



Policy Working Group #7
January 24, 2013 / 2:00 – 4:00 pm
Development Services Building, Room 301
150 Beavercreek Road, Oregon City
Draft
Meeting Summary

Attendees

PWG Members: Charlene DeBruin, Tom Civiletti, Paul Edgar, Thomas Eskridge, Mike Foley, Elizabeth Graser-Lindsey, Ben Horner-Johnson, Chips Janger, Glenn Koehrsen, Rachel Summer, Laurie Swanson-Freeman, Michael Wagner

Staff & Consultants: Karen Buehrig and Larry Conrad (Clackamas County); Marc Butorac and Susie Wright (Kittelson & Associates); Alisha Dishaw (Cogan Owens Cogan)

Public: Simon DeBruin, woman with Rachel [have emailed Rachel for her name]

Primary Meeting Purpose: To review and discuss the current policies regarding urban equity, health and sustainability, and pedestrian and bicycle facilities.

Outcomes: Comments from the PAC Policy Working Group on the existing and proposed policies regarding urban equity, health and sustainability, and pedestrian and bicycle facilities.

Note: *PWG member comments and questions are shown in italics followed by staff responses in regular text. Conversation has been summarized by agenda item.*

Welcome / Introductions -- Larry welcomed the group and reviewed the agenda.

Review PAC Input on Policy Documents A-D

Susie reviewed the PAC input to date on policy documents A-D, which included input at the PAC #5A meeting and a follow-up survey for the PWG members. Thirteen people completed the survey, and in general there is strong support for the current modified recommendations.

The survey was done previous to the last Informational Session where we began to determine how we are grading. I am a little leery of these results.

- The scoring criteria are for projects and this survey was for policies.

We always wanted to see an example.

- We will tweak the policy language when we put it into final version for the comp plan.

There is a lot of good feedback on this survey. Are these actually being thought about or used?

- All comments are reviewed as they come in and continue to help shape the TSP.

In Policy #85, can you explain this language about frontage road?

- ODOT does not want roads to provide access leading up to an interchange within a quarter mile of a freeway interchange.

Does that mean we will have miles of frontage streets?

- ODOT wants roads to dead-end within that quarter mile. Roads already there, e.g., Boring interchange, will be grandfathered in. This does not include intersections along roads like 82nd.

So this really is not about frontage roads at all, it's only about access within a quarter mile of interchanges. This policy language needs to be clearer. Why can't the comp plan be written in a way people can understand it? A few words to explain could make it better.

- This only pertains to the Interchange Area Management Plan (IAMP) to the extent that we can do that. Some of the language is required. It is hard to define in a sentence. There are five pages explaining IAMPs in the state law.

I am less concerned about IAMP because I can look that up, but when it says other, I have concern.

- The County is getting ready to do a major legislative amendment to the comp plan. We will have to prove that what we are doing is legal. About 3 – 4 months from now, when we have to write this up, some of these policies will collapse into countywide policies and some will remain urban and rural. In the fall, we will present the complete final draft and have you look at it.

After it goes to the Planning Commission, will we meet to review their results?

- The Planning Commission will submit it directly to the Board of County Commissioners with their recommendations.

It took me nearly three days to respond to the survey since I had to look up things and talk to people. I was confused on a lot of it, but I found the answers by research and calls. Not everybody did that. They just voted.

I think they vote at different levels – some have more background than others so they vote based on that previous knowledge. I appreciate the staff allowing the PAC to comment on these more.

Policy Language – Key Questions on Document F

Larry explained that a lot of the material on Document F was developed as part of the Pedestrian Master Plan and Bicycle Master Plan and folded into the comp plan 7 – 8 years ago. We are trying to update the terminology, such as *pedestrian facility* instead of *walkway*. *Walkway* is defined in the Zoning and Development Code as a path on private property. *Pedestrian facility* encompasses all public pedestrian facilities such as sidewalks, multi-use paths and shoulders in rural areas.

Key Question #1 – What is the preferred general approach to urban pedestrian system [Policies #162A and 162B]

Is there a reason why #162A says urban and it doesn't say that in all of them? Why is it needed if it's spelled out at the beginning?

- They might get merged with rural or countywide policies.

Why "focus" in Policy #162B and not "provide"?

- This may be an ODOT piece. *Provide* is much more active. *Focus* is awareness.

Focus does not compel the County to do anything. Focus means to be aware but not mandated.

The County won't do any of these things unless something new happens. If something new happens wouldn't we want the best?

- Any new projects in the urban area would have pedestrian and bike facilities. We are clarifying existing language. New stuff includes providing connections for peds and bikes between land uses where there are no roads.

What's really new here is going from provide (mandated) to focus (reasonably strong suggestion).

I would vote for focus.

We are talking about urban not rural. These things are not as necessary in the rural area, but in the urban area it's hard to think about weakening the idea of the County providing or making sure pedestrian and bicycle facilities are utilized in new projects.

I like focus because it seems to give a bigger picture.

This is where collecting SDCs and applying them correctly to the area they were generated would allow us to have banked some funds so that we can actually do something. We want to avoid islands that don't connect.

- Document E included the Fee-In-Lieu-Of (FILO) program to address this issue.

Policy #162A is flexible enough because it says pedestrian facilities – it doesn't require sidewalks.

Susie led the group in a straw poll. Six preferred Policy #162A while five preferred Policy #162B.

In Policy #162A we are dealing more within an urban area connecting within the neighborhoods. With

Policy #162B it appears to have an outgoing sense – connecting to major areas outside the area.

If you have provide and you don't have enough money, then you aren't going to do the whole project.

You weaken the whole policy and then we don't do anything.

Yes, but the current policy language is provide.

Can we say focus and provide where possible?

- Some of this language came out of the Bike and Pedestrian Master Plan. We are trying to clean up the language where possible.

Focus and provide where available (or possible) – would tie them together.

- Combining has some potential.

Marc suggested we move to the next question and discuss this at the end or do a survey if necessary.

Key Question #2 – Should the County allow interim transportation improvements under limited conditions? [new Policy #172]

The way this is written does not address the problem with having flexibility with the project.

What is considered interim?

- An example is the project on Jennings where they have been discussing adding pedestrian facilities without building out the street.

Do you open the County to legal issues if people expect it to be up to standard, it's not and there is an accident?

It should say "more safe."

- This is general language. There has been a repeated request to have the ability to build less than at County standards.

What County standards would not be met?

- For an urban road – sidewalk, planter strip, curb, bike facility on both sides and paved road; storm water facilities. For example, we could add a pedestrian facility without adding the planter strip, curb or bike facility.
- This would not open up the County to every developer getting waivers. This is primarily for County projects.
- In the long term if we built the road and if we had the money, the road would be completely rebuilt to county standard.

This is all about financial realities. How do we have some degree of flexibility when we know some things should happen.

I agree. We need to consider the best way to say this in the policy.

How many times is this a consideration due to space?

We could have a new roadway standard for certain streets to not have a sidewalk. It would be better to change the standard.

- We could add “as deemed by the County engineer.” This gives flexibility too but puts it in the engineer’s hands.

In a straw poll, 10 favored the new policy with “as deemed by the County Engineer”; one was opposed.

Key Question #3 – Should design guidelines for major transit stops be in the Comprehensive Plan or the Zoning & Development Ordinance (ZDO)? [New Policy #216]

This has to do with transit stops?

- Yes, design for the development near those stops.

What causes it to be indirect now?

- Often a developer will build a building accessible from the parking lot but right on the street so a pedestrian would have to go around. This policy gives guidance for direct connection.
- Everything inside private property should go in the ZDO; anything in the right of way should be listed here.

In some places urban retail can go right to the property line. Would this mean we are mandating set-backs so we can have greater access?

- This is very much talking about the space.

Transit stops are ½ mile apart sometimes. It’s hard to imagine that you could legislate universally.

- This is only for major transit stops.
- The way it is currently implemented in our zoning code, specific stops have been identified (typically on the corner) and businesses within the 20 feet of the transit stop have to site their facility differently. This language is trying to clarify that you need to have direct access to the businesses within the 20 feet.

The first two bullets are essentially a give it your best shot– how can you argue with that? The rest of the bullets are very specific – there is no wiggle room.

- This is new language, but it’s not that different from what we have in the code. We will likely split it between the ZDO and the comp plan.

Members agreed to language being in the comp plan or the ZDO as appropriate.

Key Question #4 – Should additional policies be adopted to support various aspects of the bikeway system in the urban area? [Policies 191 – 197]

Policy #191:

Bikes are able to get around without the way-finding system. If there are limited funds for bike facilities, it’s better to spend it on safety items than a sign.

- It is helpful for a bicyclist to understand where the low volume (safer) roads are. It is a low cost system to help people be familiar with an area. They might know they have a choice to go on River Road to Portland vs. McLoughlin.

In limited quantities it could be helpful. I was told by County staff that bike projects were not being done because all funding is going into this way-finding system. This policy is a blank check for signage.

- The County is investing in signage for bicycles, but I disagree with the information you got.

Signage is safer for others, not just bikes.

Bicycle communities favor way-finding system – signage to help them find the appropriate and safest way around. This policy doesn’t mandate it, but says establish and maintain.

This helps tourism. New people are coming to the County to bike. This is bringing spending in as well. And it gets bicyclists off the main thoroughfares.

Could we stipulate that signs be visible and not hidden behind foliage and parked cars, etc? I ran a stop sign because it was hidden behind trees.

- This is in the County standard. People are required to maintain their vegetation. It is also an enforcement issue and we don't have the funding to deal with the enforcement.

Members supported Policy #191 language.

Policy #192

Why is the reference to congestion pricing being deleted?

- This has been dropped as a major goal in the County.
- The County participated in a discussion led by the State to look at regions to have a pilot project and the conclusion was they couldn't find an appropriate place.

Members supported deleting Policy #192.

Policy #193

This policy looks at demand management and attempts to get people to reduce the use of single-occupancy vehicles to reduce traffic. Clackamas County doesn't have any Transportation Management Associations (TMAs), but there is discussion of a TMA in the Mt Hood area. Policy #193B gives examples of the types of programs. Our goal is to decide between Policy #193A or 193B.

The examples should be retained whether we decide on Policy #193A or 193B.

Policy #193B says employers while Policy #193A says major employers.

- We changed to major employers because there are Department of Environmental Quality rules that larger employers (more than 100 employees) must comply with specific regulations related to reducing single-occupancy trips to their employment center.

It would be good for County to work with small employers too.

It makes sense to implement with major employers; becomes problematic with smaller employers.

I just don't like mandates. Encourage is enough in Policy #193B.

- What if we took Policy #193B and added "require major employers to implement targets adopted in this Planning Policy 197" from Policy #193A. This would encourage small employers and require major employers.

Members supported Policy #193A with the proposed amendment.

Policy #194

How would TriMet implement demand management?

- TriMet is encouraging employers to provide transit options. We will participate, but will not coordinate.

I don't have a lot of confidence in TriMet all the time.

- Transit is predominantly TriMet in urban.
- Perhaps we could change language to "transit providers."

Members supported the new language with "transit providers."

Policy #195

I wouldn't mind changing provide back to focus.

It seems you're encouraging people to live where they can't get to work. If you're going to provide something for people to get to work, then you are taking away their need to live where they can work. Even if you live close to work you might bike or walk.

- This came out of the work on equity. We are providing bike facilities because there are many employees in these areas that do not have cars.

- There are a suite of things that are important – bike parking, onsite facilities, etc. This includes a variety of different things. There isn't any reference to where people live.

It doesn't say you have to. It just says improve access (including carpooling, etc). The only thing we are changing is the last line.

This is to make a statement about an equity issue. Change to encourage rather than improve.

Provide comes back to a mandate. To encourage would be better.

Provide is how it has been. To improve access doesn't change or mandate.

I'm against weakening it. We are trying to encourage people to get out of their cars. What if we say "to improve access..." there is no mandate there.

Ten members agreed to the new language changing "and improve" to "to improve;" one member did not agree and one member did not vote.

Policy #197

There were no objections to the proposed changes.

Key Question #4 – 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)? [Policy #220]

Karen explained that the process should rely on these analyses unless the PAC has concerns.

What is the general idea?

- The Highway Safety Manual allows you to understand the impact of a certain change on a roadway on traffic accidents.

So crashes will be included with capacity when now we only have capacity?

- The engineering staff thought this would be a good idea, but we might be ahead of ourselves.

It seems citizens have been asking for this for years and maybe we need to put it in.

What about "should be considered" instead of "shall be required"?

Members agreed to the proposed new policy with the proposed amended language.

Other Policy Questions from PWG Members

Policy #178

Could the County provide showers?

- No. That reference is to when the building is being developed there would be showers included. It would be the developer doing it.

Why is it in here and not in the building code?

- This just encourages it and then it is in the building code.

Next Steps: Susie reviewed next steps and upcoming meetings. Members were asked to submit additional comments directly to Alisha. Members will receive a follow-up survey regarding Policy #162.

Meeting adjourned.