

Meeting Summary

Technical Working Group – Meeting #2

Wednesday, August 5, 2015, 1 – 3 p.m.

Participants – TWG Members

Shari Gilevich – *Clackamas County*

Rick Nys – *Clackamas County*

Joe Marek – *Clackamas County*

Dave Queener – *Clackamas County*

Jimmy Thompson – *Clackamas County*

Avi Tayar – *ODOT Region 1*

Jamie Johnk – *Clackamas County*

Lori Mastrantonio – *Clackamas County*

Bill Holmstrom - *DLCD*

Chris Myers – *Metro*

Lidwien Rahman – *ODOT Region 1*

Joseph Auth – *ODOT Region 1*

Project Team and Staff

Karen Buehrig – *Clackamas County*

Abbot Flatt – *Clackamas County*

Carl Springer – *DKS Associates*

Ray Delahanty – *DKS Associates*

Sylvia Ciborowski – *JLA Public Involvement*

Welcome and Introductions

Karen Buehrig welcomed participants to the meeting and team members introduced themselves.

Karen reviewed the meeting agenda, project vision and the purpose of the meeting:

- to discuss the multimodal mixed-use area boundary and assess if it's the right tool for the CRCA goals / vision and
- to provide feedback on the alternative performance measures.

Sylvia Ciborowski gave a brief overview of the findings from the stakeholder interviews, with the following key points:

- Walking: major issues or barriers are lack of sidewalks or narrow sidewalks
- Biking: biggest challenge is poorly connected or missing designated bike lanes and boulevards
- Transit: biggest challenge is pedestrian access to transit; need sidewalks and crosswalks
- Driving: high level of congestion in the CRCA, particularly on I-205 and 82nd Ave.

Multimodal Mixed Use Area Overview

Ray Delahanty, DKS Associates, presented an overview of the MMA purpose and what it could potentially do for the study area.

Committee Discussion: *Is an MMA the right tool for the CRCA?*

Members had the following questions and comments in response to the presentation, which supported not having an MMA boundary:

- Seems like we don't need an MMA to accomplish the project goals.
- We already have a CRC Plan that is in line with multi-modal goals. Don't need an MMA to implement the CRC Plan.

- If we're not adding density, don't need to do an MMA.
- There doesn't seem to be much benefit to adopting an MMA.

Multimodal Mixed Use Area Overview

Abbot Flatt presented an overview of Alternative Performance Measures and how they fit into the development review process.

Committee Discussion: What boundary would make sense for an MMA?

Members had the following questions and comments in response to the presentation, which supported not having an MMA boundary:

- When are we expected to be over-capacity on our roads? An MMA is only needed to help avoid vehicle congestion standards. If we are not expecting to exceed vehicle congestion standards, then there is no benefit to having an MMA.
- Some drive-thru's and car-oriented services will be grandfathered in. An MMA won't do anything to change these existing businesses.

Alternative Performance Measures

Ray Delahanty presented an overview of an MMA purpose and what it could potentially do for the study area. Members were asked to reflect on the following questions:

- Which measures are most useful?
- What are some technical challenges?
- Other challenges and implications of new measures?

Members provided the following comments:

- Concern about the pedestrian crossing index measure. This could create a liability issue. However, could get around it by providing some disclaimer language that clarifies that the analysis does not dictate solutions. See ODOT's language for SPIS (ODOT does analysis, but does not make improvements to all identified SPIS sites).
- Concern about Destination Travel Time measure: The level of effort might be difficult for analysts. Not all agencies have the needed software. An alternative measure could be queuing.
- Someone suggested Pedestrian Crossing Spacing as a measure. However, there are limits to spacing crossings (ex: in areas with sight distance limitations or too close to traffic signal)
 - Bicycle measures: Suggestion to use Strava heat maps to determine where people ride and walk most. It is important to see how people actually use the system, rather than just following the model. However, the danger in using use-based data is that you often don't know WHY someone is or is not using the system (ex: a rider would bike on a particular street, but for the lack of a safe bike path).
 - Members discussed queuing as a safety measure at freeway off ramps as a measure. Turning movements cause lots of crashes and congestion. On the other hand, the mitigation for queuing is usually road widening—which is counter to project goals.

Closing and Next Steps

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

The next round of TWG and SWG meetings will include additional needs, performance standards, funding options, preferred alternate performance standards and safety measures, agency coordination and draft Comprehensive Plan/Zoning & Development Ordinance amendments and recommendations. The next TWG and SWG meetings are tentatively planned for October 2015.