

## Greater McLoughlin Area Geographic Projects Working Group (GAPS)

### Meeting #2

6:30-8:30 p.m., Monday, September 17, 2012

Development Services Building, Oregon City

## MEETING SUMMARY

### ATTENDANCE

GAPS: Chips Janger, Jerry Foy, Kim Buchholz, Tom Civiletti, Mike Foley, Ben Horner-Johnson, Pat Russell, Leah Robbins

Staff and Consultants: Karen Buehrig, Ellen Rogalin, Shari Gilevich, Erin Ferguson, Marc Butoric

Visitors: Thelma Haggemiller

### PRESENTATION

Karen welcomed everyone and reviewed the agenda. Marc reviewed the meeting purpose.

- 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"

Marc advised comments are due by Sept. 24 or on the virtual open house, which is open through Oct. 1.

### COMMENTS/QUESTIONS [responses in brackets]

- How do corridors function? We need to talk about what we're trying to achieve. None of the projects tell us what they really are. I don't see any room for discussion of policy related to design. Some of our through streets are too wide already without adding 12-foot bike lanes. [In the descriptions, "up to standards" refers to current standards. Policy questions are being addressed by the Policy Working Group. How a road is classified is a policy issue.]
- We're looking at functions, not specific designs.
- Are all projects on the map supposed to be on the matrix? [Pretty much, but some overlap into other geographic areas.]
- Need to think about the character of corridors – what is the need for that corridor? Is a project appropriate for the corridor? [The TSP isn't altering corridors unless specifically pushed to do so. Road classification affects how the corridor is designed.]
- Another consideration is the unintended consequences of design.
- There's a good possibility the Sunnybrook Extension will be deleted and Harmony won't go to five lanes – we need to look at the impact of that on nearby areas and on Unit 2 of the Sunrise. Also need to keep in mind city transportation system plans. [City TSPs will drive solutions in streets in the cities and will be in the cities' TSPs, but the County will be involved.]

## PROJECT EVALUATION PROCESS

Marc 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)

Marc 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 ON MAPS

Projects shown in other geographic areas that are not on the CRC list:

- U338
- U156

Projects on the CRC list that are in other geographic areas:

- 1081
- 1082
- 1083

Projects missing on map:

- 1038
- 1039
- 1086
- U707

Project not on the chart: 1085

Projects that may be an error:

- 1040
- 1084

Why are you considering removing the first two projects on the list? [There is no deficiency. Based on previous findings, they probably wouldn't complete well with other projects.] We need to do more thinking about the movement of goods, not just people. If we take out these projects, they can't even be considered.

Thinking out 20 years, we need to not just consider the cost of fuel but the shortage of fuel.

The experts are telling us to consider water transportation long-range, as well as light and heavy rail. [Consideration of water transportation makes sense for deep water ports.]

Water transportation is good for people and light freight. Freight may be questionable, but people make sense. Some river property is very difficult to reach.

Water transportation is positive for tourism, and good for disaster preparedness.

We need more ferries from one side of the river to the other more than we need water taxis.

There are huge pedestrian gaps along River Road.

We need to improve bikes and pedestrians and all modes.

Look at additional safe crossings across McLoughlin Boulevard – Vineyard, Boardman, north of Oak Grove. We should have a policy to have more east-west crossings on McLoughlin with traffic signals.

We need to get to specifics for the McLoughlin crossings. [It could be the scope of a study.] If we can recommend a pedestrian crossing at a specific location, why can't we do the same with signals?

I suggest you sort projects by major streets.

There's a deficiency in east-west transit.

- 2022 – Do we really need bike lanes the whole length of River Road or do we just need them in certain areas? [What's shown is the only segment that doesn't have bike lanes.]
- 1035 references U806, which isn't on the list.
- 1071 on River Road – we need shuttle services to a larger area.
- For 1038, can't we just do something with the intersection? If you look at the whole road, it's very narrow. Perhaps provide ped and bike connections only?
- 1036 – Are we suggesting closing a piece of Oatfield? [This is a recommendation from a member of the public to close the road to through traffic.] **The group agreed to take this project off the list.**
- 1041 – Service has been cut there.
- U141 – This seems like a project that would support safety and health.
- U-139 – I agree it should be removed from the list.
- U142 – We need sight distance review or a left turn pocket; geometry.
- 1022 and 2113 – Are these two projects doing the same thing?

- U148 and 2112 – Do these projects overlap?
- U004 – I’m not sure that full traffic signals are needed; consider a roundabout or other options.
- U152 – A turn lane without a signal might be more helpful. A signal may not be warranted at all.
- 1004 – This is more than a signage issue. We need a rapid flashing beacon.
- 2086 – Add additional traffic signals as part of the audit? Look at traffic signals at Vineyard and 99E.
- 1084 – Does this connect to Roethe? It looks wrong on the map.

#### **NEXT STEPS/FUTURE MEETINGS**

- 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