



**Clackamas County TSP
Public Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting #1**
October 18, 2011 / 6:15 – 9:00 pm
Development Services Building, Room 115
150 Beaver Creek Road, Oregon City

Draft Summary

Attendees

PAC Members: Kim Buchholz, Tom Civiletti, Charlene DeBruin, Paul Edgar, Thomas Eskridge, Elizabeth Graser-Lindsey, Ben Horner-Johnson, Alan Hull, Chips Janger, Glenn Koehrsen, Al Levit, Ralph Radmer, Bob Reeves, Leah Robbins, Rachel Summer, Michael Wagner, Dick Weber

Staff and consultants: Mike Bezner, Larry Conrad and Ellen Rogalin (Clackamas County); Marc Butorac and Erin Ferguson (Kittelsohn & Associates); Alisha Dishaw and Kirstin Greene (Cogan Owens Cogan, LLC), and Jeanne Lawson (JLA Public Involvement)

Public: Dave Coles (for PAC member Walt Gamble)

Unable to attend: PAC members Ernie Platt, Alberto Camacho, Tom Mack, Darin Sanchez, Jamie Damon; County Project Manager Karen Buehrig

Welcome and Introductions

Mike Bezner, Clackamas County Transportation Engineering Manager, welcomed Public Advisory Committee (PAC) members and thanked them for helping Clackamas County plan for future generations. He said this project will help define what Clackamas County wants to be from a transportation perspective in terms of community health, the economy and other associated arenas. Mike said he is very impressed with this group of PAC members, and that the County is looking for great ideas to come out of the PAC.

Larry Conrad, Clackamas County Principal Transportation Planner, welcomed PAC members on behalf of the Project Management Team. Larry is the technical lead for this project. Karen Buehrig, who couldn't be at the meeting, is the County's project manager, and Ellen Rogalin is leading the public involvement process. A full team roster is in the notebook given to each PAC member.

Facilitator Kirstin Greene introduced herself and asked each member to introduce themselves, say where they are from and give three words to explain their interest in this project. Members' responses follow:

- Transportation for rural areas
- Maintenance and safety (e.g., no speed bumps)
- Jobs, revenue, planning
- Environmental, water, ecology

- Transportation, seniors, access
- Planning for vulnerable populations
- Plan for a realistic future
- Meeting needs, smart investment strategies
- Integrating Milwaukie into rest of the county
- Rural road safety – bicycles, pedestrians and equestrian
- McLoughlin Area Plan
- Safe roads with diverse standards, directing away from hazardous areas
- Private property rights, financial freedom
- Safety, dislike speed bumps
- 91% single riders – freedom to continue to drive cars
- Rural, Hamlets / Villages
- How puzzle will be pieced together / rural-urban balance
- Wilsonville, bicycle, pedestrian and business interest
- Safe, rational transportation system
- Safety of personal drivers, bicycle safety

Larry explained the red "**jargon cards**" that members were given. He encouraged members to hold up the card if anyone uses terms that are not understood to help increase understanding and move the discussion forward.

Agenda Review and Additions / Meeting Purpose and Anticipated Outcomes

Kirstin reviewed the meeting purpose and desired outcomes, reviewed the proposed agenda and asked if there were any additions. There were none.

- **Meeting Purpose:** Provide an overview of the project scope and schedule, discuss committee member roles and responsibilities, provide an overview of the Draft Vision and Goals and Public Involvement Program, and prepare committee members to review the White Papers in advance of Meeting #2.
- **Desired Outcomes:** An understanding of the project, process, and communication tools and protocols, and understanding of desired feedback on Draft Vision and Goals and White Papers.

Draft Ground Rules and Chartering / PAC Roles & Responsibilities

Kirstin and Jeanne initiated review of the draft charge, reminding members that the charge comes from the County. The PAC is not able to alter the charge, but may forward questions or suggestions. None were given.

Discussion (Note: PAC member comments and questions are shown in italics followed by staff responses in regular text.)

Who is the facilitator referred to in the document?

Kirstin will be lead facilitator with Jeanne as back up, particularly for the decision-making process.

Could we limit public comment to 5 – 10 minutes at the break and 5 – 10 minutes at the end so people don't necessarily have to wait until the end of the meeting to make a comment?

The facilitator or chair can ask at the beginning if there are people who want to comment. We will consider this for future agendas.

Would it be important for PAC members to attend regional meetings that are not in their region?

PAC members are encouraged to attend both countywide and regional meetings including meetings in other regions. This will help PAC members get a sense of feedback from the entire county.

Are there large meetings with conclusions that this group comes to that will be shown to the public?

No. PAC members are encouraged to attend public events – both virtual and in person – to hear concerns, but will make decisions and recommendations as a group during PAC meetings.

Regarding meeting attendance, is there a requirement for people to attend or be replaced? I want to avoid someone missing all meetings until the end and then wanting to be updated on the whole process.

The charter addresses the difference between excused absences and someone who just doesn't show up, and says a member should be replaced if they are gone for three meetings.

Given that there are only six meetings total, members agreed to change from three to two missed meetings (without notice) before a member is considered not to be involved and may be replaced.

I would like to get more information regionally throughout the county on people's wish lists / dreams / aspirations for their subareas. Will we get a chance to preview and do some homework and understand what is coming out of those areas, e.g., for economy?

We will consider that request. In terms of scope of work, we often get a lot of requests and need to balance “mission critical” items and others. There will be lots of information coming in; our job is to package it and send it to you regularly.

Kirstin advised the project has a website www.clackamascountytsp.com where documents can be viewed and asked PAC members to let the team know if they have ideas for other documents. A member asked to include information on accidents and safety concerns.

How do we ensure the PMT actually conveys what really happens at the PAC meetings to bodies such as the Planning Commission?

Michael Wagner, the liaison for the PAC, will help ensure this. All members can help ensure the PAC's message is conveyed correctly.

Jeanne Lawson added that the charge portion of the charter is what the County assigns for the group –why the advisory committee has been formed. The charter is how PAC members will work together and may be altered by the PAC.

Jeanne reviewed the Vice Chair / Chair sections of the charter. A Chair helps serve as a link from the PAC to the staff; making sure the voice of committee is in those conversations and supports the facilitator in running the meetings. If there is also a facilitator, the chair can also participate in discussions. If the PAC chooses to have a chair, it is helpful if their qualities include the following:

- the person comes to the process objectively,
- the person is someone PAC members can trust to report opinions correctly.

Jeanne advised that if the PAC chooses to have a chair, the decision should be made by or at the next meeting.

If we don't have a Chair, how do we communicate out? It's important that we have a Chair / Vice Chair. The facilitator is charged with having a neutral role. The PAC would report out officially through County staff. It is also compelling when a member of the committee is able to go with staff to report to decision-making bodies.

As a citizen group, we need someone focused and a head of the group to communicate outside . There was agreement among members that there should be a chair to communicate with bodies outside the PAC.

How do you decide on a Chair when we are such a diverse group? Anyone who becomes chair will have bias / agenda. They will filter the information through their own filter / agenda.

Chair cannot make motions or second motions.

Jeanne said the group is not being asked to make a choice today as they haven't had a chance to work together. Another option is to ask the Board of County Commissioners and Planning Commission representatives to appoint Chair / Vice Chair.

Jeanne set aside the chair issue for consideration at the end of the meeting.

Jeanne continued to review the draft charter. She said that the decision-making is consensus-based, which takes consistent dialog. That is one of the reasons PAC members do not have alternates. She reminded members that consensus is when everyone agrees to accept the outcome -- some will be happier than others, but all can live with it. If someone absolutely cannot agree and stand up for a decision, then there is no consensus. If the group cannot reach consensus, the recommendation is that it establish a significant majority, e.g., two-thirds in favor, for a recommendation.

The group agreed with this recommendation, with the opportunity for a minority report. The PAC also agreed that once decisions are made they are frozen unless the group has a significant majority to review the decision again or if there is new information.

Kirstin asked PAC members to email any other comments on the charter by the end of the week (subsequently changed to Monday). From those comments, a revised draft charter will be circulated in the packet for the next meeting. She also asked those interested in serving as Chair or Vice Chair to let Ellen Rogalin know between now and the next meeting.

Jeanne reviewed the project recommendation flow chart and decision-making structure. Ultimately, the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) will adopt the plan, with recommendations from the Planning Commission (PC), the Project Management Team (PMT), PAC, Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Clackamas Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC). All bodies will be informed by public input.

Who is CTAC?

The CTAC is made up of technical staff representatives of all the cities within the county. PAC members will hear CTAC comments as well.

PAC as well as TAC as well as CTAC make recommendations to the PMT and you guys will put it in a form that you are comfortable with and present to the PC and the BCC. Our input gets to them through you... so whatever we do will be filtered / forwarded that will then be presented to them. We will try to summarize and not filter, but PAC members are always welcome to attend to ensure correct representation of PAC recommendations. In addition, the PAC and members of the public will have other opportunities to communicate with the PC & BCC.

Project Background

Larry gave a brief overview of the project background. Major points include:

- The Clackamas County TSP Update is responsible for the County unincorporated area.
- The cities have primary jurisdiction within their boundaries, with their own TSPs.
- The County is responsible for about 1400 miles of mostly paved road.
- For the TSP process, the County has organized the outreach efforts into three sub-regions: north, south and east. There will be a series of public workshops in each sub-region and a county/consultant team for each sub-region.
- As part of this process, we will use Metro's transportation and growth forecast through 2035, which is still being developed.
- There are regulations we have to follow as part of the TSP process, and other things we want to do. We will work through the goals and objectives and can change direction as we go, but will have to make sure we are following the regulations.

Larry said Phase Zero of the TSP planning process took place in the past year with internal County stakeholders and departments, including the BCC, developing the preliminary vision, goals and objectives. One of the first tasks for the PAC is to review and finalize the vision, goals and objectives so they can be used as the basis for the rest of the process.

Larry advised that there are limited transportation funds and a long list of desired projects. Part of the PAC's task is to help the County determine how to use those funds most effectively.

What about the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)? During other similar processes, whenever we raised issues there was an ODOT person saying why something could or could not be done. How are they represented in this process?

An ODOT representative sits on the TAC. The three main agencies with regulatory authority and responsibility in the TSP Update process -- ODOT, the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) and Metro -- all have representatives on the TAC and will be involved all the way through. ODOT has said they want to work with us cooperatively. County staff and consultants also are generally familiar with ODOT regulations and limits and can relate those to the PAC.

When we begin forming ideas about things, how will we have a sense of the cost?

There is a point when we get projects together where we will estimate costs of all the projects.

If we start proposing ideas, will we get feedback right away about the cost?

If it's something we know from experience, we will give you that information. If there are complicated projects we will have to do an analysis and get back to you.

Not all PAC members are from unincorporated areas. This is an issue since CTAC represents the cities. CTAC is technical staff, not a citizen group. We are one county in a connected transportation system. The PAC was chartered to represent a diversity of perspectives. We each might hold a number of perspectives as well - where we live and work -- and might identify both with urban and rural areas for daily needs. Some funding mechanisms are countywide. Your caution is well taken. We will get back to you on the representation mix.

It would be nice to show Government Camp on the map. Be sure to include the whole county. We will fix the maps.

We have a huge wish list in Milwaukie and a priority list. We have things we would like to see and then have to set priorities. I assume that we will have something like this for the County. Just because something is expensive doesn't mean we can't say we like it.

Orientation of Project Resources

Marc reviewed the PAC project notebooks. For this first meeting, printed materials were provided for the notebooks. Going forward, the consulting team will provide electronic copies of all meeting materials with the expectation that PAC members will print and add them to their notebooks. If anyone needs printed copies, they are asked to let Alisha know. We will give all materials to the PAC before putting them on the website.

Marc then reviewed the project schedule and the project roadmap.

On the project roadmap there is the regional meeting in the middle, develop alternatives in blue, then preferred draft plan. During this time only the TAC is giving you feedback. Citizens will want to be give feedback, too. Shouldn't the PAC also meet during this time?

PAC members will also be part of the regional meetings. The initial process has the PAC working on the plan after TAC meeting #6, but we are open to having an additional PAC meeting.

Can we audit the TAC meetings to ensure that what comes to us is properly conveyed to us?

Yes, you can attend and we will notify you of the dates and times. Please let Larry know if you plan to attend so he can be sure there is enough room.

It looks like our comments go to the consultant with just two days for review. Shouldn't the consultant have more review time in case we have substantive comments that need more time?

Yes - this is a model that we strive to meet, but there is flexibility. Also, a majority of comments and review will occur at the PAC meetings.

Public Involvement Plan

Kirstin gave a brief overview of the plan and asked members to email any questions or comments by the following Monday.

Ellen said County staff have made presentations at more than 10 stakeholder outreach meetings and has 20 – 30 more to go. She will get a list to PAC members of all the meetings and get the meetings listed on the project website. Kirstin asked PAC members to let Ellen know if they would like to attend any of the presentations.

Draft Vision and Goals

Jeanne led an exercise to collect PAC feedback on the vision and goals and begin working toward objectives. She noted the County is on the cutting edge of modern, integrated transportation planning. Group exercise:

PAC members wrote words or phrases representing their values for the TSP to help clarify, support or comment on the goal categories. After the meeting, members placed dots on the ones they care about the most. Results are attached.

Local Business & Jobs (2)	Livable & Local (2)	Equitable & Accessible (5)	Fiscally Responsible (5)	Health & Safety (8)	Sustainable (3)	Other Issues
Identifying capacity needs of transportation to enhance economy and creation of jobs. (7)	Livability (1)	Accessibility	Well-maintained roads – safety (4)	Safety for auto drivers	Sustainable (3)	Good access to football games (2)
Get ag products to market (1)	Quality of life promotion (2)	Supports access to community services (12)	Design maintainable roads (2)	Safe roads (5)	Building sustainable communities (10)	Simplicity (1)
Diverse mix of development (jobs) not focused on large centers (1)	“Last mile” transportation system. (7)	Multi-mode connections: walk, bike and transit	Funding identified	Low accidents – million miles traveled for cyclists, pedestrians and equestrians	Water runoff – treatment and /or infiltration (swales) (2)	Public involvement (1)
Citizenry moves closer to jobs through exchange options (1)	Neighborhood supportive access.	Multiple modes (1)	Cost effective construction	Safety for biking	Increase natural areas locally	Draft goal: freedom to choose methods of transportation that suite individual needs, desires and lifestyle (3)
Access to employment (2)	Community solutions – keep it close to home (1)	Off road connections between communities	Timeline	Safety over speed – need signals and reduced speed areas in congested areas (1)	Healthy waterways	Transit within county (4)
Efficient transportation of goods / materials (1)	No noise pollution (1)	Bicyclists, pedestrians, equestrians – feel comfortable using the transportation system (1)	Cost appropriate	Pedestrian safety (3)	Reduce emissions (1)	Improve public mass transportation system (1)
Good access to	Promote	Access for	Right size	Safety (3)	Long term	Beautiful

Local Business & Jobs (2)	Livable & Local (2)	Equitable & Accessible (5)	Fiscally Responsible (5)	Health & Safety (8)	Sustainable (3)	Other Issues
major roads for business	tourism	vulnerable populations (3)	infrastructure		designs	
	Make roads work for neighborhoods – not just about capacity (7)	Services near housing	Financing road repair and maintenance – local gas tax?	Health and safety (2)	Carbon control – clean air (2)	
		Accessibility – local and ADA	Taxes for roads not increase as a proportion of income (1)	Arterials near UGB at county standards with shoulders without abrupt ditch	Sustainable: buy a Honda Civic to reduce greenhouse gas emissions (1)	
		Accessibility for disabled	Affordable	All age bicycling	Road maintenance balanced by preservation i.e. weight limits may preserve fragile surfaces (1)	
		Access – park and ride (1)	Affordable transit network (1)	Fog lines	Consider geology – falling rocks, landslides, slope creep, flooding (1)	
		Rapid access to services		Rural kids and others – safe walking, biking and riding horses	More (all) transportation without carbon releases (2)	
					Efficient transportation (2)	
					Encourage forward flow (1)	
					Continuing relevance of transportation system through changing times – avoid stranded investment (3)	
					The county actually implements sustainability policy rather than just listing it.	

* Numbers next to text reflect the number of dots for each goal or issue.

In recapping the exercise, Jeanne observed that there were a few new suggestions, such as aesthetics. The project team will review these against the draft and get back to the PAC at the next meeting. Any further feedback should be given to Ellen.

White Papers Overview

Marc gave a brief overview of the white papers that are provided for immediate review and feedback, with additional time to discuss at the next meeting. The worksheet will be distributed electronically after the meeting to PAC members. Comments via the completed sheet are requested by Monday, October 24.

It says national funding but not state or local funding?

There is an attachment to 52.A that talks about local funding. If the local funding matrix is not included, we will get that to you.

Marc advised that the TSP is very complex. It used to be roads and cars, now we are looking at multiple dimensions. This is the first time public health has been included in a TSP to this degree.

Building a sustainable system, how do we create jobs and economies locally? We need to create balance that will go across all things. We have to be smarter than just applying the resources we have.

Through homework and between now and next meeting, Marc asked PAC members to narrow the field and figure where we want to go as part of this process as we cannot do everything. He reminded the PAC members that they are the sounding board for the direction of the TSP process.

Next Steps

Kirstin recapped follow-up items:

- Chair / Vice-Chair – attributes and interest (PAC to consider at next meeting; people interested in serving as chair/vice-chair or wanting to suggest someone to serve should contact Ellen)
- PAC membership – rural/urban perspective (PMT to review, report back)
- Change unexcused absences from 3 to 2 (consultant to change in Charter)
- PAC meeting on alternative development (PMT to consider)
- Public comment period earlier in the agenda (PMT to consider)
- TAC meeting schedule / times provided to PAC (consultant to provide)
- Stakeholder meeting schedule / times provided to PAC (consultant to provide)
- Fillable worksheet to PAC (consultant to email)
- Comments on white papers, charter and public involvement plan by Monday, October 24 (PAC members)

Next Meeting:

Tuesday, November 15, 6:30 pm; same location. The meeting was adjourned.