

Meeting Summary

Technical Working Group – Meeting #4

Wednesday, January 6th, 2016, 9:30 – 11:30 a.m.

Participants – TWG Members

Carol Earle – *Happy Valley*

Joe Marek – *Clackamas County*

Dave Queener – *Clackamas County*

Jimmy Thompson – *Clackamas County*

Cindy Hagen – *Clackamas County*

Katie Dunham – *Clackamas County*

Rick Nys – *Clackamas County*

Lori Mastrantonio – *Clackamas County*

Jennifer Donnelly – *DLCD* (phone)

Chris Myers – *Metro*

Lidwien Rahman – *ODOT Region 1*

Avi Tayar – *ODOT Region 1*

Project Team and Staff

Karen Buehrig – *Clackamas County*

Abbot Flatt – *Clackamas County*

Carl Springer – *DKS Associates*

Sylvia Ciborowski – *JLA Public Involvement*

Ray Delahanty – *DKS Associates*

Welcome and Introductions

Karen Buehrig welcomed participants to the meeting and gave an update on the project since the October 20th TWG.

- Stakeholder Working Group met November 4th, 2015
- Public open house October 26th – November 13th
- Agency Coordination
- County staff meetings
- Updated Additional Needed Infrastructure

Performance Measures

Abbot Flatt, Clackamas County, presented an overview of the Recommended Performance measures agreed upon by the TWG, SWG and public. Carl Springer, DKS Associates, gave an overview on the recommended safety performance measure.

Committee Discussion:

Safety Measure

- A member asked how much effort it is to set up a crash or safety baseline. Staff responded that this is typically done during TSPs. It requires getting five or six reference intersections for each intersection/category type. The level of effort depends on the number of categories we decide to go with, and how difficult it is to find reference intersections. A Clackamas County member said that the County has all the crash data needed—it is just a question of sorting through it.

- Like the combination of data driven plus engineering judgment in the safety measure.
- Concern about being able to require conditions on developers; past experience is that requiring conditions is difficult under the current framework. Hope that this project can allow us to require things like a new bus shelter with new development, or other improvements that go beyond the typical frontage improvements. One suggestion is to add “comfort at a bus stop” into the measures.
- *Members agreed that it makes sense to adopt the County’s proposed transportation safety performance measures.*
 - It seems like there is a solid basis in policy and code to adopt the proposed measures.
 - Request that the team study the financial or business impact on new development if these safety measures are implemented (i.e., run a scenario).

Pedestrian and Bicycle Measures

- Pedestrian LOS Measure: Will we be able to get good sidewalks in the unincorporated urban areas that are not served by transit? (Staff responded yes. The Pedestrian LOS measure is not tied to transit access—it looks at all areas. However, locations served by transit would be a high priority for system completeness improvements.)
- Members discussed the fact that there is not a definition for “pedestrian level of traffic stress.” This does not seem to be a major issue, and people agreed that County staff can come up with a definition that makes sense.
- Suggestion to require developers to build transit shelters as part of the measures. Members agreed that it makes sense to involve TriMet in the conversation. It will be important to find out if we can require developers to build shelters off of their frontage. This is part of the bigger picture question of what local jurisdictions can do to leverage transit investments. For example, Metro is currently updating its Transit Plan and looking at the interaction of local and regional transit investments. City of Portland recently used TGM funding to improve access to transit. There are likely examples out there of what Clackamas County can do to leverage investments in transit.
 - (Staff responded that the issue of bus shelters would require a conversation with TriMet. In past projects, TriMet has been open to this requirement as long as the developers use TriMet’s specs and contractors to build the shelters.)
- Members discussed how we can link performance measures to public health. They noted that the public health link to transportation is in the “pioneer” stage now—but there is a lot of momentum to integrate the two more closely. Health is one of the County’s strategic priorities. We should look at examples of how other jurisdictions make the connection to health in their code (i.e., how do we move from health as a policy priority to codifying it?). The Community Health Improvement Plan includes a transit/walking component. We may be able to use this Plan and other supporting documents when talking to developers.
- Concern about being able to require developers to do any projects beyond their frontage/off-site improvements. For example, what is the methodology for determining how many bike/ped trips a development generates, and how this applies to development review? Will SDC funds

simply be redirected to pay for bike/ped projects? This will be an important question to find out how to collect funds from developers to pay for non-auto projects.

- Staff responded that the team will run through scenarios for how these measures would apply at development review.
- It will be important to include property owners and developers in the conversation of performance measures and how collected funds are used. It is better to get their buy in and participation, so they are more willing and supportive of using funds for alternative transportation projects not on their frontage.

Volume to Capacity Measure

- **Members agreed that it makes sense to keep this measure.**
- Members noted that it seems like not many projects would be developed as a result of this measure. They discussed the option of changing volume-to-capacity ratios at certain intersections or streets. They also discussed the transportation plan rule that allows for “horse-trading” for alternative transportation projects if an intersection does not meet volume to capacity ratio.
- A member asked if we can look at person trips instead of just vehicle trips, or apply the volume-to-capacity measure to bicycle and pedestrian projects. Staff noted that capacity in this context is not a performance measure for bicycles and pedestrians. Volume-to-capacity has been tested and applied for vehicles only.

Queuing Measure

- A member noted that we already evaluate queuing today in some respect. If our standards allow a volume to capacity ratio of 1.1, this will undoubtedly result in queuing issues. We’ll have to be careful about what queuing standard we adopt.
- Members discussed queuing as a safety issue:
 - It is important that queuing does not become a safety issue.
 - The queuing standard should be written to indicate that its purpose is to *improve safety*.
 - ODOT sees queuing as a safety issue, and would like to apply it within the MMA boundary (i.e., especially along 82nd Ave, where queuing impacts pedestrian crossings).
 - **Other members agreed that the queuing measure should apply within the MMA boundary.**

A member expressed concern that the Transportation Planning Rule does not specifically address queuing. But it does address safety and capacity, so this could be a workaround.

Performance Measures Application Area

Abbot Flatt presented an overview of the different ways performance measures can be used and the difference areas the recommended performance measures may work best.

Members provided the following comments:

- **Members supported the boundary recommendation (including ODOT and Metro representatives).**
- Happy Valley representative said that Happy Valley is supportive of the boundary extending into their city, but is concerned about the funding mechanism. The City wants to be part of the funding discussion.
- A member asked about the impact of Happy Valley zone changes if the multimodal boundary includes a portion of Happy Valley.
- Members asked why the smaller MMA boundary was chosen, and how this intersects with the additional needed infrastructure projects outside that boundary. Staff responded that...
 - The smaller area is proposed because current zoning in that area is already supportive of the MMA boundary. The land use is already there.
 - The County will adopt all of the additional needed infrastructure projects into the TSP. Then they'll figure out how to fund them (a variety of funding strategies are available). It is possible that there will be an SDC overlay boundary that may be larger than the MMA boundary.
- Concern about adopted cross-sections for Sunnybrook and Sunnyside.

Closing and Next Steps

Abbot Flatt thanked members for their participation and talked about next steps.

The next round of TWG and SWG meetings will include final recommendation on performance measures, performance measures application areas and comprehensive plan language changes. The next TWG and SWG meetings are tentatively planned for March/April 2016.