



**Clackamas County TSP
Public Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting #2
November 15, 2011 / 6:00 – 9:00 pm
Development Services Building, Room 115
150 Beaver Creek Road
Draft Summary**

Attendees

PAC Members: Kim Buchholz, Tom Civiletti, Charlene DeBruin, Paul Edgar, Thomas Eskridge, Mike Foley, Walt Gamble, Elizabeth Graser-Lindsey, Ben Horner-Johnson, Alan Hull, Chips Janger, Glenn Koehrsen, Thomas Mack, Al Levit, Ernie Platt, Bob Reeves, Leah Robbins, Rachel Summer, Richard Swift, Michael Wagner, Dick Weber

Staff and consultants: Mike Bezner, Karen Buehrig, Larry Conrad and Ellen Rogalin (Clackamas County); Kelly Laustsen and Susie Wright (Kittelson & Associates); Alisha Dishaw and Kirstin Greene (Cogan Owens Cogan, LLC)

Public: Simon DeBruin

Unable to attend: Alfredo Camacho, Marc Butorac (Kittelson & Associates), and Jeanne Lawson (JLA Public Involvement)

Discussion (Note: PAC member comments and questions are shown in italics followed by staff responses in regular text. Conversation has been organized by agenda item.)

Welcome

Kirstin Greene, Facilitator, convened the group.

Karen Buehrig, County Project Manager, thanked everyone for attending, expressed regrets for missing the first meeting and said she is excited to meet committee members.

Commissioner Jamie Damon also apologized for missing the first meeting. She said she is very glad to be here and has worked on transportation system plans (TSPs) as a public policy mediator throughout the region. She has a fondness for TSPs and understands it is extremely important to engage the community to figure out what the needs are and to get a 20-year blue print for what the transportation system looks like. She recognized that transportation is one of the key services that we look for and that while bike or transit issues may not look the same in rural and urban areas, they do still exist in both areas. She also looks forward to conversations about financing and street design.

Kirstin then asked those who were unable to attend PAC Meeting #1 to introduce themselves.

Karen stated the PAC has two new officially appointed members – Richard Swift and Al Levit. She also said that Mike Foley, who will be here this evening, is another potential PAC member.

Meeting Purpose and Anticipated Outcomes

Kirstin reviewed the meeting purpose and desired outcomes:

- Meeting Purpose: Follow-up on issues identified at meeting #1; agree upon recommended vision and goals; discuss preliminary objectives. Discuss use of white paper review results at this PAC meeting and throughout process. Receive summary briefing on regulatory framework and updated meeting schedule with key topics.
- Desired Outcomes: Final charter, chair/vice-chair, agreement on recommended draft vision and goals, initial feedback on draft objectives. Suggestions for regional meeting format and outreach.

Agenda Review

Kirstin stated a large email packet was sent out a week prior to the meeting. In addition, we mailed hard copies of the large format white paper handout. She reminded PAC members to let Alisha Dishaw know if they need materials to be printed before the meetings or copies brought to the meetings. Kirstin underscored a main objective of the meeting - PAC consensus on the draft vision, goals and preliminary objectives. Kirstin went over the agenda and asked if anything was not covered.

Can we spend time on the white paper spreadsheet? I would like to pursue with the committee if they are really with what the staff came up with.

We have a revised summary sheet that focuses specifically on the goals and objectives portions with the comments listed. We hope to get to this later in the agenda.

Follow-up to PAC Meeting #1

Informal items (representation, “extra” PAC meetings, TAC meeting schedule, stakeholder meeting schedule, miscellaneous)

Michael Wagner said 17 PAC members are located in unincorporated areas and he is satisfied with that demographic representation.

I notice there is potential for adding a couple extra meetings. Can we consider adding those as work sessions rather than as regular PAC meetings?

Karen said two additional PAC meetings could be added as needed. She asked the group to consider when it would be most helpful to add them. Karen said there will be other critical points in the project with a lot of information.

Are the TAC and PAC working on the same topics?

Yes, the TAC discusses the topics and information that the PMT has prepared, and reviews and responds from a technical perspective.

There is a big gap in the meeting schedule from January to April 2012. It seems like February or March would be a good time to hold another meeting.

Between January and April, the project team will finalize performance measures correlated to the goals and objectives. The project team will have a significant amount of work to do to apply to existing system and future baseline. It is likely that we will not have any new information to present between January and April. When we come back in April, we will start brainstorming alternatives.

I have a concern about our role. We have been inundated with material and asked a lot of questions. Concerned about PAC role and if the role is to act as individuals to somehow verify or validate what County staff is putting in front of us so that later we can say we have been through citizen participation. We want to allow you as a group to have full, deep conversation about items we really need input on rather than drowning you with a ton of information. The primary goal today and what we want to be able to talk about are the vision, goals and objectives for this project. The material sent out for the first meeting was to introduce you to the project and provide background information. Unfortunately it was a lot of information. It has been nice to see how involved members got reading through this background information. We will try to be clearer going forward on what the expected outcomes are for each meeting.

I'm curious to hear from the project team, what you think our value is to you.

Karen said PAC members are representative of people who live in Clackamas County. The PAC is here to help the County make sure this project is going in the right direction and to ensure that the plan implements the vision and goals. This project is interesting because we are looking at a unique set of goals. It's essential to have your participation and input as we shape the plan and move forward.

Commissioner Damon said we need to have more time for conversation amongst the group about the things that are important to you. We understand that we need to be hearing from you about what is important to you. She said she likes the working group option that was suggested earlier. You all provide a tremendous value.

The way that material is coming to me is very confusing. I would like the process to be better organized. One suggestion is a web-based way to transmit meeting materials. We could send an email link to the project website where meeting materials are available for download.

When you send out an updated document, please highlight what has changed so we don't have to spend time comparing the two versions. I like the idea of numbering the attachments in relation to the meeting and the version of the document.

Please identify the areas that you need our input on. A lot of this is complicated but to the extent that you can break it down to 100 words to explain the whole concept, please do so. Give us the basics upfront.

We have put a one-pager in front with the key points followed by the longer memo or document.

Include how important this piece is for us to review and whether it needs to be printed for the meeting. Is it a guiding document or just background information?

This could be included on the agenda i.e. whether it is an action item or just informational. In the email sent a week prior, we organized the list into background materials and what we would be discussing.

Are PAC members automatically set up on the website?

Alisha will check that all PAC members are on the website notification list, and if not, will update.

Finish charter discussions; revised draft

Change the first sentence to clearly state that we help develop the plan.

Since the Charge came from the County, Kirstin asked if the County would be amendable to a change to more clearly reflect that suggestion. Commissioner Damon and Karen said that they thought so.

In the charter, under facilitator, it states the facilitator will review meeting summaries, etc. Then what? It should reference that the facilitator will review to ensure that the summary accurately reflects the key issues discussed and agreements or votes.

Under ground rules for meeting conduct, what is meant by behavior outside the meeting and the consequences for inappropriate behavior?

The intent is that as PAC members, officially appointed by the Board of Commissioners, you will act in good faith to resolve issues here and bring issues to the group first.

Members confirmed keeping the number of permitted unexcused absences at two even with the addition of more meetings. Kirstin referred members to a new section on communication in the draft charge –including the email communication log that Alisha will be keeping.

Are personal opinions within the scope of the project allowed?

Yes.

Revisions to/Final PI plan

Kirstin reviewed the changes to the public involvement plan. She acknowledged the map still needs to be updated to include the east County area. Kirstin also said there was a suggestion to require PAC members to pick groups to reach out to and while we will not have a formal process for doing so, Ellen is conducting stakeholder outreach to numerous groups and PAC members should inform their constituents. PAC members expressed interest in knowing when those meetings would occur.

Where Are We Going: Vision and Goals

Background: stakeholder, PAC, TAC feedback

Karen stated that it is important to go through the vision and each of the goals and touch on the objectives to get a sense that the County is going in the right direction. She said the next step is to go to our regional open houses and get the greater public input. She urged PAC members to consider participating in those regional meetings.

Karen said over the past nine months the County has worked internally to come up with the draft vision and goals. Clackamas County is looking at this TSP uniquely and not lead solely by the state and regional requirements for TSPs. The project team, the TAC and various stakeholder groups have taken a look at the draft vision and goals and were asked what their priorities for the transportation system were. Also, the PAC did the purple wall exercise at the last meeting which should be reflected in the updated draft under discussion today.

Karen referred the group to the summary of stakeholder outreach meetings that was part of the email packet. She said they took the vision and goals and simplified the language into different categories to get a sense (through a dot exercise) of priorities throughout the county. Karen and Ellen Rogalin have met with approximately 20 different groups. Ellen said they are getting more requests to meet with various stakeholder groups and plan to visit with more groups in the coming weeks.

Karen stated this outreach helps the County understand where what to prioritize when evaluating the transportation system i.e. commute options, connecting services and jobs, and choices for all. Things that they have found less support for are enhancing existing systems and maintaining focus on health.

How important is public safety in weighting that we apply to decisions that we make? If people know more about the weighting and the criteria methodologies, that will help everyone with the degree of consistency.

First we are working with the framework; the next step is to discuss draft evaluation criteria – how evaluated and how weighted. Health and safety are one of the goals. We have not applied any weight to any of these yet. We will look to you for input and the public for input and feedback.

Enhancing existing systems needs to be more specific. Sometimes if it's expressed wrong, then you get a misinterpretation of the information.

If you look at fixing existing first and enhancing existing, those things might be interchangeable at times. This is confusing since one is the highest and one is the lowest yet they can be the same thing. Kirstin said the project team will troubleshoot or explain the language so that we can avoid these issues at the regional meetings.

Maintaining and improving health scored the lowest on the bar graph and had the most agreement in PAC response to the white papers. I imagine it's not that people don't value health, but they don't understand how transportation impacts health. More information is needed on this. It is a relatively new trend, which could explain why it is scoring lower.

As a committee, if we are looking at this to get information or paint a picture, many are not mutually exclusive. Depending on your own perspective they can be interpreted multiple ways. We need to be clear how these will be used. I see fixing and building as the same importance. This is not a scientific survey. It helps paint the picture to get the general feel for what people are thinking out there.

How many stakeholders were surveyed?
Roughly 300.

Kirstin pointed PAC members' attention to the PAC summary which included a tally of their dots on the vision and goals purple wall exercise. As Susie refined the vision, goals and objectives that we are reviewing tonight, she looked at PAC work, input from the TAC and input from the stakeholder meetings and outreach. This does not include the approximately 50 Internet responses that have been received to date.

When you do process the results from the Internet survey, can you keep them separate from the other results?

Yes.

In looking at the stakeholder summary and comments that were tabulated, a hot issue is whether bike riders should pay for the road. Bike riders on rural roads are not typically from that community and get there by cars and/or own cars. There should be a separate conversation about charging a fee.

Bicyclists are paying their way; any commercial group does pay a fee to use Clackamas County roads.

On the bar graph, it looks like bicyclists should take over the costs of roads from homeowners. That may be an accurate read of this chart, but whether this chart is accurately representing the results is the issue. We will look at this further.

I worked at the County Fair booth and found that most people did not understand the topics. We need to provide something that we can give the public so they understand what the options mean.

Really simple language would be a big help.

Is it possible to get meeting notices for stakeholder meetings?

These are posted to the project website but do not include specific times and locations because most of them are not public meetings. Ellen suggested PAC members contact her for details.

When you have meetings with different constituencies, it would be helpful to have at least two people from this group get invited. That way we will know that nothing is filtered to us.

We can email the group with the subject "CCTSP Opportunities to Attend Stakeholder Meetings".

White Paper Discussion

Some of the information presented to the TAC from our first PAC meeting on the white papers seems not to have aligned with what we checked. People checked the agree box but their comments do not really seem to agree. If that is distorted or not right, then this is an issue.

That is a valid point. Let's talk about those specific issues during the white paper agenda item.

A lot of the questions seem to have applicability in urban setting. As a county as a whole, I couldn't agree with the statements.

The project team needs to be careful not to over-simplify the summary or your input.

The white papers read as documents for engineers by engineers. I'm worried that we are taking that approach to come up with quantitative numbers and answers to the problems. There could be many interpretations of the same thought.

Will we get a summary of the white papers?

There will be time at the next meeting to discuss the white papers and their use for the PAC and the PMT.

Will white papers have modifications based on feedback? What is the intended use of the white papers?

The white papers that you received are in draft form and will be refined. Both TAC and PAC comments are being considered.

Karen said it is challenging because some express concerns about filtering and summarizing can be a form of filtering, but others express the need to summarize more. County did redo the white paper response sheet to include comments. (Elizabeth's lengthy comments have been provided as a separate document.) Karen envisions each person using the document as a reference when we go through goals.

Vision

Karen asked the group to give feedback on changes or amendments.

In the vision and goal statements, verbs are in the present tense and nothing is mentioned about the future. Suggest changing to "Anticipated to be suitable for meeting future needs of the county."

The public wants us to fix our roads and system. The word "sustain" should be removed.

It needs to include future needs as this is a 20-year plan.

Whose plan is this, the county's plan or the plan of the citizens?

It is part of the County's Comprehensive Land Use Plan.

Using existing resources, supports objectives of other plans within this area. It should be wide enough to incorporate other plans.

Plans other than just the County comprehensive plan need to be able to be included.

Foundation of our existing assets – what about our existing values? One value that should be some place is the freedom to choose.

We need to talk about the maintenance of existing infrastructure.

Suggest adding "maintaining" to the first sentence.

Need a meeting at some point just on the current county plans. Many of us do not know what the comprehensive plan is for the county as a whole.

There are so many assets that we do not consider as assets such as light rail. These may be positive for the county but not for all. Are we saying we are going to build infrastructure whether or not it is necessary?

It is saying this is what Clackamas County has and that's where Clackamas County is starting from, but we are not afraid to go back and change if the structures are no longer valid or necessary.

Suggest "Building on our transportation system." Not sure how we can build on existing values, suggest moving values down to diverse values, geographies, etc.

How were mobility, accessibility and connectivity chosen?

Mobility as getting people around; accessibility so that all people can access the system and actually connect the different networks. These were broad terms to lead to the different goals.

The more we try to craft so that it is perfect versus flexible and fluid the more we will have trouble connecting to the goals and objectives.

My concern is that we don't construct something that preserves the model that we already have. In the future our transportation system is going to change. I would hate to have us come up with something that is not flexible for what we may need in the future.

Through discussion the group agreed to recommend amending the Vision to: "We envision a well-maintained and designed transportation system that provides flexibility, mobility, accessibility and connectivity for people, goods and services; and is tailored to our diverse values, geographies and support planned land uses."

Goals and Objectives

Kirstin stated once we are comfortable with the vision and goals, they will go to the regional meetings for the public to review. At our third meeting we will review public input and make a final vision and goals recommendation to the BCC.

Susie said the earlier goal statements were more like paragraphs and the project team broke them down into goals and objectives. Additional information that was in the goal became the start of the objectives. Some of the information is new based on feedback from the TAC, PAC and stakeholder outreach.

Kirstin asked the group to complete a dot exercise. PAC members were asked to put a red dot next to a goal or objective that concerned them and a green dot next to a goal or objective that they agreed with. Susie asked PAC members to consider whether the objectives really define the goal as they interpret and understand the goal. They are not ranked, but they are presented in alphabetical order in every document.

After the exercise, Kirstin asked PAC members why they put some of the red dots where they did. Discussion included the following:

Goal 6 Fiscally Responsible; Objective 6.2: Prioritize projects that improve the existing transportation system for all modes of travel.

- *Type of mode mix should be optional not mandatory.*
- *Different considerations for rural and urban.*
- *Too simplistic. How do you prioritize between all modes of travel? Depending on where you are the mode can be very different.*

Goal 5: Equity

- *Bicyclists do not want to pay anything. Equestrians do not pay anything either.*

Goal 4: Health and Safety; Objective 4.1: Provide for and encourage use of safe, non-motorized transportation options to support public health.

- *Hard to make bicycle travel safe on rural roads.*

Goal 3: Livable and Local; Objective 3.3: Create successful and enduring communities.

- *Not sure how the transportation system would do that.*

- *There are a lot of ways that can be done, some positive and some negative. Does creating further access mean you are going to destroy forest or public land?*
- *How will we determine successful and enduring?*

Goal 2: Local Business and Jobs; Objective 2.2.2: Provide more options for commuting to work by enhancing the existing transportation system and providing for affordable, alternative modes of travel.

- *Not just bikes. Transportation expenditures i.e. sidewalks, light rail, trolleys, bike lanes. Rural folks see trolleys, light rail using transportation dollars that don't necessarily bring benefit to the rural community.*
- *Issue with the amount of budget spent on light rail in Clackamas County when a majority of Clackamas County residents won't use it – how is that equitable for all of Clackamas County?*

All goal headings should be same parts of speech i.e., start with verbs.

Are these goals the same for all regions of the county?

Karen advised that goals and objectives will be applied differently in different areas of the county. For example, goals related to local business and jobs focus on job centers.

Due to time constraints, Karen and Kirstin recommended another PAC meeting be held in December, prior to the regional meeting, to further discuss the vision, goals and objectives, white papers and regional meetings. She recommended PAC members review technical memo #3.1 as homework and at the next meeting PAC members will be given time to discuss it.

Selection of Chair/Vice-Chair

Kirstin asked for a show of hands of those interested in the chair or vice-chair position. Those who expressed interest were:

- Glenn Koehrsen
- Michael Wagner
- Rachel Sumner
- Chips Janger
- Paul Edger
- Ben Horner-Johnson

Kirstin asked those interested to email responses to the questions listed below to Alisha; she will forward them to the group 2 weeks prior to the next meeting:

1. Position sought (chair/vice-chair)
2. Reason for interest
3. How you would maintain impartiality in your role as Chair or Vice-Chair
4. Up to two paragraphs of information about yourself relevant for other PAC members in this context

Funding: Past and Future

Larry briefly reviewed the handouts on funding and county projects over the last 10 years. The four-page spreadsheet is the first draft. The yellow highlighted items are projects currently under contract that are near completion. The color pie chart shows total project expenditures. The second

graph is a summary of the spreadsheet. Karen advised these are all the County-managed projects and does not include projects on state highways.

How much money is federal?

The next step is pulling together that information for you.

Mike Bezner noted the appearance of a funding imbalance between rural and urban. He advised the County gets an allotment that has to be spent in certain areas i.e. rural or urban. Money spent by the County maintenance division, a lot of routine work, is not reflected in the expenditures graph.

Action Items:

- PMT to review suggestion to post meeting materials to project website with an email to the link one week prior.
- When presenting an updated document, project team will highlight updates.
- PMT will indicate on agenda whether materials are an action item or informational.
- Staff will confirm that PAC members are on the website notification list.
- Staff will update PIP to include map of the full county.
- PAC members recommend County update charge to reflect the PAC is more actively advising in the development of the plan. County to consider.
- Staff will email opportunities to attend stakeholder meetings to the entire group with the subject: "CCTSP Opportunities to Attend Stakeholder Meetings."
- Alisha will forward responses to Ben's questions about the scope of work and white papers to the group.
- Staff will keep Internet responses on vision, goals, and objectives separate from the other stakeholder outreach results.
- PAC members to email interest in chair/vice-chair position to Alisha by November 29.
- An additional PAC meeting will be held in December to further discuss the vision, goals and objectives, white papers, technical memo #3.1 and approach to regional meetings.

Meeting adjourned at 9:10 pm.