

**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

***UPDATED 7/16/12**

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; 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 without funds? [Yes, they are 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.
- *The French Prairie Bridge is an essential link for bikes, pedestrians and emergency vehicles when the Boone Bridge is blocked, for equity for Charbonneau residents compared to the rest of Wilsonville and for increased business from bicycle tourism in Wilsonville and the rest of the area south. Enhancements to the sidewalk network south of this project would augment its usefulness for pedestrians.

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