



**Public Advisory Committee (PAC)
Policy Working Group (PWG) Meeting #4
August 30, 2012 / 2:00 – 4:00 pm
Development Services Building, Room 301
150 Beaver Creek Road**

DRAFT SUMMARY

Attendees

PWG Members: Tom Civiletti, Mike Foley, Elizabeth Graser-Lindsey, Chips Janger, Rachel Summer, Laurie Swanson-Freeman, Michael Wagner

County Staff and Consultants: Karen Buehrig, Larry Conrad and Ellen Rogalin (Clackamas County); Susie Wright (Kittelsohn & Associates); Alisha Dishaw (Cogan Owens Cogan), Steve White (Oregon Public Health Institute) and Martha McLennan (Housing; need affiliation)

PWG Members Unable to Attend: Charlene DeBruin, Paul Edgar, Thomas Eskridge, Ben Horner-Johnson, Glenn Koehrsen

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 summarized by agenda item.]

Welcome / Introductions / Agenda Overview

Larry Conrad, Principal Transportation Planner with Clackamas County, welcomed the group and advised that this was the second of three meetings on rural roads and associated policies. He introduced Steve White and Martha McLennan who are here to speak with the group about equity related issues. Larry then went over the agenda and the meeting purpose and outcomes described below.

Primary Meeting Purpose: To review and discuss the current policies regarding rural land use and transportation Clackamas County and staff recommendations for revising those policies and creating new policies. Topics include improvements to serve rural communities and agricultural land, road access standards, agricultural equipment movement, road conditions, parking, the County's Transportation Safety Action Plan, and Comprehensive Plan Chapter 10 transportation issues.

Outcomes: Comments from the PAC Policy Working Group on the existing and proposed Countywide policies related to rural land use and transportation topics.

Equity: How is this implemented through policy language?

Karen Buehrig said that since this project has goals on equity and now that we are talking about policies on how to make equity happen it is important to have a thorough discussion and understanding of equity. Steve and Martha then lead an informal discussion on the topic of equity.

There is confusion on what equity actually means for us. It would be wise to have this conversation with the full PAC team as well.

Steve advised that he has been using the Vision, Goals and Objectives to help develop the policy language from an equity standpoint. He said that traditionally we would think urban vs. rural and economic equity. This project is taking a different perspective – equity as benefits and burdens of growth. It is a broad based approach similar to what Metro is considering in their work.

Steve then discussed transportation disadvantaged populations (TDP). Traditionally look at car-oriented and benefits to car owners. TDP includes (but is not limited to) low income, youth, elderly, isolated people, persons with disabilities. These people need to benefit from the system as well. We also look at people who are adversely affected i.e. those near rail, highway (pollution, noise etc). We now need to look at ways to offer more transportation choice – multi-modal transit options are important. When he reviews the draft policy language he looks to make sure they are addressing these issues.

Martha offered that you have to look at the TSP through many lenses. Equity is one and environmental is another. Every policy is going to affect three-four other things. You have to be careful to evaluate each policy against all criteria. You cannot just look at them through equity, but ask does this equity have a differential impact on people? If so, can we mitigate? That should just be one question you ask. Another idea to consider is whether or not there are institutional equities in the system?

Simple explanation would be equity in terms of the TSP would be to work for people who don't have cars, right?

- That's one example. Another is in local improvement districts – affluent communities are more likely to get road improvements because more likely to vote for an increase in taxes.
- If you look at the map that shows TDP by geographic area you will see variations in transportation options and value – sidewalks, transit, etc. These are available in the existing conditions report.

Can elections solve equity?

- In any political system you have richer and poorer. Some community members feel a person's place in life is their fault others feel it's a fluke of their birth etc. Where you can get to affects what type of job you can have etc.

We cannot weigh equity very well because we do not know all the subsidies given.

Martha discussed her handout on Affordable Housing Background Information which is available on the project website <http://clackamascountytsp.com/websites/1/pages/6> for review. She advised that there is a significant population in Clackamas County that is lower income that we should be concerned about when we think about these transportation policies. Need to consider who it is in the community that has different income and how to help improve their access to transportation.

Where are these TDP in line currently in terms of transportation?

- Persons with disabilities get a disabled pass for Tri-Met. Tri-Met lines are getting cut /reduced. Tri-Met system is not just a system for low income. More people of low income ride the bus with no low income discount.
- Need to invest in expanding transportation options – everyone benefits but this is a great strategy to address TDP. Not one policy is specifically for addressing this.

There is a movement of young people who choose not to drive cars, is this considered under equity since it's a choice?

- Social equity should be considered. Do folks across different income levels have access to options – schools, housing, jobs, parks, food, sidewalks, transit, etc? Does the transportation system facilitate people to get to where they need to go to be healthy or are there barriers?

So you are asking us to consider this going forward?

- It's one of the many lenses that we need to look through. Transportation Opportunity maps are also a good tool to use.

We need to consider that transportation is different in the urban vs. rural areas.

- Yes, the strategy for urban and rural or small and large communities would be different.
- Clackamas County Health & Human Services will have a good piece of work coming out soon look at rural vs. urban. We will share that with you when it is available.

Is looking at equity through the income lense sufficient or do we need to look at it separately?

- We need to look at outcomes and historic trends of different race groups. Outcomes – once you standardize for incomes there are still disparate opportunities for all ethnic and race groups.
- If I had to choose one variable that would be a good choice, but we don't have to choose.
- Our system works well for the people it works for. We need to look at improving it for the people it doesn't.

Karen advised that the PMT will consider this conversation for the full PAC as it is very important for all to consider when reviewing not just policies but projects as well. She also said the TDP maps will be available at the meetings going forward.

Policy Language – Key Questions

Larry then led the group on the discussion of policy language specific to the questions on the agenda. He advised that the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) reviewed the same document the previous day. He advised he would review their conversation for each question as the PWG went through them. Notes from the TAC meeting can be found on the project website:

<http://clackamascountytsp.com/websites/1/pages/6> as well as PWG comments that have been incorporated in Document C: Rural Land Use and Transportation in blue text.

1. Do we need a general policy on the integration of rural land use and transportation? If so, which one? [Responses are included in italics.]

ID #s 83A, 83B and 83C

“A” does not talk about methods. Supports idea, but it's too vague.

Evident that 83A, 83B and 83C language needs to be integrated.

Under which of these policies does pedestrian traffic fit? Creating system for pedestrians should e down the line. People will not really be walking an hour to the grocery store.

Pedestrians are not the primary focus of 83A, 83B or 83C. There are some issues but this isn't the focus.

With 83C – sees good with less commuting, but needs to be stated in a way that doesn't cause negative consequences.

83C appears to take away options. Should encourage but not require.

Rural farms are where they work.

Suggest adding "to end reliance on long commutes."

Rural areas need to be connected to where services are located. Easily accessible could be a longer trip.

- OK to keep prioritize? TAC asked us to remove that language.

Suggest hybrid: "Support and promote an integrated approach to land use and transportation planning and implementation to help create livable and sustainable rural communities and areas and end reliance on long commutes." Participants agreed.

ID #84

Suggest removing "such as the Mt. Hood Corridor and Government Camp areas."

- TAC had the same request. We will make that change.

Partnerships need to be adjusted to benefit the County.

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

ID #85A and 85B

Should it be 85A and 85B or one of the other?

- Issue is whether comp plan set a specific enough standard.

Isn't 85B more of a policy than 85A?

- TAC recommended not adopting.

If other standards are being drawn up, let's wait and review the new language.

- We will draft up and provide to you.

ID #87A and 87B

Are there any IAMPs now?

- Only a few proposed.

Can you explain access language?

- Talking about private access on highways i.e. driveways.

Are we thinking far enough in advance for this?

- Where these interchanges actually exist – there are few in rural Clackamas County. Not a big deal but need to have in place for the future.
- IAMPs are not many places we are or will look at, only thing that could change it would be higher speed rail.

Does this language leave enough leeway in place for that?

- Yes, this advocates to design for all modes and minimize impacts to our communities.

3. Do we need a policy concerning agricultural equipment on the road way? If so, which one?

ID #89A and 89B

Concerned with language in 89A.

- TAC suggested we remove and liked 89B better.

Can see why staff would like 89B better but 89A addresses the issue better.

Likes language to improve to County standards.

What if standards conflict?

Curbs are not on County standards.

- Perhaps we should look at standards to see if there is anything that would conflict with agriculture movement.

89B would provide paved shoulder in some areas so tractor could potentially pull over.

I have heard a lot of concern from ranchers that have paved on side (arterials) then you have people (bikes) using it and makes it less safe.

Having bikes in the lane of traffic is way less safe. If you don't have a paved shoulder then they are in the lane of traffic.

- Through this conversation perhaps it is more a conflict between cyclists and ag equipment.

Real difficulty is when ODOT adds a curb. The farm equipment cannot go over the curb and it is too wide. When things are tough for the farmers they have to pull up on the curb which screws up tires, but is safer for others. I have heard big concern if bikes are able to go down the path, then farm equipment can't go on the path.

Bikes are not there consistently.

Tight turns and coming upon a bicycle or bike coming around the blind turn, farm machine has hard time getting out of the way.

- What about having key agriculture corridors where you could not do things that would encourage more recreational bike travel.

It is not always a conflict. It may sometimes be the neighbors to the farmers or their kids traveling via bike. Having paved shoulders will just give more room.

- One thing that comes to mind is an educational piece – could be educating cyclists about the appropriate way to handle farm equipment. Not necessarily bringing to County standards but educating.

This is a new time, bikes are going everywhere. They will be a part of our lives.

Farmers have deadlines, if they have pullovers or gravel shoulders then cyclists ride on the road. Farmers want some place they can go to create safety but not having to worry about someone else being there.

There will always be conflicts between different users. Cars do not want bikes in the road. There could also be other farm equipment in those spaces too.

- Propose having 89A and then a second policy similar to: “Develop a study to address conflicts between ag equipment and cyclists by education, signage, pullouts, etc.”
- We will review and make suggestion on this language. If you have suggestions please send to us for review.

6. Which policies should be used to address equestrian issues in the County?

Due to time constraints the group agreed to move ahead to question #6. PWG members will provide any comments on the 3 – 5 via email by September 6, 2012. Karen asked the group to consider what are the aspects of equestrian use that we want to address?

Larry went over the TAC recommendations in detail including deleting 96 and 97. The TAC preferred 98 but with some modified language.

96, 97 and 98 are all about trails. There are very few existing now and little funding to create separate trails. Does not see the issue with 96. Why not protect – this seems harmless.

- Good point. We can keep.

Whenever you say “where feasible” means that you aren't going to do it.

97 talks about aspiration and is not a policy.

It is positive to say and it's desirable to have them.

Thinks it nice to have it in the plan.

Need another policy to address the current issues. Currently equestrian can use all roads except highways. The question isn't if they are allowed on the road it more how can we live together. Suggest "Work to safely accommodate the equestrian use of the road system."

Agreed. There may be a need in the future for significant equestrian use of the transportation system for non-recreational uses. Need to address animals on the roads.

People are using roads on roads for transportation – it's not just recreation. Suggest policy: "Make existing county rights-of-ways available." We should let people use these roads and easements that are currently available to be more safe and not have conflicts.

Oregon Equestrian Trails (OET) would support 96, 97, 98 and 99 from a recreational standpoint (except "where feasible"). Also supports the two new proposed policies.

The idea is to find a way to help people avoid the road (easement) when possible. Bring safety and connections.

I would discourage anything that would point towards encouraging people to ride on the road. My first thought is to keep them off the roads – I would rather have trail heads. As a long time horse trainer, rider, etc. I know that people want to stay off the roads.

- Please send us your comments and suggestions on these policies and suggest additional policies.
- This group needs to work through this more. This conversation can potentially carry over to the next meeting.

Next Steps

- Comments on Document C by September 6.
- Round 2 of GAPS Meetings starting September 10.
- Public Open House September 11 before the CPO Leaders Meeting.
- PAC Meeting #4B is on October 16.

Meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.