



Meeting Summary

Stakeholder Working Group Meeting #4

Wednesday, February 3, 2016

7:30 – 9:30 a.m.

North Clackamas Aquatic Park, Parkside Rooms, 7300 SE Harmony Rd

Participants – SWG Members

Li Alligood – *City of Milwaukie*

Dennis Curtis – *Clackamas Town Center*

Ken Horn – *Clackamas Fire District #1*

Martha Waldemar – *Sunnyside CPO*

Jennifer Harding – *East Side Athletic Club*

Chris Runyard – *North Clackamas Urban Watersheds Council*

Luke Norman – *Clackamas Community College*

Ted Hartzell – *Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee*

Joe Krumm – *North Clackamas School District*

Michael Walter – *City of Happy Valley*

Project Team and Guests

Karen Buehrig – *Clackamas County*

Abbot Flatt – *Clackamas County*

Ellen Rogalin – *Clackamas County*

Carl Springer – *DKS Associates*

Sylvia Ciborowski – *JLA Public Involvement*

Dan Houf – *Harper Houf Peterson Righellis*

Stephanie Slyman – *Harper Houf Peterson Righellis*

Dave Queener – *Clackamas County*

Rick Nys – *Clackamas County*

Welcome and Introductions

Karen Buehrig, Clackamas County, welcomed participants and reviewed activities that have taken place since the last meeting. These include meetings between the project team members and Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), updating the Additional Needed Infrastructure project list and a meeting with the Technical Working Group.

Sylvia Ciborowski, JLA Public Involvement, reviewed the meeting agenda. She summarized the public involvement outreach that the project team conducted in fall 2016, which included an online open house and informational tabling events. The purpose of the outreach was to solicit input on the alternative performance measures and multimodal mixed-use area (MMA) boundary. Participants generally supported the recommended package of alternative performance measures, and said that the

greatest need for multi-modal improvements is around the Clackamas Town Center and along 82nd Ave. A [summary of public comments is available online](#).

Performance Measures Recommendation

Abbot Flatt, Clackamas County, gave a [presentation](#) on the Technical Working Group's recommended set of performance measures. This package of performance measures includes all of the measures that members saw at the last meeting, minus *Duration of Congestion* and *Destination Travel Time*. The package of measures also includes an approach to address safety.

The recommended package of measures includes:

- **Pedestrian:** Pedestrian Level of Stress with Crossing Review and Accessibility to Transit
- **Bicycle:** Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress w/ Completeness Review
- **Vehicles:** Volume-to-Capacity Ratio and Motor Vehicle Queuing
- **Safety:** Layered portfolio of measures that includes establishing a County-specific safety baseline; applying critical crash rate methodology; and identifying suitable countermeasures to address impacts

In practice, these measures will be used at three different stages throughout the entire urban unincorporated area of Clackamas County:

- 1) when there is a proposed change to the Comprehensive Plan,
- 2) when there are zone changes, and
- 3) in development review.

If the County goes forward with designating an MMA, all measures will be applied within the MMA boundary *except* vehicle-to-capacity ratio for Comprehensive Plan and zone changes.

Committee Discussion: Performance Measures

Members discussed: Can you support the Technical Working Group recommended package of performance measures?

Comments included:

- Members are generally **supportive of including bicycle, pedestrian and safety measures** within the suite of performance measures.
- **Vehicle-related measures:**
 - Question about **how traffic capacity is measured** to arrive at a volume-to-capacity ratio. Members commented that signal timing should be properly adjusted, particularly at the 122nd and Sunnyside Ave signal.

- It is important that we **do not plan for major rush hour capacity** when determining the appropriate volume-to-capacity ratio. It is expected that there will be heavier traffic during peak hours.
- Concern about not studying **duration of congestion**. It would be more transparent and useful to have duration of congestion data in order to determine how the transportation system is performing—even if the County does not explicitly make or limit choices based on this data.
- Clackamas Town Center travelers are most concerned about ingress and egress and lack of parking. In a survey conducted by the Town Center, visitors did not complain about any travel modes except cars. It is important that the package of measures show a **balance between all modes**—since vehicle-related issues are the major complaint among travelers and the majority of travelers use vehicles.
- Concern was expressed about the need for a **multimodal focus** in the CRC area to help ensure the safety of all types of travelers.
- **Safety measures:**
 - While looking at baseline data and categorizing intersections is important, it is also important to **look at overall safety of the area**. For example, if an intersection fits into a category that has a higher threshold for number of accidents that are considered unsafe, that should be taken into account within the larger context of other intersections in the area.
 - Concern that crash data and other **safety data might not meet the reality** of what is happening at the intersection or street (i.e., some areas feel more dangerous than the data suggests). Staff noted that the safety data will not dictate decisions, but will help inform decisions. Currently there is very little safety data available and including measures that allow for collection of safety data is the first step.

Outcome: Members were generally supportive of the TWG recommendation, although they support including duration of congestion, and have questions about the details and how this would be implemented. Abbot Flatt asked members to provide additional comments by email by February 15.

Performance Measures: How to implement in Development Review

Abbot Flatt explained that members of the public and the TWG and SWG have generally supported developing performance measures for all modes of transportation. How to actually implement this in development review is less clear. Currently, developers are only required to make on-site improvements on their frontage (or off-site improvements if analysis shows that increased traffic from their development will cause roads to be overcapacity). Developing a model to require developers to pay a fair share of bicycle and pedestrian improvements *off* of their frontage will be a challenge, since this is a new area in planning and there are limited models to use as examples.

Carl Springer, DKS Associates, explained models from three other jurisdictions that require developers to make off-site bicycle and pedestrian improvements:

1. Conduct detailed analysis to determine how much bicycle and pedestrian traffic the development is likely to generate. The problem with this model is that tools are limited and it takes a lot of estimation.
2. Develop various sub-areas and require all developments within each sub-area to pay a fee based on the needs within that area (Bellingham, WA). The city then uses these funds to build the prioritized list of projects in the sub-area.
3. Require developers to contribute funds towards bike/ped projects within a certain radius of their frontage.

Committee Discussion:

Members discussed: How should the County develop a system to fairly assess developers to contribute towards bicycle and pedestrian improvements? What should the County consider if it asks developers to pay for offsite bicycle and pedestrian improvements?

Comments included:

- Members asked about how bicycle and pedestrian deficiencies were addressed during the **urban renewal district development**? Staff replied that most of that work was done in the 1980s, and the sensitivity to and needs of alternative travel modes has changed much since then.
- Suggest creating a local improvement area that **assesses all developments** in area—existing and new. It seems unfair to assess a fee on only *new* developments, since existing developments also generate bicycle and pedestrian traffic and will benefit from new bike/ped projects.
- **Density** is increasing and that will continue as the population grows. It's a different transportation paradigm than 20 years ago. We need to respond to that responsibly and educate the community. We can't build out of vehicular congestion like we used to.
- There was a question about whether the **urban renewal money** is gone. Dave Queener responded that what remains is committed to various projects.
- Recent **court case decisions** have prohibited jurisdictions from requiring offsite improvement requirements when there is no criteria or system. The Bellingham model (developing sub-areas) might be the best model to avoid courts striking down the action.
- Look into the **City of Milwaukie model**, where developers are sometimes required to pay a fee to help build a project within a Neighborhood Association boundary.
- When selecting which projects developer fees should fund, focus on those projects that help **complete the bike/ped system**.
- We should look at what other cities with MMA's have done to address the funding issue. Karen Buehrig noted that most other places adopt an MMA at the same time they change zoning, so our situation is different.

Multimodal Mixed-Use Area (MMA) Boundary

Abbot Flatt presented the TWG-recommended-MMA boundary: using the existing Clackamas Regional Center boundary. This area is already zoned to support higher density and a mix of uses. Previous planning efforts have shown that the public generally supports higher density in the core Clackamas Regional Center area, and designating this area as an MMA would advance publicly-supported plans.

Karen Buehrig noted that adopting an MMA may not have a major impact right away, but will support future multi-modal development of the whole area without having to make any zoning changes.



Committee Discussion: MMA Boundary

Members discussed: Can you support the MMA boundary recommended by the TWG?

Comments included:

- It is important to determine **how we fund projects** and get developers to pay for offsite improvements for alternative modes. Staff responded that adoption of an MMA does not require the County to simultaneously adopt a funding mechanism.
- A member asked why the area **further north along 82nd Ave** is not included in the recommendation. Staff responded that areas along 82nd Ave north of the Clackamas Regional Center area are not zoned for high density, and allow things like drive-throughs that are not supportive of higher density. Extending the MMA boundary beyond what the TWG recommends would require rezoning those areas. Previous public involvement processes have shown that the public does not want to change the zoning requirements in this area (See Fuller Road Station Plan for more details).
- There might be more development opportunities **along I-205 south** of the proposed boundary.
- We need to consider the impact of changes in travel patterns such as Uber, electric cars, etc.
- A member asked how the urban renewal projects recommended by the **Clackamas Regional Center Working Group** will be included in this project. Staff responded that projects from the urban renewal process have priority.

Clackamas Regional Center (CRC) Mobility Improvements Project

Dave Queener, Stefanie Slyman and Dan Houf shared information about the CRC Mobility Improvements Projects that is just beginning. The \$15 million project, funded through urban renewal, is to plan, design and construct improvements in the area including the intersection of SE 82nd Avenue and Sunnyside / Harmony Roads; SE 82nd Avenue one-half mile north and south of that intersection; Sunnyside Road east to I-205, and Harmony Road west to Fuller Road.

The project will build off plans and analysis that have been done in recent years. Planning will take place in 2016, design in 2017 and construction will begin in 2018.

Committee Discussion: CRC Mobility Improvements Project

- Is it a possibility to get ODOT involved with the **overpass that's needed over I-205**? Dave responded that is under consideration.
- Could there be an extension of **the path from light rail to Clackamas Town Center**? Dave said the county is already working with Clackamas Town Center on that project.
- Are there **other funding options**? Dave said urban renewal funds can be used to leverage other funds, and we are also watching for grant opportunities.
- What about the **sidewalk improvements planned by ODOT** for the 82nd/Sunnyside intersection? Dave said the project is coordinating with ODOT on that.

Closing and Next Steps

Abbot Flatt thanked members for their participation. The next round of TWG and SWG meetings will be held in April 2016. At that time, members will review draft Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Development Ordinance language revisions.

Concern was expressed about issues that won't be addressed through this project. Abbot noted that the second phase of the project on system development charges may address those and encouraged SWG members to provide additional comments by February 15th.

Comments Submitted after the February 3rd SWG Meeting

Below are the comments submitted after the SWG. If appropriate, a Clackamas County Staff response will be shown in green.

- With a number of Clackamas Community College students driving to our campuses, I understand the concerns my fellow stakeholders raised concerning traffic flow and safety. However, with 1/3 of our students arriving at our campuses via another mode, it is encouraging to see their safety and travel needs taken into account through the pedestrian, bicycle, and transit measures.

- As Clackamas County staff, consultants, and the Technical Working Group evaluate the application of the performance measures, I hope the transportation needs of CCC students and community members who do not have access to a car, are strongly considered.
- As the MMA Boundary is finalized, I recommend that it incorporate the eastern segment of the Monroe Neighborhood Street Design Plan from the intersection with Fuller Road to the I-205 multi-use path. Clackamas County's Street Design Plan will connect with the City of Milwaukie's Monroe Street Neighborhood Greenway Concept Plan, which will encourage pedestrian and bicycle connections between Milwaukie and Clackamas County, aligned with the MMA's goal of encouraging density without vehicular capacity improvements. Additionally, development fees from new construction inside the MMA could help pay for improvements along the Monroe Street Design Plan, providing a funding source, once the plans are finalized and adopted.
 - The Monroe Project is outside of the TWG selected the proposed boundary. The boundary was selected because only minor changes need to be made to the zoning code and previous studies show support for moving in the direction of higher density within the recommended boundary. Changes on 82nd Ave, outside of the proposed boundary have previously been unsupported by the community. As for funding, the Monroe Project is currently being planned in coordination with the North Clackamas Revitalization Area. This area has a distinct funding source and the Monroe Project will likely be added to its project list.
- Can you advise on whether there would be any impact on a school or district property inside this area? Would it matter if we were going to construct or renovate on a property we own and/or operate? Could we face SDCs or another fee/charge/tax? I believe we have rental space inside this area and we have land and schools just outside this area.
 - If adopted, the MMA boundary would not impact a property that is renovated or constructed within the boundary. An MMA only comes into play with land use or zone changes. Renovated or constructed properties would be subject to the development review process and any SDCs or fees would be assessed then.
- I think the City of Happy Valley (for the MMA area that encumbers the city limits) should be concerned about the most recent set of materials for a number of reasons, but mostly it comes down to the costs/benefits of an MMA versus the funding mechanisms (or lack thereof) that appear to being built into the system. Specifically, here are some comments/concerns:
 - The MMA boundary not utilizing V/C ratios for Comprehensive Plan/Zone Changes (which is typically going to be "upzoning") – could have significant impact on the MMA boundary within the City of Happy Valley (as that is where the majority of vacant lands are located within the proposed MMA boundary). Performance Measures Recommendation Memo dated January 26, 2106 (pg. 3). The concern is that the level of traffic congestion being "generated" from this area w/out particular vehicular improvements, will never realistically be "offset" by ped/bike/safety improvements.
 - Under No. 2 "ODOT Coordination" (pg. 3 of the Updated MMA Draft Boundary Recommendation), the discussed MOU and addition of "dump loops" on 1-205 off-ramps to "help prevent queues from forming on the 1-205 mainline" – is a great idea/improvement. Again, lack of clearly defined funding sources.

- Finally, speaking directly to funding – from the Stakeholder Working Group Mtg. #3 Meeting Summary dated Nov. 4, 2015 (How Do We Pay For It: Potential Funding Sources) pgs. 5-6, there are some listed potential funding sources (grants, business license fee, fines for red light violations) that one is hard pressed to imagine could “offset” the improvements that might occur vis-à-vis improvements (or proportionate share of improvements in a “fee-in-lieu”) for upzoning as compared to the funding for ped/bike projects/public safety projects that have been discussed throughout the MMA project. Without dedicated funding source(s) and/or the defined ability to require “offsite improvements” by the developer (as has been discussed for some of the other “case study” areas – for example, in Washington) – I am at a loss as to how that “would work”? Any response would be much appreciated.
- Looking ahead, although it will be interesting to see how it all is proposed to “work out in the end” w/the draft Comp Plan/ZDO amendments (applicable in County – would require coordinated/mirrored changes in City) as part of the next steps, at this point (acknowledging all the memos/products are not yet complete), there does not seem to be any real “back end” to the project that would result in the much discussed ped/bike/safety improvements and could end up (without said “back end”) resulting in an increase in traffic congestion in the MMA boundary area, w/no real resultant “offsets” that the MMA boundary is supposed to help generate.
 - I understand the concern that the project doesn’t include a stronger funding mechanism for projects. Please keep in mind that Comp Plan / ZDO amendments are one part of the development process. The intent of this project is to place emphasis on safety for long range planning instead of vehicular capacity within the MMA. After the Comp Plan / ZDO amendments, developers will still be required to analyze the adequacy of the transportation system when they propose a specific development and request permits to build. The current V/C standard will still be used in analysis and we’re working to formalize standards for safety, vehicular queuing, bicycles and pedestrians. We understand that the improvements developers are required to contribute towards are for their growth only. We recognize that there is a gap between the funding needed to maintain and improve the transportation system and funding sources. This is relevant but also a larger issue than the CRC Connections project.
 - We are also working with ODOT to better understand what their requirements may be if the MMA is adopted. It is likely that projects such as the “dump loops” will be required through the development process, similar to how V/C projects are required currently under the Transportation Planning Rule.
- I understand your concerns but let’s not forget why we might want the MMA. It allows us to make sure we have the opportunity to get the types of intense, transit-oriented uses that make sense near a light rail line and transit center – it may be that upzoning (or simply rezoning in some manner) is needed to make the development happen. If we are tied to the V/C standards required under the State’s transportation planning rule, you might be at risk of never getting the

necessary approvals. The MMA adds flexibility! That said, it is still our responsibility to do the necessary transportation planning (and identify funding) to make sure the overall system works.