



Public Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting #5B

April 23, 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, Elizabeth Graser-Lindsey, Chips Janger, Glenn Koehrsen, Al Levit, Thomas Mack, Bob Reeves, Rachel Summer, Laurie Swanson-Freeman, Michael Wagner, Dick Weber

Staff: Sarah Abbott, Mike Bezner, Karen Buehrig, Shari Gilevich and Ellen Rogalin (Clackamas County); Erin Ferguson, Kelly Laustsen and Susie Wright (Kittelson & Associates); Kirstin Greene and Alisha Morton (Cogan Owens Cogan)

Public: Simon DeBruin, Christine Kosinski, Wendy Nelson, Pat Russell, Mike Hammons, Thelma Hagenmiller

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 the meeting purpose and desired outcomes.

Meeting Purpose

- 1) Provide an overview of the remaining project prioritization process
- 2) Review and discuss the project priorities coming out of the GAPS and TAC meetings
- 3) Discuss and provide guidance on projects with agreement and for removal
- 4) Begin discussion on projects with different recommendations from the GAPS and TAC

Desired Outcomes

- 1) PAC guidance on projects with agreement and for removal
- 2) Begin discussion on projects with remaining questions
- 3) Recommend projects into Tiers or Removal
 - Tier 1 – 20-year Capital Projects
 - Tier 2 – Preferred Capital Projects
 - Tier 3 – Long-term Capital Project Needs

PROJECT PRIORITIZATION OVERVIEW

Susie Wright reviewed the project prioritization process, GAPS and TAC processes, and next steps. A full overview can be viewed here: <http://clackamascountytsp.com/websites/1/pages/6>.

PROJECTS PREVIOUSLY AGREED UPON BY THE GAPS AND TAC

Kirstin Greene explained there are more than 250 projects with ranking agreed upon by both GAPS and TAC. Of those, there are approximately 30 that PAC members or the public suggest we discuss further. She asked PAC members to identify any other projects to add to the discussion list. The following projects were identified for discussion:

- U926
- Realignment of Judd Road across Highway 211 (close to, but not, 2004)
- U210
- U475a
- U241b

Public Comment

Pat Russell: The Clackamas Community Planning Organization (CPO) hasn't had the opportunity to study the project proposals in our area. Areas of concern include:

- Harmony Corridor into Milwaukie, including the Sunnybrook Extension and regional trails to Milwaukie Expressway, and the bridge over the railroad proposed at five lanes. Maybe that corridor should be left to Milwaukie.
- Webster Avenue is a major north/south corridor that most people in neighborhood want to stay two lanes.
- Designating Jennings Road as a through street is an issue due to the topography of the area.
- Webster Road is where we want to see the effort as it serves two schools and a shopping center.

Christine Kosinski: Resident of Holly Lane. Recommend that Project #U750, Holly Lane, currently in Tier 3, be moved to Tier 1 due to increasing safety issues that are increasing at an alarming rate. The addition of shoulders will provide much more safety. The road is narrow, most homes sit close to the road and many driveways are short. Holly lane is heavily used by the school district. The state department has labeled street as unsafe and development has occurred without the necessary infrastructure. Holly Lane is used as a bike path for those who do not use Beaver creek. People drive fast. We don't know if Oregon City is going to widen Holly Lane as it is a known landslide area – widening could make this worse.

Wendy Nelson: Resident on Holly Lane and concerned about safety. Lots of fast moving traffic, driveways and a middle school. Support the proposal to close ditches and add shoulders, and move the project from Tier 3 to Tier 1. Holly Lane is an active landslide area. Increased traffic on the road and not knowing what it will do to the land underneath could reactive the landslides and impact homes. Oregon City TSP has included Holly Lane. There seems to be disconnect between this process and the City. Please coordinate with the City.

Can we propose to lower the speed limit to 30 mph?

- No, the County does not control the speed limits on our roads – the State does.

Karen handed out a written comment from the City of Milwaukie for the record on Project # U103, expressing the city's hope that the City and County can work together on this.

PAC Vote on those projects with agreement

Motion by Tom, seconded by Thomas, to accept the projects on the agreement list with the exception of those identified for further discussion. Motion passed, with two abstentions. (NOTE: PAC member Michael Wagner is also a member of the Clackamas County Planning Commission, which will be voting on the TSP plan later in the process; therefore, he abstained from all votes.)

PAC discussion on projects identified for discussion

Project #1020 - Judd Road (currently on ODOT list)

This project is on the ODOT list; the group could recommend moving it to the County list.

I support that. I think it's probably the most important in our area other than the ODOT projects that will happen. It should be in Tier 1.

ODOT will need to partner with the project anyway, so why remove it from the ODOT list?

- The project would need approval from ODOT. The ODOT list is a recommendation list from the County to ODOT on what the County priorities are for ODOT facilities.

Project # U001 – Sunnybrook Extension West (currently in Tier 3)

Chips reviewed his perspective on the history of the project and how it appears to keep being a County priority even when the community is opposed to it. He noted that the sustainability score of the project was changed by the project team since the last PAC meeting and he would like that score returned to the one previously approved by the PAC.

Motion by Charlene DeBruin, seconded by Rachel Summer, to recommend the original score of zero in the sustainability section. Motion passed with two abstentions.

Motion by Thomas, seconded by Dick, to put the project on the removal list. Motion passed with two abstentions.

Project U102 (currently in Tier 3)

The project is in Tier 3. The question is whether the PAC would like to place it on the removal list.

It's about having bike/ped ways on the side of the road. I don't understand why we would remove it? There are plenty there now.

It is \$5 million to do that stretch.

- We will balance the budget for Tier 1 and 2; but we don't accomplish a lot by removing a project from Tier 3 because that is not a funded tier anyway.

Motion by Tom, seconded by Elizabeth, to keep the project in Tier 3. Motion approved, with one dissension and one abstention.

Project U103 (currently in Tier 1)

It should be on the list. The way it is graded is appropriate, the railroad overpass is the worst thing on the corridor and this would solve part of that.

If we get more rail traffic it will exacerbate that project.

Could change the number of lanes from five to three?

- This is an area where there is high need and it is identified as a problem. It is part of what the City of Milwaukie would like discuss with County staff to come up with solutions.

If we build an overpass, it could come back that we should have a road that connects Sunnybrook to this overpass; there will be significant pressure to put Sunnybrook back on here or do something there.

I would like to lower to Tier 2. Milwaukie has expressed that they want to be involved in this. Let them head this up. If they recommend we do it then it is something we could recommend at that time.

- During the public outreach time this summer we could talk with the City.

It is good to involve the City. We shouldn't give up on working with the railroad. It should stay in Tier 1 as it is not just a local problem. There are very few opportunities / limited places to have rail. As a region, we need this corridor to work really well.

This needs to be in Tier 1, but could leave some flexibility in the project description. I suggest we add them to the project description that we will look for additional solutions with other involved parties including the City of Milwaukie and the railroad.

Motion by Charlene, seconded by Dick, to keep the project in Tier 1 with the additional language suggested above. Motion passed, with two dissensions and one abstention.

Project U241B:

No longer an issue.

Project U104 - Harmony Road widening (currently in Tier 3)

There is a suggestion to add to list of projects recommended for removal.

I recommend leaving it in Tier 3.

The community has voted this down and the City of Milwaukie objected to this. Recommend it to be taken off.

Motion by Chips, second by Thomas, to move the project to the removal list. Motion passed, with three dissensions and two abstentions.

Project U108 (currently in Tier 1)

The suggestion is to change from a project to a study or removing it.

Isn't there a narrow pathway there now?

- This would be a multiuse trail, not just narrow pathway. It comes from the regional pathways plan for connecting the communities.

Motion by Chips, seconded by Elizabeth, to keep the project in Tier 1. Motion passed, with one abstention.

Project U156 (currently in Tier 3)

The suggestion is to move to list of recommended projects for removal.

What are the ramifications of leaving this \$52 million project in Tier 3?

- It is a deficiency this is the solution. It has right-of-way preservation options if in Tier 3.

I don't want to see something where we have this overlay of this potential project that stops future development. Maybe the best thing is taking it off at this time.

- This project would widen a two-lane road to five lanes, and would be driven by development. *Once we formulate this plan, we don't add things back.*

Motion by Tom, seconded by Glenn, to leave in Tier 3. Motion passed, with one abstention.

Project U160 (currently in Tier 3)

Suggestion is to move to Tier 1.

Motion by Bob, seconded by Paul, to keep in Tier 3. Motion passed with two dissensions and one abstention.

Project U926 (currently in Tier 3)

Suggestion is to move to Tier 1.

The trail will connect Wilsonville, Sherwood and Tualatin.

What's the price?

- \$8.6 million

They have spent a lot of time working on it. I hope the TSP supports this. It has support from the local people.

Motion by Al, seconded by Chips, to move the project from Tier 3 to Tier 1. Motion passed with one abstention.

Because of time constraints, PAC members will be asked to vote on suggested changes to project ranking through a survey to be available in the next few days, before the April 30 meeting.

PAC members indicate recommended tiers or removal for projects with disagreement between GAPS and TAC (Table C)

Susie reviewed the sticker exercise focusing on projects with disagreement between the GAPS and TAC. For every yellow and green sticker (Tier 1 or Tier 2), we need you to add a red (Tier 3). Because of available funding, 25% of projects (by cost) will end up in Tier 1, 25% will end up in Tier 2 and 50% will be put in Tier 3.

Comments on Southwest Area

On projects 1088 and 1089, the TAC says that there has already been a large investment in that area – what does that have to do with anything we have discussed in this process? I would like these to stay as Tier 1 – not move to Tier 2 as TAC recommends.

Project U302D is not described the way it was meant to be. It is meant to add a shoulder on the south side only, and should be kept in Tier 1. TAC recommends moving to Tier 3, but the project description needs clarification. GAPS agreed to add shoulder just on the south side and the project description shows shoulders on both sides.

- The TAC got message that it would be only on one side.

Project U249b for the Springwater Corridor is a \$40 million project. We agreed that the Damascus section be done, but not this full piece as the money could be better spent elsewhere. TAC recommended Tier 3. GAPS would support a Tier 3 – this is agreement and it's listed as a Tier 1 for GAPS. For Project # 2808, I can live with the TAC recommendation of Tier 2 rather than Tier 1.

Comments on Northwest Area

Ben had a question about U934 and the traffic count.

- That was for specifically on sufficiency rating.

The traffic count is wrong.

- When bridges reach a certain sufficiency score, we will apply for federal funding.

Sounds like it should stay at Tier 3 so that you can get federal funding when the bridge needs repair.

Comments on McLoughlin Area

Project 1037 would be a transformative project. I recommend we move it to Tier 1 in agreement with the TAC recommendation.

I agree.

Presently, project #2044 is Tier 3 and the TAC recommends it go to Tier 1. That's where the school is and would provide pedestrian ways for school children. Because of the school I am comfortable with that. I am ok with it going from Tier 3 to Tier 1 as well.

Comments on East Area

Project 2007 is interesting because I don't know how you do paved shoulders when there are sidewalks in some areas. I would have to defer on that one.

- Paved shoulders are more appropriate there than sidewalks.

TAC recommends Tier 1 – I can agree with that.

Project 2008 – a good portion is pretty well developed. Agree with TAC recommendations.

Project 2005 – adding paved shoulders on Hwy 224 to Firwood Road is not feasible. I support TAC recommendation to move to Tier 3.

Comments on Clackamas Regional Center/Industrial Area

Project U781 – I thought this was a state parkway?

- South of Boring it is a state parkway.
- GAPS recommended Tier 3 and TAC recommended Tier 2.

I thought it was a state trail. Would we use county funds on this?

- Not necessarily; we could apply for grant funding.

I would like to see it go to Tier 1.

Project U782 – GAPS recommends Tier 1 and TAC recommends Tier 3. There are right-of-way issues. I agree with moving to Tier 3.

PAC members then completed the sticker exercise. This information will be used to lead the discussion at the next meeting on April 30th.

With the exercise taking the rest of the time available, the meeting was adjourned at 9 pm.