



Meeting Summary

Stakeholder Working Group Meeting #3

Wednesday, November 4, 2015

7:30 a.m. – 9:30 a.m.

North Clackamas Aquatic Park, 7300 SE Harmony Road, Milwaukie, OR 97222

Participants – SWG Members

Denny Egner – *City of Milwaukie*

Dennis Curtis – *Clackamas Town Center*

Ken Horn – *Clackamas Fire District #1*

Martha Waldemar – *Sunnyside CPO*

Laura Edmonds – *North Clackamas Chamber of Commerce*

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 Staff

Karen Buehrig – *Clackamas County*

Abbot Flatt – *Clackamas County*

Carl Springer – *DKS Associates*

Ray Delahanty – *DKS Associates*

Randy Young, *Henderson Young & Co*

Sylvia Ciborowski – *JLA Public Involvement*

Stephanie Slyman – *Harper Houf Peterson*

Righellis

Welcome and Introductions

Abbot Flatt, Clackamas County, welcomed participants to the meeting.

Sylvia Ciborowski, JLA Public Involvement, reviewed the meeting agenda. She reviewed the August 16 Stakeholder Working Group meeting summary; members had no comments or revisions.

The Big Picture: Additional Needed Infrastructure

Carl Springer, DKS Associates, kicked off with a reminder of the purpose of the project and how the various project elements fit together.

Ray Delahanty, DKS Associates, gave a presentation on additional needed infrastructure. He explained that the project team reviewed various planning documents to see what kinds of transportation projects

are planned and/or funded in the Clackamas Regional Center. Using this data and existing conditions information about the gaps and deficiencies in the area, the project team put together a list of *additional* infrastructure that would be needed to support the vision of the CRC area as a vibrant community that supports all modes of travel. The identified additional needed infrastructure includes:

- 7 CRC Bike/Ped Plan projects
- 12 safety projects
- 13 pedestrian crossing projects
- 6 active transportation projects
- 3 motor vehicle projects

Committee Discussion: Additional Needed Infrastructure

Members discussed: *Does it seem like these projects will help us meet our vision for a vibrant, multimodal CRC area? Is anything missing?*

Members made the following comments:

- Members clarified that all projects from the Transportation System Plan were assumed in this analysis. The Monroe Street Extension project is also included.
- A member asked what kinds of treatments are included in the pedestrian crossing projects. Staff responded that an analysis will need to be done to identify the appropriate treatment at each location, depending on traffic volumes and other factors. Treatments can include painted crosswalks, flashing beacons, Ped Xing signs, among others.
- Members discussed the amount of spacing that would be appropriate between pedestrian crossings. The 530 foot minimum standard used in the Additional Needed Infrastructure analysis seems appropriate. It is important to be reasonable and flexible with spacing standards. For example, crossings may need to be spaced even closer together in very dense, high pedestrian traffic areas or near schools. In areas where vehicle traffic needs to flow smoothly and efficiently, crossings should be spaced further apart. The crossings should be placed based on pedestrian demand and not just the 530 foot minimum.
- Crossings on 82nd Ave and Sunnyside Rd are not pleasant today, and should be improved to be more comfortable. Staff responded that the analysis did not conclude with a recommendation to improve pedestrian crossing projects for these streets. Improvements to existing pedestrian crossings on 82nd Avenue and Sunnyside Rd, such as shorter cycle lengths or additional crossing legs, would negatively impact traffic operations. Further study and discussion of the tradeoffs between crossing quality and motor vehicle congestion are needed.
- Flashing red lights on stop signs (like in Clackamas Town Center) are great for safety. Consider these treatments on Fuller and around La Salle High School.
- Improved lighting at pedestrian crossings is important.

- Project CRC BP 2H, the proposed bike lane through the Clackamas Town Center, should be removed. The Town Center has recently improved this drive and there is not room for a bike lane. The bike lane on Monterrey should be used instead. Monterrey, however, doesn't connect to the transit station so there would still be a gap for cyclists.
- The goal should be to divert bike traffic *away* from Sunnyside Rd. The multi-use path north of Sunnyside is a good alternative, but it is only safe and efficient until 82nd Ave. It should be extended west of 82nd Ave to connect the Harmony CCC campus.
- At the multi-use path just north of Sunnyside at 82nd Ave, install signage to alert right turning drivers to look for cyclists before turning.
- Suggest studying the unintended consequences of the ODOT Sunrise JTA project. This is outside of the CRC area, but it impacts traffic movement in the CRC area.
- Closing Lawnfield Rd results in pushing more people to use Sunnybrook Rd and Sunnyside Rd. This traffic pattern will change again once the Tolbert overcrossing is constructed – likely by the end of 2016.

How Do We Build It: Alternative Performance Measures

Sylvia Ciborowski reminded members that at the last meeting they reviewed a draft list of alternative performance measures and discussed what makes up a good transportation system for the various modes. The team is now moving towards a recommended list of measures.

Ray Delehanty gave a presentation that explained how the alternative performance measures could work in three various contexts: transportation system planning, comprehensive planning/zone changes, and development review. Performance measures are used in each of these contexts to evaluate the transportation system to identify specific projects that are needed. Currently the County relies mostly on one measure: volume to capacity ratio (which only measures the impact of zone changes or development on vehicle traffic). Using new measures would make the CRC area more multimodal by changing the way we measure the system (transportation planning) and the kinds of projects that developers might be required to fund (development review).

Committee Discussion: Alternative Performance Measures

Members worked in pairs on worksheets that asked whether it makes sense to use the proposed alternative performance measures for development review. This was followed by a large group discussion. Comments included:

- A member asked whether designating an MMA boundary essentially offers a “free pass” for upzoning. Staff explained that the MMA only applies when there is an application for a zone change. It requires implementing safety and alternative transportation improvements to absorb the increased traffic created by the densification.

- The public expects that added density should correspond with improvements to the flow of motor vehicle traffic.
- Increased traffic on main streets leads to cut through traffic on neighborhood and smaller roads.
- Performance measures should help make it easier to bike, walk and take transit, but not at the expense of drivers. As much as possible, we should make it easier for all modes to get around—including cars. Vehicles should have priority because they will still be the dominant mode, even with improvements to bike, pedestrian and transit facilities.
- Which mode gets priority, or how the measures are weighed, will be crucial. If volume-to-capacity is kept as a performance measure, the bike, pedestrian and transit measures need to be given more weight.
- It is important to look at *ALL* measures, including the new alternative measures and the standard volume-to-capacity measure.
- Members said that the overall this package of measures for development makes sense.
- The CRC area will become denser because of the nature of population growth and increased vehicle traffic is the price to pay. Because we know this will happen, it is important to provide options for all modes. There is nothing to relieve congestion except by providing infrastructure of people to get out of their cars.
- It is important to consider emergency service vehicles. They need to be able to respond quickly. If congestion is accepted, people need to realize that emergency response time will be impacted.
- Not everyone can work where they live, and people tend to move jobs a lot but remain living in the same place. People will continue to drive.

Responses to worksheet and specific comments on measures:

Measure	Committee Input
Modified Pedestrian Level of Service	5 said this measure makes sense, and 2 have concerns Concerns and comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each main arterial gives a different level of concern because of traffic volumes. • Seems like it will be impossible to reach this standard in some areas. Design is so vehicle-centric. • Needs to be quantifiable.
Pedestrian Crossing Index	6 said this measure makes sense Concerns and comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 530 feet as a crossing standard seems appropriate.

Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress	5 said this measure makes sense, and 1 has concerns Concerns and comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do you determine “proportionate share?” • Needs to be quantifiable.
Duration of Congestion	5 said this measure makes sense, and 2 have concerns Concerns and comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For this and all other vehicle performance measures, concerned that it could hinder an increase in bike, pedestrian and transit improvements • Concern about putting <i>too much</i> emphasis on this measure.
Accessibility to Transit	3 said this measure makes sense, and 3 have concerns Concerns and comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not sure if needed, since for many people access to transit does not matter because they do not use the bus or light rail. • Several members said this measure should also look at <i>quality</i> of access (including convenience and parking)
Volume-to-Capacity Ratio	5 said this measure makes sense, and 3 have concerns Concerns and comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to take into account how increased capacity and traffic on roads impacts emergency response. • Concern about putting <i>too much</i> emphasis on this measure. • Overall, members felt that it is important to keep this measure in the mix, and does not conflict with the vision of moving the CRC area towards a multimodal vision. However, it may need to be weighed less than other measures so that it does not impede the vision.
Motor Vehicle Queuing	4 said this measure makes sense, and 4 have concerns Concerns and comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to take into account how increased capacity or traffic on roads impacts emergency response. • This is a good measure. But the level of queuing allowed could keep the CRC area a difficult area to navigate. • Don’t put too much emphasis on motor vehicles and not enough on other measures.

How Do We Pay For It: Potential Funding Sources

Randy Young, Henderson, Young & Company gave a presentation on the range of funding sources that could be used to build the additional needed infrastructure identified for the CRC area. The team reviewed dozens of potential funding strategies to determine which ones could be the most useful and practical for the area. This list was developed as a tool for consideration by the County, and is not necessarily a recommendation or a path forward for how to fund projects.

Projects in the study boundary could be funded by a core group of three primary funding sources and an ancillary group of two secondary sources:

Core Funding Sources for MMA:

- Transportation System Development Charges for all modes of travel and some safety projects
- Road Service District or Special Road District for projects benefitting current residents and businesses
- Grants for all modes of travel

Ancillary Funding Sources for MMA

- Business License Fee for Transportation for projects benefitting businesses
- Fines for Red Light Violations for safety projects

Committee Discussion: Potential Funding Sources

Members asked questions and discussed the benefits and drawbacks of the funding sources. Comments included:

- A business license fee will be a challenge for businesses who already pay many fees and taxes and may be facing more costs in the future (for example, legislative bills being considered to increase the minimum wage and the corporate tax). A low business fee might be acceptable, but the County will need to show the businesses why the fee benefits *business* or it will not gain support.
- A member asked whether we could create an urban renewal district in the CRC area. Staff responded that this would require a county-wide vote, which would not likely pass in today's political climate.
- A member asked why the two districts were selected (of the five listed in the memo). Randy Young replied that the other districts are not feasible for the MMA. One district is only for maintenance, not for capital, another is based on California and Florida approaches that are not currently authorized in Oregon, and the third is for local improvements that would not include the MMA projects.
- An increase in SDCs for all modes seems like a fine strategy, but the charges should not be vastly increased from current SDC rates.

Closing and Next Steps

Abbot Flatt thanked members for their participation. The next round of TWG and SWG meetings will be held in December 2015 or January 2015. Topics will include a review of preferred alternate performance standards and safety measures, and a discussion on the MMA boundary.

Sylvia Ciborowski encouraged members to participate in the online open house (available until November 13) and to spread the word through their organizations and channels.