Clackamas County TSP
Public Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting #3
February 7, 2012 / 6:00 – 9:00 pm
Development Services Building, Room 115
150 Beavercreek Road
Draft Summary

Attendees

PAC Members: Tom Civiletti, Jamie Damon, Charlene DeBruin, Paul Edgar, Thomas Eskridge, Mike Foley, Elizabeth Graser-Lindsey, Ben Horner-Johnson, Alan Hull, Chips Janger, Glenn Koehrsen, Bob Reeves, Rachel Summer, Laurie Swanson-Freeman, Richard Swift, Michael Wagner, Dick Weber

County staff and Consultants: Karen Buehrig, Larry Conrad and Ellen Rogalin (Clackamas County); Marc Butorac, Erin Ferguson and Susie Wright (Kittelson & Associates); Steve White (Oregon Public Health Institute); Alisha Dishaw and Kirstin Greene (Cogan Owens Cogan)

Public: Simon DeBruin, John Valley (Senator Merkley's office), Thelma Haggenmiller

Unable to Attend: Kim Buchholz, Alfredo Camacho, Walt Gamble, Al Levit, Thomas Mack, Ernie Platt and Leah Robbins (PAC Members)

Discussion Note: A summary of PAC member comments and questions is shown in *italics* followed by staff responses in regular text. Conversation has been organized by agenda item.

Welcome

PAC Chair Chips Janger called the meeting to order and thanked everyone for attending.

Karen Buehrig, County Project Manager, thanked PAC members for their time and assistance the previous week at the TSP Regional Workshops. She said they were successful. She said that while the turnout was lower than the County would like, project members were able to introduce the TSP to a diverse range of participants. The Workshops also gave PAC members an opportunity to get to know each other in a more casual setting.

Regarding this evening's PAC meeting, Karen stated the two objectives – a recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners on Vision, Goals and Objectives; the other is the evaluation criteria and performance measures that will be used to measure progress toward the visions, goals and objectives over time.

Meeting Purpose and Outcomes

Facilitator Kirstin Greene reviewed the agenda, discussed the updated storyboard and timeline and reiterated the meeting purpose and desired outcomes:
- *Primary Meeting Purpose(s):* Finalize draft objectives; discuss draft evaluation criteria and performance measures.
- *Desired Outcomes:* Recommended project vision, goals, and objectives. Feedback on draft evaluation criteria and performance measures.

Public comment:
Kirstin said that Elizabeth brought two public comments from community members. PAC members reviewed the letters; they are included with the meeting summary.

Vision, Goals and Objectives

Considering public comment from the Regional Workshops, Kirstin and Marc lead the group in the final discussion about the Vision, Goals, and Objectives. Reporting from the comment forms and virtual open house responses, she said that the recommended draft vision and goals generally received a score of 4 or higher. This is a high rating and should be considered an affirmation of the PAC's work.

PAC members had the following comments on the Regional Workshops:
- *I am a little concerned that I knew most the people that showed up at the Milwaukie regional meeting from neighborhood associations, CPOs, Milwaukie Area Plan etc. Same people already plugged in were there. While people were thoughtful, they seemed a little bit overwhelmed by the number and complexity of goal and objective statements. They appreciated the ability to give feedback later online. All in all most people did make at least some of their concerns known.*
- *Appreciated that the language was redone and personally would like it to stay that way and not have it go back.*
- *If this document is to be a usable document by the citizens then it should be written in English. It was so useful and helpful to have it written in plain English. Why do we have to go back to the other language?*
- The language that we worked with and that is in the Tech Memo #6.1 came out of a more technical process and that also informs the evaluation criteria. The more complex version carries some subtleties that are used as a base for the evaluation criteria.
- *I am concerned with technical-ese as leads us into a more legal decision making process that we don't necessarily understand that are implied in that speak.*
- *We need it to be reader friendly otherwise it's off-putting. I can't say to you how important it is that it is simple and everyone can understand it.*
- Staff will consider using the less-technical or somewhat less technical language where possible.

- *People are very aware of what is happening in their very small neighborhood but tend to be unaware or don't even care what is happening in someone else's neighborhood. People would ask me specific questions about local questions and I would have to send them to a staff person.*
- *Thought the regional workshops were a great opportunity to get a pen out and mark on the maps. A lot of PAC members want to give specific input and highly recommend taking some time to mark up the maps.*
- This option is still available online.
- *Has been involved in a lot of processes and this is the only process that I have seen that whatever you put down it will actually be counted. We as PAC members need to do better about getting people to these meetings. That is going to be one of the ways to fill up attendance.*

Vision:

Through group discussion, the PAC came to consensus on the vision, goals and objectives as follows:

Building on the foundation of our existing assets, we envision a well-maintained and designed transportation system that provides safety, flexibility, mobility, accessibility, and connectivity for people, goods and services; is tailored to our diverse geographies; and supports future needs and land use plans.

Goals and Objectives:

Goal 1: Sustainable
Provide a transportation system that ~~balances~~ optimizes benefits to the environment, the economy, and the community.

Goal 2: Local Business and Jobs
Plan the transportation system to ~~support~~ create a prosperous and adaptable economy and further the economic well-being of businesses and residents of the county.

Goal 3: Livable and Local
Tailor transportation solutions to suit the diversity of local communities.

Goal 4: Health and Safety
Promote a transportation system that maintains ~~and~~ or improves our safety, health, and security.

Goal 5: Equity
Provide an equitable transportation system.

Goal 6: Fiscally Responsible
Promote a fiscally responsible approach to protect and improve the existing transportation system and implement a cost-effective system to meet ~~shared~~ future needs.

Issues and Solutions

Marc Butorac, Consultant Team Project Manager, then discussed the map-based comments received at the Regional Workshops. He noted the maps in the back of the room from the workshops with participants' comments. Those have also been recorded on the maps on the website – over 90 total.

Kirstin asked PAC members to forward this information to their listservs or email lists to drive people to the website to put their comments. Alisha will send an email that PAC members can forward.

- *I am concerned that no one was really ever talking about impediments in the system towards business or the economy. Focusing more on the superficial things. Major things were not solicited to look at the global picture. Like freight movement. Or what do we need to do to create jobs. Focusing on how could I ride a bike from one side of town to the other. If I'm weighting something – where would I put my money to get greatest return on investment. Somewhere along the line somebody will have to start paying taxes. If we get buried down in the tiny things we lose track of the big picture.*
- Erin Ferguson, Transportation Engineer with Kittelson and Associates, confirmed that we could create a general comment box for the map so that these types of comments could be included. Also, countywide comments could be included here.
- *There is concern with state highways that are part of the county. We are talking about county roads in this TSP but not state roads.*
- We are not excluding comments on state roads and we will forward these to ODOT. We are looking at the state system and will be part of our identification of deficiencies, but we are not going to get into the level of detail of specific issues and solutions.
- *In the general comments area, could we also clarify that we are looking for comments by region. Recreation and getting to Mt. Hood and it's the particular regional area not intersection.*
- Safe access onto state roads will be one consideration. There are many places that are accessible only by one narrow county road. If the road is cut off then you isolate the area. We may be able to identify other connections through this process.

Evaluation Criteria and Performance Measures

Marc discussed the storyboard handout and advised we are moving out of first phase of work into the second. He said that they would use these evaluation criteria and measures to access baseline conditions. Looking at today and 2035 and identifying deficiencies based on

the evaluation over the next 3 – 4 months for the next PAC meeting. We are making a major step forward here in moving into the project Discovery phase. The full presentation is available at www.clackamascountytsp.com.

Discussion:
- *Can you differentiate measure and criteria for me?*
- The measure is like a ruler. Say we measure you at 5.10 and the criteria we use to see if you are tall enough to be on the basketball team.
- *The arrows are in the PPT diagram are confusing.*
- We can move fiscally and vision plan down below the Preferred Plan to decrease confusion.
- *Preferred plan is the wish list. If you've asked for and planned for it you just don't have the funding you will be more likely to get funding down the road.*
- We are giving an overview of where we are heading over the next year. The best thing we can do is to define them in language with which we are comfortable.
- The workshop results included comments about where is the money? For example, if the preferred plan is 500 million but revenue only shows that we have 50-100 million. What to do? There is a loop back that if there is so much unfunded then is it realistic to say that we will get there. There is a point where you can take this where it gets so big that it is unrealistic and we will have to look at that. But at the same point you want to be able to have it in there so that you can look for other funding sources. It's a balance.
- *Urban unincorporated fell into low bid, where does rural fit?*
- Under unconstrained.
- *What about all the plans that have not been done. How do those get into them?*
- There are a lot that are planned by the County. ODOT has a number of projects in their STIP. Planned in rural that we will have to take a look at but we will have to look further.

Karen asked members to work in small groups to discuss Tech Memo #6.1 Evaluation Criteria and Performance Measures. She asked members to identify any questions they have, and to indicate whether anything is missing. These have been developed by the project team and reviewed by the Technical Advisory Committee. Karen referred the group to pages 13 – 17 of Tech Memo #6.1 and advised that additional the table on page 18 has more detailed information.   She introduced Chips to give an example of what might be missing in this draft.

Chips said that at regional workshops, he found, by talking with PAC members, that we have had many similar experiences, including running organizations and businesses. Chips found that having read a lot of business plans that what's missing in Tech Memo #6.1 is a risk analysis. What happens if assumptions that this is based upon don't come about. We as the PAC have a lot to contribute. It's important not to get swept up in spending time making little decisions if we miss the big picture.

- *Page 6 elaborates and explains these better.*
- They are grouped differently. In this memo – they are not directly related to the goals except for at the end of the table. Objectives meet a variety of goals.
- *For years we have spoken about attracting development – the concept should be accommodating development.*

Results from the small group discussions are included in an attachment to this summary.

In wrapping up, Marc noted that the measures are going to allow us to evaluate things and the criteria is what data is available to us to actually measure that thing. If the data is not available or would cost too much to do then that measure was taken off the table. The measures here are ones that we have the data and the capability to use.

- *There were a lot of thoughtful ideas have been heard tonight and they should make their way into the matrices.*
- One suggestion is to take a week and please read and email in some thoughts and comments. At that point project team could evaluate whether another meeting is needed to go over this.
- *I personally think it takes too much of my time to document all comments and send them in. Spent hours on the white papers and was not used. Would like to get together as a meeting to decide on this.*
- *Gravel roads are expensive to maintain, do you have access to those studies? Sometimes gravel roads cost a lot more than paved roads. Would like to see data on what they cost in the long run.*
- *This is significant particularly since the county has been talking about this exact thing and that we may have to prioritize which roads might go to gravel. I don't think we are talking about creating gravel roads to maintain but letting them go to gravel.*
- *Has Clackamas County started to allow roads turn into gravel?*
- Not that I'm aware of. The intent was to highlight the issue.
- We have a lot of valuable information on the flip charts and we were not able to talk about them. The project team will report the comments this evening and develop a strategy – such an additional meeting - after seeing all the comments.
- *Discussion helps everyone understand these concepts. How was equestrian considered?*
- TAC looked at equestrian – types of things that we are required to do, looked at type of travel in the sense of equestrian being travel for recreation vs. transportation; what we have available now to review it; TAC really felt that within our TSP that this wasn't the place to take on the analysis of the equestrian system.
- For equestrian I think it's fair when we're talking about adding shoulders to rural areas as it provides benefits to multiple users. The TAC was not interested in identifying the equestrian as a system, but it's fair to note that shoulders will serve that user group.

- *I know we have roads that get us to the bigger places and we have connector roads for the rural areas. Almost all rural roads are not up to standard. Need to identify main roads.*
- *I think that it's incorrect to say whether it's about equestrian or not. County has all these different constituencies that are dismissed before it goes to the public. Dismissed without any proper review.*

Karen then explained that she thinks there is likely value for us as a PAC to gather again in a shorter and more consolidated meeting. Marc asked the PAC to review page 6 of Tech Memo #6.1 over the next and answer the two questions: do you have questions and is there anything missing. He asked the group to review and forward all responses and comments to Alisha by February 14th. Marc said the project team will review the responses and the PAC will come back and discuss the results.

Karen discussed the handout that Elizabeth put together on County funding. She discussed the transportation brown bag and that we will continue to have a series of brown bag meetings to engage PAC members who would like more information.

- *Can we have a March meeting to continue this discussion today?*
- Yes in February. We will get back to you on the timing.

Kirstin recalled that one thing we talked about at the beginning of the meeting is the question of language. Karen and Marc will look at lightening up the language but full simplified but simpler than the original. Please stay tuned on the language discussion.
- *Simplified in the executive summary and detailed in full plan would be acceptable.*

Public Comment:
Thelma: When we were designing the Tuality Trail – Elizabeth's comments came up and people in the community had horses and the trail was supposed to be designed to accommodate bikes, peds, and equestrians. Nobody ever combines when they are doing – they just talk bike/ped. They should be including equestrians. We did get equestrian friendly on that trail because the issue was brought up. Road separated pathways should include three users.

Chips adjourned the meeting at 9 pm.

Transportation System Plan

1 message

Jessica Lindsey <jessica.h.lindsey@gmail.com>
Tue, Feb 7, 2012 at 9:45 AM

To: Alisha Dishaw <alisha.dishaw@coganowens.com>

Dear Alisha:
I am sorry I missed your open house meeting. Please include this feedback. I have 3 horses that I ride and drive with the carriage on Beavercreek's roads. The conditions of the road are unsafe and dangerous for road users who are not cars and I would like equestrians to be considered in the Transportation System Plan. (I bike also, because I don't drive a car). A helpful link for understanding this situation that I made is at: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PLw2VStpbCM Can you please have the committee view this?
Sincerely,
Jessica Lindsey

Thiessen Stables

Dave and Michelle Thiessen

Date: February 7, 2012

RE: Beavercreek Road, Oregon City, Oregon 97045

With living on Beavercreek Road with horses and running a horse boarding facility has been very difficult with the way Beavercreek Road is laid out for any pedestrian, bicyclist, equine or a vehicle that needs to pull over for any reason. If there was more of a shoulder on the road it would be easier for any pedestrian, bicyclist or equine to walk safely on Beavercreek Road. But, currently as of today there is no safe way for any of the mentioned above to be able to do so.

With us being a horse boarding facility there is no close trails or area to go riding at for our clients. We always have to haul out to a trail head or an equine facility. It is very unsafe to even ride along Beavercreek Road to get to a side street like Lammer Road, Wilson Road or even Ferguson Road from our facility. If there was more of a shoulder along the road then it would open up more opportunities for our clients to go and enjoy the community.

Additionally, on Beavercreek Road right around Lammer Road there is a curve in the road that bends that has a white picket fence that has a Victorian home. On that curve the speed limit if 45 miles per hour which has had many accidents each year. The last few years there was Life Flight that had to come in to take a male to the hospital. Beavercreek Road was shut down for awhile and we used our driveway as a turn around since there was not enough shoulder for vehicles to turnaround safely. Not only is our driveway used for accidents but it is also used as everyday turnaround when people are going the wrong way or need to pull over to let traffic pass them. This corner is unsafe and the speed needs to be relooked at with as many accidents that have occurred over the years. One day someone will not live because of the speed people take at this curve.

Thank you for taking the time and relooking at what needs to be done to Beavercreek Road for the future of pedestrian, bicyclist, equine or a vehicle that needs to pull over for any reason.

Thank You

Michelle Thiessen
Owner/Manager

21339 S Beavercreek Road

Oregon City, OR 97045
503-784-6722 Michelle Cell
503-704-8681 Dave Cell
thiessenstables@yahoo.com

Clackamas County TSP
Public Advisory Committee Comments on TM 6.1
February 15, 2012

In addition to the small group discussions, comments have been received from Al Levit, Tom Civiletti and Elizabeth Graser-Lindsey. Notes from the small group discussions and Al and Tom's comments are reflected below by theme.

The comments received Public Advisory Committee members were organized into three basic categories:

1. Comments or questions that will be addressed and answered in future work within the Transportation System Plan update (symbol: **F**);
2. Suggestions that are outside the scope of the Transportation System Plan update (symbol: **O**); and
3. Suggestions and edits the project team incorporated into the measures and evaluation criteria and/or suggestions and edits already addressed by an existing measure or evaluation criteria (symbol:✓).

The project management team placed the symbols above next to each comment below based on the category into which the comment fell.

General Comments

✓ It seems to me that the description/purpose sections do not have a consistent theme. Some are just statements, some could be used to come up with a project ranking scheme and some just "hang there." (AL)

F Is the change in population and demographic mobility included?

✓ TDM programs – benefit measurement. (Vehicle miles reduced and number of programs)

F Risk analysis is missing. What if some of the expectations, projections don't come about or change.

F Priorities – which roads do we let go to gravel.

F "Ultimate" outcomes or modeled outcomes i.e. bike / ped traffic.

✓ Potential limitation of meaning for measures not easily mapped or visual.

✓ Need a measure / evaluation criteria to encourage alternative routes especially in isolated areas.

✓ Some measures don't seem like measures.
Note from the Project Management Team: Some measures are qualitative and not measurable for developing the plan but can be useful over time to determine if the objectives are being met. The above comment was considered, but no changes were made to the measures and evaluation criteria.

Bike / Pedestrian

- ✓ Bike and Pedestrian Facilities: This is a good, quantifiable goal but the purpose statement should have a target of miles or % increase to assess impacts. Otherwise, all projects will have an impact on that mileage - or some miles so all will have equal weight w/o a target. (AL)

- ✓ Low Volume Streets: essentially the same comment as above. (AL)

- O Bike use of sidewalks? Legal?

- F Should include equestrian.

Funding

- ✓ Budget Allocations and Funding are different tools but the descriptions and purpose sections are essentially the same. I would suggest something along the lines of current or near term funding and long-term funding to distinguish the two categories. Or, just collapse the 2 into 1. (AL)

- F Stable funding – review and include user fees.

- F Funding should stay within the County.

- F Fuel Tax.

- F Consider contingency funds to help deal with unexpected natural disasters.

- F Need to assess / consider fluctuations in funding due to influence of human behavior on sources such as gas tax.

- F Pavement conditions – want to see conditions map not just percentage.

Environment

- ✓ The section on Alternative Energy Programs description should replace "quantify the number of" to "identify and determine the current effectiveness of." The purpose should be to track the increase of use unless the TSP will have the ability to kill non-performing programs or actions (which I doubt it can do but should be done in general.) (AL)

- ✓ Aren't construction emissions already required in EIS statements and BMP already included in contracts? (AL)

- F The sensitive uses tool essentially has 2 options - don't build more emitting transportation facilities near schools/daycares, etc. or near senior housing/centers, etc. (AL)

- ✓ The emissions tool purpose doesn't sound like an action item. We'll be aware of them but will we make decisions to reduce them? If so, say so. (AL)

- O The energy efficiency tool description should quantify the number of vehicles at the implementation of the new TSP while the purpose will improve air quality by increasing the usage of such vehicles. As written, the purpose is just a statement which doesn't give a way to evaluate programs. (AL)

- o 1.1.4, 4. 7 Measure effectiveness of alt-fuel and fuel efficient vehicles based on goals such as total energy use, reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, economic efficiency, etc.; not by accepting all such vehicles as equally advantageous. (TC)
- o 4.6 Factor prevailing winds into consideration of effect of transportation corridors on air quality. This may require meteorological data or air quality monitoring at points of concern. (TC)
- o Concerning Tom's 4.6, the Hamlet of Beavercreek learned that there is an existing air quality network and we heard of air quality concerns in our area from prevailing winds pushing polluted air our way from several health professionals, so I know from those past experiences that there is some data on this. The NWS (National Weather Service office in Portland looks at weather maps every day to make forecasts so they are likely to know prevailing weather patterns from experience. I used to go to the local American Meteorological Society meetings and had the pleasure of visiting there. (EGL)
- ✓ Emissions – should we be looking at local jobs? Does the project support local jobs?
- ✓ Exposure to air toxics. Also include reduction in congestion. Look at programs that adjust peak period activities.
- o Alternative fuel is not always efficient – we should be more selective in what we are encouraging.

Motorized Vehicles and Roadways
- ✓ Level of service for motorized is missing.
- ✓ Add rail to freight movement.
- ✓ Freight connectivity.
- ✓ Also need to measure cost of moving people – not just their travel time.
- ✓ Intersections.
- ✓ Access to highway – should be considered another measure under Objective 2.2.

Public Safety
- ✓ Emergency Vehicle Response Time section is clear and direct. I guess this is what they should all be. (AL)
- ✓ The space for ... tool is interesting. I think it is extremely rare that there is no space for such activities. Isn't it more likely that there isn't good access? I would propose a change to measure effectiveness in terms of a maximum number of miles required or time it takes for emergency vehicles to reach an incident and then to get victims to care facilities. Building in enough extra space would be impossible as it would require massive infrastructure due to the randomness of accidents. (AL)
Note from the Project Management Team: The purpose of this measure is to reward projects that protect existing space and/or add such space to the system. The additional space is beneficial for incident management and emergency vehicle response time. The above comment was considered, but no changes were made to the measures and evaluation criteria.

- ✓ 3.2 Should the county aid school districts in producing Safe Routes to School plans in addition to counting the number of those that have them? (TC)
- ✓ Sheriff Deputy Involvement – input into safety hazards.
- ✓ Include safety in school programs.
- ✓ Education for school kids.
- O Education for bicyclists.
- ✓ What about potential crashes?
- F Infrastructure condition for safety throughout County – up to standard? Highways used to measure safety.
- O What County roads to be evaluated in terms of CMFs?
- ✓ Emergency vehicles response time – ability for vehicles to pull off roadway/shoulders.

Social / Community
- ✓ The employment accessibility tool description is good but the purpose is redundant and is written in a way that implies the county should be affecting the way businesses design their facilities. Perhaps the purpose should be for the TSP projects to provide attractive work neighborhoods hoping that this will encourage businesses to spruce up. Actually, accessibility and attractiveness should be separate tools. (AL)
- ✓ Access to schools – bikes; urban / not rural.
  Note from Project Management Team: Access to schools for pedestrians and bicyclist is important in urban and rural areas. Families living in rural areas area active and the measures and evaluation criteria should reflect that to the extent possible. The above comment was considered, but no changes were made to the measures and evaluation criteria.

Transit
- ✓ There is no mention of park-and-ride facilities and route service of the facilities. The facilities should be mentioned under infrastructure. Service of the facilities is not covered by any description in the transit section. Example of relevance: Tri-met bus 99X does not stop at the Milwaukie Elks Club park-and-ride. So, infrastructure exists, but is not optimally utilized. (TC)
- ✓ Cost. Benefit from different types of service.
- O Efficiency – can number of times required for transit transfer be looked at?
- ✓ Cost.
- ✓ Access to transit in rural areas – lack of park and rides is a deterrent to transit.
- F Transit reasonable to Portland but not cross-country destinations.

Elizabeth Graser-Lindsey's Comments

The comments the project team received from Elizabeth are below in black text. They are organized to be similar to the table summary that begins on page 6 of Technical Memorandum 6.1. The green text in the table below is the project team's responses to Elizabeth's comments.

BIKE /PEDESTRIAN/**EQUESTRIAN** (*New)*

Measure/Evaluation Tool	Description	Purpose	Project Team Response
Measure of Bicycle Safety	Quantify bike safety in terms of absolute numbers (# accidents/year), relative to motor vehicle accident statistics (# accidents/ VMT (vehicle miles traveled) and # accidents as percentage of traffic)	To monitor bicycle safety progress	The frequency and severity of crashes will be considered for all modes as part of Objective 4.1.
Measure of Bicycle Use	Quantify percentage of traffic traveling by bicycle by location	To determine progress in prioritizing and providing transportation to non-motorists, reducing carbon emissions, increasing public health, reducing road damage, serving areas without public transportation options.	Sufficient bicycle traffic volume data is not available and not financially feasible to collect within the timeline of the Transportation System Plan Update.
Measure Public Attitudes about Self-Powered Transportation (safety, interest)	Quantify by surveying public attitudes about their interest and perceptions of safety for self-powered transportation for subareas of the county	To identify locations where infrastructure facilities for or public interest in self-powered transportation are a barrier to potential use of these means of transport; To wisely prioritize and design projects	The purpose of the online interactive map and public open houses is to collect this type of information. A targeted, county-wide survey on this subject is not within the scope of the Transportation System Plan Update

Measure/Evaluation Tool	Description	Purpose	Project Team Response
Monitor Areas with Common Non-Conforming Use	Identify areas where pedestrians or cyclists or equestrians are not using the transportation facility as designed or encountering safety risks e.g. high amounts of jaywalking across Hwy 99	To increase safety of non motorists; to identify needed infrastructure changes to accommodate pedestrians, etc. such as by adding cross walks at a frequency related to actual behavior.	This level of detailed analysis is not financially feasible within the timeline of the Transportation System Plan update. The project team has asked community members to inform of us of such concerns through the use of the online interactive map and at the public open houses.
Determine the needs of the Equestrian Community	Communicate with the equestrian community about their needs recognizing that the needs may vary by location and that the community may have subsets which should be identified.	To allow Bike/Ped Facilities to be inclusive of equestrians	The project team will be establishing a sub-committee of interested Public Advisory Committee members to identify existing equestrian facilities and identify how connections to those facilities could be improved.

BIKE /PEDESTRIAN/EQUESTRIAN (*Improved*)

Measure/Evaluation Tool	Description	Purpose	Project Team Response
Access to Schools	**Roads** instead of streets Note: "Streets" sounds urban, "Roads" is inclusive of rural areas Streets		Revised to roads.

Measure/Evaluation Tool	Description	Purpose	Project Team Response
Bike and Pedestrian Facilities	Quantify miles of **safe** bicycle and pedestrian facilities such as sidewalks and bike paths **in urban areas and compliant shoulders in rural areas** Note: there are facilities everywhere: by law pedestrians and cyclists share the lane everywhere if there are not dedicated facilities		Modified to read "Quantify miles of bicycle and pedestrian facilities, such as sidewalks, bicycle lanes, multi-use paths, and sufficiently wide shoulders." The term safe is subjective and means different things to different people. Crashes are also random events influenced more by road user behavior than roadway infrastructure. Bicyclists can be and have been hit while riding in bicycle lanes, which some may consider a safe facility.
Bike and Pedestrian Network on Low Volume **Roads** Note: "Streets" sounds urban, "Roads" is inclusive of rural areas Streets	Add: Measure separately for urban and rural where in rural areas the shoulder might be the main facility	Increase safety… Note: move to top	In implementing this measure, the project team will evaluate the urban and rural areas separately. The term "street" replaced by roads.

FUNDING

Measure/Evaluation Tool	Description	Purpose	Project Team Response
Budget Allocation **Distinguish restricted money: money available for capacity, safety and maintenance and urban and rural uses**		**Add safety**	These distinctions will be made in forthcoming Transportation System Plan update activities.

Measure/Evaluation Tool	Description	Purpose	Project Team Response
Funding (same)		**Prioritize financially feasible projects on safety and capacity lists**	The discussion of priorities will be held in more detail after the forthcoming existing and future conditions analysis results. Objective 6.5 discusses prioritizing projects, programs, policies based on their impacts on safety, mobility and multiple modes.
Quantify Transportation Maintenance **Needs**	**Add map**		Existing conditions analysis will begin to look at current roadway conditions. Information will be mapped to the extent that roadway data is available in a format conducive to mapping (i.e., geo-located data).
Quantify Traffic Safety Needs	**Identify and map percentage of the transportation network that needs safety improvements based on Crash Modification Factors, etc. (inclusive of shoulders, ditches, guard rails, rumble strips, reflectors, fog line, sight distances, etc)**		Crashes and the opportunity to improve safety on the transportation system are captured in Objective 4.1.

Crash modification factors are used to consider the potential safety tradeoffs when designing roadway improvements. The analysis for the Transportation System Plan update will not get to this level of detailed analysis. The Transportation System Plan will identify locations for safety corridor studies to evaluate potential improvements that integrate engineering, education, enforcement, and emergency services solutions. |
| **Reduce wasted funding from needless road damage** | **Protect roads from heavy vehicle damage and studded tires by keeping off neighborhood streets and legal changes such as paying full cost of repair and/or restricting.**

Note: Cam Gilmour said heavy vehicles cause 6000x the damage of a car. | | This idea is better suited for a policy or program as opposed to a measure or evaluation criteria. Future activities within the Transportation System Plan update will provide an opportunity to provide input on potential policies and programs. |

Measure/Evaluation Tool	Description	Purpose	Project Team Response
Monitor public sentiment about transportation priorities and transportation costs	**Keep the public informed about transportation funding issues. Survey CPOs about road priorities and attitudes about tax/fee/fares.**	**Keep income in line with public desires. If funding is insufficient, make sure citizens have input on their community priorities**	This is the purpose of Objective 3.11 and Objective 5.5 which are to create project outreach activities and decision-making processes that provide meaningful opportunities for all residents to influence decision-making.
Bring cost of services in line with funding	**Have fares, fees and public payments reflect the actual costs of service; Quantify and ameliorate external costs.**	**Let the (economic) market communicate real costs so good decisions will be made. Determine the subsidizes/favorable treatment (local and state and federal) and externalized costs given various components of the transportation system. Reduce or eliminate these barriers to a level playing field while remedying historical inequities.**	This idea is better suited for a policy or program as opposed to a measure or evaluation criteria. Future activities within the Transportation System Plan update will provide an opportunity to provide input on potential policies and programs.
Interact with Easement and Property Donors and Donors of Resources and Waste Asphalt and Utilize the County's own under-utilized transportation resources	**Identify no-cost and low-cost options for paths, shoulders, etc. Enlist volunteer services such as by utilizing waste asphalt, trail builders such as the Oregon Equestrian Trails group, community groups and members e.g. CPOs, churches, Eagle Scouts. Utilize the county's unused roads and historic railroad corridors.**		This idea is better suited for a policy or program as opposed to a measure or evaluation criteria. Future activities within the Transportation System Plan update will provide an opportunity to provide input on potential policies and programs.

ENVIRONMENT

Measure/Evaluation Tool	Description	Purpose	Project Team Response
Carbon-Emission-Reducing Alternate Energy Programs	**Determine the life-cycle carbon emissions of vehicles**; Quantify the number of **Carbon-Emission-Reducing Alternative Energy Vehicles and the Reduction in Carbon Emissions** Note: Electric vehicles could transfer on street carbon emissions to the power plant; alcohol fuels could cause more carbon emissions than gas depending on the conventional sources of alcohol.	…**at reducing carbon emissions.**	It is outside of the scope of the Transportation System Plan to identify specific alternative fuel and fuel efficient vehicle types. The Transportation System Plan can establish a program to identify the preferred alternative fuel and fuel efficient vehicles and then that program can encourage the use of those specific vehicles.
Construction Emissions		…to **reduce/control** emissions	Text modified.
Green Street Design Elements	**List and Distribute…; County Projects** (urban?)		Comment appears more applicable to upcoming project, policy or program discussion.
Sensitive Habitat	**Map, acres**		As feasible based on available data, the project team will map these areas as part of the existing conditions analysis.
Fuel Price		**Impacts motor vehicle use, potentially/currently impacts road funding, identifies a major transportation system trend for planning**	The price of fuel is not directly in control of the County and will not be used as a measure or evaluation criteria to achieve goals.
Fleet Size	**#**	**Identifies a major transportation system trend for planning**	Future traffic volume projections and vehicle fleet composition are considered in analysis models used in the existing and future conditions analysis. The impact of fleet size and composition is captured in other measures such as tons of transportation emissions.

Measure/Evaluation Tool	Description	Purpose	Project Team Response
Incentives	**Provide helpful incentives for the public to reduce their carbon emission which minimize public and private cost**		This idea is better suited as part of the upcoming policy or program discussion.

CAPACITY FOR MOTORIZED VEHICLES ~~AND ROADWAYS~~ (Subject heading revised)

Measure/Evaluation Tool	Description	Purpose	Project Team Response
Average Travel Time		…Develop list of capacity projects	No revisions made. The purpose of the measure is to determine the impact of projects on travel time.
Slow-moving vehicles	**Quantify slow moving vehicles in lane of traffic e.g. farm vehicles, bikes, pedestrians, equestrians, livestock**	**Monitor trends in roadway use; determine where shoulders are needed to reduce conflict between roadway users**	This proposed measure would require a level of detailed analysis beyond the scope of the Transportation System Plan. This is not feasible within the Transportation System Plan update.

SAFETY OF TRAVELING PUBLIC (Subject heading revised)

Measure/Evaluation Tool	Description	Purpose	Project Team Response
Safety Culture	**Quantify measures (infrastructure projects, legal enforcement actions, wreaks, state and county legislations**	**Identify needed changes e.g. current lack of enforcement specific to overwhelming rates of driving without license and insurance.**	Increasing safety culture consists of a broader effort to expand coordination between transportation engineering, enforcement, medical services and education. To specify all of the possible activities that could take place to enhance the safety culture would

Measure/Evaluation Tool	Description	Purpose	Project Team Response
	Add to existing: **and driver attitudes and behavior**		be too limiting and narrow of a definition.
Emergency Vehicle Response Time	**Consider routes and ensure routes are available that utilize arterials rather than neighborhood streets for out-of-the-area responses.**		Considering routes has been incorporated into this measure.
Space for Incident Management and Emergency Vehicles	Adequate space is needed **for vehicles to reach incidents,…** **Quantify miles of rural shoulders on arterials**		If feasible with available data, the project team will consider quantifying the miles of rural shoulders available for incident management.
Vehicle Crashes Add: **Road conditions at location of crash relative to roadway standard**	**Map; Crash/VMT for roadway segments and intersections**	**Develop and Prioritize a Safety List based on Vehicle Crashes**	Crash analysis will include mapping crashes as part of the existing conditions analysis. A roadway that meets County standards is not inherently a safe roadway. Roadways that do not meet County standards are not inherently unsafe. Historically, roadway standards were developed to provide consistency in basic roadway characteristics across jurisdictions - such that a rural roadway that goes to a county boundary matches the cross-section and connects to the roadway at the boundary of the neighboring county.
Infrastructure Condition for Safety	**Map; Miles of Roads at County Standard; Miles of Road with Crash Modification Factors and Rumble Strip, Inclusive of Shoulders, Ditches, Guard Rails, Rumble Strips, Reflectors, Fog Line, Sight Distances, Etc.**	**Develop a Safety List based on Road Condition;** **Identify and Prioritize where safety projects are needed**	A list of safety corridor projects will be developed based on historical crash data reviewed and analyzed as part of existing conditions analysis. This is captured in Objective 4.1.

Measure/Evaluation Tool	Description	Purpose	Project Team Response
Quiet Local Roads	**Discourage overflow of heavy traffic off arterials on to local roads and neighborhood streets**	**Maintain safety for children and pets using the road**	This idea is better suited as a policy or program.

SOCIAL/COMMUNITY

Measure/Evaluation Tool	Description	Purpose	Project Team Response
Design Elements	**Identify and encourage use of design elements in land use planning that improve neighbor access to services and products without the need for use of motor vehicles;** **Map services and housing and map the distances between them for planning purposes**		Developing a map of design elements implemented at a County-wide level is not feasible within the scope of the Transportation System Plan update. This measure will be assessed qualitatively and will evaluate the degree to and consistency with which a project, program, or policy incorporates design elements identified to increase livability and community cohesiveness.
Employment Area Accessibility	**Map the jobs:housing ratio; Encourage voluntary approaches to helping the public live near their work with the goal of reducing the need for commuting e.g. job exchange**	attractiveness of job sites **???**	The purpose of this measure to encourage providing additional access to employment areas to make the employment areas more viable and attractive to potential employers (and their potential employees). The project team will use existing data on current employment areas and future planned employment areas to identify the projects, policies, and programs that benefit them.
Land Use and Transportation Integration	**Measure distance between services and stores from housing; Interact with the public on the integration of Land Use and Transportation; Undertake projects that integrate services and stores with**		Land use and transportation integration will be assessed qualitatively based on the degree to which a project, policy, or program facilitates or improves the integration of residential, employment, government, medical and commercial (including grocery shopping) land uses.

Measure/Evaluation Tool	Description	Purpose	Project Team Response
	neighborhoods		
Rural community equity	**Ensure rural communities are considered in evaluations and projects which work to integrate housing, services/shoping and jobs.**		The needs for transportation improvements in rural communities will be identified as part of the existing and future conditions analysis. Potential projects, programs, and policies to address those needs will be identified based on the results of the existing and future conditions analysis.
Access to Transportation for Transportation Disadvantaged Populations	Include: **rural, young/old, no Driver's Liscence, substance abusers**		The current definition of transportation disadvantaged includes people who cannot drive due to age or ability which in-turn includes people who do not have a driver's license as well as those who are too young, too old, and/or have a substance abuse that impairs their ability. To categorically include rural residents as transportation disadvantaged is inappropriate, as there are sufficiently affluent rural community members with automobiles who are able to drive to meet their needs.