



**Public Advisory Committee (PAC)
Policy Working Group (PWG) Meeting #3
July 12, 2012 / 2:00 – 4:00 pm
Development Services Building, Room 301
150 Beaver Creek Road**

DRAFT SUMMARY

Attendees

PAC Members: Charlene DeBruin, Tom Civiletti, Mike Foley, Elizabeth Graser-Lindsey, Rachel Summer, Laurie Swanson-Freeman

County Staff and Consultants: Larry Conrad, Shari Gilevich, Rick Nyes and Ellen Rogalin (Clackamas County); Marc Butorac, Erin Ferguson and KAI Intern (Kittelson & Associates); Alisha Dishaw (Cogan Owens Cogan), Joe Dills (OTAK)

Unable to Attend: Paul Edgar, Thomas Eskridge, Ben Horner-Johnson, Chips Janger, Michael Wagner

Members of the Public: No members of the public were present.

[Discussion note: PWG member comments and questions are shown in *italics* followed by staff responses in regular text. Conversation has been organized by agenda item.]

Welcome / Introductions / Agenda Overview

Larry Conrad, Principal Transportation Planner with Clackamas County, welcomed the group and advised that this was the first of three meetings on rural roads, policies, etc. He noted that Rick Nyes, County Traffic Engineer, is here to speak with us today. Larry then went over the agenda and the meeting purpose and outcomes:

Primary Meeting Purpose: To review and discuss the current policies regarding rural roads in the Clackamas County Comprehensive Plan and staff recommendations for revising those policies and creating new policies.

Outcomes: Comments from the PAC Policy Working Group on the existing and proposed County-wide policies related to rural roads.

Functional Classification – What it is and how it is used

Rick discussed functional classification of roads for Clackamas County. He explained what it is and how it is used:

- Group roadways into arterials, collectors, locals
- Relationship between mobility and access

- ▣ Some roadways demand higher mobility (generally higher speed, higher volume)
 - ▣ Some demand higher access (generally lower speed, lower volume)
- Brings the plan together. Land use, trip type, continuity, expectations, etc.
- Most VMT travelled on arterials (volume and length), while more miles of road local
- Defines roadway cross section, access requirements, maintenance priorities, ability for traffic calming, sight distance
- Capital project priorities
- Development review frontage and offsite improvements

Rick then discussed *Key Elements of Functional Classification*

:

- Locals should connect to Collectors
- Collectors should connect to Arterials
- County classifications:
 - ▣ Rural Major Arterial / Urban Major Arterial
 - ▣ Rural Minor Arterial / Urban Minor Arterial
 - ▣ Rural Connector / Urban Connector
 - ▣ Rural Local / Urban Local

For a full look at his discussion, view the PowerPoint Presentation on the project website <http://clackamascountytsp.com/websites/1/pages/6>.

When you have a road go from local to collector (like Howlett Road) does it change the right-of-way (ROW)? It was re-classed as a collector yet it has no shoulders.

- It would maintain the current ROW. If we were to build a project on that road, we would look at it based on new classification. Any new development dedications would be based on new standard.

If no new development, then it will continue to stay a two-lane road with no room for people?

- Generally, there would not be money to expand what's already there without development.

What affect does the number of accidents have to do with the designation?

- It does not play into the functionally classification of the roadway.

Please elaborate a little more about this question. If someone is concerned about an area that is causing accidents, what do you look at if you don't look at functional classification?

- We would look at what is causing the crashes and would look to improve the roadway to eliminate the crashes or minimize them like creating a safety corridor.

Can you tell what safety measures taken have done for improving risk involved? I.e. if you put a light in for safety, do you have data to show if there was a decrease in accidents?

- We will focus on safety during the next meeting.

Sometimes the volume will lead to the classification; does the number of lanes play into that?

- Part of the TSP is right-sizing the existing and planning for the 2035 capacity / volume.

Does the volume to capacity ration take number of lanes into account?

- In the cross sections that we showed you in the functional classification map, the analysis that we did was based on the number of lanes out there now. It could be classified as a collector. The ultimate standard for collector is three lanes and we need to identify if there is a deficiency.

What does the effect of adding center turning lanes have on the speed of the road and trip length?

- In isolation, if you have a two-lane road and a three-lane road, the three-lane road would generally have higher speeds because turning vehicles would be out of the lane of moving traffic and it increases capacity.

Would it make a road more dangerous if it sped up?

- It depends on the situation. I-84 east has really high speeds, low volume and less accidents. I-5 in town has lower speed but higher volume and higher speeds.

Policy Language – Key Questions

1. What should be the County’s general policy approach to the provision of Rural Roads within the framework of the TPR requirements?

Is every word from the comp plan in here?

- Every policy relating to rural roads is in here. You will see the rest of the parts as we go along. Today we will get through the first of three meetings on rural roads.
- Rural roads outside of the zone, not for resource are allowed but are generally speaking smaller roads, rural arterials – generally no wider than three except for the state highways. Next two meetings will be safety, traffic plan access, equestrian, bike / ped issues – those things are coming down the road.

Is bike / ped specifically in rural?

- Through this group we will make a determination if there needs to be separate policies for rural and for urban or if you can have a policy for both. I imagine there will be a mixture of both. We will go through the questions from the agenda today and would like your comments and questions. Then we will give you a week to get us more comments back. We will then take this document and red-line it based on your comments for your review.

In terms of farm land, is there consideration of trains not going through the middle of somebody’s land.

- Navigation is first, railroad is second and everybody else is third. We would need a fairly major source of people or product. There have been a series of discussions of continuing to have Amtrak on Union Pacific or moving onto the old existing utility line which goes in Milwaukee behind Island Station across into Lake Oswego. Currently there are 1 – 2 trains per day but could be bumped up to 6-8 per day.

So the chances of new rail would be down the road and would need a major change?

- Yes. Higher speed rail, not high speed rail.

Is it possible for us to recommend to look at items we would think would be beneficial?

- Yes.

2. Does the County Functional Classification system address all of the rural road requirements?

Existing policies #63, 64, 77

New policies #65A, 65B, 66

On 65A, the second sentence states “County will support ODOT.” I have found that support means to endorse whatever they say.

How about the “County will work with” or “County will coordinate with”?

Marc asked the group if they updated “support” to “coordinate with” or “work with” in 65A, which would the group prefer 65A or 65B? The group preferred 65B four to one.

Can we add something about catastrophic issues? We will follow all of this, but if something catastrophic occurs, we will go to an emergency situation.

- 66 kind of gets to that. In emergency situations you go from the top down, go from arterial to collectors to locals.
- The State has an emergency plan.
- The County has an emergency plan that we have made in coordination with state and feds. If an emergency situation happens, transportation people are immediately brought in.

Would the County effort be more to coordinate with the State to maintain roads to help keep people moving?

- State has gone through entire road system and has prioritized based on getting roads up to standard in the event of an emergency.

Emergencies you are talking about assume certain types of emergency. What about other types like if a war goes on and we can't get gasoline. If we have a lack of oil for some foreign policy reason, we might have to focus on local roads because people won't be able to drive across the region.

- What we are writing here are policies for how the system functions routinely. If emergencies come up we respond as needed and depending on the emergency that is happening. Does not make sense to use your time here. There are ways already to set aside policies in the event of the emergency.

How do you get back to normal after the emergency? Emergency situation happened, did the things we needed to do, will we need to change our plan after?

- I believe 66 addresses this.
- That will be part of the emergency process. Follow up after. What worked, what didn't and what needed to change.

It seems like it's the land use system that is causing the road way systems to fail.

If you put a development on the side of a land side area with no other outlet and then you have a problem with transportation.

- We will incorporate that comment and include under "other land use topics" section.

3. Do the policies adequately address the land use / transportation issues in the rural portion of the County?

Building Rural Roads (#51A, 51B and 52)

What is the reference to rest areas on rural roads?

- Existing right of way expands out with public ownership to take in these types of facilities. We have them in some places.

My feeling is that these new ideas by their introduction could cause other ideas to be displaced, i.e. capital improvement projects in rural areas should be highlighting high volume, high speed and high accident areas.

- We have to get an exception to do outside of ROW area, this is looking at the pieces in the ROW.
- This is a regulator piece – add this in. This is not our own special language, it is state wide.

Needs to be clear that it doesn't bump other things. If ROW isn't sufficient to correct problems, then it needs to be stated.

Could add "other things don't conflict with Goal 3 and Goal 4" to the last bullets.

- Bullets are rephrasing what's in the TPR language.

Does it have to say to bring it up to County standards?

Generally does like to get to County standards because they are good. But there are some instances that are improvement but don't need County standard so then they are not made.

Even collector roads can have different standards depending on local collectors, arterial collectors etc.

- We were trying to build in items that you are allowed to do based on TPR standards. You "can" do these things without doing a goal exemption. Trying to clarify what you can do.

What we are wondering is where does it say what you can't do rather than what you can do. Weight restrictions – how do those get decided?

- Start with asking the County weight master as they are the ones making a decision.

51A mentions ORS and 51B doesn't. Do the staff and consultant feel that it matters?

- It is two different ways to approach it. We could add ORS to 51B.

Can you just add the reference to ORS but not the language as the language is likely to change.

Agree. If the State pulls back then these policies will be held back. I would rather reference the law and not list things that aren't our priorities.

Would it give us more flexibility?

- It is the same meaning just gives us clarity. Could stick with the existing policies and add reference to ORSs.

Doesn't have a working knowledge of all these terms, would have to spend a long time to explain them all.

- The terms are in the law / regulations. It doesn't matter if we understand them completely.

Group agreed to 51B but adding reference to ORS.

Improvements to Serve Development (ID #54, 55, 56, 57)

Can you take out the term alternative modes in 54? Don't think we need to separate them out anymore. Need to make sure the replacement language is obvious that it includes bikes / peds.

Alternative modes could include park and ride as well. Some of these new rural developments are huge. Would rather see something like "all users."

TriMet, there is the famous five hours to get to Portland and the discussion being that TriMet's plan is Portland centered right now vs. priority places. Wonder if we need to be careful / or need to keep this in mind. It has a lot to do with who gets money. Does that get in the way of this if we get too specific?

- We looked at what sort of policies we would need for rural development whether it's industrial or residential. Residential is not at the top of the list. Zoning keeps residential in low densities. Probably won't have a lot of residential developments. But if somebody decides to put a new mill in then what are the supporting pieces, policies etc that we need to approach that particular land use with.

Special transportation plans are referenced. Is that just chapter 10?

- No it's new term that we worked up for 172nd. Chapter 10 stuff could go in there.

Isn't there reference on ZDO to boulevards, main streets and it's really loose? Doesn't define where it goes. Thought ZDO talks about different street section but doesn't say you have to do it.

- It's in Chapter 10 under alternative street standards.
- In August we will have to talk about situations with multiple street sections.

On 56, what about the rationale for promoting single access points? Will this promote out of centric transportation and make it more difficult for those walking / biking?

Seems too specific for the TSP, they have this already in the ZDO.

- Trying to keep internal transportation focused on the inside.

- Rural allowed uses such as for a farm with a barn and how they circulate off. This policy is trying to have one conflict point instead of two. One entry point for the barn traffic vs. two entry / exit points. Don't want to semi's entering / exiting from multiple points.

Rural to Urban Connectivity (ID #68, 69)

Rural addresses many things to different people. Could be outdoors, could be forestry, agriculture. A lot of money comes out of rural area and that's important to me. If the money stops coming out of the rural areas then they will go away. It's great to be out there and have a nice time. I like #69.

A lot of people moving hay around. This is talking about going from urban to rural and back and forth. What about the internal movement. Too much high speed movement and the farm workers are moving their vehicles around and holding up traffic. It would be nice to include use of rural roads for local farm movement.

- Look at 67 – that's what we are going for there.

I sometimes wonder if our rural uses generate enough income to repair the road – i.e. hauling rock out of the rural areas and tearing up the road.

- We have agreements with these guys (at least new ones) that they have to contribute to the maintenance of the roadway that they are impacting.

There are a lot of dump trucks that the business is located in the rural area because it is cheaper to park there and they are destroying the roads as they drive back to the urban area. Provisions on not having through traffic on rural roads, but don't know if they're substantial enough.

- Please send examples to Alisha.

Other Land Use Topics

Functional Class & Roadway Standards (ID #77)

Improvements to Serve Development (ID #78, 81, 82)

Parking (ID #79, 80)

Could you please talk about #80?

- It is one of those policies that we have a general policy for and not an urban and rural one. We aren't sure that it fits.
- The question is really do you want on-street parking on a rural street? 79 without 80 is saying that all parking in rural areas should be off the street. Do you want cars parked on the shoulder in new situations?

I am comfortable with that.

Through trips are not local at all and are wrecking the road, 82 addresses this and is what I was looking for during the previous conversation.

This became an issue after the Bakers Ferry Road. We had a landslide 120 ton rig that went through a very unstable area – tried to go through. There were quite a number of large vehicles going through while it was in this sinking phase and making it much worse. Put a 15 ton limit on it, discouraged some but not all. Need separate standards for roads that are in unstable areas that cannot be brought up to a higher standard. This would be a good place to put a permanent weight limit on it.

Is putting up a sign going to stop someone?

- Is there wording on 82 that we are missing?

Apparently we are just missing the action. Policy is here but we need to action.

- We are adding rural here so it will be different and more policy enforcement.
- Right now says "discourage rural through trips on rural local..." should we take off the first rural?

- Yes, it's over-editing.

On 77, the purpose here to conserve capital improvement funds, might there be a case where the party asking for the zone change would be willing to fund the necessary improvements of the road?

- If you have a significant effect to the road, then the County can change the conditions for approval to include that change / improvement, i.e. would change the classification.

4. Should the County pursue the formation of an Area Transportation Commission (ACT) to address state transportation system issues outside of the Metro boundary?

Other Rural Road Topics (ID #76)

Change ACT to ATC.

Marc explained that ATCs are throughout the state. The ATC in this area looks at both rural and urban, the purpose of 76 is to have a specific ATC for rural. Marc asked if there was any opposition to this, there was none.

5. Is it appropriate to pursue a Transportation Demand Management strategy in the rural portions of the County?

Building Rural Roads (new, existing, rebuilding) ID #53

See that you are including schools. Why?

- This is one of the times where it is better to have a separate urban and rural policy.

Could you please spell out TDM?

- Yes.

More serious problems finding these things you listed for those living in rural. Some of them might not be appropriate, i.e. flexible work schedules. Rural people need all the help that you can get.

- Quite frankly we weren't even sure that we include. Do we do it or not?

Sometimes rural people are in a bedroom community and will need these things to help them.

I like the new proposed text.

6. What is the appropriate approach to Scenic Roads and Agri-Tourism in the rural areas?

Scenic Roads (ID #58, 59, 60)

Rural Tourism (ID #61, 62)

I don't mind having good scenic roads, but felt there should be a lot of sections talking about good roads that I use and there are a lot talking about scenic roads. Have we not seen the others yet or is in disproportionate?

- Scenic roads have a designation in a way that you can deal with them and sometimes there is a different pot of money for dealing with them. Scenic roads area generally more left scenic in nature. Looking at esthetics not the actual function.

Elizabeth – feel like there is a missing policy – prioritization of our existing rural roads.

- When we get to the funding piece, we will address.
- All policies here that are not specific to scenic roads are talking about rural roads.

The things that I think are important are not reflected.

- These policies give the general guidelines here. We are at the high level – we won't be talking about guard rails. This is in the GAPS process.

Arterials that have high volume and high speed need to have high priority rural county wide.

- This will come out in the GAPS process – we will come together and discuss as a full PAC. That is project based.

There is a proposal by the City of Sandy to extend the scenic byway from Sandy to Boring on Hwy 26, some local landowners are not happy about this.

During the very first meeting we ever had as a full group, the charge was to make the roads better for everyone in the county. We have to think in that direction. Transportation – scenic roads – tourism is one of the largest money makers in our state. We have to do what's best for everyone.

Next Steps

Marc advised that any further comments on Document B need to be submitted to Alisha by July 19th. We will meet again on August 30th to discuss Document C – Rural Land Use and Transportation.

Meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.