

TSP Policies Document F - Urban Equity, Health and Sustainability, and Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities

INTRODUCTION

This document provides an overview of current policies regarding urban roads in the Clackamas County Comprehensive Plan, and staff recommendations for revising those policies and creating new policies. The staff recommendations are based on review of the existing County Comprehensive Plan – Chapter 5, State Transportation Planning Rule (TPR), Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), and TSP Vision, Goals and Objectives.

Key Questions:

1. What is the preferred general approach to the urban pedestrian system (#162 A or B)?
2. Should the County allow interim transportation improvements under limited conditions? (#172)
3. Should design guidelines for major transit stops be in the Comprehensive Plan or the Zoning & Development Ordinance (ZDO)? (#216)
4. Should additional policies be adopted to support various aspects of the bikeway system in the urban area? (#191-197)
5. Should the Comprehensive Plan require the use of the Predictive Method Analysis (Highway Safety Manual) along with a capacity analysis as part of traffic impact studies (TIS)? (#220)

The Pedestrian and Bicycle Policies in Chapter 5 were taken from the Clackamas County Pedestrian Master Plan and Bicycle Master Plan which have been adopted by reference into Chapter 5 of the Comprehensive Plan.

The Working Group Issues column in the following table identifies similar rural policies that were previously discussed and policies that may be applicable in both the rural and the urban areas.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Policies:

Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities	2	ODOT Comments	22
Transportation Demand Management (TDM)	9	TriMet Comments	26
Transit	11		
Traffic Safety Action Plan	17	Working Group Issues Definitions:	
Other Safety Topics	18	• O= Overarching	
Maintenance policies	19	• R = Regulatory (in County Code)	
Other Sustainability Topics	20	• M = Mandated (OAR, RTFP, etc)	
Other Health or Equity Topics	21	• P = Program / agency	

TSP Policies - Urban Equity, Health and Sustainability, and Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities

ID #	Current Location in Comp Plan	Current Policy	Staff Recommendations <i>Changes in Red (PWG changes in blue)</i>	Working Group Issues
		<i>Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities</i>		
161	New		<u><i>Rights-of-way for urban arterials and collectors shall be adequate to accommodate all required road improvements including bikeways, shoulders, landscaping, street lighting, drainage facilities, and sidewalks with a buffer area between pedestrians and traffic.</i></u>	O Similar to Rural #100
162 A	Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities 1.0	Provide networked systems of walkways and bikeways connecting neighborhoods, transit stops, commercial areas, community centers, schools, parks, libraries, employment places, other major destinations, regional bikeways and walkways, and other transportation modes.	Provide networked systems of walkways <u>pedestrian facilities</u> and bikeways connecting neighborhoods, transit stops, commercial areas, community centers, schools, parks, libraries, employment places, other major destinations, regional bikeways and <u>pedestrian facilities-walkways</u> , and other transportation modes. <u>Utilize separate access-ways for pedestrian facilities and bikeways when street connections are impractical or unavailable.</u>	O R
162 B	Alternate Language		<u>In urban areas, focus pedestrian facilities and bikeway improvements on connecting cities, neighborhoods, commercial areas, schools, recreational facilities, employment centers, other major destinations, regional and city bikeways, and other transportation modes. Utilize separate access-ways for pedestrian facilities and bikeways when street connections are impractical or</u>	O R

ID #	Current Location in Comp Plan	Current Policy	Staff Recommendations <i>Changes in Red (PWG changes in blue)</i>	Working Group Issues
			<u>unavailable.</u>	
		<i>Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities</i>		
163	Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities 2.0	Identify walkway and bikeway improvements necessary to ensure direct and continuous networks of walkways and bikeways on the county road system.	Identify <u>pedestrian facilities-walkway</u> and bikeway improvements necessary to ensure direct and continuous networks of <u>walkways pedestrian facilities</u> and bikeways on the county road system.	O P
164	Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities 3.0	Support acquisition and development of multi-use paths on abandoned public and private rights-of-way.	<u>No change – applies in both urban and rural areas</u>	O
165	Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities 4.0	Encourage bicycle and pedestrian access across rivers and other natural barriers.	<u>Identify locations where bicycle and pedestrian access is blocked by rivers or other natural barriers, and encourage the creation of bicycle and pedestrian access across those barriers.</u>	O
166	Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities 5.0	Promote grid-street development patterns to provide direct routes from neighborhoods to destinations frequented by pedestrians and bicyclists.	Promote grid-street development patterns to provide direct <u>and convenient</u> routes from neighborhoods to destinations frequented by pedestrians and bicyclists.	O R
167	Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities 6.0	Construct all walkways, bikeways, and trails as designated on Maps V-7a, V-7b, and V-8, and as adopted in Special Transportation Plans.	Construct all <u>walkways, pedestrian facilities,</u> bikeways, <u>multi-use paths</u> and trails as designated on Maps V-7a, V-7b, and V-8, and as adopted in Special Transportation Plans.	R

ID #	Current Location in Comp Plan	Current Policy	Staff Recommendations <i>Changes in Red (PWG changes in blue)</i>	Working Group Issues
<i>Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities</i>				
168	Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities 7.0	Construct all walkways designated in this Plan and any other walkways proposed, according to the current county design standards, the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) standards, and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards.	Construct all <u>pedestrian facilities</u> walkways designated in this Plan and any other walkways proposed <u>pedestrian facilities</u> according to the current county design standards, and standards of the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). <i>[TriMet - In special cases where this may not be possible while still providing pedestrian access, standards for all modes shall be reviewed and considered for exceptions to meet all needs.]</i>	R
169	Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities 8.0	Construct all bikeways designated in this Plan and any other bikeways proposed, according to the current standards in the Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan and the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) standards.	<u>No change – applies in both urban and rural areas</u> Question -- Should the County continue to use its current bikeway design standards, develop its own standards or use the National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) standards?	R
170	Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities 9.0	The implementation of bikeways and sidewalks shall be considered in all new collector or arterial construction or reconstruction, even if not designated on Maps V-7a, V-7b, and V-8.	<u>In urban areas</u> , bikeways and <u>pedestrian facilities</u> sidewalks shall <u>be required</u> for all new collector or arterial construction or <u>substantial</u> reconstruction, even if not designated on the <u>Planned Bikeway Network</u> (Maps V-7a, V-7b) or on the <u>Essential Pedestrian Network</u> (Map V-8).	R Similar to Rural #101
171	Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities 10.0	Require that new development include construction of pedestrian and bikeway connections within the development and between adjacent developments for the	<u>To increase active transportation</u> , require that new development construct pedestrian <u>facilities</u> and bikeway connections within the development and between adjacent developments.	R

ID #	Current Location in Comp Plan	Current Policy	Staff Recommendations <i>Changes in Red (PWG changes in blue)</i>	Working Group Issues
		purpose of increasing non-motorized mobility.		
		<i>Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities</i>		
172	New		<u>As appropriate and safe, construct interim pedestrian facilities –and bikeways on existing streets that are not built to County standards where the construction of full street improvements is not practicable or imminent as deemed by the County Engineer.</u>	
173	Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities 11.0	Coordinate with pedestrian, bicycle, and trail master plans of the Oregon Department of Transportation, the United States Forest Service, Metro, parks districts, and city parks departments to achieve a safe and convenient off-road trail system connecting to the on-road pedway and bikeway network.	Coordinate with pedestrian, bicycle, and trail master <u>and Special Transportation Plans</u> of the <u>County</u> , Oregon Department of Transportation, United States Forest Service, Metro, parks districts and city parks departments to achieve a safe and convenient off-road trail system that connects to the on-road pedway –pedestrian facilities- and bikeway network.	O
174	Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities 12.0	Coordinate the implementation of pedways and bikeways with neighboring jurisdictions and jurisdictions within the county.	Coordinate the construction or other provisions of <u>pedestrian facilities-pedways</u> and bikeways with neighboring jurisdictions, jurisdictions within the county <u>and transit providers.</u>	O
175	Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities 13.0	Support the continuation of the “Bikes on Transit” program on all public transit routes.	No change	O

ID #	Current Location in Comp Plan	Current Policy	Staff Recommendations <i>Changes in Red (PWG changes in blue)</i>	Working Group Issues
<i>Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities</i>				
176	New		<u>Coordinate with cities to identify streets with low traffic volume that are appropriate for signing as bicycle routes to enhance safety and connectivity, and to supplement the system of bikeways on the major street system.</u>	
177	Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities 14.0	Require new development to provide bicycle parking, and initiate a program for adding bicycle parking in areas frequented by bicyclists.	Require new development to provide <u>both short- and long-term</u> bicycle parking, and initiate a program for adding bicycle parking in areas frequented by bicyclists.	R
178	Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities 15.0	Encourage the provision of appropriate supportive facilities and services for bicyclists, including showers, lockers, bike racks on buses, bike repair and maintenance information/clinics, and secure bicycle parking.	<u>No change – applies in both urban and rural areas</u>	R
179	Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities 16.0	Support continuation of current (or equivalent) federal, state, and local funding mechanisms to construct county pedestrian and bicycle facilities.	Support continuation of current (or equivalent) federal, state and local funding mechanisms to construct county <u>pedestrian facilities and bikeways and to identify and pursue approaches to provide new permanent funding for these facilities.</u>	O

ID #	Current Location in Comp Plan	Current Policy	Staff Recommendations <i>Changes in Red (PWG changes in blue)</i>	Working Group Issues
<i>Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities</i>				
180	Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities 17.0	Develop dedicated funding sources to implement the Clackamas County Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plans.	Develop dedicated funding sources to implement <u>Active Transportation Projects in urban and rural areas of the county.</u>	O P
181	Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities 18.0	Develop routine maintenance standards and practices for pedestrian facilities and on-road and off-road bikeways, including traffic control devices.	No change – applies in both urban and rural areas	R P
182	Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities 19.0	Inform the public of their responsibilities for sidewalk and bikeway maintenance.	<u>Establish a program to inform property owners of their responsibilities to maintain sidewalks and pedestrian facilities.</u>	O
183	Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities 20.0	Ensure an opportunity for representative citizen involvement in the county pedestrian and bicycle planning process by sponsoring the Clackamas County Pedestrian and Bikeway Advisory Committee as a forum for public input.	Ensure an opportunity for a <u>diverse and</u> representative citizen involvement in the county pedestrian and bicycle planning process by sponsoring the Clackamas County Pedestrian and Bikeway Advisory Committee (<u>CCPBAC</u>) as a forum for public input. <u>To increase broad representation on the Committee, seek to recruit representatives of transportation disadvantaged populations.</u>	P
184	Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities 21.0	Encourage the provision of street lighting for the purpose of increasing the visibility and personal security of pedestrians and bicyclists.	<u>In urban areas,</u> encourage the provision of street lighting <u>to</u> increase the visibility and personal security of pedestrians and bicyclists.	O

ID #	Current Location in Comp Plan	Current Policy	Staff Recommendations <i>Changes in Red (PWG changes in blue)</i>	Working Group Issues
<i>Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities</i>				
185	Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities 22.0	Monitor and update the Clackamas County Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plans through data collection, evaluation, and review activities necessary to maintain and expand the programs established in these plans.	No change – applies in both urban and rural areas	P
186	Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities 24.0	In Unincorporated Communities, construct walkways adjacent to or within areas of development, such as schools, businesses, or employment centers near or along highways.	Delete – this is a rural issue.	R
187	New	<u>Covers similar policy areas to #168 through #171</u>	<u>In urban areas, improve health, safety and attractiveness of walking and biking by requiring the development of bicycle and pedestrian facilities and networks on secondary roads and off-street rights-of-way as part of land development or redevelopment, and by reviewing development plans to ensure that they provide bicycle and pedestrian access from secondary streets and off-street rights-of-way.</u>	<u>O</u> <u>Similar to Rural #124</u>
188	New		<u>Support (Prioritize?) bicycle, pedestrian and transit projects that serve the needs of transportation-disadvantaged populations.</u>	<u>O</u>
189	New		<u>Ensure that programs to encourage and educate people about bicycle, pedestrian and transit options are appropriate for all Clackamas County residents, including transportation-disadvantaged populations.</u>	<u>O</u>

ID #	Current Location in Comp Plan	Current Policy	Staff Recommendations <i>Changes in Red (PWG changes in blue)</i>	Working Group Issues
		<i>Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities</i>		
190	New		<u>Coordinate with cities to identify streets with low traffic volume that are appropriate for signing as bicycle routes to enhance safety and connectivity, and to supplement the system of bicycle lanes and paved shoulders found on the major street system.</u>	O
191	New		<u>Establish and maintain a way-finding system to facilitate bicycle travel in urban areas of the County.</u>	O
		<i>Transportation Demand Management (TDM)</i>		
192	Transportation Demand Management 1.0	Work with Metro and the state to explore Congestion Pricing (Value Pricing) on appropriate transportation facilities to encourage reductions in VMT.	Delete	O
193 A	Alternate Language		<u>Work with and support Transportation Management Associations (TMAs), and major employers and business groups to develop and implement demand management programs to work towards mode share targets adopted in this Plan in Policy 197.</u>	
193 B	Transportation Demand Management 2.0	Encourage employers in Clackamas County to implement a range of TDM policies to help their employees reduce VMT. Examples are, subsidized bus passes, company owned vanpools, preferred parking for carpools and vanpools, bicycle racks, and flexible work schedules. <u>Require</u>	See alternate above	O

Comment [ad1]: PWG members were in support of this language.

Comment [ad2]: PWG members were in favor of deleting this policy language.

Comment [ad3]: PWG is in favor of 193B with amendment.

ID #	Current Location in Comp Plan	Current Policy	Staff Recommendations <i>Changes in Red (PWG changes in blue)</i>	Working Group Issues
		major employers to implement targets adopted in this Planning Policy #197.		
		Transportation Demand Management		
194	Transportation Demand Management 3.0	Coordinate with DEQ and Tri-Met to implement TDM programs and the Employer Commute Options (ECO) rule.	<u>Support and participate in efforts by Metro, the state Department of Environmental Quality, TriMet transit providers and Transportation Management Associations to develop, monitor and fund regional Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs and to implement the Employer Commute Options (ECO) rule.</u>	O
195	Transportation Demand Management 4.0	Provide adequate bicycle and pedestrian facilities to employment areas of Clackamas County to encourage use of alternative modes for the commute to work.	Provide adequate bicycle and pedestrian facilities to employment areas of Clackamas County to encourage use of alternative modes for the commute to work <u>and to improve access to jobs for workers without cars.</u>	O
196	Transportation Demand Management 5.0	Work with Clackamas County employers located in concentrated employment areas to develop Transportation Management Associations (TMAs) to coordinate and support private sector TDM efforts.	No change	O P

Comment [ad4]: Members were in support of new policy language with one amendment.

ID #	Current Location in Comp Plan	Current Policy	Staff Recommendations <i>Changes in Red (PWG changes in blue)</i>	Working Group Issues																														
Transportation Demand Management																																		
197	Transportation Demand Management 6.0	<p><u>Establish the following Year 2040 Non-Drive Alone modal targets for Regional 2040 Design Types.</u></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="390 581 898 1112"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="390 581 722 673">2040 Design Type</th> <th data-bbox="722 581 898 673">Non-Drive Alone Modal Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td>Regional Centers</td><td>45 – 55%</td></tr> <tr><td>Town Centers</td><td>45 – 55%</td></tr> <tr><td>Main Streets</td><td>45 – 55%</td></tr> <tr><td>Station Communities</td><td>45 – 55%</td></tr> <tr><td>Corridors</td><td>45 – 55%</td></tr> <tr><td>Passenger Intermodal Facilities</td><td>45 – 55%</td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td>Industrial Areas</td><td>40 - 45%</td></tr> <tr><td>Freight Intermodal Facilities</td><td>40 - 45%</td></tr> <tr><td>Employment Areas</td><td>40 - 45%</td></tr> <tr><td>Inner Neighborhoods</td><td>40 - 45%</td></tr> <tr><td>Outer Neighborhoods</td><td>40 - 45%</td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td></tr> </tbody> </table>	2040 Design Type	Non-Drive Alone Modal Target			Regional Centers	45 – 55%	Town Centers	45 – 55%	Main Streets	45 – 55%	Station Communities	45 – 55%	Corridors	45 – 55%	Passenger Intermodal Facilities	45 – 55%			Industrial Areas	40 - 45%	Freight Intermodal Facilities	40 - 45%	Employment Areas	40 - 45%	Inner Neighborhoods	40 - 45%	Outer Neighborhoods	40 - 45%			<p>The table has been modified to meet the requirement of the RTFP in Metro Area.</p> <p>Implements RTFP provisions in the Metro area</p>	R
2040 Design Type	Non-Drive Alone Modal Target																																	
Regional Centers	45 – 55%																																	
Town Centers	45 – 55%																																	
Main Streets	45 – 55%																																	
Station Communities	45 – 55%																																	
Corridors	45 – 55%																																	
Passenger Intermodal Facilities	45 – 55%																																	
Industrial Areas	40 - 45%																																	
Freight Intermodal Facilities	40 - 45%																																	
Employment Areas	40 - 45%																																	
Inner Neighborhoods	40 - 45%																																	
Outer Neighborhoods	40 - 45%																																	

Comment [ad5]: Members were in support of proposed modifications to the table.

ID #	Current Location in Comp Plan	Current Policy	Staff Recommendations <i>Changes in Red (PWG changes in blue)</i>	Working Group Issues
		Transportation Demand Management		
198	New		<u>Support programs that work with schools to identify safe bike routes and pedestrian ways which connect neighborhoods to schools and seek funding to support the improvement of these routes.</u>	O
199	New		<u>Ensure that all Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs are appropriate for all Clackamas County residents, including transportation disadvantaged populations.</u>	O
		Transit		
200	Transit 1.0	Work with transit agencies to identify existing transit deficiencies in the County, needed improvements, and park and ride lots to increase the accessibility of transit services	Work with transit agencies to identify existing transit deficiencies in the County, needed improvements, and <i>additional</i> park and ride lots <i>needed</i> to increase the accessibility of transit services <i>to potential users</i>	O Similar to Rural #110
201	Transit 2.0	Major developments or road construction projects along transit routes shall be required to include provisions for transit shelters, pedestrian access to transit and/or bus turnouts where appropriate.	Major developments or road construction projects along transit routes shall be required to include provisions for transit shelters, pedestrian access to transit and/or bus turnouts where appropriate.	R Similar to Rural #111
202	Transit 3.0	Coordinate with transit providers to achieve the goal of transit service within 1/4 mile of most residences and businesses within the Portland Metropolitan UGB. More frequent service should be provided within Regional Centers and Corridors.	Coordinate with transit providers to achieve the goal of transit service within 1/4 mile of most residences and businesses within the Portland Metropolitan UGB. More frequent service should be provided within Regional Centers, <u>Town Centers</u> , <u>Station Communities</u> , and Corridors <u>and Main Streets</u> .	O

ID #	Current Location in Comp Plan	Current Policy	Staff Recommendations <i>Changes in Red (PWG changes in blue)</i>	Working Group Issues
		Transit		
203	Transit 4.0	Emphasize corridor or roadway improvements to increase transit speed, convenience and comfort.	Emphasize corridor or roadway improvements to <u>improve the reliability of transit service in the County. increase transit speed, convenience and comfort</u>	O Similar to Rural #113
204	Transit 5.0	Coordinate and cooperate with Tri-Met and other transit agencies to provide transportation to the elderly and people with disabilities.	Coordinate and cooperate with TriMet and other transit agencies to provide transportation to the elderly <u>for seniors</u> , people with disabilities, <u>and other transportation-disadvantaged populations.</u>	O Similar to Rural #113
205	Transit 6.0	Promote park and ride lots, bus shelters and pedestrian/bikeway connections to transit.	Promote park-and-ride lots, bus shelters and pedestrian/bikeway connections to transit. <u>Coordinate the location of these facilities with other land uses to promote shared parking and bicycle/ pedestrian-oriented transit nodes.</u>	O Similar to Rural #114
206	Transit 7.0	Emphasize transit improvements that best meet the needs of the County, including more east-west connections and service between the County's industrial and commercial areas and medium to high density neighborhood areas.	Emphasize transit improvements that best meet the needs of the all County <u>residents, employees and employers, regardless of race, age, ability, income level and geographic location. including Transit improvements shall include</u> more east-west connections and <u>improved</u> service between the County's industrial and commercial areas and medium to high density neighborhood areas.	O Similar to Rural #115

Comment [ad6]: See Post PWG #7 Comments document. Please define "reliability."

Comment [ad7]: Post PWG #7 comment to add bicycle reference in the second sentence.

ID #	Current Location in Comp Plan	Current Policy	Staff Recommendations <i>Changes in Red (PWG changes in blue)</i>	Working Group Issues
Transit				
207	Transit 8.0	Protect neighborhoods, recreation areas and pedestrian/bikeways from transportation related environmental degradation.	Protect neighborhoods, recreation areas, and pedestrian <u>facilities</u> / bikeways <u>and sensitive land uses (such as schools and senior centers whose users are more vulnerable to pollution)</u> from transportation-related environmental degradation. <u>Coordinate transportation and land use planning to minimize the proximity of these land uses to high traffic roads, and use mitigation strategies such as physical barriers and design features to minimize transmission of air, noise and water pollution from roads to neighboring land uses.</u>	O Similar to Rural #116
208	Transit 9.0	Require pedestrian and transit-supportive features and amenities and direct access to transit through the Development Review Process. Such amenities may include pedestrian / bikeway facilities, street trees, outdoor lighting and seating, landscaping, shelters, kiosks, strict standards for signs, and visually aesthetic shapes, textures and colors. Parking should be at the rear or sides of buildings. Buildings measuring more than 100 feet along the side facing the major pedestrian/transit access should have more than one pedestrian entrance.	<u>In the urban area</u> , require pedestrian and transit-supportive features and amenities, and direct access to transit through the Development Review Process. Such amenities may include pedestrian/bikeway facilities, street trees, outdoor lighting and seating, landscaping, shelters, kiosks, strict standards for signs, and visually aesthetic shapes, textures and colors. Parking should be at the rear or sides of buildings. Buildings measuring more than 100 feet along the side facing the major pedestrian/transit access should have more than one pedestrian entrance.	R

Comment [ad8]: Post PWG #7 comment to change to "In urban areas,"

ID #	Current Location in Comp Plan	Current Policy	Staff Recommendations <i>Changes in Red (PWG changes in blue)</i>	Working Group Issues
Transit				
209	Transit 10.0	Coordinate with Tri-Met on all new residential, commercial or industrial developments to ensure appropriate integration of transit into the developments.	Coordinate with TriMet on all new residential, commercial <u>and</u> industrial developments to ensure appropriate integration of transit <u>and pedestrian facilities to provide transit access</u> into the developments.	O
210	Transit 11.0	Bus routes will be improved and coordinated with financing and implementation of necessary roadway improvements and in cooperation with transit service providers.	No change	O
211	Transit 12.0	Encourage Tri-Met to restructure transit service to efficiently serve local as well as regional needs.	Encourage <u>transit providers Tri-Met</u> to restructure transit service to efficiently serve local as well as regional needs.	O
212	Transit 13.0	Work with federal, state, and regional agencies to implement high capacity transit in the downtown Portland to Milwaukie (McLoughlin) Corridor, and the Highway 224 Corridor to Clackamas Town Center. The HCT is part of the Regional Transportation System Plan. The plan designates the HCT corridors but not the specific modes. The most common modes are light rail transit (LRT), street car or bus rapid transit (BRT).	Work with federal, state and regional agencies to implement high capacity transit in <u>the regional High Capacity Transit System Plan, to help relieve traffic congestion, provide for transportation alternatives to the automobile and promote the County's economy.</u> the downtown Portland to Milwaukie (McLoughlin) Corridor, and the Highway 224 Corridor to Clackamas Town Center. Implements RTFP provisions but may be impacted by September 2012 Rail Ballot Measure – Alternate Language in #213	O

ID #	Current Location in Comp Plan	Current Policy	Staff Recommendations <i>Changes in Red (PWG changes in blue)</i>	Working Group Issues
Transit				
213	Transit 14.0	Provide high capacity transit to the Oregon City and Tualatin areas, and in the I-205 corridor including the Gateway Transit Center. The purpose is to relieve traffic congestion, provide for transportation alternatives to the automobile, and to promote the economy of the Oregon City and Tualatin areas and the I-205 Corridor.	<p>Support implementation of the Regional High Capacity Transit (HCT) System Plan.</p> <p>The HCT is part of the Regional Transportation System Plan. The plan designates HCT corridors, but not the specific modes. The most common modes are light-rail transit (LRT), street car or bus rapid transit (BRT).</p>	O
214	Transit 15.0	Major Transit Streets , for the purpose of setting standards for orientation of development to transit, shall be those streets planned for High Capacity Transit and Primary Bus as shown on Map V-6, as well as any other street that receives 20 minute or better service at the PM traffic peak.	<p>No change?</p> <p>Implements RTFP provisions</p>	R M
215	Transit 16.0	<p>Major Transit Stops shall be any transit stop along a Major Transit Street where that stop is within 250 feet of the centerline of an intersection with a public or private street.</p> <p><i>Orientation of buildings to transit at Major Transit Stops shall be accomplished by siting new commercial buildings as close as possible to transit, with a door facing the transit street or side street, and with no parking between the</i></p>	<p>No change?</p> <p>Implements RTFP provisions</p>	R M

ID #	Current Location in Comp Plan	Current Policy	Staff Recommendations <i>Changes in Red (PWG changes in blue)</i>	Working Group Issues
216	New	<p><u>Major Transit Stops – from the RTFP</u></p> <p><i>This may be more appropriate for the ZDO.</i></p> <p>Implements RTFP provisions</p>	<p>The following site design standards shall apply for new retail, office, multi-family and institutional buildings located near or at major transit stops:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide reasonably direct pedestrian connections between transit stops and building entrances and between building entrances and streets adjoining transit stops; • Provide safe, direct and logical pedestrian crossings at all transit stops where practicable; • At major transit stops, require the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buildings located within 20 feet of the sidewalk near the transit stop, a transit street or an intersecting street, or a pedestrian plaza at the stop or a street intersection; • Transit passenger landing pads accessible to disabled persons in accordance with ADA and transit agency standards; • An easement or dedication for a passenger shelter and an underground utility connection to a major transit stop, if requested by the public transit provider; • Lighting to transit agency standards at the major transit stop, and • Intersection and mid-block traffic management improvements as needed and practicable to enable marked crossings at major transit stops. 	R

Comment [ad9]: PWG members agreed to language being split between the comp plan and ZDO as appropriate.

ID #	Current Location in Comp Plan	Current Policy	Staff Recommendations <i>Changes in Red (PWG changes in blue)</i>	Working Group Issues
		Transit		
217	Transit 17.0	Pedestrian access should be provided to connect transit centers or transit stops on bus routes with centers of employment, shopping or medium-to-high density residential areas within one-quarter mile of these routes.	No change	R
		Traffic Safety Action Plan		
218	New		<u>Work with state and local partners to implement the Oregon Transportation Safety Plan.</u>	
219	New		<u>The Clackamas County Transportation Safety Action Plan will be adopted by reference as a Transportation System Plan implementing strategy. As necessary, the Board of County Commissioners will update and amend the Clackamas County Transportation Safety Action Plan to reflect any needed changes.</u>	
220	New	This represents a major change in the approach to traffic impact studies.	<u>A predictive method safety analysis (Highway Safety Manual) of impacted roadway facilities, along with a capacity analysis, shall be required should be considered as part of traffic impact studies (TIS).</u>	

Comment [ad10]: Members agreed with new language with proposed amendment.

ID #	Current Location in Comp Plan	Current Policy	Staff Recommendations <i>Changes in Red (PWG changes in blue)</i>	Working Group Issues
		Other Safety Topics		
221	New		<u>Work to decrease the number of fatalities and injuries for all travel modes at high crash locations and on rights-of-way within ¼ mile of schools through education and use of appropriate roadway improvements.</u>	
222	New		<u>Reduce inter-modal conflicts by providing new signalized pedestrian/bike crossings, grade separation, new route designations and/or other conflict reduction measures.</u>	
	New		<u>Work to ensure that traffic speeds are compatible with adjacent land use and support safety for all modes of travel.</u>	
		Stormwater Management		
		Other Vehicles		
		Emergency Response and Disasters		
223	New		<u>Work with the Oregon Office of Emergency Management and Clackamas County Department of Emergency Management to ensure that the TSP supports effective responses to emergencies and disasters.</u>	Similar to Rural #120
224	New		<u>Work with Clackamas County Department of Emergency Management to ensure the TSP supports effective response and access to the entire County during natural and human-caused incidents.</u>	Similar to Rural #121

Comment [ad11]: Post PWG #7 comment: Are there going to be any urban stormwater management areas and/or policies? .

Comment [ad12]: Post PWG #7 comment: What would be an "other vehicle" that we'd need policies about? Perhaps electric golf-cart like vehicles to allow transportation to/from the retirement complexes during daylight hours? I know there was a PAC member interested in that earlier in the process.

ID #	Current Location in Comp Plan	Current Policy	Staff Recommendations <i>Changes in Red (PWG changes in blue)</i>	Working Group Issues
Maintenance				
225	Efficiency and Finance 2.0	Emphasize maintenance of existing roadways, with improvements where appropriate, to improve traffic flow and safety at a reasonable cost.	Emphasize maintenance of existing roadways <u>rights-of-way</u> , with improvements where appropriate, to improve traffic flow and <u>safety for all transportation modes</u> at a reasonable cost.	O Similar to Rural #118
226	Efficiency and Finance 3.0	Determine roadway maintenance needs and priorities and develop an effective and efficient roadway maintenance program.	Determine roadway <u>right-of-way</u> maintenance needs and priorities, and develop an effective and efficient roadway <u>right-of-way</u> maintenance program.	O Similar to Rural #119
Other Sustainability Topics				
227	New		<u>Work with public agencies, private businesses and developers to increase and improve infrastructure necessary to support the use of alternative fuel vehicles.</u>	
228	New		<u>Transition County vehicles to lower emission vehicles, such as plug-in hybrids and electric cars, and encourage the purchase of newer technology vehicles that are more fuel-efficient and/or are not dependent on higher emission fuels.</u>	

ID #	Current Location in Comp Plan	Current Policy	Staff Recommendations <i>Changes in Red (PWG changes in blue)</i>	Working Group Issues
		<i>Other Health or Equity Topics</i>		
229	New		<u>Work with state and regional agencies to track and increase the proportion of transportation contracts awarded to minority-owned businesses.</u>	
230	New		<u>Support projects and programs, such as pedestrian and bike connections to transit stops, that expand and improve transportation options for residents in areas identified as “most vulnerable” on the Transportation-Disadvantaged Populations Map.</u>	Similar to Rural #129
231	New		<u>Establish goals to utilize minority, female and resident workers on construction projects.</u>	

Department of Transportation, Region 1 Headquarters, 123 NW Flanders Street, Portland, Oregon 97209
(503) 731.8200 FAX (503) 731.8531

November 14, 2012 MEMORANDUM

TO: Larry Conrad,
FROM: Gail Curtis and Sonya Kazen, ODOT
SUBJECT: **TAC Member Comments on TSP Draft Policy Document F -Urban Equity, Health and Sustainability, Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities**

Thank you for the opportunity to serve on the TSP TAC. Below are responses to the specific question asked by county staff followed by other comments.

Key Questions from County Staff

1. Which language is the preferred general approach to the urban pedestrian system? (162 A or B)
RESPONSE: Prefer B because it says "focus" vs. "provide" giving the county direction on investment priorities; plus relaxes the expectation that such facilities are "provided" for all of the referenced types of areas.
2. Should the County allow interim transportation improvement under limited conditions? (172)
RESPONSE: No objections but consider: 1) adding phrase: "safe as determined by the County Engineer" to ensure that safety is considered; defining "interim" and "as appropriate" by having an application process to track requests, decisions and facility maintenance.
3. Should design guidelines for major transit stops be in the Comp Plan or the ZDO? (216) RESPONSE: ZDO.
4. Should additional policies be adopted to support various aspects of the bikeway system in the urban area? (187 thru 191)
187: In urban areas, improve health, safety, and attractiveness of walking and biking by requiring the development of bicycle and pedestrian facilities and networks on secondary roads or off-street rights-of-way, and reviewing development plans to ensure that they provide bicycle and pedestrian access

from secondary streets and off-street rights-of-ways are provided as a part of land development or redevelopment.

Note: Make sure secondary roads are defined somewhere. May want to add a caveat about “where facilities can be reasonably maintained” to suggest that the future maintenance has been considered.

188: No comment.

190: Consider alternative language: Work with agency partners and others to keep Clackamas County residents, particularly transportation disadvantaged populations informed about bicycle, pedestrian, and transit travel options and benefits. Note: Drop the word “appropriate” because it is assumed the county would provide appropriate info and education.

191: Note: Support concept of “maintaining” facilities included in policy language. You may want to address maintenance more broadly. See recommended caveat language to #187 and specific comment about landscape maintenance below.

5. Should the Comprehensive Plan require the use of the Predictive Method Analysis (Highway Safety Manual) along with a capacity analysis as part of traffic impact studies (TIS)? (220)

RESPONSE: Yes, as an option based on certain threshold conditions or at the discretion of the County Engineer after reviewing initial data. This option will provide an additional tool to evaluate existing traffic operation and safety information to understand the potential traffic impact of proposed changes including increased traffic volume. The current practice to determine if there is a safety concern is to use crash rate based on the number of crashes per year as it relates to average annual daily traffic (AADT). The predictive method is designed to provide an estimate of long-term average crash frequency which improves the process of decision-making to identify solutions and potential mitigation.

Other Comments on Draft Policy

193: You may want to add language that says “Encourage and in some case require [TDM]...” as it is a method to allow development while working to reduce single-occupant vehicle trips.

195: The proposed language is redundant to the first phrase and therefore, unnecessary.

197: Typo: along should be alone.

198: I understand “Safe Routes to Schools” is no longer part of federal transportation bill and that none the less, ODOT will continue to fund for a period of time. This is short to say the program as we have known it may change. You may want to use more generic terms.

- 199: *The policy as drafted is unclear because it is impossible to know what “appropriate” means. Further, it is too ambitious to suggest “for all Clackamas County residents”. Consider adding TDM to #187 or dropping all together and instead rely on existing #193 which in practice will be the most effective TDM provision.*
- 200: *Combine this policy, #205 and #211 into one policy. The TSP requires forecast transit service deficiencies (based in part on existing conditions) making the proposed language unnecessary. Consider something simpler like: Work with transit agencies to provide needed, transit service and facility improvements, including park and ride lots.*
- 208: *Refrain from using the word “shall” to direct self regarding the zoning code provisions.*
- 213: *Add note to “see Policy 212”.*
- 214: *Recommend keeping in order to help achieve comfortable, walkable communities. Consider broadening application to more than “Major Transit Streets” based on an analysis of the “Major Transit Streets” to determine if the coverage is reasonably wide.*
- 215: *Seems more like a definition than a policy. Perhaps it will become a definition.*

Potential Policy Issues Not Reflected

- A) *As you know, the county has adopted corridor plans for 82nd Avenue (OR123) and McLoughlin (OR99E) both of which include landscaping within the public right of way. Presently, there is an outstanding question as to whether the county will accept the landscape maintenance of state-made improvements. The state interest is to help make alternative modes of travel (transit, walking and biking) more appealing in order to help reduce the forecast single-occupant vehicle (SOV) traffic volumes; and simply, to provide people with travel options. Landscaping, street trees in particular are integral features to help make these high-volume facilities more welcoming to transit users, pedestrians and bicyclists. We request that the county support the maintenance of landscaping so that we can continue to work together to achieve streets that enhance livability and help stimulate area investment.*
- B) *A related issue is: does the county support ODOT making incremental sidewalk improvements on the state highways that do not meet the county’s adopted plan? This is a current practice associated with projects that are primarily to preserve the pavement while some, limited pedestrian-related improvement funds are added to the project.*

- C) Would the county consider convening ODOT, Metro and city technical staff to identify city and county streets that either serve or have the potential to serve as an alternative route to the highway system? This exercise would help integrate the recent local, city TSP work with the County TSP. Given that the county has opted to not include county streets within the cities, we are concerned that some potential, important street connections may have been overlooked.*
- D) Consider distinguishing the draft and existing policies that will no longer be necessary when implemented through the zoning development code (or through another tool) from the policies that will be on-going and implemented exclusively through the comprehensive plan. This will shorten policy framework making it more user-friendly and workable. As proposed, there are too many policies and some should be turned into clear and objective code language once the concept and direction are agreed upon and adopted. This approach would give citizens a better understanding of the policies that are implemented through land development.*

Once again, thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft TSP policy and participate on the TAC.

Tri Met Comments

1. *Which language is the preferred general approach to the urban pedestrian system? (162 A or B)
[Suggest 162 A. The “urban areas” restriction seems unneeded. There may be a few key locations in hamlets that need these connections and have a concentration of the kind of destinations mentioned. If they don’t have that concentration, then they won’t come up]*
2. *Should the County allow interim transportation improvement under limited conditions? (172)
[Urge the County to encourage them because the need is now rather than perhaps decades out; though there should be a strong emphasis on low-cost solutions such as asphalt paths with swales rather than concrete with stormwater treatments that might have to be rebuilt]*
3. *Should design guidelines for major transit stops be in the Comp Plan or the ZDO? (216)
[Probably don’t know all the background. However, the requirement would be better to simply say provide direct access to the sidewalk and to crossings (with perhaps a preference to accessing the bus stop). In some cases, bus stops may move and the connection to the sidewalk is more important than what may be an awkward connection to a specific bus stop location.*