



Policy Working Group Meeting #6
November 1, 2012 / 2:00 – 4:00 pm
Development Services Building, Room 301
150 Beaver Creek Road, Oregon City

Draft Meeting Summary

Attendees

PWG Members: Ben Horner-Johnson, Mike Foley, Glenn Koehrsen, Paul Edgar, Rachel Summer, Charlene DeBruin, Laurie Swanson-Freeman, Tom Civiletti, Chips Janger, Mike Wagner

Staff & Consultants: Sarah Abbott, Karen Buehrig, Larry Conrad and Shari Gilevich (Clackamas County); Susie Wright (Kittelson & Associates); Alisha Dishaw (Cogan Owens Cogan)

Public: None

Unable to attend: Thomas Eskridge, Elizabeth Graser-Lindsey

Meeting Purpose: Review and discuss the current policies regarding urban roads in the Clackamas County Comprehensive Plan and staff recommendations for revising those policies and creating new policies. **Outcomes:** Comments from the PAC Policy Working Group on the existing and proposed policies regarding urban roads.

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

Welcome / Introductions / Agenda Overview: Larry Conrad welcomed the group, discussed the meeting purpose and desired outcomes and reviewed the agenda.

Policy Language – Key Questions

Key Question #1: Should the Comprehensive Plan broadly define the transportation improvements that are permitted uses in the Zoning and Development Ordinances?

Policy #130

Can you explain outright use?

- No permission and no public hearings are needed to build that use.

There are arguments on what constitutes land use and where we want public process, and now we're trying to say we don't want public process.

- County code states that streets and roads are considered outright. The change to this policy clarifies the language to include the text in red – alleys, bikeways, pedestrian facilities, etc. Anything that is public right-of-way should be included in the definition and means hearings wouldn't be required.
- We are not introducing something new, just clarifying.

Are there any restrictions – i.e. going over a wetland?

- That is a separate process.

What about a new development? It wouldn't have to go before the public for the roads?

- No, but the development would have to, and would have to meet standards.

In theory someone could say you could put a road through an old neighborhood with large properties.

- The construction of new roads would still need to be identified in the TSP. If it's not in the TSP then it most likely would not happen.

The County has made recommendations and we should see what they look like. Nothing will ever be built if everything is in the middle of a public process.

What is a road diet?

- For example, there are times where a low volume four-lane road would function more safely and efficiently as a three-lane road..

PWG members are ok with proposed changes.

Key Question #2: Should Policy #136, which addresses improvements required as a result of development, be divided into two parts to address on and off site-improvements?

Do incidents of travel generated by types of business have any relationship to this policy?

- Not really.
- This is tied to Policy #135. We want the right-of-way to be big enough for what needs to be put into it.

What does active transportation mean?

- Bicycle and pedestrian

The PWG agreed to separate Policy #136 into two parts.

Key Question # 3: How specific should the County policies be on the adoption / integration of the Metro Green Streets standards as required by the Regional Transportation Functional Plan? (Policies #146 and #147)

Larry said we need to select one of these policies. He explained that Policy #147 is broader while Policy #146 addresses the main issue with green streets.

I would rather not tie us to Metro standards and go with Policy #146 instead. Green streets are a really positive major movement that has economic and environmental justification.

Do green streets require a lot more bio-remediation and more ROW to filter water?

- Not a lot. The 172nd project, which has a lot of green street structures, required the purchase of just a little bit more property.

In an idealistic green street you don't have all the piping going on and you allow the water to flow off with pinpoint impacts. It spreads it out nicely.

When new industries look for areas of new development, they look for these types of high standards.

- The key piece to consider is storm water.

Would this be countywide or just in the urban growth boundary?

- It would just be in the UGB.

Can you explain green streets more in this policy or have a glossary?

- There is talk about adding a glossary to the Comp Plan.

I'm not sure what Policy #146 does – I don't know what support the use means? Don't see anything there. It appears to imply if you'd like to build a green street here that would be nice.

- We could make them more comparable by changing "Support" in #146 to "Integrate".

Group agreed.

Greens streets are one example. How many other things are in low impact developments?

- Predominantly it is storm water runoff. We are trying to show good faith in meeting Metro standards.

I think some place you should say what it means.

- We can add a definition section.

Key Question #4: Should the Comprehensive Plan continue to support implementation of the eastern portion of the Sunrise Corridor (east of 172nd Avenue)? (Policies #149A, #149B, #149C and #149D)

Larry explained the current language is Policy #149A in the left column with a slight change in the right column by adding Rock Creek Junction. ODOT proposed alternate language and would like the second half of Policy #149A or #149B. Karen said Policy #149A allows for identifying a better alignment for the Sunrise Corridor. Policy #149B basically says the existing alignment of Highway 212 would be used.

Policy #149A gives us the ability to interpret what is the best alignment; this makes the most sense to me.

I don't like the "this is it" language. (Several PWG members agreed.)

We need to keep our options open. Let other things come in that make sense at the time.

I recommend keeping Policy #149A with the new language.

We should agree to the second half of Policy #149A and don't agree with Policies 149B, 149C and 149D. Group agreed.

Key Question #5: Should the Comprehensive Plan support adoption of a new "Fee in Lieu of" (FILO) program that may be applied to transportation improvements required as part of the land development process? (Policy #150)

Karen said this helps prohibit development of a sidewalk that doesn't get linked anywhere for an extended period of time and makes money available to build sidewalks where it makes sense. Larry said this Policy is designed to allow the County to develop a FILO system and do it correctly.

Is this all urban or countywide?

- It could be countywide.

I see a problem with something like funds from a Beavercreek development being used in Oak Grove.

- We would create a series of districts such as McLoughlin, CRCIA, Southwest, etc. and funding would have to be spent in that district. This would establish a mechanism for doing so.

Group agreed to keep new #150.

We need to safeguard funds for specific use. I recommend adding language about creating districts where money has to be spent in that district.

I would like it to be broken out into further strata.

If there is money set aside for Estacada then it shouldn't be taken into Damascus. The FILO dollars need to stay very close to home.

General Comments and Questions

Are there things that you think we should look at that we haven't looked at yet?

- We have pulled out the most important items.

How would you pull off Policy #159? What does it mean?

This is happening a lot – more in urban areas that are being rehabbed and rebuilt. Do you build for parking of the past? Nowadays there is movement away from that due to people using more transit etc.

- We are moving this policy from a general countywide policy to an urban policy.

If you limit parking in front of businesses, then people park blocks away in the residential areas.

Also, you get into situations in urban setting and preservation.

- This is not a significant change. The change is only to the urban area.

Could such limits be expressed as square footage as well as parking spaces as a way of promoting multi level parking structures?

- This is getting into the land use piece of the Comp Plan.

I don't want to say anything that prevents us from creating jobs, or preservation.

Why is this in the TSP?

- It is broad and is addressed in the ZDO in detail. There are additional regulations in the zoning code that would deal with this.

Roadway Functional Classification Review

Larry discussed the Roadway Functional Classification Review. He said the Engineering staff recommends changes to functional class in three groups – newly classified, higher class and lower class.

What are the significant ones we should be reviewing?

At the last PAC meeting you advised that Sunnybrook Road has been classified as one thing and you are considering changing it to a different classification so that it would be reviewed differently.

- That was changing the operational standards, which is different than the Roadway Functional Classification.

What does it mean to developers, property owners, etc?

- The biggest difference is striping (for rural areas). Collectors and above we stripe and bike lanes are on collectors and arterials but not connectors.

If I build a house on something that has been upgraded, will I have to dedicate 10 more feet?

- Potentially, depending on the location.

Do local residents have any say in this?

- It would go through the Comp Plan process and everyone would have a chance to comment.

Can we recommend as a group that the Functional Classification from the Ranger Station through Estacada to Highway 26 past Timothy Lake be changed so that it's a major arterial all the way?

Shari discussed the memo *Methodology for Identifying Projects to Comply with the RTFP*. She explained that RTFP requirements are Metro code requirements and only apply within the UGB. The County went through each table the consultant had presented and found several roads to include, specifically V100 and V101 over vacant land found which looked flat and with good potential for future development. Those two streets seemed to fit criteria and will be added to the TSP.

What about V103, V104?

- Those are basically streets running over the bluff and do not make sense.
- Metro standards say you should have collectors at 0.5 mile spacing and arterials at 1 mile spacing. County staff helped document why we were not including the connections due to issues like grade, bluff, wetland etc.

This needs to have neighborhood input.

- When we go to adoption next year we will take this to the public. This is all material you will see again before we are done.

I don't fully understand the implications of these.

- For the most part it is either maintenance or striping, or if the road gets rebuilt it says what standard it has to be built to.

Countywide and Rural Policy Summary and Next PAC Meeting

Larry said the summary of all work done in the first five Policy Working Group meetings was handed out at the last PAC meeting. There will be time on the PAC #5A agenda for further discussion. The question for you is the equestrian topic. We drafted a simple policy similar to the policy on agricultural vehicles. Are you comfortable with this?

I thought we wanted to separate the equestrian movement to keep the trail systems where they are. Some of us think it is ok to put them on the roads and some think it's a bad idea. We should not promote horses on roads. Several members agreed. Change the title to "rural policies" rather than policies to date.

Karen asked the group to let the project team know by November 15 if there are certain policies that we need to highlight at the next PAC.

Pat Russell sent a document for us to review which was handed out today. I disagree with some of it, but we all need to read it.

When do we get to discuss which projects move forward?

- This will happen during the next round of GAPS meetings.
- At PAC #5A we will talk about scoring the different goals and projects.

Will you have a scoring proposal?

- Yes, we will and when we get together as GAPS group we will show how the projects in your area ranked in the scoring system.

I would like to make a motion from the PWG to remove the Sunnybrook Extension from the TSP and the RTP.

I second that motion.

- We are doing an analysis where we will set up one of the more advanced transportation models and take the Sunnybrook Extension out and see what it does to the transportation system.

Since it has been moved and seconded, we will take this on to the PAC as unanimous with the PWG.

Next Steps: Susie went over next steps, including upcoming meetings.

Meeting adjourned 3:50 pm.