -- current gap
- Improve bike with side in ped/bike [Thiessen at Aldercrest]
- Define safety corridor, e.g., frequent sidewalks [McLoughlin between Boardman & Roethe]
- Can bike to transit so more areas are transit supportive [Arista south of Courtney]
- GW transit [McLoughlin just north of Risley]
- Light rail to Oregon City [McLoughlin south of Park] (2 comments)
- High speed bus corridor along 99? [McLoughlin at Roethe]
- Make 99 border area denser - parking lots [McLoughlin south of Meldrum]

- County own transit service standard
- Any way to put bike/ped access on this bridge? [railroad bridge from Oak Grove to Lake Oswego]
- Ped/bike connector across bridge [railroad bridge from Oak Grove to Lake Oswego]
- Greater bike protection needed at turn to south from 22nd and River Rd -- big bumps in road
- Need those big bumps to separate bike lane from auto on west side of switchback (Oatfield)
- For maps labeled "Planned Bikeway Network," should be named existing, not planned -- bike lanes on the map currently exist
- Connect Trolley Trail [E Berkeley St.]
- Bike boulevard -- Rusk Rd and Aldercrest from Oatfield to Thiessen Rd
- Frequent crosswalks, e.g., 600 ft [McLoughlin]
- Delete ALL neighborhood interior street walks (4 comments)
- Sidewalk gap -- Johnson City to Webster -- nothing on north side
- Shuttles to Park Ave Station for large retirement communities along River Rd
- Oetkin Way & Naef Rd. - bike boulevard
- Congestion is building -- light coordination could be stronger; left turn stop sign and exit to south 205 has created some accidents [82nd and I-205]
- Coordinate with sewer project [Riverside Dr., just south of railroad bridge]

PUBLIC COMMENT

- Jerry – I was involved with the 2040 Plan and it was the same kind of data. So far population figures are coming in a bit lower than projections.

NEXT STEPS

Two more GAPS meetings are planned:

- Meeting #2 (late July/early August)
 - Review remaining gaps and deficiencies (not addressed by previously planned projects)
 - Brainstorm alternatives to address the gaps and deficiencies
- Meeting #3 (mid-October)
 - Review alternatives analysis findings
 - Discuss draft preferred project list
 - Initial discussion on priorities

Other upcoming meetings:

- TSP Public Advisory Committee - July 17 and Sept. 25
- Public open houses/input opportunities -- mid-August through mid-September

**Public Advisory Council
Northwest County Area Geographic Projects Working Group (GAPS)**

Meeting #1
2-4 p.m., Wednesday, June 20, 2012
Development Services Building, Oregon City

MEETING SUMMARY

ATTENDANCE

GAPS: Paul Edgar, TSP PAC; Al Levit, TSP PAC; Walt Gamble, TSP PAC and Stafford Hamlet; Skip Ormsby, Birdshill CPO/NA; Jamie Damon, TSP PAC and Board of Commissioners
Staff and Consultant: Erin Ferguson, Kittelson & Assoc.; Larry Conrad, Ellen Rogalin, Mike Bezner, Clackamas County

PRESENTATION

Larry and Erin reviewed the meeting agenda and purpose:

- Confirm existing gaps and deficiencies
 - Gaps -- Missing facilities or connections in the sidewalk system, bicycle network and/or roadway connections, and densely populated areas without transit service.
 - Deficiencies -- Facilities that exist but do not perform up to defined standards, such as an intersection with too much delay and congestion, a sidewalk or bicycle lane that is too narrow or a roadway with a poor safety record.
- Gather initial comments on existing planned projects and other projects identified through the public process.

Erin walked the group through definitions and maps related to existing and projected future conditions, and low build and full build project lists in the Northwest County Area. She explained that previously planned projects come from four sources:

- Current TSP
 - low-build projects (projects with funding available or identified)
 - full-build projects (all projects on list, even those without funding)
- Pedestrian Master Plan
- Bicycle Master Plan
- Public comments (from open houses and website)

She then asked GAPS members to spend some time reviewing the maps and writing comments about any gaps or deficiencies on sticky notes.

COMMENTS/QUESTIONS [responses in brackets]

- Is the Metro list the trump list? [The Metro list includes everything we adopted in the current TSP (adopted 10 years ago). Criteria (level of service) are set by Metro.]
- What's the impact of LOS now? [LOS is not the criteria anymore; now Metro is using V/C. The new standards allow for more congestion which actually gives us more flexibility.]

- How does this affect road through-put? [When capacity is exceeded, at an intersection or on a roadway segment, there will be back-ups.]
- I would like a summary sheet to refer back to in later years.
- Did you get information from Lake Oswego? [The County has contacted all the cities.]
- Does money come mainly into Metro? [Federal money flows through Metro; we also have other sources of money – state, local, bonds, etc.]
- Does the “preferred plan” include shovel-ready projects that don’t have funds? [Yes, this shows they’re a priority.]
- Would projects in the “vision” box allow for acquiring land as it become available? [Probably not for projects in the “vision” box; probably yes for projects in the “preferred” box.]
- It seems there are arbitrary definitions of path widths. We shouldn’t get overly invested in replacing facilities that basically work as they are, even if they don’t meet the definition.
- Do some bike paths widths depend on the source of funds? [Yes.]
- How do we think about providing more connections to employment and residential areas that are off the main roadway? How do we get these inter-connections? We need long-term plans so we can prepare for future needs.
- Chip seal isn’t good for cars and is really bad for bicycles. It won’t fix a really bad road. Avoid chip sealing bike lanes. Could this be set as a standard?
- It might be useful to have transit standards to help connect our bike/ped facilities with transit. How does access to transit facilitate better use of the bike/ped network?
- I have a problem with areas not getting their money’s worth from transit – they pay the tax but don’t get the service.
- How do we deal with the issue of Stafford and the urban reserve? Metro leaves the area rural until 2040, but the Hamlet is looking at urbanization much sooner, perhaps as early as 2014.
- A new school is planned in West Linn. We should check where these facilities are planned.

COMMENTS ON MAPS

- Willamette Falls Dr backs up frequently when 205 does [just east of 10th St]
- Sidewalks exist here [Stafford south of Rosemont]
- U304 and U305 should be one project [Stafford Rd., south of split with Mountain Rd]
- Priority need [Rosemont-Stafford]
- Bike/ped project RB428 effectively completed this year [Rosemont Rd]
- 4-foot shoulder is not continuous [Borland Rd]
- Does anyone live here? [east of Gage, south of Advance]

NEXT STEPS

Two more GAPS meetings are planned:

- Meeting #2 (late July/early August)
 - Review remaining gaps and deficiencies (not addressed by previously planned projects)
 - Brainstorm alternatives to address the gaps and deficiencies
- Meeting #3 (mid-October)
 - Review alternatives analysis findings
 - Discuss draft preferred project list
 - Initial discussion on priorities

Other upcoming meetings:

- TSP Public Advisory Committee - July 17 and Sept. 25
- Public open houses/input opportunities -- mid-August through mid-September

**Public Advisory Council
Southwest County Area Geographic Projects Working Group (GAPS)**

Meeting #1

4:30-6:30 p.m., Wednesday, June 20, 2012

Molalla Public Library

MEETING SUMMARY

ATTENDANCE

GAPS: Tom Eskridge, TSP PAC; Laurie Freeman-Swanson, TSP PAC; Elizabeth Graser-Lindsay, TSP PAC; Mike Wagner, TSP PAC; Linda Eskridge

Staff and Consultant: Susan Wright, Kittelson & Assoc.; Karen Buehrig, Ellen Rogalin, Mike Bezner, Clackamas County

PRESENTATION

Karen and Susan reviewed the meeting agenda and purpose:

- Confirm existing gaps and deficiencies
 - Gaps -- Missing facilities or connections in the sidewalk system, bicycle network and/or roadway connections, and densely populated areas without transit service.
 - Deficiencies -- Facilities that exist but do not perform up to defined standards, such as an intersection with too much delay and congestion, a sidewalk or bicycle lane that is too narrow or a roadway with a poor safety record.
- Gather initial comments on existing planned projects and other projects identified through the public process.

Susan walked the group through definitions and maps related to existing and projected future conditions, and low build and full build project lists in the Southwest County Area. She explained that previously planned projects come from four sources:

- Current TSP
 - low-build projects (projects with funding available or identified)
 - full-build projects (all projects on list, even those without funding)
- Pedestrian Master Plan
- Bicycle Master Plan
- Public comments (from open houses and website)

She then asked GAPS members to spend some time reviewing the maps and writing comments about any gaps or deficiencies on sticky notes.

COMMENTS/QUESTIONS [responses in brackets]

- Where do the population projections come from? How accurate are they?
- What is a safety corridor? Does the safety corridor information include bike crashes? [Yes, it includes both bike and pedestrian crashes.]
- An accident down the road from me isn't shown. [Data about crashes lags about a year and, since Oregon is a self-reporting state, at lot of crashes are not recorded.]
- Shoulders in rural areas serve multiple purposes – walking, some bicycling, enhanced safety for drivers. Need to include them as part of the safety assessment.
- Need licensing and education for bicyclists.

- Explain the different standards – LOS and V/C – and their impact. [State standards allow for more congestion.]
- You can never meet the standard in Mulino because people go out of their way to turn right and turn around at the school – so you never get the level of left turns that calls for a signal.
- What are safety statistics between four-way stops and traffic lights? [Depends on the situation.]
- Include information about ditches and accident data. [Crash information is available on the ODOT website. We don't have a good way to map ditches.]
- Consider the impact of curbs and speed limits on rural agricultural users. Curbs are a challenge; speed limits should be lower around curves and corners.

COMMENTS ON MAPS

- Clackamas River Drive landslides -- not likely to be widened
- Sidewalks to Holcomb Elementary have gaps along Holcomb Blvd
- 205 Stafford to have highest priority
- Need ped/bike safety at "French Prairie Bridge"
- Need bridge [across Clackamas River south of S Bakers Ferry Rd and north of Estacada]
- Highway 211 should be a safety corridor [west of Molalla]
- This part of Union Mills is an existing safety corridor
- Continued intersection problems [Leland and Beavercreek] (2 comments)
- Dangerous intersection [Leland and Beavercreek]
- Continued intersection problems [Henrici and Beavercreek] (2 comments)
- ODOT to fix ditches [Barnards and Elisha]
- Don't allow congestion [Highway 213 south of Redland Rd]
- County: don't decrease standards like state [S. Hattan Rd]
- Better standard of transit service [Highway 213]
- Please show shoulder need in maps
- Need equestrian map with Mike Wagner
- Sidewalk for Molalla Middle School by Highway 211
- Why not bring trains back? [Canby to Molalla]
- Sidewalks down Highway 211 [Molalla]
- Apartments across 211 -- kids cross 211 s crosswalk to Molalla Middle School -- stop light?
- Sidewalks down 213 to Safeway [Molalla]
- Mulino has sidewalks from bridge to Passmore and on Mulino west 100 feet
- Dangerous intersection [Feyrer Park and Adams Cemetery Rd.]
- Bike crash in 2011 with severe injuries [just east of Beavercreek and Leland]
- Severe injuries, overflow from Beavercreek Rd [Ferguson north of Beavercreek]

NEXT STEPS

Two more GAPS meetings are planned:

- Meeting #2 (late July/early August)
 - Review remaining gaps and deficiencies (not addressed by previously planned projects)
 - Brainstorm alternatives to address the gaps and deficiencies
- Meeting #3 (mid-October)
 - Review alternatives analysis findings
 - Discuss draft preferred project list
 - Initial discussion on priorities

Other upcoming meetings:

- TSP Public Advisory Committee - July 17 and Sept. 25
- Public open houses/input opportunities -- mid-August through mid-September



**Public Advisory Council
East County Area Geographic Projects Working Group (GAPS)**

Meeting #1

6:30-8:30 p.m., Thursday, June 21, 2012

City of Sandy City Hall

MEETING SUMMARY

ATTENDANCE

GAPS: Charlene DeBruin, TSP PAC; Paul Edgar, TSP PAC; Marge Stewart, Firwood CPO; Jerry Hein, Firwood CPO; Shirley Dueber, Villages of Mt. Hood; Jay Medley
Staff and Consultant: Karen Buehrig, Ellen Rogalin, Clackamas County; Erin Ferguson, Kittelson & Assoc.
Visitor: Simon DeBruin

PRESENTATION

Karen and Erin reviewed the meeting agenda and purpose:

- Confirm existing gaps and deficiencies
 - Gaps -- Missing facilities or connections in the sidewalk system, bicycle network and/or roadway connections, and densely populated areas without transit service.
 - Deficiencies -- Facilities that exist but do not perform up to defined standards, such as an intersection with too much delay and congestion, a sidewalk or bicycle lane that is too narrow or a roadway with a poor safety record.
- Gather initial comments on existing planned projects and other projects identified through the public process.

Erin walked the group through definitions and maps related to existing and projected future conditions, and low build and full build project lists in the East County Area. She explained that previously planned projects come from four sources:

- Current TSP
 - low-build projects (projects with funding available or identified)
 - full-build projects (all projects on list, even those without funding)
- Pedestrian Master Plan
- Bicycle Master Plan
- Public comments (from open houses and website)

She then asked GAPS members to spend some time reviewing the maps and writing comments about any gaps or deficiencies on sticky notes.

COMMENTS/QUESTIONS [responses in brackets]

- Need to address the shortfall in population growth and what projects from the last TSP haven't been done and perhaps don't need to be done. [We will consider alternative growth scenarios.]
- What about the gaps and deficiencies cause delays or hindrances to economic or job growth? [The economic lens is one of many to look through in regards to our transportation system.]
- Are we going to coordinate with the state, like for Highway 26? [ODOT is on our TAC and involved with the process. We are looking at the state system as part of the package.]

- What about forest lands, etc.? [They are also working with us. We're also involved with the Mt. Hood Multi-Modal Study for Highways 26 and 35.]
- Have you set guidelines based on travel needs, safety, etc.? [Yes, by first setting vision, goals and objectives and evaluation criteria, we have established a sieve.]
- At the end of this process I would like to see the rationale for prioritization of projects, not just a ranking. [We'll do that. We've set evaluation criteria and are reaching out around the county.]
- We need to look at return on investment for projects; cost per vehicle, etc.
- We need fog lines. Need to stop ditches that undermine the road.
- Need to look at the total picture of how people move around. How do people get around without a car?
- We can't have walking and biking if it's not safe.
- We're after a viable maintenance plan, safety, major arteries for emergency vehicles, sidewalks near schools.
- Horses don't work on rural roads – it's not safe.
- There's an offset intersection at Judd Road and Highway 211 – is there any way to straighten it out? [Yes, there are options. Give us feedback on safety at intersections, sight distances, etc.]
- Can you have volume and still have an efficient intersection? [Yes.]
- Do you have solutions for unsafe intersections and possible safety corridors? [Yes, for some, no for others – that's where we may need to come up with new plans.]
- On Hwy 224 between Eagle Creek and Barton, can ODOT be pushed into adding a passing lane? [We can make that suggestion.]
- Need a bicycle lane along 224. Right now it's not safe. Highway 224 is not the place for a bike lane. [A multi-use trail, the Cazadero Trail, is planned for along 224.]
- Bicycle tourism groups are working on a route to Detroit Lake. How do we work with that?
- Is there any ability to resurrect the railroad right-of-way along Highway 224? [Probably not – some trestles aren't even safe for bicycles. State Parks now owns the land.]
- Another gap we have is lack of park & rides. We have bus service, but no place to leave your car when you drive to the bus stop.
- In some places church parking lots are used as park & rides. The churches are paid for use of the space. It's mutually advantageous.
- We need shelter areas, too, where people could wait for the bus.
- We need better and expanded transit up Highways 6 and 224 and other major roads.
- Frequency and reliability are critical elements of transit.
- The transit works pretty well for my daughter coming to visit from Portland. It could be used for commuters, bicyclists, people who want to float down the river, skiers, etc. [The Forest Service is talking with ski areas about transit.]
- The Villages of Mt. Hood is also trying to work out transit with one of the ski resorts.
- We need bike lockers, not just bike racks. If you have an expensive bike, you don't want it seen.
- Do we have a record of the maintenance status of our roads?
- The County does a good job with what they have. What's really impressive is how quickly they respond to emergencies.
- We need a substantial property tax dedicated to transportation, with most of it going to the county and the rest going to the cities. Utility fees and gas tax aren't enough. A good transportation system adds value to property.
- The leveraging element is jobs and economic growth.
- Other than Highway 26, we don't really have the opportunity to develop anything. People come here for parks, fishing, skiing, etc.
- Our bottlenecks come in Boring at Highway 212/224.
- More than half the people here commute to Portland.

- The biggest industry in Clackamas County is agriculture – we should talk about supporting that; efficient delivery of goods from source to market.
- We need another bridge across the Clackamas River.
- You can't have bicycles on Marmot Road – trucks can't even pass each other on that road. [Plans calls for bike lanes on arterials and collectors, which doesn't always work in rural areas.]
- What's the correlation between the price of gas and transit ridership? [Usually very high gas prices or a dramatic rise in the cost of parking is needed for people to switch to transit.]
- Are the changes in traffic flow in Boring reflected in the map? [We'll have to check.]
- Can you tell us estimated property values for each of the five TSP geographic areas, e.g., our area has X percent of the county's population and X percent of the county's property value?
- At the third round of GAPS meetings, share what the other four groups have come up with.

COMMENTS ON MAPS

- Realign Judd at Highway 211 to straighten
- Overhead lights needed at 224/211
- Firwood School [Highway 26 and Firwood Rd]
- Park and ride [Highway 211 - Highway 224]
- Need park and ride; consider contract with churches [211/224 in Estacada]
- Slow down [Wildcat Mtn Rd and Eagle Fern Rd]
- Pedestrian extremely necessary in the area -- prefer off-road [Fairway and Salmon River Rd., Welches]
- Extend Highway 224 to Highway 26 as major access to Bend
- Bike loops [east of SE Divers Rd]

NEXT STEPS

Two more GAPS meetings are planned:

- Meeting #2 (late July/early August)
 - Review remaining gaps and deficiencies (not addressed by previously planned projects)
 - Brainstorm alternatives to address the gaps and deficiencies
- Meeting #3 (mid-October)
 - Review alternatives analysis findings
 - Discuss draft preferred project list
 - Initial discussion on priorities

Other upcoming meetings:

- TSP Public Advisory Committee - July 17 and Sept. 25
- Public open houses/input opportunities -- mid-August through mid-September