

Meeting Summary

Technical Working Group – Meeting #3

Tuesday, October 20, 2015, 1:30 – 3:30 p.m.

Participants – TWG Members

Karleen Aichele – *Happy Valley*

Joe Marek – *Clackamas County*

Dave Queener – *Clackamas County*

Jimmy Thompson – *Clackamas County*

Eric Hesse - *TriMet*

Lori Mastrantonio – *Clackamas County*

Jennifer Donnelly - *DLCD*

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*

Ray Delahanty – *DKS Associates*

Sylvia Ciborowski – *JLA Public Involvement*

Ellen Rogalin - *Clackamas County*

Welcome and Introductions

Abbot Flatt welcomed participants to the meeting and gave an update on the project since the August 6th TWG. The project management team received new information from technical partners about the benefits of an MMA and a request from stakeholders to provide more information on the impacts of an MMA.

Additional Needed Infrastructure

Ray Delahanty, DKS Associates, presented an overview of the Additional Needed Infrastructure Memo.

Committee Discussion: *Did we miss anything?*

Members had the following questions and comments in response to the presentation:

- Look at off-ramp queuing analysis for future year (not just present year)
- Question about how the project team decided which projects to recommend (what was the process/criteria for deciding?)
- Page 8 in the memo refers to a “previous table”. Fix the language because the table is no longer in the memo.
- What is the next step for the three projects that are in the RTP but not in the TSP? The memo should state what the county’s recommendation is for next steps on this project. (County committed to checking the Happy Valley TSP to see if they are in there).
- Check to see that the project descriptions are the same in TSP and RTP.
- Project CRC BP 4L description should read “southbound”
- CRC BP 1D project has a condition on it. It will be slightly different than what is described here, so might want to include that caveat in the description.
- On page 8 of memo “Widening 82nd to 7 lane boulevard”: We don’t do 7 lane roads anymore. Karen said that she and Dave would figure out how to deal with this.

- Project A1 S1 (page 3 of memo): Joe M said that the County had attempted to do this project but was not able to because of land use restrictions. This project might not be buildable. How should the memo deal with this project and others that are listed, but not actually feasible?
- Question about how the project team will prioritize projects, since there likely won't be funding to build them all.
- Question about what treatment is proposed for pedestrian crossings (staff said that they'll need to go through design process to determine each treatment; won't be part of the memo/plan for this part of the MMA/SDC project)
- Eric H. said he wanted to talk to staff more about project A1 S3. There might be other things TriMet can do with the County to maintain bus movement.
- Coordinate the memo with what is in local IAMPs.
- Project A1 S8: Is there sufficient space to allow for U-turns, as proposed here? Check on feasibility of actually doing U-turns. (This comment applies to project A1 S8 and any other projects that include U-turns)
- Need to be on the same page about what is planned for Eagle Landing (ex: is there going to be a pedestrian crossing over Sunnyside?)
- Pedestrian overcrossing projects should include some caveat language that the actual design of the project might be different than the description (need flexibility to create overcrossings that work for the area)

Funding Alternatives

Randy Young, Henderson, Young & Company, presented an overview of the Funding Alternatives for a Multimodal Mixed-Use Area.

Members provided the following comments:

- A legislative change would be needed for the County to utilize red light cameras
- Question about how SDC laws might restrict the amount/types of bike/ped improvements that could be built using SDC funding (since law is that projects must relate to growth/capacity).
- Are there legal issues we need to know about regarding including highway improvements on SDC project lists?
- Suggestion that the memo should clarify that some of the recommended funding strategies could work well in other parts of the County
- Question about whether an SDC overlay or development of separate districts would be appropriate in the CRC area

Alternative Performance Measures

Ray Delahanty presented an overview of the highest ranking performance measures and how the measures are used in long range planning and development review.

Members provided the following comments:

- Suggest using motor vehicle queuing measure for off ramp too (not just intersections)
- For the transit access measure: consider the temporal aspect of how long people have to wait at the bus stop. This feeds into access (time spent walking/biking to stop + waiting time)
- Lidwien said that bike/ped system completeness can have a deficiency threshold. For example: the threshold could be "separated bike facility" or "6-ft sidewalk". You can have a definition for

“completeness” which seems simpler than trying to define LOS (hard to define what is a “sufficient environment”).

- We need to prioritize deficiencies, since we don’t have funding to address them all. Need that caveat language.
- Need to be clearer about how the measures operate at development review stage versus comp plan amendment/zoning change
- LOS should be evaluated not just along frontage, but how it connects to the larger system. Include in the memo how the measures relate to frontage improvements.

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 alternate performance standards and safety measures and multimodal mixed-use area boundary. The next TWG and SWG meetings are tentatively planned for December 2015.