



**Clackamas County TSP  
Public Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting #5A  
November 27, 2012 / 6–9 pm  
Development Services Building, Room 115  
150 Beaver Creek Road  
Draft Meeting Summary**

**Attendees**

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

**Staff:** Karen Buehrig, Martha Fritzie and Sarah Abbott (Clackamas County); Marc Butorac and Susie Wright (Kittelsohn & Associates); Alisha Dishaw and Kirstin Greene (Cogan Owens Cogan), Walt Roberts

**Public:** No members of the public in attendance

**Unable to attend:** Kim Buchholz, Ernie Platt, Leah Robbins, Walt Gamble

**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**

Chair Chips Janger called the meeting to order. Karen Buehrig welcomed the group, gave a process overview, and reviewed next steps, the meeting purpose and desired outcomes.

***Meeting Purpose:***

1. Review and comment on Policy Working Group (PWG) recommendations to date (county-wide and rural transportation system policies).
2. Discuss and give guidance on prioritization process leading into the GAPS meeting.

***Desired Outcomes:***

1. Guidance on recommended county-wide and rural transportation system policies.
2. Understanding of funding forecast.
3. Guidance on prioritization process.

There were no questions on the proposed agenda. There were no members of the public in attendance, so the public comment period was skipped.

**Policy Working Group (PWG) Recommendations**

Martha Fritzie reviewed the county-wide and rural transportation system policies from the four PWG meetings. A full overview can be viewed here: <http://clackamascountytsp.com/websites/1/pages/6>.

Martha said 128 policies were recommended to be moved forward:

- Freight movement (county-wide) – 49 policies
- Rural Roads and Land Use – 32 policies
- Rural Transportation – 17 policies
- Rural Equity and Sustainability – 30 policies

All the policies are listed in the summary document given to the PAC prior to the last meeting. Martha said some still have a couple alternatives that we will talk about today. These policies will be sent to the PMT after PAC review and approval. The PWG will go through this same process for the urban policies which the full PAC will have a chance to review. Once this is done, the PMT will forward the policies to the Planning and Zoning staff to incorporate into Chapter 5 of the Comp Plan, and be used to revise the TSP maps. These policies will be vetted and redundancies will be removed. Once the policies are incorporated into Chapter 5, they will be brought back to the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and PAC for final review and comment.

*I attended all the PWG meetings and we did not discuss 128 policies.*

- These are the policies the PWG recommended to move forward. Some of them were existing and not changed, some were revisions to existing and some were brand new.

Kirstin asked if there are any other policies the PAC would like to discuss that were not sent in prior to the meeting. Mike W. and Laurie each had one policy to discuss and Al had several.

### **Policy Working Group - Discussion**

*Note: during the straw poll exercises green, red and yellow cards were used. Unless otherwise specified, green indicates agreement, red disagree and yellow unsure.*

**Equestrian Policy #96** – “Support the safe movement of equestrians in rural areas.” Should other equestrian policies be added that were previously dropped?

*My recollection is that all four policies were in and approved.*

- If that’s the group’s understanding or consensus, we can leave them in.

*The only point of contention was the wording regarding horses on roads.*

*I’m not sure if the sentence at the top should be “rural areas” vs. “roads.”*

- This wouldn’t negate the movement in rural areas; it would be help.

*In our area there is some concern with horses on roads. If people are going to have horses on the roads, they need to be trained to be on the road.*

*One state regulation addressed any horse situation on roads as if it was a vehicle. The rider is responsible for being there. Horses are flight animals and that can create a lot of issues when they are on the road. It’s important to say equestrians are responsible, like a vehicle, not a pedestrian.*

- ORS 814 is related to livestock. “Application of vehicle laws to animals on the roadway. Every person riding, or leading an animal on the roadway are responsible like a vehicle, etc.” So your proposal is to add a reference to this ORS.

Yes.

*Can road funds be used for trails?*

- No, they cannot be used outside of the road right-of-way.

*Animals on the roadway should have the same responsibility / liability as vehicle. Should they also have liability insurance?*

- We can't require that.

*Equestrian parallels bicycles. We need to consider the amount of projects and money spent on roadways that is not spent for motor vehicles.*

*When on a roadway, you have a duty to use that roadway in a safe manner.*

Kirstin said she hears the PAC saying to not encourage equestrians on the road, refer to state statute if they are going to be on the road, accept the original policy #96 and the four policies dealing with trails and add another one that references the ORS.

*I don't see anything preventing equestrians from riding up the middle of the road.*

*State law makes the road for all users, whether it's safe or not. Historically, other users were using them and then when cars came along we have to share with them.*

*Is there a way of issuing equestrian permits to people qualified to ride on the road?*

*We need a policy to educate pedestrians, bicyclists, drivers, etc on how to use the road correctly and safely. Information could be on signs or in the stables, schools, etc. The best thing we could do as a policy is to have a training program.*

- That is a great idea.

*It doesn't seem to belong specifically here, just under safety.*

Straw polls on the equestrian policies:

Does the group agree to include the four equestrian policies on trails?

- Green: 13
- Red: 0
- Yellow: 1

Does the group agree to add a policy referencing state statute for equestrian riders on the road?

- Green: 11
- Red: 1
- Yellow: 2

*The number one thing to me is to push away from the road. This should be emphasized first.*

*I looked at state laws several years ago for livestock, pedestrians, motor vehicles and equestrians. If we refer to state law then we should do it consistently throughout, not in just this section.*

- This particular section is something new that we are adding into our TSP and being able to highlight that reference to the state ORS is beneficial to everyone.

*There is a companion to the one you read that includes livestock owners. It tells motor vehicles what their responsibility is. If we add one, we should add them both.*

- The state statute stands regardless of what we add into the TSP.

Commissioner Jamie Damon thanked everyone for the opportunity to participate in this group. She said the group has come a long way since it began a year ago. She is delighted by the conversation here with people making decisions and really listening to each other's points of view.

**BREAK**

## Policy Working Group (discussion continued)

### Policy #117 on Road Maintenance

*We need to maintain before we consider building new things. These roads were not made for walking. We have a great deal invested in the transportation network and we need to maintain what we have.*

- Policy #118 emphasizes maintenance, etc. Would it help to shift these two policies?

*Maintaining infrastructure we have now is fundamental. What is the base of maintenance and what do we have for new things?*

- Different funding pots can be used for different things.
- In the funding memo, maintenance is critical. All Road Fund monies have been earmarked for maintenance.

*We should also consider maintenance when we consider new projects.*

*There should be a policy to maintain current infrastructure before building anything new.*

*Maintenance is important, but we also should build things that are durable.*

- Policy #117 specifically talks about transportation system management strategies and what we should look at first. Policy #118 is different – emphasizing the importance of maintenance. Would it be acceptable to move #118 above?

Yes.

*Let's make sure maintenance projects do not fall out when we talk about scoring..*

- Maintenance is very important, but I would caution against saying we won't build anything new before all roads are maintained.

*There could be projects that are necessary to be built, but there won't be a lot of them. Emphasize maintenance on existing roadways. Why can't we just say "maintain existing roadways"?*

- We can if the group agrees.
- What if we just said on Policy #118 – "Maintain existing roadways..."
- When you get to funding, that's when this prioritization is really important.

*We can maintain to keep roads smooth and pleasant to drive. More importantly we maintain to protect infrastructure investment. Suggest – "Prioritize maintenance to protect infrastructure investment of existing roadways."*

Straw poll:

Does the group agree with the recommended language: "Prioritize maintenance to protect infrastructure investment of existing roadways."?

- Green: 17 (unanimous)
- Red: 0
- Yellow: 0

Karen said this concludes the discussion on policies for now due to time constraints; we can talk about policies at upcoming PAC meetings. Kirstin advised there were other policies we had planned to discuss but did not get to, including Rural Equity Policies #122-127. Staff will email in advance the alternatives for PAC members to review and comment on at the next meeting.

## Project Prioritization Overview

Susie reviewed where we are in the process; the funding forecast and project prioritization. A full overview can be viewed here: <http://clackamascountytsp.com/websites/1/pages/6>.

## Funding Forecast Discussion

*If the Columbia River Crossing takes all the funding in this region, should we look at parallel planning?*

- Federal funding is one of about six funding sources. We can see what kind of impact that would make and get back to you.

*All the funding sources are estimates. We haven't talked about where the estimates come from. Do we take a percentage of these and say what if we get 25% less – what happens? Do we shrink the boxes?*

- The Fiscally Constrained Plan is the most critical project for the next 20 years at this time. The financial projections will continue to be updated over time.

*We are determining these things now, not in five years.*

- Through the prioritization process we can even say high, medium and low within the Fiscally Constrained Plan.

*Will we be prioritizing high, medium and low in those categories?*

- Our first goal is to get to the Fiscally Constrained Plan, Preferred Plan and then Vision Plan. If we can get further we will with the high, medium and low.

*C-4 has been working on funding sources. Should the PAC be made aware of what C4 is working on so there are no conflicts?*

*Is the cost of existing debt service increasing?*

- It is taking up a larger percentage, not increasing.

*I am concerned that these dollar figures are highly inflated. If that money is not there, what do you do?*

- If the money isn't there then you go to the prioritized list and start picking them according to priorities.

*I think about prioritizing differently if we don't think we are going to get the \$444 million.*

- Tonight we are dealing in theory. You will have a couple more meetings to talk about actual projects – this will happen in GAPS #3.

Kirstin said there are three items to focus on tonight: how we score the projects; specific questions related to Goals 3 and 6; and if we are going to weight goals and if so how.

## Project Prioritization Discussion

*In the seven-step process, urgency is a poor use of the term in number six. If you're just talking about capacity, then it ignores all the goals.*

- Urgency could be a number of things, not just capacity.
- The majority of the projects on the list are not impacted by capacity. This also includes local sentiment, relative urgencies – what you and your peers see as urgent.

*I am concerned about how we invest into infrastructure to create economic development. Do we look at the economic returns that we need to get in payroll / jobs / economic activity and all those things that will create ongoing revenue to effectively pay for that infrastructure?*

- A true return on investment (ROI) analysis is complicated. We cannot get to a true ROI on 500 projects. Instead we are asking whether each project provides access to employment areas.

Susie said the project team got a lot of positive feedback from the pre-meeting survey. There are questions about Goals 3 and 6. Goal In general, there was agreement but there were a lot of questions.

*The scoring scale has a plus one and plus two; should we also have a minus two?*

- The negative doesn't get applied frequently. There is not usually a range; it's either degrading or not.

*I am thinking about Sunnybrook Extension. The scale of possible damage is greater than just negative one. The environmental impact would be huge. The economic impact would be so negative to the community and county that it presents another huge impact.*

- There are 500 projects. If a project gets a negative here, then it most likely won't make the cut for that first plan.

*In 20 years we don't know what's going to happen. Since we're starting with the last plan, the next group will start with our plan. We need to be clear about what we do and don't want to include and why. The chart is extremely biased to bike / ped and transit.*

- We attempted to not duplicate the attributes used for scoring.

*If you get a plus one or plus two for a sidewalk or bike path any time, then it will always win.*

- The push to increase walking and biking comes from multiple goals. The project team made a concerted effort not to repeat the same question under different goals so it would not be weighted more than once.

*If you have a negative, why would it even be on the list?*

- We need a paper trail. This is the process to remove projects from the list.
- At GAPS #3 you will have the opportunity to remove projects that you feel are really negative.

*What happens to the list of negative projects that don't make it?*

- That will be part of the final record.

*I'm just not sure how we are going to pay for some of these projects.*

- We did not include debt service in the funding memo.

*My assumption is that some of these large projects are not funded completely with cash in hand.*

- I'm only aware of one time that we funded a project with cash in hand from a loan that we are paying off with SDCs.

### **Goal 3 Discussion**

*On the proposed metrics for Goal 3, can we add schools to the first metrics?*

- Yes, we can do that.

Kirstin asked if the group agreed to add the question: "Does the project help the public stay in their local community to meet their daily needs?" Karen asked how this would be measured. Susie said this seems to be more a land use question and she is not sure how the project team would evaluate or measure this.

*What about the landslide issue?*

- The TAC felt it should be moved to Goal 6 because you can't change an area prone to landslides.

*Landslides belong in Goal 3 and you can impact them. You can have a project to drain water away from the area or you can plant trees or maintain the trees that are already there.*

- A couple folks recommend adding landslides to livable and local.

*Land use and transportation planning are dependent on each other.*

*If the real topic is having continuous connectivity, then anything else is a barrier to that and means you need to have a second way out.*

- Why are flooding and landslides different? This is about new projects, not maintenance. An existing slide is a maintenance issue. But this is for not putting new projects in a landslide zone.

*I am concerned about the flooding metrics. How do you decide that one project is going to get a high priority because it floods?*

- There is a difference between having to go around a little bit and having to go 10 miles around. Then you need to include connectivity in this.
- Sounds like these could be two separate questions - one for new roads and one for connectivity of current roads.

Straw poll: Do you agree to keep Goal 3 metrics as written (with the addition of schools to the first metric)?

- Green: 12
- Yellow: 4
- Red: 1

*I look at this almost like there is a pre-conditional type of land type – ancient landslides. We can't turn around and say one single thing is impacting it – it's all part of a big picture.*

- This is a reductionist exercise. You will have another bite at this during GAPS #3.

*We need to address land use problems at the head of the metrics. Does it help or hurt planned land use?*

- We are trying to address that in the first statement on connections between the land uses.
- We can call that out.

*On question 3, what is a local plan? Please spell this out to include community, city, county or hamlet / village plan.*

*I am concerned about the land use and connectivity issue.*

Due to time constraints, Karen asked the group move on to goal weighting and then cost effectiveness, if time permits.

## **Goal Weighting**

Kirstin said there is one main question to consider tonight: are there goals that are more important than others. In the pre-survey half of those who responded said to keep the goals equal, and the other half said weight them differently. Only eight PAC members answered this question in the pre-survey. Having heard the conversation tonight we want to ask you whether we weight them flat or vary them?

Straw poll:

- Green: (keep them flat) 8
- Red: (weight them differently) 8

*Safety should be the highest priority. I don't like how Goal 4 is written; it defeats the purpose of the safety goal. You could have a road that is totally unsafe but if it isn't shown as a Candidate Safety Audit Corridor then it won't make the cut.*

- There are broad issues that are not categorized as safety. Do you have a metric to recommend?
- What identifies as unsafe condition is number of crashes, etc. Everything that we have identified as unsafe are in these classifications in question #1 on Goal 4.

*Include actual road conditions that are not safe because of narrow, dangerous ditches, line of sight, etc..*

- All those things are included.

*For people voting for goals to be level, how can you compare a potential fatality to a job? If you say level for all goals, then you are saying jobs are equally weighted with safety / fatalities.*

- Different funding sources will focus on different areas.

*Goal 6 Fiscally Responsible, would weight the highest. It is extremely important.*

*It is difficult for people to look at and make these value judgments. All of us are concerned with safety. The process we are dealing with has to deal with the real world. In no situation are we going to prevent all crashes, but we want to minimize as best we can. All goals can affect the lives of many people. Things like Livable and Local connect to how some people need to get to places of employment. Safety and Health – total affect on the community might be greater by increasing livability or providing equity for people who have difficulty getting places. I understand the concern but there are different ways to look at this that value life.*

*Is it worthwhile to look at this in terms of urban / rural and see if we would come up with different thoughts on priority and weighting?*

*When I drive in town the roads are up to standard and I don't feel afraid. But in the rural areas a lot of roads are not up to standard and I could feel afraid.*

*Before we vote, could we have a couple pros and cons? We need to use the combined intelligence of everyone here.*

- This exercise was done with 25 County staff. At the end of the day they decided to keep them flat. You will have the subjective discussion at GAPS #3. It's not easy. There is a reason why we are gridlocked here.

*One suggestion is to rate fiscal responsibility really high.*

- That is part of the goal. It includes a few other things like protecting investments.
- Let's resend the survey with this question and also the rural vs. urban question. We would ask that everybody answers the question.

*I have a hard time trying to use this ODOT Safety Highway Index. Problems in rural county are a lot different than in urban areas. If we wait for 25 accidents we will never see any improvements.*

- We have our own list, not just ODOT's list.

*Every project had to be judged by whether it is safe. Every project should be safe.*

- All projects on the list would be designed in a safe manner. There is only a subset of the projects that address specific safety issues. Fixing an existing safety issue would score higher than linking a sidewalk from point A to point B.
- We could take this vote quickly as a temperature, then vote on weighting in general or by rural and urban.

*We worked long and hard to get the Vision and Goals. We decided a long time ago that they would be weighted equally. I'm confused about splitting it off and having a subset of rules for rural and for urban.*

Kirstin suggested taking another poll on whether to weight the goals evenly or differently:

- Green: (Keep them flat) 11
- Red: (Weight them differently) 5

Kirstin gave each person who voted to weight goals differently the chance to say how they would weight differently:

*Safety is most important.*

*We need to allocate a portion of the funds to rural.*

*Fiscally responsible should be weighted highest.*

*Fiscally responsible and local jobs are most important.*



*Safety and fiscally responsible are most important. We should weight different in rural and urban.*

- Three geographic areas are rural and two are urban. You will get to this in the GAPS.

*If you're not fiscally responsible, then all the rest goes away.*

*Goal 2 metric #1 seems to be talking about urban jobs and ignores rural jobs such as agriculture.*

*Agriculture is a strong job opportunity in the county. Also for Goal 2, we need to add freight corridors.*

- Projects that are on the freight corridor should get a higher rate?

*If they go to employment areas, then yes.*

- If a project on a freight route gets a higher score, we need to be clear that is what the group wants.
- The project team will take this as homework.

*I have heard concern about safety, particularly in rural areas, and fiscal responsibility. If I understand the metric on fiscal responsibility then it would be at odds for rural roads.*

*Will the GAPS have opportunity to move projects up that got a negative score?*

- Yes.

Chips said the PWG unanimously voted to take the Sunnybrook Extension project off the TSP and recommend to take it out of the RTP, and recommended bringing it to the full PAC for a vote. Chips asked the group to vote on recommending removal of the Sunnybrook Extension project.

- Green: 14
- Yellow: 3
- Red: 0

Karen said the project team is analyzing the Sunnybrook Extension project and will have more information later. We are also going to have a detailed conversation about it with the GAPS group.

## **Next Steps**

Susie reviewed next steps including PWG #7 on January 24 and GAPS meetings #3 in February 2013.

Kirstin commended the group for their hard work and staying late. She explained the project team will come to them with lists and buckets to work on at the GAPS meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 9:20 pm.