



**Public Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting #4B**  
**October 16, 2012 / 6-9 pm**  
**Development Services Building, Room 115**  
**150 Beavercreek Road, Oregon City**  
**Draft Summary**

**Participants**

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

**Staff and Consultants:** Karen Buehrig, Larry Conrad and Ellen Rogalin (Clackamas County); Marc Butorac, Kelly Laustsen and Susie Wright (Kittelson & Associates); Alisha Dishaw and Kirstin Greene (Cogan Owens Cogan)

**Public:** Simon DeBruin

**PAC Members Unable to attend:** Kim Buchholz, Jamie Damon, Walt Gamble, Alan Hull, Ernie Platt, Leah Robbins, Laurie Swanson-Freeman

*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** – Chair Chips Janger called the meeting to order.

**Welcome & Meeting Purpose**

Karen Buehrig, County Project Manager, welcomed the group and thanked PAC members for their participation in the working groups. She explained that the Geographic Area Project Groups (GAPS) have been looking at projects in each of the geographic areas and have recommended projects to remove for PAC review tonight. The project results of this evening’s meeting will advance into the next phase of the process as the *Draft Master Projects List*.

*In the materials, is the recommendation from the GAPS or from the consultants and the County? The GAPS groups recommended the projects to remove in the five geographic areas. What remains are the projects to move forward in the process.*

*Adjoining jurisdictions are taking actions on highways that affect other communities and there appears to be some disconnect. I was asked about a Highway 267 overpass in Gresham closing Stone Road and Haley Road, which are outside the jurisdiction. I had no idea that we had agreed to or discussed this with Gresham and Multnomah County. As County staff, we were also uninformed. It was our understanding that Gresham and Multnomah County were not looking at projects outside of their jurisdiction.*

**Process Overview and Next Steps**

Karen discussed the Project Evaluation Approach Diagram (which can be viewed in the PowerPoint Presentation online at <http://clackamascountytsp.com/websites/1/pages/6>). At the previous GAPS meetings, each group worked to identify projects to advance to the next phase of the process and

projects that should be removed. At our next PAC meeting (5A) we will talk about priorities to give direction to the GAPS to prioritize projects by geographic area.

Kirstin Greene, Facilitator, asked those who participated in the GAPS groups to raise their hands. She affirmed the hard work that had been done at that level, and encouraged the PAC to defer to their peers who went through that process, and to the GAPS groups for their knowledge of the geographic areas. Tonight's meeting will focus on what comes off the list; at the next meeting we will focus on what remains. Kirstin reviewed the meeting purpose and desired outcomes.

### **Countywide Overview of Input**

Marc Butorac, Consultant Project Manager, explained that when the project team met with the GAPS and the public, they asked if each project address a gap or a deficiency. If it did neither, it was a high target for elimination. The project team looked at those projects to see if they met the TSP Goals. The list of projects recommended for removal is based on this analysis. Each GAPS group reviewed projects recommended to be removed and agreed or disagreed with the recommendation. This evaluation was used to see if the project had merit to continue in the process.

Approximately 500 projects remain on the list:

- 90 in East County
- 170 in Southwest County
- 65 in Greater McLoughlin Area
- 130 Clackamas Regional Center / Industrial Area (CRCIA)
- 40 in Northwest County

Thirty percent of the projects affect road capacity, 50% are multi-modal and 30% address road standards. (Marc noted that a lot of projects fit in more than one category, which is why this adds up to more than 100%.)

Input that was received from GAPS, Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), public open house, virtual workshop and email resulted in three major themes: feasibility (physical or financial constraints); modifications (extend project, combine projects) and priority (high or low).

Tonight the PAC is being asked to come to agreement on projects to remove. Marc noted that just because a project made it through the first test does not mean it will make it through the full process. The 48 projects recommended for removal either:

- Do not address a gap or deficiency;
- Duplicate another project and/or
- Have been incorporated into another project.

Marc asked the group to consider the following two questions:

1. Are there any projects recommended for removal that we should keep?
2. Are there any projects not recommended for removal that should be removed?

*Some projects on the "Projects Recommended for Removal" map but not on the list are U548, U549, U594 in the East County area and U678, U675, 2027 in the CRC/IA. We will review those during the break and get back to you.*

Marc asked PAC members to take 20 minutes to review the maps.

*There are some projects related to state highways; I thought we were not addressing state projects. We received ODOT feedback on projects that led to recommending projects for removal. We are considering ODOT roads, but do not have authority to make decisions about them.*

In response to an earlier question, Susie Wright explained that U548, U549, U594 in the East County should be on the table, but were left off in error. The project team will add them. The other three projects in CRC/IA (U678 and U675) were projects on 172<sup>nd</sup> and are recommended for removal because there is a new set of projects that reflects the outcome of the 172<sup>nd</sup> / 190<sup>th</sup> corridor plan. Project 2027 does not belong on the map for removal; it is a bike lane that is on the keep list.

Marc asked the group to consider the following questions as they discuss each geographic area:

- Are you comfortable with the projects recommended for removal in your geographic area?
- Are there any projects that you want to keep on the list?
- Are there any projects on the keep list that you feel should be removed?

#### **East County - Northern Portion**

- *Anything along Highway 211 would be an improvement. It's a safety corridor; shoulders are non-existent. U534 and U535 on Highway 211 are not proposed for removal.*
- *What are the two dots on Highway 211? They are right turn lanes where volumes do not appear to justify the improvements.*
- *Most of the community wants overhead lighting features. Not right turn lanes. Suggested projects came from various sources. Those were previously planned projects.*
- *What is going on with Highway 26 where it first comes into Fred Meyer complex in Sandy? The road is all messed up there. We will get back to you.*

#### **Southwest County**

- *Keep 1025. When logging trucks make left turn they really back up traffic.*
- *I am concerned where I see railroad right of ways (ROW) being infringed upon. They are on the national and local rail and trail program. If a rail line needs to come back, that ROW is there for it. There is a clause in most agreements to revert back to the original use which is rail.*
- *Redland Road widening project (U198) is not removed, but it is my understanding that it was already widened. We will check if it has been widened or still needs to be.*
- *U477 is right next to Oregon City Golf Club in the UGB, an area which is being considered for massive economic development that could result in increased travel.*

#### **Southwest County – South Portion**

- *I recommend removing U320, U326, U325, U323, U322 and U321 because the use is so low. Most of the land is already populated. Most is rural and there won't be a lot of population growth. It would be a pretty drive, but is not necessary.*
- *Remember that rural roads may have a destination on the other side. People traveling through rural communities may not do it every day, but some improvements would be nice for those that live there. It is possible to leave them on and set the priority very low in the next phase. (PAC members agreed to leave them on the list at this point; and likely as a low priority or unfunded.)*
- *It is important that we consider everything and at some point we have to start cutting things that are not safety issues. We have to realize that we cannot do everything.*

### **Greater McLoughlin**

- *What is the difference between a sidewalk and a pedestrian way?* They are the same.
- *Why was 1046 removed?* We have a high school right there. It is a duplicate of U818.
- *What is 1034?* It is a trail along the creek. We will add “trail” to the description.
- *Why do ped ways score so high in almost every category, especially compared to rural projects?* We will come back to that at the next meeting. Scoring will get more quantitative as we start prioritizing.
- *Why is staff time being spent on light rail after the last election?* We were told to continue working on projects that had begun before the election.

### **Clackamas Regional Center Industrial Area**

- *Are all the projects left really necessary?* We will do a lot more evaluating in the next phase.
- *Are citizens or businesses representing this area or just staff?* There are 10 pages of projects. The group was enhanced with community members. This list was vetted at two GAPS meetings.

### **Northwest County**

- *1013 is listed as Southwest but it is actually Northwest.* We will fix that.

Marc asked for any other comments or other projects that should be removed from consideration.

*At some point we need to get harsh with it. We have a lot of bike lane projects. We don't have enough money in transportation to get to build the blacktop for the cars that paid gas tax. We cannot keep diverting asphalt money to bike lanes and sidewalks so that everyone feels safe.*

*Those shoulders on the roads could be given various names. The County has chosen to call them bike ways, but they could be used for other purposes -- pull over if you break down, pass, oversize loads.*

*I am all for a shoulder. Bike lanes are designated specifically for bikes by state statute.*

### **Scenarios for Alternatives Analysis**

Larry Conrad discussed the scenarios for alternatives analysis. He explained that once we go through this analysis more projects will fall out. He discussed the Sunnybrook Extension that is on the Regional Transportation Plan. To pull it off the RTP, we would have to show why it is not needed or propose an alternative to meet the need. We plan to study three alternatives – no build, the 30% design of the Sunnybrook Extension proposed about a year ago, and the second alternative (D) to widen Harmony.

*Sunnybrook is also in a floodplain. We would like to simply like to take it off the TSP and make a recommendation to the BCC to remove it from the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Otherwise we don't know how to remove it. I understand your position. We are showing you the background and the alternatives to potentially to take it off the list. Some people are not as familiar with this proposed project as others.*

Larry explained that concurrency rules limit what we can recommend considering capacity. We propose to take a couple of those alternatives and any one the PAC suggests and analyze using Metro 2035 Gamma forecasts and a 70% lower growth forecast scenario to re-establish whether there is a need. This is part of what we would need to do to prove that the proposed project should come off the RTP.

*I have talked to so many people about this and it has been discussed for so long. There are other alternatives. I appreciate the fact that you put the forecast information along with this. Part of the problem is what kind of future are we building for? Are we building for the future that will actually exist? Necessity to build this was based upon a previous forecast.*

Marc noted that since 2011, the forecasts have gone down, and the project team will do an even lower growth scenario at 70% and see how that affects the need. We are looking at this through a totally new lens – potential new alternatives, new forecasts and new / different tools. If we change the concurrency requirement, we may find that we may not need any alternative.

*I would hate to hear that it's still in the RTP because we couldn't change the concurrency standards.*

- Yes we can.

*Let's go ahead with it then. Do the analysis of the various alternatives you suggested.*

*Where do they think the traffic is going to and coming from? How do they analyze the movement? About 70% is through traffic.*

*If they put multi-use in the area, fewer people will use the road. It's basically the connectivity – the three roadways leading to this are already pretty full.*

## **Performance Standards**

Marc discussed the proposed performance standards:

- Rural Areas – Maintain existing Level of Service (LOS) D standard (no change)
- Urban Areas – Adopt Metro vehicle-to-capacity (v/c) ratio standards
  - 1.1 or 0.99 1<sup>st</sup> hour
  - 0.99 2<sup>nd</sup> hour
- Clackamas Regional Center – Eliminate concurrency
  - Potentially change priorities in the CRC
  - Alternative development review approach needed

*Do we have the vehicle-to-capacity ratio? It is on the existing conditions report.*

*It would be nice to have it on this project list. When we get into prioritization at next meeting – the ones that are worse will come to the front of the pack. If it says deficiency on the deficiency column, it was measured against these standards.*

Marc asked if the PAC wants to consider eliminating concurrency (remove performance measure).

*Are we endangering the County's ability to collect money from developers to do the improvements? We would require that the developer pay an SDC to improve the road to a particular standard.*

*Are we discussing changing the VC ratio countywide or just in the CRC? We are talking about elimination of concurrency just in the CRC.*

*I don't feel good about having congestion when citizens want livability. Rather than accepting congestion, why not talk about other options? Why are we so eager to have development that we don't care if the people are comfortable?*

- It is not gridlock; it is just more congestion.
- What we are saying is if we study this scenario and we decide to go with it, then the County would decide to accept congestion and have more development and economic development.
- We would look at other types of modes of projects.

*I don't think this is the alternative. This is a planning tool that allows them to decide how to build in the future for projected population growth and automobile growth. That tool will not really be needed. These are helpful tools. We probably aren't going to have that kind of significant growth that would merit those kinds of things. It isn't that you are suddenly creating more congestion.*

Kirstin asked if this new tool is acceptable for the project team to review as an alternative. In a straw poll, nine were for considering these strategies, none were against and one abstained.

*Would rural performance standards stay the same? We are still going to look at projects and prioritize.*

*It is important for my business mind to see the return on investment (ROI). We will start to review this at the next meeting when we talk about the funding forecast and estimated costs.*

*I am not seeing economic development plans in some of these areas. Are there land use changes or allocation methodologies to create industrial areas? If we had more of this information it could radically change how we make decisions.*

*I would like to see the number of trips on the maps.*

### **Growth Rate Alternatives**

Marc explained that we have a new forecast – the Metro Gamma Forecast – that is lower than when we started this process. We also want to do a sensitivity analysis at a 70% lower growth rate scenario. If we see that a project may or may not be needed at a 70% growth rate that is needed at a 100% growth rate, then we will probably not prioritize it. Only 50 of 500 projects are affected by growth rate impacts.

*Are most of them in the CRC? Approximately 60–70% of the 50 are in the CRC.*

Larry discussed the Historic Growth Pattern and Lower Growth Rate Scenario graphs which can be viewed in the PowerPoint Presentation online at <http://clackamascountytsp.com/websites/1/pages/6>.

*Do we have numbers from 2000? I would like to see what the projection was versus the actual population in 2000. Metro says they are plus or minus 5% within a five year period. They are using better methodologies today than 20 years ago.*

*There are a projected 60,000 new households by 2035. Where are those going? Most are going in the urban area and UGB. There is a large rural forecast as well.*

*I understand that we have to come up with a number to plan these things. The problem is that you are talking about households. At this point the numbers of drivers and of automobiles are based upon metrics. Young people and others are driving less. Gas scarcity will cause less driving. These numbers*

*are used to justify a lot of possible build that we may not actually need because we may not have the equivalent driving patterns. Public transit is changing; employment centers are changing. Do you think it should be less than 70%?*

*We should look at 0% growth.*

*People are trying to create jobs where people live. We are trying to do everything we can to facilitate this lesser mileage that people are using or creating. The numbers are grossly out of sync with reality and they are dynamic. Look at the amazing success of Canby. We need to be thinking that way and change how these numbers are to be reviewed. I would suggest taking it down to 50%.*

*What about 33.3%*

*The nation is growing 1% / year; why shouldn't we assume the same here? If they are not coming to Clackamas County then that's a pretty dire situation. If you put employment centers far from highways then you need special kinds of businesses that want to move there. You want jobs that have people working from home, high tech jobs, software jobs etc. but if we build up logging and agriculture we will need more intense roads.*

*We are assuming correlation with population and transportation needs, and I don't believe this will be the case. Population will continue to grow but the transportation requirement won't accelerate the same as the population. 70% is the proxy.*

*We also need to look at lifestyle changes, not just population growth, that will affect the need for transportation infrastructure. If you think it would be need to be lower than 70% let us know.*

*I think it should be 50%.*

*Where did the 70% come from? A suggestion by the project team.*

*Metro's 100% is way down from where it was before. Households and amount of traffic will vary. I am comfortable with 70%.*

*We seem to be focusing on cars and household. As you increase the people, trucks and other vehicles will also increase. They will need more capacity. More products will be needed. Even if more people are using transit – the freight still needs to move.*

*I have heard over the last few years that traffic volumes have gone down by 5% even with population increase. My suggestion would be 0%. We have that in the current situation.*

*That would be good to have on the graph. We have to choose one alternative percentage. We already have 100% and 0%. We don't need to vote on 0% since it's the baseline.*

*If we go too low then it won't show us the sensitivity that we don't know. I think 70% is good.*

*Kirstin asked the group for a straw poll. Zero members agreed with 33.3%; six preferred 50% and nine preferred 70%. Members agreed to go with the 70% alternative.*

Kirstin suggested that due to time constraints, PAC discussion of the rural policies will be held during the next meeting on November 27<sup>th</sup>. She asked the group to review the handout on rural policies and come ready to discuss that at the next meeting.

### **Next Steps**

Marc gave a brief overview of next steps and upcoming meetings. Details can be viewed in the PowerPoint Presentation online at <http://clackamascountytsp.com/websites/1/pages/6>.

Chips Janger adjourned the meeting at 9:06 p.m.