

## TAC Meeting #5 Notes on Policy Document C

### Policy Paper “C” – Rural Land Use and Transportation

*Question 1 - Do we need a general policy on the integration of rural land use and transportation? If so – which one?*

*Yes - Revised and combine 83 A and B*

#### **1. Policy ID 83 – prefer option A, B, or C?**

- a. Question about definition of **livable** and **sustainable** – This is in TSP goals
- b. Header calls “Integration of Rural Land Use and Transportation,” but only 83A speaks to that.
- c. General Preference -- combine A and B into a single policy
- d. 83C – suggest change “end” to “reduce”
- e. 83C – weak support for this option, due in part to the priority setting provisions

#### **2. Policy ID 84**

- a. How does this relate to the ACT recommendations and other coordination and cooperation policies – is this needed?
- b. Change “solve” to “address”?
- c. Delete “needed” - This may not be necessary.
- d. Delete - “such as the Mt. Hood Corridor and Government Camp areas.” Calling out specific examples a good idea? So many other projects.
- e. May not be needed because this may be addressed in Document B.
- f. Call out airports? – covered in Document A

*Question 2 - Should we modify the rural access standards so that they are based on the speed of the road?*

*No - But a revised version of 85 B should be developed based on a number of factors.*

**3. - Policy ID 85 (access standards)**

- a. 85 A – Language is currently in the Comprehensive Plan and is the same for both the rural and urban areas.
- b. 85 A - Remove AASHTO references, as no standards for access management. Sight distance calculations are separate issue. Instead, rely on county standards in the County decision.
- c. 85 A – Special Transportation Plans – the only one currently adopted is the 172<sup>nd</sup>-190<sup>th</sup> Corridor Management Plan but it may be necessary to adopt some or reference the work done in the Sunrise Project FEIS as part of this process.
- d. 85 B Engineering not in favor of basing access standards on 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed – suggest deleting this language and replacing it with a recommendation that bases rural access management decisions on the following :
  - i. Road Functional Class
  - ii. Traffic Volume
  - iii. Road Speed (Posted or observed?)
  - iv. Adjoining land uses
  - v. Adjacent intersections and driveways.
- e. There were general concerns from engineering about the existing access management standards in Comprehensive Plan and whether or not they should be kept there. The consensus was that that should be (MISSING A WORD)the policies should be kept in the Comprehensive Plan and that the level of detail would be review in a future urban policy document.

**4. Policy 86 – Access Standards in IAMP Areas**

- a. No changes from proposed.

**5. Policy ID 87 – prefer option A or B?**

- a. Prefer 87 B with edits because it includes multimodal operations
- b. Remove “for all modes”?
- c. Remove “when appropriate”?

**6. Policy ID 88**

- a. What does “open to the general public” refer to?
- b. Help for requests for bike lanes/facilities where not appropriate/realistic, i.e. residential
- c. What about areas where land use does not suggest bicycle and pedestrian facilities are appropriate? (for example, recreational routes)

*Question 3 - Do we need a policy concerning agricultural equipment on the road way? If so – which one.*

*Yes – Support 89 B*

**7. Policy ID 89 A or B (Agricultural Equipment Movement)**

- a. Preference for 89 B expressed
- b. Less support for 89 A
- c. Questions concerning – “by improving existing roads to county standards”. This question centers on setting priorities for projects.

*Question 4 - Do we need a policy concerning agricultural equipment on the road way? If so – which one.*

*Yes – Amend 90 A and B, Delete C*

**8. Policy ID 90 (Safety and Road Conditions in General)**

- a. Should Safety Action Plan be called out specifically? (Safety Action Plan is addressed in 93 – 95)
- b. 90 A Delete the words “The County will” and “preventable”
- c. 90 A Change “next 10 years” to “by 2023”
- d. 90 B Add federal agencies
- e. 90 C Do we want to call out safety as being the first priority or more generally should policy be setting priorities for projects? If this is retained, add development
- f. 90 C Recommend deleting this policy suggestion because, Implementing the Traffic Safety Action Plan will cover this issue. Do we want to integrate priorities?

*Question 5 - Do we need specific parking policies for the rural area?*

*Not discussed by TAC*

**9. Policies 91 and 92 (Parking)**

- a. These policies were not discussed due to lack of time.

**10. Policies 93-95 - Traffic Safety Action Plan**

- a. 93 Object of this policy is to identify the Traffic Safety Action Plan as a program that is not part of the Comprehensive Plan, but which will be used by the county to guide traffic safety programs. The status of this document may change depending on how the Regional Transportation Safety Action Plan is adopted by Metro.
- b. 94 Remove this policy because it is too specific for Comprehensive Plan. It identifies the Predictive Method (Highway Safety Manual) as a requirement for land development review.
- c. 95 Recommend using this policy.

*Question 6 - Do we need specific parking policies for the rural area?*

*No Recommendation - this set of policies needs more work.*

*Discussion should focus on 98*

**11. Policies 96-99 Equestrian**

- a. 96 Consider this policy for deletion –
  - i. General concerns that this policy would be adding a new class of transportation facility and commit the county do additional planning efforts for this new category of “transportation facility”.
  - ii. Generally support equestrian trails. As a recreational issue, need to consider including appropriate provision in recreational trails discussions.
  - iii. Concern that Policy 96 implies that the County has an inventory of equestrian trails. The County does not have an inventory and it assumes that most existing equestrian trails are on private land, federal forest land, or state or local parks.
  - iv. This statement moves substantially beyond typical traffic safety issues for equestrian use of the existing road system.
- b. 97 as drafted is a statement not a policy – consider deleting.
  - i. From a traffic safety perspective, this statement indicates that County prefers separate facilities, not on-roadway for equestrian use based on safety issues.
  - ii. Add language about equestrian trails outside of right of way if retained.
- c. 98 is the preferred policy section but needs to be modified to consider the following;
  - i. County generally support s equestrian trails and equestrian use along roads but the policy may imply that the County expects to be doing more with regards to equestrian trails than it may actually be willing to undertake.
  - ii. Instead “consider equestrian when designing multi-use trails”
  - iii. Remove b?
    - 1. Does the County or the Park District own equestrian trails?
    - 2. Should equestrian trails be located in County right-of-way?
  - iv. State Highway call for a design that includes 6 foot bikeway shoulders which may not be supportive of equestrian use.
  - v. Support the creation of off-road equestrian recreation trails in state parks and on federal forest land.