



**Clackamas County TSP
Public Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting #5D
June 25, 2013 / 6– 9 pm
Development Services Building, Room 115
150 Beaver Creek Road
Draft Summary**

Attendees

PAC Members: Tom Civiletti, Charlene DeBruin, Paul Edgar, Thomas Eskridge, Mike Foley, Elizabeth Graser-Lindsey, Ben Horner-Johnson, Chips Janger, Glenn Koehrsen, Al Levit, Thomas Mack, Bob Reeves, Rachel Summer, Michael Wagner, Dick Weber

Staff: Karen Buehrig, Larry Conrad, Martha Fritzie and Shari Gilvech (Clackamas County); Erin Ferguson and Susie Wright (Kittelson & Associates) Kirstin Greene and Alisha Morton (Cogan Owens Cogan)

Public: Simon DeBruin, Linda Eskridge, Ralph Gertkie

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

WELCOME & MEETING PURPOSE

Chips Janger, Chair, called the meeting to order and welcomed participants. Karen Buehrig thanked Chips for attending the BCC study session earlier in the day. She explained they discussed the project recommendations that the PAC has made as well as the outreach activities. The BCC wants the project team to come back in August and talk specifically about projects. They would like more time to become familiar with the proposed recommendations.

Chips said he found it interesting that the BCC members want more time to look at projects. One thing that concerned him was that the Chair mentioned that he understands that most of the comments in the Virtual Open House on the bike / pedestrian bridge across Willamette at Oak Grove to Lake Oswego were from a group (petition) effort. In Chip's opinion these comments should not be discredited. He said he has heard more excitement about that project and a lot of people in Oak Grove and Lake Oswego are excited about it. It's not just one group; it's a number of individuals.

Karen reviewed the meeting purpose and desired outcomes.

Meeting Purpose

- 1) Review and comment on Policy Working Group recommendations on urban transportation system policies.
- 2) Review the TSP policy development process. Gain a better understanding of the refinement process of converting the Policy Working Group's policy statements into the comprehensive plan framework.
- 3) Review the public feedback on the PAC recommended projected lists and understand general themes that will be used for any refinements prior to the August 20th PAC meeting.

Desired Outcomes

- 1) Guidance on recommended urban transportation system policies.
- 2) Understanding of the TSP policy development and refinement process.
- 3) Understanding of the public feedback themes on the PAC recommended project lists.

Kirstin Greene, Facilitator, reviewed the agenda and meeting format.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No members of the public wished to comment.

POLICY WORKING GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS ON URBAN POLICIES

Martha Fritzie gave an overview of Urban Policies. She said that last November the PAC had a chance to review the Rural Policies out of the Policy Working Group (PWG). All of the policies will come back to the PAC at the August meeting. Handouts and presentation slides can be viewed here:

<http://clackamascountytsp.com/websites/1/pages/6>.

Policy Document E: Urban Roads and Travel

With regional standards, we seem to be stepping away from level of service (LOS) to volume to capacity (V/C). I keep asking transportation people to define V/C in layman's terms. It appears to be an excellent way for us to no longer have to apply LOS or defined impedance and gives us fudge room to modify where we can live with congestion. Is that really what we're trying to do?

- Yes, it does allow for more congestion. LOS is about delay – how long are you waiting to get through an intersection. This has been a change statewide. The Oregon Highway Plan has moved all standards on state highways and inside Metro to V/C.
- The change from LOS to V/C isn't necessarily for that purpose. It is measuring a slightly different thing and gives you more sensitivity. You have more scales to measure by and it's a little easier to understand. ODOT has been with VC for a lot longer than the Metro area.

Do we have to cut out LOS completely? I waited through four lights today trying to turn left. With V/C, that won't be a problem.

- We have kept LOS for strictly County roads in the rural county. We are required to use V/C in Metro areas by administrative rules, to implement Oregon Highway Plan. What you are experiencing are intersections that are not considered functioning even with V/C standards.

Where is the term transportation disadvantaged defined?

- It was defined in the Existing Conditions Report. We haven't come back to the definition yet.
- It includes a combination of a number of different factors such as populations of disabled, elderly, low income, English as second language etc.

If there is not enough time to talk about what this, can we star it so that it can stay in the final report?

We need to get it on the record that we do not agree with allowing more congestion. My recommendation – don't allow more and more congestion. Even though we cannot make a recommendation to change the law, I would still like to discuss it at our final meeting.

Urban Policies – Policy Document F: Urban Equity, Health and Sustainability, and Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities

We have a critical problem where TriMet is in a potential financial collapse. If we can't count on TriMet being a viable entity then we shouldn't be putting these policies in place.

Transit is not just TriMet. There are a number of other transit providers. There is one transit provider in Sandy that is increasing in the fall to serve Timberline.

For the disadvantaged group, this is where transit starts weighing heavily because we have to start catering to a group that cannot afford to pay for the service.

On Document F, on page 13 where it references TriMet – perhaps we should erase TriMet and just say transit providers.

- We can remove TriMet where it was left in. We attempted to remove all specific references to service providers.
- It is important to keep in mind that these are policies that we want to affect change, be supportive of or provide connections to. We are not transit providers. There may be different transit providers in the future. So we want to set the stage to support those transit providers.

Excellent.

We need to ensure that we have public transit put into this area, especially as autos decrease and gas increases. If we don't have a transit system, there will be a big issue. It is relevant to me that we consider building an active transit system to plan for the future.

Urban Policies- Document G: Urban Roads and Travel

PAC members did not have comments or questions on this policy document.

Policy Document H: TSP Project Lists and Maps

Martha reviewed the TSP Project List and Maps handout and explained that it incorporates all changes made by the PWG or TAC. Many of these policies were discussed at PWG meetings. There weren't any real urgent items that we felt that we had to bring to you for additional decision making / discussion. She then asked the PAC to review the document and asked for any comments or questions.

TriMet is also in Policy #209. Please remove and change to transit providers.

How can ODOT come in and put projects into our policies in our documents. Considering Policy #149, at this point it is building roads to nowhere. There are a lot higher priorities in my opinion. How does ODOT muscle its way in here?

- Sunrise Project has been a County priority for years. Based on connecting I-205 to Hwy 26. *Even though the Sunrise Corridor has been a priority since the 1970s doesn't mean it should remain a priority. When a new TSP task has begun, we should be reviewing all old priorities and determine if it is still a priority. How can this be assumed without discussion? There are other corridors that need some priority as well.*

- The Sunrise EIS was previously adopted by the County. It's part of Comp Plan. This is showing it continuing in the Comp Plan. It would be a very big reversal, but it is something that it is important to discuss. This isn't ODOT coming in and telling the County to do it. ODOT recognizes that the County has adopted it.

When we did our project prioritization to get to the tiers, how does an ODOT priority interface with our list?

- ODOT list is separate list. ODOT funding is different than County funding.

How does the report reflect what the PAC want versus what the County wants?

- The PWG worked through these documents and this is your citizen recommendations working with TAC and staff to develop.

I have some concern about this weighting that we are now applying in a value structure for the bike / ped structures as a whole. Hwy 99 in front of Oregon City Shopping Center - Dunes Drive is at LOS F or VC 1.01. The interchange with I-205 is the issue. We have traffic backing up way across the Clackamas River Bridge. Now the County wants to spend \$4.5 million to add bike / ped improvements and flowers, but yet we have traffic backing up. There is already a bike lane. We could add another lane of traffic through there instead. Then we put a bus stop in front of McDonalds where we will block your ability to turn right. We throw all eggs in bike / ped basket and cannot see common sense solutions. We have to prioritize our ability to interact with commerce and vehicles. We overly weighted some of this in a manner where it doesn't come out in common sense.

- We are reviewing policies today as opposed to prioritized capital improvements. We are trying to balance all these things – multi-modal travel, economic development etc. Your idea is captured for the record. For this conversation today, it would be most helpful to discuss a specific policy.

On Document F – Policy #161. Might give Paul some comfort if we say “where possible”.

I think that it should stay like it is. When I listened to Paul I didn't know what project he is talking about. I do know that I have biked around in that area and I don't know if there is a problem or not. But there are a lot of pedestrians on Hwy 99 and peds/bikes should feel safe. These policies are all aspirational. They are saying “our desire is...”

We need to make the funders carry part of the load. We are moving limited dollars to projects that don't help the masses. You can't keep giving transportation to people who cannot pay for it. The County doesn't make jobs – tries to encourage people to come here to work. But we have shifted this so far that it's insane to me. Bike paths across the river, but I can't get a truck / car bridge across the river. We have failed in this state for 20 years in building roads to move people and product.

Policy #161 “shall be adequate” shall is an absolute, but how do you define what adequate is? If we put in words that are so absolute then it has to happen. The wording needs to consider this.

- You have a very good point. Part of what Larry is going to talk about next is how we get from this point to the final language. We as staff will look at what does this mean and what does it mean for implementation. Is “shall” the right word or should we look at another word that allows for a little more flexibility.

I have two suggestions for wording – Policy #161 “shall” change to “should.” Policy #150 “allow” should be changed to “require.” We can't get across I-5 right now if you're a bike / ped.

- What Policy #150 means is that developers are required to do certain things with developments. We are looking at doing a Fee In Lieu Of (FILO) instead of the particular development. This will allow the County to pool money to do the development themselves rather than requiring development by the developers of something like a half street or sidewalk to nowhere.

My concern is that we are moving the responsibility from developers to put in sidewalks, roads etc. Would it be put into general fund? City of Portland annexed miles of sidewalks, sewers, roads etc and promised that they would do it, and it still hasn't been completed years later.

- *It would not be a general fund. FILO program works like this – we set up a series of zones and fees collected in each zone are spent in that area. It would be an option for the developer.*

It makes sense to me so that we avoid island etc. It just concerns me that funds won't be spent appropriately – i.e. sidewalks funds spent for other things.

Basically, I understand how it works. Those funds should be directly spent in that area and should not go into a general fund. The definition is too loose right now in Policy #150.

- *I agree entirely.*

The language is imperfect in Policy #161. If you don't have "shall," then it's up to the whim of whoever is in charge of that project. Without "shall" most of those will never get done. I would prefer it to stay "shall."

In some legal documents "shall" forces the thing to happen, but it doesn't here. The Comprehensive Plan is aspirational. There is a lot of flexibility because it is a Comp Plan looking out into the future. It needs to be strong if there is anything to it.

I agree. I am aware of a previous County project in which laws were being written, they changed it away from "shall" and it completely knocked the bottom out of the whole thing. There was no mechanism to enforce, because they "tried".

"Where possible" makes sense. Somewhere along the line we can't be asking for something that is not possible. This mandates idiotic circumstances that are taking place. It's inappropriate to continue heading down the wrong way. "Should" and "where possible" are in the same category.

Kirstin led the PAC in a vote by hand. By nine to six, members agreed to keep "shall" instead of "where possible" or "should."

We put part of the equestrian in the rural transportation area, but it also interfaces with the urban ped/bike facilities. Specifically, where there are long bike/ped corridors that are also used by equestrians. The equestrians would prefer dirt on the side of the corridors rather than gravel. I suggest adding "Where appropriate equestrian facilities could also be allowed in the corridor" to Policy #162A. Footing is number one important for equestrians. I do not agree with dirt instead of gravel as it turns to mud and gets riveted.

This stuff is already happening such as on the Springwater Corridor. Equestrian uses it and there are conflicts. We should be trying to avoid the conflicts.

There are concerns with surface water management, if you have loose soil on the side of a road / path depending on the pitch in a rain event you can end up with dirt on the road and then washed into the storm drain system. Gravel is to keep soil from getting on the road.

I am talking about things that are dedicated paths away from the road, not specifically roads.

With the Springwater issue – it's hard to keep it clear, gravel or not as there are blackberries, weeds etc.

If you have gravel or dirt the horse won't be able to go on the side unless it's kept clean. Mixing horses and other uses is a messy proposition. Maintenance is already a real problem.

Equestrians are already going there, it's whether they are accommodated or not.

A premier trail for horses, bikes/peds is the Banks-Vernonia trail. It's premier site in Oregon. It will grow over for bike / peds as well. On Banks-Vernonia there are wood chips and they clear back the whole right-of-way. This is an example for how it works.

I would like to make the comment that mud can be very dangerous for cars and bicycles as well.

Kirstin led the group in a hand-vote (straw poll) to see if staff should look to add equestrian trails where appropriate to urban policies. Staff could bring this back to the PAC on August 20 to show how equestrian trails will interface with urban policies. The PAC unanimously agreed.

Please change “disabled persons” to “people with disabilities” on Policy #216.

No objection.

Kirstin asked the PAC to send any more suggestions / comments via email on this by the end of this week to the full group.

FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION OVERVIEW

Larry gave an overview on Functional Classification. Handouts and presentation slides can be viewed here: <http://clackamascountytsp.com/websites/1/pages/6>.

What is the principle reason to down class?

- The recommendation usually it came out of the Traffic Department based on how it fits in the network. This is the core set of changes we will be proposing.

Other than the amount of traffic that a road carries, why classify?

- Affects access to the street and the primary purpose of the road.

I have a comment on Ferguson Road top of page 2 on the Proposed Functional Classification Changes document. There should not be any collecting or connecting into this little local road which is not up to standard. We did a road safety audit on it, felt really uncomfortable on it because the road is so narrow. There are accidents on it all time. This local road shouldn't be thought of as a collector without having improvement. It doesn't collect. It is collected from by these other two little local roads.

- We did make the recommendation to change to collector which is a type of road that we would consider as a part of our capital improvement. We do not look at local roads for capital improvements - we are looking at collectors and above. It does provide access from two different arterials and provides from these other roads, so we still felt that it was a road that would benefit from being a collector. There is this other subtle theme for class that has to do with funding.

I asked for traffic calming because people overflow onto this road from Beavercreek. This road is too unsafe. This is a road that is not going to get fixed for 20 years. Having it be in a category that makes it eligible for funding doesn't make sense because the funding won't happen for 20 plus years. Also, I have been told that there is not supposed to be through traffic on local, collectors and connectors.

- My preference would be to get feedback from the whole PAC. We did go back to our staff and they wish to keep as a collector.

A collector can get funding, but local will never get it.

- It is a challenge to find funding in other areas as well. We are thinking about safety. Functional class does play into safety. There are these roads that do provide access like this between Henrici and Beavercreek. How do you provide the best possibility for people traveling between those two?

What would traffic calming be there? Is traffic calming a capital project?

- Traffic calming usually means things like speed bumps, traffic interrupters.
- We have a specific traffic calming department that could be done outside the TSP. It's on their list to start thinking about.

Are there four-way stops at those two intersections on Ferguson?

No.

On Eagle Creek Road at Wild Cat a four-way stop was added and has cut down on speeding and accidents. Would this be considered a traffic calming thing?

This is a valuable idea. The Road Safety Audit focused on it because of the safety issues.

Does changing the classification alter the tier that it falls in?

- It does not.

How would it improve it keeping it as a local road? If you call it a collector then people won't just know that and treat it differently. It's just changing the classification.

Kirstin led the PAC in a straw poll to keep Ferguson classified as local instead of collector as listed. The group agreed to keep it local by a vote of nine to four.

Kirstin asked the group to send any further comments via email by Friday. The full packet will be discussed at the August 20 meeting.

TSP DOCUMENT PREVIEW

Larry gave an overview the handout - Summary of Process for Developing and Incorporating Policies into the Transportation Section of the Comp Plan. This handout and presentation slides can be viewed here: <http://clackamascountytsp.com/websites/1/pages/6>.

Will this affect other chapters in the Comp Plan?

- Yes, Chapter 10 for example. There are a number of things that we have to do to make it consistent.

On the top of page 4, TriMet should be changed to transit providers.

On bottom of page 5, support high capacity transit, should we put in something about voter approval?

- This is a regional requirement.

We have talked about equestrian policies that we do not exist in this chapter 5 outline. Shouldn't it be?

- This is still a work in progress as we fit the policies it may move things around. This is a living document. This document will look different when we bring it to you in August.

INITIAL OVERVIEW OF PUBLIC COMMENT

Susie Wright gave an overview of the VOH and stakeholder/community meetings. The handout and presentation slides can be viewed here: <http://clackamascountytsp.com/websites/1/pages/6>.

At the top of each of the charts you have the total for each geographic area, if I total them up it doesn't add up.

- It is not the complete list, just the summary. The raw data is now on the website for your review.

Does it include if it was the same comment four times?

- We only included unique comments from unique people. This is a quick overview not a full summary because the VOH just closed.

When I look at this summary document I see projects where just two people commented, how does that weigh into the big picture?

- The PMT's work is to try and get some feedback from you on the summarizing that came from the public. We will do a model run in what you guys included in Tier 1 and will talk with TAC about all these three types of input to get to a financially constrained Tier 1. We will take the public comment into consideration but doesn't mean we will do it.

One thing to consider is that when people suggested moving a project, they didn't have the constraint to move another project down. We shouldn't put a whole lot of weight on it.

Plus they might not be taking into the Vision, Goals and Objectives as we have in the last two years.

Do we have to go back and review these changes within each tier and how they affect the other tiers?

- The PMT will make recommendations for the PAC to review. We are trying to have a clear set of recommendations for you to consider on August 20.

The PAC then reviewed the summary results by geographic region.

Clackamas Regional Center / Industrial Area

For project U919, Karen said the County did go and talk with North Clackamas Parks and Rec District Advisory Board and some folks provided comments that there were some multiuse trails they felt should be lower priority but this Scouter's Mountain Loop trail should be moved up. A substantial portion of this trail is within Happy Valley.

Did they say what they wanted to move it up to?

- Yes, the Parks District wanted it to move up to Tier 1.

If Happy Valley is going to have this in their Master Plan and work on it, will the work be degraded if it remains in Tier 3 and nothing happens from the county line? It would be a bummer to have an actively used trail stop at the county line.

- This would most likely be an intergovernmental plan with North Clackamas Parks & Rec probably leading it.

East County

There seems to be some confusion between the Springwater Trail and Cazadero Trail.

- Yes, it is two different projects. The PMT had recommended removing the Springwater Trail extension project because we felt that the Cazadero Trail handled the need.

What happens if you put the bike/ped projects separate from the road projects? And have a Tier 1, 2, 3 for each type of project. And prioritized them separately?

- That is more of a traditional way to do it. For the financially constrained funding, its one pot of money, we are not deciding that we will spend a particular percentage on each type of mode.

At the August meeting can you have the money broken down into bike/ped vs. road projects by Tiers?

- Yes, some will cover both though but we can summarize by project category. We can also show cost.

Greater McLoughlin Area

Susie said where it says "medium" is where the County is giving our priority recommendation for ODOT projects.

I thought Hwy 99 is a high priority for us. I don't know how it got the medium.

- We will check to see if we got the record wrong on that one.

At the BCC meeting today, I heard the Chair say that the Milwaukie – Lake Oswego Bridge comments were just a particular group pushing for this. This is an incorrect statement. I would like to do something to state to the BCC that this is not just one group. They are all very different comments. For them to dismiss this as it just one group is wrong. Milwaukie Council is behind it as well. I don't know how we can communicate that to them. I would like some sort of written communication about this to the Chair of the BCC.

- It may be more affective to sit down and talk with them. We can figure out the best approach. *These people who supported this had no restriction like we did. In the VOH there was no restriction that we have had to look at.*

We already have this as Tier 1, they are just supporting our recommendation.

When we communicate with the BCC we should indicate that it was not just these 56 people who supported it, but also this group.

Northwest

I don't recall the PAC saying project U918 was a medium priority for ODOT, as far as I know this has always been a high priority.

- As far as I know this was not a vote to the PAC, but it was discussed in the GAPS as time allowed. This went to the TAC – they commented on them extensively. This was a PMT recommendation.

I don't think we should have a medium unless the PAC votes on it.

- I am actually recommending that it be taken off our project list. It is not consistent with how we identify ODOT facilities / projects. It's completely within the City of West Linn and this is a road project. It isn't in unincorporated project. It is a West Linn project and they support it.

I'm ok with that.

Southwest County

At the GAPS meeting project U774 was recommended as a high ODOT priority. I seem to recall that it happened at the PAC meeting as well.

- This list is going to TAC for final review and will come back to you. We will take your recommendation to move to higher priority to the TAC.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Randy Gertkie said he has been a School Board Member for 15 years. Regarding project 1090, Passmore Road closure or rerouting is an extremely dangerous situation, but we thought that it was under constant concern with the area and the County. Only two people made comments on it. Our biggest problem on it is trying to get the kids to cross back safely over Passmore Road. We need to close that part of the road and reroute behind the school rather than in the middle. We have large freight going through there and there is not enough visibility. We appreciate that it is Tier 1. We agree with Tier 1.

It won't reduce it because there were only two comments. We agree that it should be Tier 1 and it will remain.

NEXT STEPS

Kirstin went over the next steps which include:

- TAC Meeting # 8 on July 18
- “Brown bag” informational meetings for PAC members in August (most like one for projects and one for policies)
- PAC Meeting # 6 Aug 20 to review / discuss final draft TSP to present to Planning Commission

Chips adjourned the meeting at 9:02 pm.