

Public Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting #5C

April 30, 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, Glenn Koehrsen, Bob Reeves, Rachel Summer, Laurie Swanson-Freeman, Michael Wagner, Dick Weber

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

Public: Simon DeBruin, Christine Kosinski

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

On behalf of Chair Chips Janger who could not be present, Tom Civiletti called the meeting to order and welcomed participants. Karen Buehrig thanked PAC members for completing the pre-meeting survey and reviewed the meeting purpose and desired outcomes:

Meeting Purpose

Finalize PAC Recommended Project Priorities for Public Review.

- a) Review PAC survey responses and vote on remaining projects to discuss from *Table B – Projects with Agreement* and *Table D – Projects to Remove*.
- b) Discuss and recommend changes to *Table C – Projects to Questions*, based on results of sticker exercise on April 23.

Desired Outcomes

PAC recommended projects lists (Tiers 1, 2 and 3) and *Projects to Remove* ready for public review.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No members of the public wished to comment.

REMAINING PROJECTS WITH AGREEMENT

Susie Wright reviewed *Table B - Projects with Agreement – Remaining for Discussion* along with the results of the pre-meeting survey. There are 18 remaining projects with agreement that PAC members or the public suggest we discuss further (Table B). The project team reviewed the survey results and suggested tier recommendations for 11 of those projects. For projects without a recommendation, Susie suggested they be kept in the tier agreed to by the GAPS and TAC. Slides can be viewed here: <http://clackamascountytsp.com/websites/1/pages/6>.

Project U150 (currently in Tier 3)

Karen said Project U150 is very important to the Clackamas CPO. Therefore, staff recommends moving it up to Tier 2 from Tier 3.

Project 2117 (currently in Tier 3)

Sunnybrook and 82nd is a highly important economic zone. These turn lanes could help relieve pressure at the congestion points. I recommend this be higher than Tier 3.

- The Sunnybrook piece will add some capacity, but not a lot. The intersection that causes a lot of issues, Harmony and 82nd, is the hardest to fix. We have applied for a Metro grant to produce an Alternate Performance Standard Plan for this area. This plan has to be agreed upon by ODOT and adopted by Oregon Highway Plan.
- Projects like this are important overall, especially with economic development. Removing it means that it would not be an option, but if we keep it in Tier 3 it can still be considered.

I sense that this whole center and economic development has been pushed back because the neighbors didn't want something to happen. We need to grow jobs. I would like this in Tier 2.

Motion by Paul Edgar, seconded by Bob Reeves to accept the suggested tiers on Table B and approve the discussed tiers for those without suggestions on Table B. Motion passed with one abstention.

Table B

Project #	Recommended Tier Approved by PAC in First Vote
U150	Tier 2
1081	Tier 3
2117	Tier 2
U149B	Tier 2
U154	Tier 3
U654	Tier 1
U809	Tier 3

NOTE: PAC member Michael Wagner, who is also a member of the Clackamas County Planning Commission that will be voting on the TSP later in the process, abstained from all votes.

Later in the meeting, a suggestion was made for Table B for projects U475a and U2010. In the charter, we have agreed to not revisit a previously decision unless all PAC members agreed. PAC members agreed to revisit by a vote of five in favor and four opposed.

Projects U475a and U2010 (Currently in Tier 2 and Tier 1)

There was a discussion about other segments of Henrici Road at the last meeting. It was suggested to switch the prioritization of these two segments.

- These projects were scored very closely. If we switch them, it would place the project where there is a projected higher future demand in the higher tier.

There is higher projected traffic for U475a and there is also currently higher traffic.

Motion by Elizabeth to switch U475a to Tier 1 and U2010 to Tier 2, seconded by Paul. Motion passed with one abstention.

Table B

Project #	Recommended Tier Approved by PAC in Second Vote
U150	Tier 2
1081	Tier 3
2117	Tier 2
U149B	Tier 2
U154	Tier 3
U654	Tier 1
U809	Tier 3
U475A	Tier 1
U2010	Tier 2

PROJECTS TO REMOVE

Susie reviewed *Table D - Projects Recommended for Removal – Remaining for Discussion* along with the results of the pre-meeting survey. Slides: <http://clackamacountytsp.com/websites/1/pages/6>.

Project 1079 (currently to be removed)

ODOT thinks this bike/ped path along I-205 is very important and has prioritized it like a Tier 1. If ODOT is thinking along that line and this connects to what they are going to be doing, maybe it should be in Tier 3.

Why did the TAC recommend this for removal?

- This project would create new bike/ped bridge across I-205 and end near the Highway 212/224 crossing. With the west side of the freeway bike/ped path completion, the need for this is reduced. There are a lot of design challenges. It also was not included in the Sunrise Corridor recommendation.

I agree with moving it to Tier 3.

Project 1053 (currently to be removed)

The Ferguson Road description continues to be wrong. The idea was not to reduce the speed limit, but to reduce cut-through traffic. This could work in partnership with Beaver Creek Road improvements. I think it should stay in Tier 3.

I agree.

- We can install traffic calming. Improvements are needed on another project for Beaver Creek.

Project 2116 (currently to be removed)

I would like to move to Tier 3.

- It was a duplicate project.

Project U756 (currently in Tier 3)

This is listed as a duplicate project. We should recommend for removal.

Motion by Thomas Eskridge, seconded by Paul Edgar to keep suggested recommendations on Table D except: move #1053 to Tier 3; move #1079 to Tier 3; and move #U756 to recommend for removal.

Motion passed with one abstention.

IDENTIFY ANY CHANGES TO DRAFT PRIORITIZED PROJECT LIST FOR PUBLIC REVIEW: OVERVIEW AND QUESTIONS

Susie reviewed *Table C – Projects with Remaining Questions*, which includes projects with different recommendations from GAPS and TAC. The results of the sticker exercise from PAC #5B are included in the table. Slides can be viewed here: <http://clackamascountytp.com/websites/1/pages/6>.

Can you explain the funding table in the upper right?

- We tried to take into consideration all the votes already taken. Everything in Tier 1 was deducted from the \$444 million. The first column is what is available and the second column is what is suggested in the updated tables today. The package is slightly over budget.

I thought there would be detailed information so the GAPS group could persuade me to vote their way. I don't feel comfortable enough to vote on those.

- It would be extremely difficult to get through all these projects with expert familiarity. That is the role of the TAC, not the PAC. The role of the GAPS groups was to lend their expertise in their area of the County.

The group took a break to review Table C individually, then discussed Table C by geographic area.

Greater Clackamas Regional Center / Industrial Area

No questions or comments.

East County

Project 2069 (currently in Tier 1)

Firwood has been called Wildcat Mountain Road for over 30 years.

It seems like a safety audit and a major road improvement.

- We tried to pair safety audits with specific identified road needs. The idea is to move the safety audit and the road improvement project to Tier 1. Project 2069 is paired with Project U257.

It seems like a safety audit would be part of fixing the road.

- We don't always perform a safety audit when fixing a road. We feel this one is very important.

Project U901 (currently in Tier 3)

This project to replace a failing bridge is pretty important.

- The TAC recommendation is Tier 1 and GAPS suggestion is Tier 3.
- We checked with the maintenance department to ensure that we are including the correct bridges. Any bridge with a sufficiency rating of 50% or less was moved to Tier 1. Ultimately, the funding of failing bridges has been through OTIA. It wouldn't matter whether it's Tier 1 or 3. There may be other state funding programs in the future. If you look at future demand, this particular bridge is not high usage.

I am comfortable with this staying in Tier 3.

Project U924 (currently in Tier 3)

Isn't the Tickle Creek Trail going to have a lot more usage? This needs to be higher than Tier 3. We need signage or signals because you come into this curvy area with people crossing the road.

- A portion of this trail is constructed within the city limits. This project would extend outside the city limits to the edge of Boring. It is a connection that interests the City of Sandy. Tickle Creek will provide good connection into the future, but putting it in Tier 3 makes sense now. The County will start working on the Active Transportation System Plan this summer, which will focus on the connections in more detail than we are able to do.

Greater McLoughlin Area

Project 1037 (currently in Tier 1)

I talked to several people about this project and everyone agreed it would be very valuable. I think it is appropriate in Tier 1.

I agree.

Northwest County

Project U173 (currently in Tier 2)

The terrain on Rosemont is the biggest issue. There is growing density and a lot of bicyclists. I have driven there a number of times. It is so narrow that if your wheel falls off the road you wouldn't be able to get back on. There is a new path, but no shoulder for bikes or emergency pull off. I am surprised this isn't a Tier 1 project because it is so bad and highly used.

- Other parts in that area had higher priorities.
- With the sticker exercise you recommended to move from Tier 3 to Tier 2.

Tier 2 is ok. (Seven members agreed to keep it in Tier 2)

Southwest County

Projects 1088 and 1089 (currently in Tier 1)

Did the State look at these projects as a possibility when they redid the bridge?

- At the time, it wasn't needed to address the safety concerns with Graves Road and the bridge.

Can we combine these two projects? They are linked and you cannot do one without the other.

- Yes, it is ok to pair them.

Project 1054 (currently in Tier 3)

It's not actually Killdeer Road – it's an unnamed road. Connection to Ivel Road should be struck. The description should simply state "Extend unnamed road to provide bike/ped access."

Project U302d (currently in Tier 1)

There are a variety of trails in the Southwest. I am not clear that the Union Mills Road Trail is more significant than the other trails. I talked to (County staff person) Rick Nys about roadway standards and with the parks department, which has a dozen different plans for trails, some that are dirt or 3 feet wide or 12 feet wide. I would rather have more trails at a lower quality than one trail at a higher quality.

- Parks department trails are different than roadway trails; some are for different types of usage. There are safety and legal requirements that we are required to meet.

It was meant to add safety with a shoulder to the south side. People drive fast and it's very dangerous.

This project started out as \$47 million with bike paths on both sides. There is a major demand in the safety corridor to do a separate path on the south side in the Union Mills district.

- This is my understanding as well. With bikes going both directions on the path, it needs to be separated from the road for safety reasons. Right-of-way (ROW) would need to be acquired. For the multi-use trails, we are going to be dependent on accessing other funding sources. Park districts are heavily involved in constructing multi-use trails. Federal Recreation Trails program is funneled into the discussion about transportation. They will have some design requirements for how we are able to build and construct.

There are some old farms / houses close to the road. When you talk about doing a bike path and ROW acquisition, what does that mean?

- It would be the same as if we were expanding the roadway. We have a ROW staff person that talks to property owners.

In our rural area, we watch anyone riding a bike for security reasons because that's when things go missing. There are people riding bikes who are different than commuters or recreational riders. I would say no to a bike path.

Project 1068 (currently in Tier 2)

The description is correct but should include the multi-use path connection to Loder Road.

- There could be a multitude of challenges, including right-of-way (ROW) issues, etc. There are a handful of important connections throughout the region. I am hesitant to add that one in because it's hard to judge against the others right now.

If you're going into an Active Transportation Plan, would it be important to at least identify in this plan?

- I recommend keeping Thayer Road to Ferguson Road, have Loder Road in the Active Transportation Plan and keep the current project in Tier 2.

This project is only \$700,000 and Union Mills (U302d) is almost \$6 million. It would be very affordable to include that little segment in Tier 1 projects. There needs to be some equity across the map. I recommend moving 1068 to Tier 1.

We have challenging terrain there.

There is a valley which is not a problem for a path. Originally, the person suggested a road, which would be difficult. When the Active Transportation Group meets, will they consider these comprehensively?

- Yes, they will consider these in a comprehensive way and look at identifying the key active transportation corridors. Then they can provide a better cost estimate and will do some prioritization. We are talking about meeting with four stakeholder groups throughout the project. Ultimately, there is the process related to the Planning Commission and public outreach. We will notify this PAC of that process.

Project U938 (currently in Tier 1)

I drive this every day. It floods twice a year. I don't think that makes it a Tier 1 project. If we move this project to Tier 2, it could offset moving 1068 to Tier 1.

There is a water treatment facility there. I don't agree with moving to Tier 2.

I think Tier 2 would be ok.

There is another road on the side of Molalla that floods several times each year also. I don't have a problem with it flooding twice a year.

We have had roads with horrible flooding; it's not just people having to drive around it, but into it. I live in this area and the deepest flooding I have seen is one foot.

There were no PAC member objections to moving U938 to Tier 2 and 1068 to Tier 1.

Project U249B (currently in Tier 3)

This area has a lot of roads and has historically been under served. We had the Springwater Road as the highest priority at \$44 million; the GAPS recommended Tier 1 and it's currently in Tier 3.

It has been quite some time since any safety work has been done in rural Clackamas County. Many places have sharp curves, roads drop off, no guard rails. When we eliminated the Springwater Road as a high priority, the idea was to substitute it with a blanket safety audit across the southwest area to identify some of the worst problems and reserve funds to address pinpointed problems.

- We engaged the appropriate County departments to identify the important projects. There are certain places more important to fix sooner than a whole road segments. We are identifying the segments now rather than identifying a pool of money. It will depend on how we raise the funding and are able to spend the money.

How do we address emergency situations and maintenance like landslides?

- That is different than the TSP. Transportation sets aside money on a yearly basis.

Motion by Glenn Koehrsen, seconded by Dick Weber to combine projects 1088 and 1089; move project 1068 to Tier 1; move U938 to Tier 2; and forward all recommendations for public review. Motion passed with one abstention.

NEXT STEPS

- Online open house: May 15 – June 15
- Community outreach meetings: May and June
- Policy Working Group #9: June 6
- PAC #6: June 25
- PAC #7: will check a August 20 and 27 with PAC members

Kirstin explained that we are currently about \$10 million over in Tier 1 and \$20 million in Tier 2. We will take the recommendations out for public comment. Staff will come back with a recommended plan after public comment.

How is this going to be boiled down and presented to the public?

- We are working on a virtual open house. When Larry and Karen present at community meetings, people will have a chance to look by region and comment on what they disagree with and why.

We haven't seen much recently about what we would like to say to ODOT and I think that is important.

- We will bring it on June 25 or at the August meeting to discuss with you.

What happened to park-n-rides?

- We moved the information about park-n-rides into the policy section and forwarded specific recommendations to local transportation agencies.

Tom Civiletti adjourned the meeting at 8:56 p.m.