

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

Meeting #2

9-11 a.m., Tuesday, September 18, 2012  
Development Services Building, Oregon City

**MEETING SUMMARY**

**ATTENDANCE**

**GAPS:** Al Levit, Walt Gamble, Paul Edgar, Dick Weber (unable to attend: Skip Ormsby)

**Staff and Consultant:** Erin Ferguson, Larry Conrad, Ellen Rogalin, Martha Fritzie

**PRESENTATION**

Erin reviewed the meeting purpose and outcomes.

- Purpose
  - Review project evaluation approach
  - Provide input on the draft project evaluation recommendations
  - Discuss alternatives analysis scenarios
- Desired Outcomes
  - Understanding of project evaluation approach
  - Agreement on Initial recommendation for each project under 'Action'
  - Understanding of "Next Steps"

**PROJECT EVALUATION PROCESS**

Erin discussed the sources of the projects shown and reviewed the process used to evaluate them.

- Identified Projects
  - Projects previously identified as needed (*Previously Planned Projects*)
  - Projects suggested by the public (*Public Suggested Projects*)
- Used what was learned in the "Existing Conditions" report to help determine if projects were still needed
- Made an assessment of how each project supported the goals
- Determined if additional projects were needed (*New Identified Projects*)

*Previously planned projects* -- identified in the Clackamas County TSP (Chapter 5), Clackamas County Pedestrian Master Plan, Clackamas County Bicycle Master Plan and the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP); U001-U999.

*Public suggested projects* -- based on input from PAC members and the public; U1000 to U1999

*New identified projects* -- U2000 and greater; address remaining gaps and deficiencies; developed with TSP Vision, Goals and Objectives in mind; include roadway, ped, bicycle, safety and transit projects

Projects were evaluated based on:

- Whether they address a gap (missing facilities or connections in the sidewalk system, the bicycle network and roadway connections, and densely populated areas without transit service)
- Whether they address a deficiency (facilities that do not perform up to defined standards, such as an intersection with too much delay and congestion, a sidewalk or bicycle lane that is too narrow, or a roadway with a poor safety history)
- Their impact on the transportation system
- Whether they support one or more of the TSP Goals (Sustainable, Local Businesses and Jobs, Livable and Local, Safety and Health, Equity, Fiscally Responsible)

Erin explained that, based on the evaluation, each project received one of three recommendations:

1. Advance in the evaluation process;
2. Advance in the evaluation process, but revise, or
3. Consider removing.

### **COMMENTS/QUESTIONS [responses in brackets]**

- Do we consider interrelationships between projects? [Yes, we will run modeling with priority projects to see how they impact other projects.]
- Are we pushing back on land use planning?

### **COMMENTS ON MAPS**

- The scoring of Goal 2 seems strange – it isn't met at all on previously planned projects but is given credit on all public and new projects.
- U167 – This doesn't go all the way to 65<sup>th</sup>; it's just the rural portion. That's a dangerous stretch of road; a choke point. It needs to go on from Stafford to West Linn (U741).
- The roundabout on Borland was a lifesaver for that road.
- We need to consider freight and job creation.
- U741 and U167 – These are labeled on the wrong place on the map.
- The scoring is not very sensitive, for example comparing U173 to U168. It doesn't take into account traffic counts and other factors. [We're still working through the details of how to prioritize all 600 projects.]
- Before meeting #3, let's have the technical scores – traffic counts, etc. – so we know the basis for the ratings. [Our priority is to put each item in one of three buckets – high, medium or low priority – not a rank order.]
- There are other considerations. For example, Pete's Mountain Road is a terrible bike ride because of elevation. Adding bike lanes might not make sense because it wouldn't increase bike ridership.
- If you add bike capacity to roads with freight, you could decrease safety.
- Wider roads are safer, with reduced chances of interactions; they make roadways safer for everyone.
- On page 1, adding shoulders also increases safety.
- Perhaps we could have a legend to define terms so we don't have to repeat what things mean.
- Focus first on bike connectivity needs, except for tourism issues, and if we have an enduring bike route that's not safe, we should fix that, too.
- It's not always smart to stuff bikes and all forms of transportation in very tight corridors. [The County has bike and ped master plans.] We need to enable commuting to work.
- There are no ped improvements to the north.
- If we improve roads in Stafford, will they remain when the area becomes urban? [Yes, if this area becomes urban, those roads will be the transportation backbone for the area.]
- U277 – The road already has bike lanes. [The bike lanes will remain.]
- U276 – This is a critical intersection – it's hard to get out of and very dangerous.

- 1063 – This is shown right on I-5; it should be west of there.
- 1014 – This is a dangerous intersection. It should be a higher score on Goal 3.
- Putting in both a six-foot bike lane and a six-foot shoulder seems a waste of money. [The Policy Working Group is focusing on whether to change roadway standards.]
- For bicycle tourism, we should look at roads where the fog line is at the edge of the pavement.
- U169 – This should be rated higher. It helps local businesses and improves safety for bikes.
- The Johnson Road intersection can't be improved without fixing the road first.
- There should be a safety flag on the map for the Childs Rd/Stafford Rd intersection.
- What's the distinction between a safety project intersection and an intersection that's just on the project list? Are safety focus intersections more likely to be addressed than others?
- How are things weighted? [Everything's in the same playing field right now.]
- I'm concerned about the ratings (example, Goal 2), and project descriptions should focus on more than just bike improvements.
- I agree – if it's bike-centric, there are people who won't appreciate how that helps safety and other factors.
- We also need to look at the significance of some of the roads – whether the long-term vision for the roadway is to be a major artery or a back way.
- I agree. For example, if Stafford from I-205 to Lake Oswego is prioritized, then we should do projects there to get the biggest bang for the buck. Safety should be our number one priority.
- U180 and 1013 – Are these two projects the same? **The group agreed to combine these into one project.** It should also have a safety flag on it.
- There's no easy way to go from West Linn to Wilsonville.
- Consider Borland Town Center as an entity in the same way as Clackamas Town Center for multi-modal, planned urban space. [We can discuss this in planning, but not in the TSP because the Borland Town Center doesn't exist yet. From the TSP we can identify new programs and studies, as well as projects.]
- It would be great to go on a bus trip of the area.
- Need to have a more complete description of what the projects are.
- Bring draft priorities to the PAC to react to, and have a virtual tour of the high priority projects.

#### **NEXT STEPS**

- Virtual Open House (September 9 – October 1)
- GAPS Meetings #2 (September 10-18)
- Policy Working Group Meeting #5 (September 27, 2-4 p.m.)
- PAC #4B (October 16)
- GAPS Meetings #3 (November)
  - Confirm project evaluation results
  - Discuss Alternatives Analysis Scenario Findings
  - Review Draft Preferred Project List
  - Discuss Project Priorities