



Meeting Summary

Stakeholder Working Group Meeting #2

Wednesday, August 26, 2015

7:30 a.m. – 9:30 a.m.

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

Participants – SWG Members

Ted Hartzell – *Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee*

Martha Waldemar – *Sunnyside CPO*

Dennis Curtis – *Clackamas Town Center*

Doug Bean – *Doug Bean & Associates*

Ken Horn – *Clackamas Fire District #1*

Bob Cochran – *Clackamas Community College*

Denny Egner – *City of Milwaukie*

Jennifer Harding – *East Side Athletic Club*

Project Team and Staff

Karen Buehrig – *Clackamas County*

Abbot Flatt – *Clackamas County*

Ellen Rogalin – *Clackamas County*

Carl Springer – *DKS Associates*

Ray Delahanty – *DKS Associates*

Sylvia Ciborowski – *JLA Public Involvement*

Welcome and Introductions

Karen Buehrig, Clackamas County, welcomed participants to the meeting.

Sylvia Ciborowski, JLA Public Involvement, reviewed the meeting agenda and noted the purpose of the meeting: to discuss possible Multimodal Mixed-Use Area designation of the Clackamas Regional Center Area, and to review and discuss alternative transportation performance measures.

Sylvia reviewed the “Success Factors” that members developed during the June 17 Joint SWG-TWG meeting, and reviewed the June 17 meeting summary.

Transportation Needs, Opportunities and Existing Conditions, and MMA Designation

Abbot Flatt, Clackamas County, presented information on what the project team has learned about existing conditions and transportation needs and opportunities in the Clackamas Regional Center area.

The presentation included:

- Transportation needs that have been identified for the bicycle, pedestrian, transit, and road networks in the area, as well as safety.
- Key highlights from stakeholder interview responses and comments on transportation needs and opportunities in the area.
- Map of planned transportation projects.

Ray Delahanty, DKS Associates, provided information about Multimodal Mixed Use Area (MMA) designation. He explained that an MMA designation would allow comprehensive plan amendments without considering mobility targets for the movement of automobile traffic. For example, comprehensive plan amendments to add density or new businesses would be allowed even if it would lead to traffic that exceeds vehicle congestion standards.

Ray explained that the project team met with the Technical Working Group (TWG) in early August. The TWG's initial recommendation was that an MMA designation is not needed because the Clackamas Regional Center (CRC) Design Plan is already in line with multimodal goals, and future conditions analysis does not indicate that the CRC area will exceed vehicle congestion standards.

Committee Discussion: MMA Designation

Members discussed the benefits and drawbacks of designating the CRC area as an MMA, and considered a map of potential MMA boundary options. Staff noted that regardless of whether an MMA is the right tool for the area, we'll still need a defined geographic area for where we want a strong multimodal and safety focus, with new tools specific to the area that will help get improvements built.

Members made the following comments:

- Members discussed some reasons why it would be beneficial to adopt an MMA:
 - The projections show that none of the intersections in the CRC area are projected to fail in the future—but how do we protect intersections from failing in the future? It is important to consider and plan for the possibility of failing intersections. It might make sense to adopt an MMA in case we do have failing intersections.
 - Adopting an MMA would not hold us to the current volume to capacity ratio. This is a positive because bicycle and pedestrian connections and safety improvements are needed, and these are likely to increase congestion.
- Overall, members wanted more information about the benefits, drawbacks, and unintended consequences of adopting versus not adopting an MMA. For example: if we have an MMA designated, would it be easier to prevent road widening and implement road diets? If we do not have an MMA, would it be more difficult to implement road diets and other improvements that could impede traffic flow? Members had some questions about what the real impact of an MMA designation would be. They suggested it would be helpful to have a list or chart of what would happen with an adopted MMA, and what would happen without adoption.

- Members discussed concerns about allowing more congestion in the CRC area. Currently there are many complaints from customers and shoppers about congestion and parking issues. Increased congestion could prevent some travelers from choosing to shop at the Clackamas Town Center. One of the project’s “success factors” is to grow the CRC as a regional destination center—which will require making it easy for people to travel to the center from far away (likely by car).
- Members noted that the proposed MMA boundary options include some land that is within Happy Valley boundaries. County staff should check to see how Happy Valley requirements might impact the MMA.
- Members asked whether any city has considered and set aside an MMA.
- The community wants the CRC area to become more of a hub with increased density (particularly the Clackamas Town Center and Sunnyside areas). The future trend is that people are moving to urban settings. We should implement the right tool to make sure that the CRC can continue to grow as a vibrant, dense area with the urban qualities that people are seeking.

Alternative Performance Measures

Ray Delahanty gave a presentation on alternative performance measures. He explained how transportation measures are used in the development review process today: currently Clackamas County relies on traditional, auto-based measures that look mostly at volume-to-capacity ratios. The current measures do not look at how the multimodal system is functioning (i.e., bike, pedestrian and transit) and do not consider safety.

The project team is considering developing alternative performance measures that would provide a more holistic review of the transportation system. New measures would consider the functionality of all modes (vehicles, bicycles, pedestrians, freight, and transit) and safety.

The project team looked at dozens of potential performance measures. The following measures stood out as the most preferred, based on a scoring exercise:

Category	Measures
Pedestrian	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modified Pedestrian Level of Service (<i>“grades” all streets on how conducive they are to walking</i>) • Pedestrian System Completeness • Pedestrian Crossing Index (<i>looks at the distance between pedestrian crossings</i>)
Bicycle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress (<i>“grades” all streets on how conducive they are to bicycling, looking at width of bike lanes, separation from traffic, traffic speed, etc.</i>) • Bicycle System Completeness
Transit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Duration of Congestion • Destination Travel Time

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accessibility to Transit (<i>asks whether a specific percentage of people live within a certain distance of a transit stop</i>)
Freight	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Duration of Congestion • Destination Travel Time
Motor Vehicle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume-to-Capacity Ratio • Duration of Congestion (<i>considers the number of hours that streets are operating above set volume-to-capacity ratios</i>) • Destination Travel Time
Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Critical Crash Rate (<i>measures number of crashes in the area, as compared to similar areas</i>)

Committee Discussion: Alternative Performance Measures

Members discussed performance measures for each of the following modes/categories: pedestrian, bicycle, transit, freight, motor vehicle, and safety. They discussed:

- **What do you *value* about each of the travel modes? What is needed to support each mode?**
- **What should we be *measuring* to get us to the kind of multimodal transportation system that people want to see?**

Pedestrian

- Prioritize safety in areas where children walk – such as around schools, shopping malls and school bus stops.
- Measure the length of time it takes to walk across the street. For example, Sunnyside Road is very wide and takes a long time to cross, which impedes the pedestrian experience and safety.
- Measure the availability of sidewalks.
- There should be a focus on connectivity between places that generate pedestrians (e.g., transit stations) and the places the pedestrians are headed (destinations).
- Prioritize “first and last mile” connections (e.g., to facilitate walking from the MAX stop to major destinations).
- We need a system of walking paths to provide good connectivity between Clackamas Town Center and Eagle Landing. This could also include rental electric vehicles and shuttles so that visitors from other parts of the region do not have to drive to and within the CRC area.
- Pedestrian bridges would be beneficial to all modes—bicycles and pedestrians, as well as drivers who would not need to stop for people crossing the road. Highest priority is a pedestrian bridge from the MAX terminus to the east side and a pedestrian overpass over Sunnyside Rd/Stevens.

Bicycling

- Measure the availability of safe bicycle parking. For example, businesses could provide bicycle lock-up areas for employees.
- Prioritize bicycle connectivity from the MAX terminus to access the Town Center. This should include safety and signage improvements.
- Measure travel time for bicyclists.
- Measure bicycle safety, including safety of routes (with signed bicycle paths and amenities) as well as protection against bicycle theft (safe bike parking).
- Connectivity to stores and retail areas is a priority.
- Measure the quality of the *experience* of bicycling: Does it feel safe, pleasurable and stress-free to bicycle in the area?

Transit Performance Measures

- Accessibility to transit is important, but it is also important to measure the *frequency* of buses.
- CRC area needs better north-south transit.
- Offer incentives to developers who provide amenities for transit users, such as shelters and benches.
- Measure how well the system provides access to transit hubs (i.e., trips to transit hubs have more value than trips to other stations and areas).
- Prioritize connections to high demand areas, such as Clackamas Community College, area hospitals and the Clackamas Transit Center.
- Look at “last mile” connections. The Kaiser shuttle takes transit riders from the MAX stop to the hospital. This is a great example of a last mile connection that supports transit use.

Freight

- Improvements to I-205 are a priority. Widening of I-205 would improve freight movement.

Motor Vehicles

- Improved quality of pedestrian movement will help vehicle movement.
- Prioritize technology improvements that could reduce congestion, such as flashing yellow arrows and synchronized traffic lights.
- To be a “regional center,” traffic needs to move more efficiently. A primary focus should be on reducing congestion on I-205, and particular pinch points that we know about on the freeway.
- When a pedestrian pushes the pedestrian light, it can cause delay for dozens of vehicles. The project needs to balance the needs of drivers and walkers.

Safety

- Measure the annual *total* number of crashes, not just the crash rate as compared to similar areas.
- Measure perception of safety: Do people feel safe? Crime rates and reputation of the area might keep some people from walking.
- Focus on safety of children. Talk to people who run the school bus system about their safety concerns.

Comments about Regional Character

Members discussed how to best support the CRC area as a *regional* destination that attracts visitors and shoppers from far away:

- Members were interested in knowing what percentages of people use the various modes in the CRC area. The project should look at what mode people are really using, and what is best for the general traveling public. The CRC area is unique in that it is a *regional* destination—and that means we are drawing customers from far away who mostly travel by car.
- Improvements are needed at the terminus of the MAX Green Line, to provide better first and last mile connections for regional travelers. The line ends without good connectivity to other destinations. This could also support regional connectivity, providing an alternative mode for traveling to the CRC.
- To support the CRC area as a regional destination, it is important to prioritize transit improvements rather than bicycle improvements (i.e., people from far away might take transit to the CRC area, but would not bike that far). Keep in mind the *reason* people are traveling: for example, they may bike to work but not to shop, because they have to carry goods back home.

Note on Process: Members suggested developing a chart that shows the various ways/tools that could be used to achieve the multimodal vision, and how effective or applicable each tool is for the CRC area.

Closing and Next Steps

Carl Springer, DKS Associates, thanked members for their participation and handed out the anticipated meetings schedule.

The next round of TWG and SWG meetings will be held in October. Staff will present a recommended list of performance measures, incorporating SWG and TWG feedback. The meeting will also include discussion on funding options and additional needed infrastructure.