



**Public Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting #4  
July 17, 2012 / 6 – 9 pm  
Development Services Building, Room 115  
150 Beavercreek Road, Oregon City  
Draft Summary**

**Participants**

**PAC Members:** Tom Civiletti, Commissioner Jamie Damon, Charlene DeBruin, Thomas Eskridge, Mike Foley, Elizabeth Graser-Lindsey, Ben Horner-Johnson, Chips Janger, Al Levit, Thomas Mack, Bob Reeves, Rachel Summer, Laurie Swanson-Freeman, Richard Swift, Michael Wagner, Dick Weber

**Staff & Consultants:** Mike Bezner, Karen Buehrig, Larry Conrad and Ellen Rogalin (Clackamas County); Erin Ferguson and Susie Wright (Kittelson & Associates); Alisha Dishaw and Kirstin Greene (Cogan Owens Cogan)

**Public:** Simon DeBruin

**PAC Members Unable to attend:** Kim Buchholz, Paul Edgar, Thomas Eskridge, Walt Gamble, Alan Hull, Ernie Platt, Leah Robbins

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

**Call to Order** - Vice-Chair Ben Horner-Johnson called the meeting to order.

**Meeting Purpose and Outcomes:**

Karen Buehrig welcomed the PAC members, reviewed the agenda, meeting purpose and desired outcomes:

- **Meeting Purpose:** Summarize changes to existing and future conditions memo from Geographic Area Project (GAPS) #1 meetings. Initiate alternatives development process. Review summer public involvement opportunities.
- **Outcomes:** Confirmation of identified gaps and deficiencies (existing conditions); understanding of the alternatives development process and next steps.

**Schedule Overview**

Karen discussed the schedule overview diagram. In the Desire phase, the Vision, Goals and Objectives were adopted by the Board of County Commissioners. As part of the Discovery phase, a very thorough Existing Conditions report has been drafted with a lot of associated analysis we will discuss today. Next, we will move into the Design & Discussion phases.

Through the evaluation process, members of the PAC and other community members familiar with each particular area are involved in the GAPS process. During the first round of GAPS meetings we discussed programs, policies, existing planned projects and low-build projects. The next step in the GAPS process

is confirming needs and developing priorities. At this stage, we will discuss projects to potentially remove from consideration. For more information, both the schedule overview and evaluation process diagrams can be viewed in the presentation on the project website:  
<http://clackamascountytsp.com/websites/1/pages/6>.

*When are we going to look at specific projects?*

- That will begin at this next round of GAPS meetings. We have also been collecting information from the greater public where they think there are gaps and deficiencies.

*Will we start removing projects during that round?*

- That will happen at PAC #4B.

*If we find a project that we dislike and it is listed in the TSP, we cannot suggest it be removed unless we have an alternative solution to solve the deficiency. We need to be define where that happens and who does it.*

- This is one of the topics we will discuss tonight. We will give you a quick background on the existing conditions then we will start talking about themes that we heard at GAPS round one.

*When we get to the point of removing projects, will we have a full list of projects including past and new?*

- Yes, as well as projects in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

### **Existing and Future Conditions Overview**

Susie Wright then gave an overview of the Existing and Future Conditions report. She explained that ultimately the TSP is trying to address gaps and deficiencies in the transportation system. Gaps are missing pieces of a transportation system. Deficiencies are where you have existing facilities that do not perform to standard.

*We are noticing in rural areas that transit could be needed in a low density area where we might be able to pool people that are within walking distance. Would it be good to include that in the gaps?*

- In rural areas, there are not areas that are supportive of transit by urban standards. This has been documented in the report and we are not recommending that service be reduced. In rural areas transit, does service a much broader area – park and rides and biking to transit work. It is appropriate to suggest that as a gap.

*People need access to park and rides to utilize public transit.*

- That is a fair comment. Also, we will be able to look at the maps and see how they have been updated since the GAPS meetings.

Susie then discussed the handout GAPS Meeting 1 Maps Comments Summary. This document can be viewed in detail on the project website at <http://clackamascountytsp.com/websites/1/pages/6>. Susie explained that the table is sorted by geographic area. She said there were some actions that are listed as “will consider in alternative analysis phase”. These comments were not addressed in this phase, but will not be lost. They will carry forward to the next phase. She said there were also some comments that the project team did not understand. If anyone has clarification on those we can discuss them during the breakout session.

Susie then reviewed a few examples of the gaps and deficiencies maps including the vehicle network for Southwest County, the pedestrian network for Greater McLoughlin Area, the bicycle network for Southwest County, and transit service for Greater McLoughlin.

*Can you explain the red areas in the transit service map?*

- Red indicates a focus area – an area where we anticipate potential density to support transit but no current transit facilities.

### **Key Themes from GAPS #1 Meetings**

Susie explained that three key themes came out of the first round of GAPS meetings:

- Process for changing RTP listed projects
- Population projections
- Candidate road safety audit corridors

### ***Process for changing RTP Projects***

Susie then discussed the RTP List of Projects handout. She explained that the table is a list of projects that are specifically in the RTP today. They are different because they were identified in the regional planning process. Projects shown are mostly under County jurisdiction. The TSP updates will not specifically change the RTP plans. We need to pay attention to specific criteria for when a projects gets added or removed. Once it is adopted in the TSP, then it can go through the RTP process.

*What does that mean?*

- Specifically focusing on the idea of removing a project you need to identify what the need is that the project is filling or servicing and if that need still exists. If it does not, then it can be removed. If it does, then we need to provide alternative solutions.

*Will that be our task as a PAC or will County staff take our recommendation to remove and then find another alternative?*

- We will have identified these more clearly as part of GAPS round two. If a project does not meet gaps and deficiencies, then we will remove. If there are projects that meet gaps and deficiencies minimally we will still recommend removing. If a project meets the Vision, Goals and Objectives, then we will recommend it stay in. During this next round of GAPS, you will have a chance to review our findings in detail.

*If there is a particular project that was designed to meet a deficiency at the time but looking at it now it appears to create another deficiency would we look at this during GAPS round two?*

- I believe you are referring to the Sunnybrook Extension from 82nd to Harmony. It is not on the RTP. It was designed as part of a larger process to meet the needs in the area.
- It got pulled from a larger project as part of extending Harmony Road. That particular project has always been assumed to be a five lane arterial. As part of the federal process it had to be brought into part of that analysis. Through that analysis it was found that a three lane would function as well as a five lane. It was analyzed in great detail. We will be able to talk about this at the next round of GAPS.

*I thought we were planning for unincorporated Clackamas County. Can you explain why one-third of these projects are in incorporated Clackamas County?*

- These are all the projects in the TSP currently. The intent is that the County is not going to plan for incorporated areas and will remove those from the TSP.
- If we take a city project off the TSP, then we will need to confirm that the city will add to their TSP.
- We have been talking about projects that we might remove from the RTP. We should consider that we have Commissioner Lininger advocating on the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) to have a rural Clackamas County seat added to that group to recognize the importance of infrastructure in rural areas. They are currently considering it and this could have good ramifications for us keeping RTP projects.

*How would it coordinate with Area Commission on Transportation (ACT)?*

- Basically, it would state that if the County is not going to get an ACT anytime soon, then we need to have JPACT. We do need an ACT, but this is a way to have a voice now.

### **Population Projections**

Susie then discussed the handout on population projections. She said that we started this TSP process using the most updated 2035 forecast from Metro. All modeling has been done using that forecast. The County is responsible for doing the forecasting outside of Metro area. Historically, the County has taken a hands off approach to forecasting outside of Metro. The RTP rule is that we have to use Metro's model and forecast from the last TSP. If things have changed since then we can make recommendations. A new forecast was just released that was not warmly received. It predicts that growth will stay at the same rate for the next 15 years and then will flat line. Metro forecasts the natural growth rate and also includes net migration.

*Where will the 2000 houses go?*

- Most will go in the cities.
- We would like you to understand what the population forecasts are. Later, we will discuss if this is what we are comfortable with or if we should pick an alternative.
- With the 172nd project, we forecasted based on the model and then we estimated if the population comes in 10-20% lower we confirmed we would still need the same set of improvements.

*Who makes that judgment?*

- We ran the model, reduced by 20% and still required intersections of a certain type. I did not reduce it enough to drop the facility down a level.

Karen said there were a couple key points we should focus on. At GAPS round one there were a lot of conversations about population forecasts and the concern that they were too big. We also heard concern about how old the forecasts were. The County is using what Metro is currently discussing which is the most current information. There is a way through the alternatives analysis to look at what would happen if we have lower than projected / forecasted population. Through this TSP process we will develop three plans – fiscally constrained plan, a preferred plan and vision plan.

*It's my understanding that we will not come up with an alternative technology for forecasting population but we would take Metro's forecast and look at 70%, 60%, or another agreed upon percentage.*

- Yes, we can look at 2035 with Metro's population forecasts and then we can look at different percentages to come up with alternatives.
- Prioritization will also be a way to do the analysis.

*I noticed there are higher growth rates in Clackamas and Clark Counties – how are they distributing the growth within the county?*

- Cities are pulling most of the growth. There is growth in the rural areas given Measure 37 claims, zoning etc. But we are looking at in the hundreds in the rural areas and thousands in the cities.

*What about rural cities?*

- They are projected to grow quite strongly.

### **Safety**

Erin Ferguson advised there were questions and little confusion during round one of the GAPS meeting on safety corridors. She explained that Candidate Road Safety Audit Corridors are a series of roadway

segments and intersection that have experienced higher frequencies of three crash types: roadway departure crashes, crashes involving young drivers, and crashes involving aggressive driving. This is used to identify those roadway segments that contribute the most to fatal and serious injury crashes in the county.

*Did the study include crashes between larger vehicles and pedestrian vehicles?*

- Yes, it is a multi-modal approach not just looking at cars. It looks at the full picture.

Erin stated that within the TSP process, we are identifying Candidate Road Safety Audit Corridors that we want the County to study.

*Are you pulling these out of the GAPS?*

- Yes.

Kirstin said that through the process so far, the project team has been getting feedback from the PAC and taking those comments to produce the updated maps that you see today. We want to know if there are any changes to the maps before we go into the alternatives analysis.

### **Confirm Gaps and Deficiencies Identified through GAPS #1 Meetings**

After having time to review the maps during the break, PAC members walked through each geographic area and summarized their conversations. All comments indicated directly on the maps will be reviewed by the project team prior to GAPS round two. A brief summary of the group conversation follows.

#### ***Greater Clackamas Regional Center / Industrial Area***

*The stop light at 92<sup>nd</sup> and Johnson Creek does not seem to operate too well.*

*If Happy Valley takes over a road to extend their city limits, does that road lose its opportunity for improvements or does it go to the City's TSP?*

It would transfer to the City under an agreement with the City and the City would maintain it.

*What about 142<sup>nd</sup> which extended down through Happy Valley but not all 142<sup>nd</sup> is in Happy Valley?*

- We do not maintain local access roads. If it is collector or above, the City has to ask for the road and then the County has to approve. It doesn't automatically get transferred to the City. For example, all roads in Damascus are still currently County roads.

*There were also questions about the bicycle network and an identified gap on 142<sup>nd</sup>.*

Karen summarized that there were also questions about the bicycle network and specifically an identified gap in the system on 142<sup>nd</sup>. She said they will look at projects to address this during GAPS round two. She said they also discussed road striping and widening during the break.

#### ***Northwest Area***

Erin recapped the comments she heard about the Northwest Area. Some of the comments were looking at vehicle networks and noted issues on the outlying boundary. PAC members indicated that the pedestrian network has some missing information. Stafford Road was also indicated as needing improvements for bicyclists to connect Wilsonville and Lake Oswego. Along Hwy 43 the map shows having continuous bike lanes and the project team needs to double check that they really are there.

Susie indicated that within the cities, the only data shown is ODOT or County data. The GIS data is not complete for cities or incorporated areas.

Vance Road has a wicked dip area where there was a serious / fatal accident with kids trying to jump it. The line of sight is really poor there.  
French Prairie Bridge is also a serious gap.

### **Southwest Area**

*Why are there some breaks in the safety corridor?*

- This is based on the location of crashes. We might end up connecting these. Some were added based on comments at GAPS round one as well.

*I would like to see Holly Lane remain quiet – it's rural residential.*

*There is poor visibility at Highway 211 and Jethro.*

*Map should also show lack of shoulders like the bike / ped map.*

*A lot of roads have inches not the 4 feet or wider needed for bike lane shoulders.*

*Bikeway network – even if there is not a bikeway plan it could be indicated as a gap if they don't have a shoulder. All roads without a shoulder in the bikeway network do not have enough room for a bike to get off the road.*

- With the collector roadways and above there is a certain required shoulder width. When you get to the local roads, then you look at the connector roads and the functional classification where shoulders are required. For local roads, we are not reflecting those as they are not required.

*For existing collector roads if there are deficiencies what happens to them? Do they get improved? Also, it's very dangerous for any car that breaks down on one of these country roads.*

- Adding a shoulder to these roads is not easy. We will discuss these later in the process.

*Can we figure out what projects would be better for the bicyclist and drop the others off?*

- Yes, this will be part of the prioritization process.

*There is a park and ride way down south with nothing in between. There are several places which large parking lots that could be utilized for new park and rides.*

### **Greater McLoughlin**

*I suggested a modification around the Park Avenue Station Plan.*

*Rusk is extremely dangerous for pedestrians.*

*There should be ways for pedestrians to cross Hwy 99 every 600 feet.*

- That will be a potential project.

*I cannot think of a single sidewalk on Oakfield and it is listed as 1 – 25%.*

- Essentially, it is listed as a deficiency.

*Trolley Trail ends in Gladstone with no connectivity.*

*Do these maps take into account future lightrail?*

- No, it considers current and future planned transit.

### **East County**

*On Welches Road, there is a path, culvert and 10 foot easement that is undeveloped. This is an opportunity to close the gap in the future for pedestrians and bicyclists.*

*There are transit support runs from Rhododendron to Sandy and Estacada.*

- The map shows the area not the actual lines.

*I indicated several locations for park and rides.*

*There are issues with Forest Service roads.*

- These wouldn't be included in the TSP project list but could be recommended.

## GAPs Meeting #2 Preview

### **Alternative Analysis Process Overview**

Susie said the alternatives analysis process consists of evaluating individual projects and evaluating broader system alternatives. She explained that the project team is doing an initial evaluation of previously planned projects and this will be discussed during GAPS Meetings #2. We will begin the discussion of a range of broader system alternatives that will be continued at GAPS Meeting #2 as well.

Broader system alternatives include major project alternatives such as adding a new roadway or widening to a major regional roadway; assumption scenarios which could include changing the rate at which population increases; and policy scenarios such as focusing investment in urban areas on pedestrian bicycle and transit improvements by changing performance measures to multimodal analysis.

*We have been told there are approximately 600 projects already in the TSP. We have projects and we have a pot of money. We also have projects that we are coming up with. Can you explain the process for how these will be fleshed out?*

- We are going to talk about these projects, what are included, excluded and what the priorities of those projects are at the next round of GAPS meetings and PAC #4B and 5. By the time we get to PAC #6 we will be set.
- Also, in your packet for GAPS Meetings #2, projects will be broken down by area. You will see our initial assessment on the projects for discussion at the next two GAPS meetings.
- There will also be opportunities for comment on the virtual open house and public events.
- Will we be looking at the initial 600 projects or the recommended additional as well?  
We will do a full evaluation of the 600 projects and a list of recommended projects will be given. The full review will not be completed by GAPS #2.

*Will cost be included?*

- Cost will be included by PAC #5.

*Some of these projects are under other jurisdictions. At what point do we have to discussions with Cities?*

- Nearly every City in the County is currently updating their TSP. County staff is part of all of those processes.
- It is our goal to give maintenance of roads in cities to the cities.

*If a city agrees to take a project off the County TSP, is there coordination for when the city road becomes County again?*

- Yes, we meet monthly and talk about these various issues. The County Technical Advisory Committee (CTAC) reviews this as well.
- If we are identifying new projects to address gaps and deficiencies, we will focus on unincorporated. For incorporated areas we will let the Cities do their own planning.

*A lot of projects will be in the RTP, so we can't just get rid of them if we feel like it. We will have to follow RTP rules.*

*If we approve the plan, and cities do their own planning, but realize they do not have the money, that could be a problem.*

- The County could still partner with cities on their projects. Cities get to define what the needs are, but the County could partner on a case by case basis.

## Population Forecasts

Kirstin acknowledged that the group had indicated the desire to discuss population forecasts in more detail. She said the option for a global alternative is to pick a lower population target and see how that looks. This would be based on a gut feeling.

*This is a complex issue. The head planner at Metro told me that they have been using a 3% growth rate constant for the 2035. Looking out to 2035 right now I was told that the growth rate is actually 1.1%. Is this general for all Metro area?*

- From 2010-2025 they go up at one rate and then it flattens out after that. Washington County and Multnomah County area pulling the most growth between 2025-2035, Clackamas County is the slowest growing County of the four.

Kirstin said she believes the project team needs to know what alternative we will study soon. Is the PAC comfortable with going with the full growth rate or another alternative?

*I think we need to pick a couple alternatives for population forecast.*

- A scenario we could look at would be the mode split, percentage of bike / pedestrian travel and then we could double it.

*Could we cut the vehicular mode travel and look at how that impacts other modes?*

- We cannot go negative that way.

*If it's not too complex, it would be nice to see this with an example of no growth, 50% and 100% of the population forecast.*

- The change of 59,000 households by 2035 is a 40% increase of 1.6% per year. It is higher for the first 15 years and then lower for the last 10 years.

*What was the projection in 2000 for now and how far off are we?*

- We are lower.

*It would be better to have the percentage growth projection than just a number. You still have the added complexity of adding bike / pedestrian facilities. It would be good to know what was predicted in 2000 for now.*

- Metro says they have 5% accuracy five years out. The County is obviously very diverse and most of the population is going to be moving into the cities.

*We may have zero growth. I don't think we should run too many projections. On some projects they will still be worth doing even if there is only 90% of the projected growth.*

*My gut feeling is that the County numbers are too high.*

*Why is change for employment so much higher than population?*

- Because more than one job per household will become available.

*Why are you projecting that rural cities will be growing as well?*

- Due to available land and zoning allows it.

Karen said this is a very complicated topic. It may be worth a brown bag. Also, so you are clear, we will start talking about these ideas for global alternatives at the GAPS meetings. Confirmation with what we move forward with happens at the next PAC meeting 4b.

## Next Steps

Kirstin then gave an overview of the next steps. She said the project team is taking a different approach to the regional meetings this round and going to where people are such as the County Fair and Road and



Safety Fair. The third event will piggyback the Community Planning Organization (CPO) Leaders Meeting on September 11.

*We did have poor attendance at the first round of regional meetings. People at fairs will not have any idea about this stuff. What types of materials will be available?*

- We are considering a video. There will be a postcard that they could take that will direct them to the virtual open house. The virtual open house will include a web-based map to show what you like and what you agree and disagree with. We did this last year and were able to reach a lot of people.

We are looking for other events / fairs to have a booth so please let us know of any you feel would be good for us to attend. Also, if you know of places where we could put up display boards and leave postcards that would be helpful as well. In addition to the upcoming public events, the Policy Working Group Meeting #4 is on August 30<sup>th</sup> and PAC Meeting #4B will be on September 25<sup>th</sup>. [subsequently rescheduled for October 16]

Chair Chips Janger closed the meeting. Adjourned at 8:57 pm.