

Clackamas County Transportation System Plan Update

Policy Working Group Meeting #7

January 24, 2013



Meeting Agenda

2:00 – 4:00 p.m.

- Welcome/Introductions
- Review PAC input on policy documents A-D
- Discuss Document F – “Urban Equity, Health and Sustainability, and Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities”
- Next Steps

PAC Input on Policy Documents A-D

- Policies discussed by PAC:
 - Equestrian (#96)
 - Road Maintenance (#117)
 - Rural Equity (#122 through #127)
 - Policies with alternatives (#85, #87, #90)
- Equestrian and Road Maintenance discussed in PAC #5A meeting; rest in survey completed by 13 PAC members
- Handout provided with notes from PAC #5A meeting and survey summary of results
- In general, strong agreement with all staff recommendations

Key Question 1: Preferred general approach to urban pedestrian system

- **162A:** Provide networked systems of ~~walkways~~ pedestrian facilities and bikeways connecting neighborhoods, transit stops, commercial areas, community centers, schools, parks, libraries, employment places, other major destinations, regional bikeways and pedestrian facilities ~~walkways~~, and other transportation modes. Utilize separate access-ways for pedestrian facilities and bikeways when street connections are impractical or unavailable.
- OR

Key Question 2 (continued)

- **162B:** In urban areas, **focus pedestrian facilities** and **bikeway** improvements on connecting cities, neighborhoods, commercial areas, schools, recreational facilities, employment centers, other major destinations, regional and city bikeways, and other transportation modes.
Utilize separate access-ways for pedestrian facilities and bikeways when street connections are impractical or unavailable.

Policy Document F – Key Question 2

- Should the County allow interim transportation improvements under limited conditions? (#172)
 - As appropriate and safe, construct interim pedestrian facilities and bikeways on existing streets that are not built to County standards where the construction of full street improvements is not practicable or imminent.
 - *New policy*

Policy Document F – Key Question 3

- Should design guidelines for major transit stops be in the Comprehensive Plan or the Zoning & Development Ordinance (ZDO)? (#216)
 - The following **site design standards shall apply for new retail, office, multi-family and institutional buildings** located near or at major transit stops:
 - Provide reasonably direct pedestrian connections between transit stops and building entrances, and between building entrances and streets adjoining transit stops;
 - Provide safe, direct and logical pedestrian crossings at all transit stops where practicable;

Key Question 3 (continued)

- At major transit stops, require the following:
 - Buildings located within 20 feet of the sidewalk near the transit stop, a transit street or an intersecting street, or a pedestrian plaza at the stop or a street intersection;
 - Transit passenger landing pads accessible to disabled persons in accordance with ADA & transit agency standards;
 - An easement or dedication for a passenger shelter and an underground utility connection to a major transit stop, if requested by the public transit provider;
 - Lighting to transit agency standards at the major transit stop;
 - Intersection and mid-block traffic management improvements as needed and practicable to enable marked crossings at major transit stops.

Policy Document F – Key Question 4

- Should additional policies be adopted to support various aspects of the bikeway system in the urban area? (#191-197)

Policy Document F – Key Question 5

- Should the Comprehensive Plan require the use of the Predictive Method Analysis (Highway Safety Manual) along with a capacity analysis as part of traffic impact studies (TIS)? (#220)
 - (150 proposed) **A predictive method safety analysis (Highway Safety Manual) of impacted roadway facilities, along with a capacity analysis, shall be required as part of traffic impact studies (TIS).**
 - **New policy – Highway Safety Manual (HSM)**

General Comments and Questions

- > Additional questions or comments on Document F?

Next Steps

- Policy Working Group Meeting #8 (Feb. 21) -- Urban Roads and Travel
- GAPS Meetings #3 (March 11 – 14)
 - Discuss Alternative Analysis Scenario findings
 - Review Draft Preferred Project List
 - Discuss project priorities
- Public Advisory Committee Meeting #5b (April 9)
 - PWG Update
 - Discuss Outcomes of GAPS Meeting #3
 - Discuss Draft Preferred Project List and Priorities