

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

Meeting #3

6:30-8:30 p.m., Monday, March 11, 2013
Molalla Library, 201 E 5th Street, Molalla, OR

MEETING SUMMARY

ATTENDANCE

GAPS: Mike Wagner, Warren Jones, Matilda Deas, Tammy Stevens, Lynda Countryman, Fred Countryman, Elizabeth Graser Lindsey, Tom Eskridge, Linda Eskridge, Laurie Freeman Simon

Staff and Consultant: Susie Wright, Kelly Laustsen, Larry Conrad, Sarah Abbott

WELCOME/MEETING PURPOSE

Larry welcomed everyone and asked people to introduce themselves. The TSP projects have been scored and ranked relative to one another. The purpose of this meeting is to review these preliminary rankings and determine what trade-offs should be made between project rankings to better reflect the needs of the community.

PRESENTATION

(The presentation and handouts are available online at www.clackamascountytsp.com.)

Susie explained that the goal is to recommend projects that should be in the top 15% (20-year capital projects) and the second 15% (preferred capital projects) by cost. All other projects will go into a long-term capital project needs category. The initial project scoring process was based on the evaluation criteria for goals 1-6, 70% housing and employment growth analysis, and identified needs (impact on gaps and deficiencies). County projects will also be prioritized based on input from the Project Management Team, Public Advisory Committee, Technical Advisory Committee, the public and other stakeholders.

Larry said the estimate of projected future revenue is conservative, and came from looking at anticipated local, state and federal revenue over the next 20 years, as well as revenue from other sources (development fees, etc.). Chips noted that the numbers are tenuous and fluid.

Susie reviewed the meaning of the data in each column on the draft project list, and then asked everyone to take 15-20 minutes to identify on a large project map which projects they think should be rated higher or lower or about which they have questions, and write their comments on the Project Rating Comment sheets. Once the projects of interest are identified, the group will discuss them as whole and come to consensus on recommendations for any changes.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

(NOTE: Comments/questions from GAPS members and the public are first; responses/comments from staff follow in brackets, italicized.)

- Why isn't a project in Molalla on OR 211 on the list? ***[This stretch of OR 211 is within the City of Molalla and covered by Molalla's TSP.]***
- Major heartburn regarding the Synergy score. PAC worked on 6 goals and now there are additional goals. Why are there additional goals? ***[The PAC requested 70% to be integrated into the process so there are additional points for 70%. Synergy scores are used to link projects that will work better together. DTA scores are for CRC area based on additional analysis in that area only. The Gaps and Deficiencies have been a part of the process the entire time.]***
- Why is the Synergy score blank? ***[The synergy score will be developed by using information from the GAPS, TAC and PAC meetings.]***
- Why isn't a project on Loder Rd on the list? ***[Loder Rd is mostly within Oregon City and covered by Oregon City's TSP. Loder Rd is a Local road and TSPs generally cover Collector and Arterial roadways.]***
- We need to recommend real projects to ODOT and not just safety audits.
- Trails need to be grouped and rated together and placed in Tier 1.
- Why isn't Maintenance funding Road Safety Audit Plans? ***[Engineering funding has been established to fund the planning process whereas Maintenance funding has been established to resolve fixes associated with maintenance: restriping, signage, etc.]***
- Why aren't Road Safety Audits proactive? ***[The traditional approach to safety projects is not proactive. Generally, agencies follow crashes, mitigating after instead of planning to avoid accidents. Road Safety Audits are proactive because they find solutions to problem areas before crashes occur.]***
- We need more modest projects. Perhaps split up the projects?
- Perhaps add path to the side of the road instead of shoulder improvements?
- Shoulder improvements benefit all users.
- PAC wants to maintain existing roads before building onto them.
- A safety/maintenance project just south of the City of Molalla on Molalla Ave needs to be added to address the reoccurring flooding issues.
- OR 213 should be a high priority between Mulino and Molalla, the ditches along the side of the roadway are dangerous.

COMMENTS ON PROJECTS

- 2801 (Hult Rd: OR 211 to Unger Rd): fixing the hole on this section should be a top priority. The unstable sections may or may not be fixable.
- U279 (Arndt Rd: OR 551 to Knights Bridge Rd): Recommendation to move way down; no need to add additional capacity because of recent work on this segment. Option for a new connection to relieve Barlow connection? Remove U279 (Arndt Rd: OR 551 to Knights Bridge Rd) and increase 2806 (Arndt Rd Extension: Knights Bridge to OR 99E) to relieve Barlow.
- 2806 (Arndt Rd Extension: Knights Bridge to OR 99E): increase, project is clearly needed.

- 1066 (Emerald Necklace Trail: To Canby Ferry): Increase Goal 3 score to 2 because this project is a part of Candy's Emerald Necklace planned project. ***Should be in Tier 1.***
- 2082 (OR 170: OR 99E to Macksburg Rd): ***Support project because of all the accidents at this location.***
- U469 (Clackamas River Dr: Oregon City city Limits to Springwater Rd): ***shouldn't be highest priority. Move down because the goal scoring doesn't make sense. There are slide issues here and it's not a good use of money.***
- U190 (Hattan Rd: Fischers Mill Rd to Gronlund Rd): ***Really expensive, move down the list. Zero fiscal responsibility. Not a capacity issues but the road is dangerous.***
- 1068 (Ferguson Rd: Thayer Rd to Ferguson Rd): ***considering changing project from roadway extension to constructing a trail to reduce cost.***
- U211 (Beavercreek Rd: Henrici Rd to Yeoman Rd/Steiner Rd): ***move to Tier 1. Should be rated a 2 on livable and local goal, as provides for connectivity, bicyclists, and safety.***
- 1089 (Graves Rd: Ranch Hills Rd to OR 213): ***should be the highest priority, move to tier 1, increase score for goal 1 and goal 5.***
- U261 (Ridge Rd: Lower Highland Rd to Redland Rd): ***Project is just needed to fix the sinkhole and not for the entire road.***
- U302 (Union Mills Rd: OR 213 to OR 211): ***consider adjusting the description to put a mixed use trail on one side to lower cost. Turn lanes at Union Mills/Ringo Rd, Dalmatian/Union Mills are most important. Move down and change the description. Some members agree with description change, some members do not agree.***
- U475 (Henrici Rd: Beavercreek Rd to Redland Rd): ***Dangerous roadway. Should be widened at least in the downhill section. Move up in priority.***
- 2075 (OR 213: Graves Rd to OR 211): ***Tier 1 project but change the description to just between Mulino and Molalla.***
- 2074 (OR 213: Molalla Ave to S Spangler Rd): ***this has been completed. Lower priority or remove.***
- 1088 (Passmore Rd: East of OR 213)/1089 (Graves Rd: Ranch Hills Rd to OR 213): ***Synergy***

NEXT STEPS

Upcoming meetings and activities:

- TAC Meeting #7 to review and comment on prioritized project list-- March 28
- PMT review and comment on prioritized project lists and identify probable funding sources
- PAC Meeting #5b to review the recommended prioritized project list and divide the projects into countywide categories of the first 15%, second 15% and final 70% of funds - April 23, 6-9 p.m., Development Services Building
- PAC Meeting #5c -- In May, if needed for additional discussion
- Public outreach/virtual open house -- May-June