

CLACKAMAS REGIONAL CENTER WORKING GROUP
MEETING SUMMARY: August 29, 2012

Committee members present: Doug Bean, Jennifer Harding, Ken Horn, David Kelly, Shelly Parini, Bill Monahan, Jason Tuck, Martha Waldemar, Thomas Joseph, Cyndi Lewis-Wolfram and Joe Krumm.

Committee members not in attendance: Dennis Curtis, Matt Ellington, Jim Gersbach, Anna Geller, Patricia Holloway and Lori Luchak.

Guests present: Cam Gilmour and Larry Conrad

Staff: Dan Johnson, David Queener and Lori Phillips

Notes by: Lori Phillips

Dan Johnson called the meeting to order at 8:05 a.m.

1. Review Agenda, Previous Minutes, and Correspondence

The Agenda was approved as presented. The previous meeting summary (8/1/12) was approved as written. There was no correspondence.

Dave said he was still working on an informational flyer and will have that completed and sent out to everyone in a short time. The thought is this flyer could be shared with your constituents to inform them of what is happening and how and when they can weigh in during the process.

Comment cards are now available for all working group meetings to provide an opportunity for members of the public to submit written ideas or comments to the committee.

2. Work Program Development

Work Plan

Dan talked about needs v. resources, and reminded the committee that there are limits to what Urban Renewal can fund. The district closes in June 2012, so no additional funds will be collected. The task of this work group is to offer suggestions and prioritize the projects; the Commissioners are the ones that will make the decisions.

We will gain public input through:

- The connections each of the working group members have;
- Open Houses – currently being scheduled for sometime in October and November. We are trying for the Town Center to get more people; we want to have an interactive Open House, not just maps and literature; and
- Web based interaction. We are still working on the web site and posting information on it.

It was suggested that if we hold the Open Houses at the Town Center that we should try to locate close to the bus terminal to get their input.

As discussed, the Work Program will be developed from the committee's feedback on the following:

- Objectives / Evaluation Criteria
- Project Types
- Areas of Need (AON)

The committee agreed that this information would provide a reasoned methodology for developing the work program and prioritizing future projects and programs.

3. Objectives/Evaluation Criteria

Dave reviewed the Evaluation Criteria handout. Four primary goals were developed with evaluation criteria for each goal. These are based on the objectives outlined in the Urban Renewal, Clackamas Regional Center and County Strategic plans. The intent is to evaluate each project against these in order to develop a list of priority projects.

Jason Tuck commented that the ability to leverage other funds is good criteria to have across the board in all the categories, not just under Develop Projects that are Cost Effective.

Dave said leveraging funds is always something we look for. If it isn't specifically noted in a category, it just means that it is not in the specific plan, but doesn't mean we don't look for that opportunity.

Dan Johnson used as an example that the county knows ODOT is coming in to work on 82nd, so the County has been in conversation with ODOT to see how we can partner to get a better project.

Jason Tuck suggested private partners as well.

Shelly Parini suggested we add the Harmony Community Campus Plan to the list of plans and also mentioned that the original Evaluation Criteria had an educational component. Dave will add this.

The committee agreed that these evaluation criteria are suitable. Development of the future work program should prioritize the fundamental urban renewal plan objectives, though leveraging funds and meeting the criteria of other plans in the Clackamas Regional Center should also be taken into consideration.

4. Project Types

There are 4 main project types:

- Transportation / Street Network
- Multimodal
- Development / Redevelopment
- Community Use

There is an Area of Need (AON) discussion that will take place within each of these 4 project types.

5. Area of Need

- Within project type
 - a. Will need to identify and prioritize
- Geographic or Programmatic
 - a. Geographic – where are the areas of need
 - b. Programmatic – something like a façade grant program
- Priority
 - a. Want your opinions based on the project type and AON. How do you prioritize expenditure across the categories.

➤ Multi Modal AON

Dan passed out a map from the Clackamas Regional Center Pedestrian Bicycle Plan that was recently completed by area stakeholders and the County. Dan explained how that group evaluated needs and deficiencies, developed 7 areas with several projects within each area, developed routes with projects connecting these areas, and prioritized those routes.

Ken Horn asked if there was still a ped/bike committee. There is a committee that works on the county-wide process.

Jason asked if there was a strategy to put all the money into 1 route or to pick 1 or 2 routes within all the areas. Routes have identified projects to fill the gaps. The plan does not suggest the entire route is reconstructed. Dave will be developing cost estimates for the recommended improvements, which will help in determining what can or should be completed. The focus will likely be on the Regional Center core.

Comment: We should look to see if there are other funds that might be needed to fill the gaps. We should also prioritize projects that provide multiple benefits.

Cam stated that TriMet has a prominent role too, we we will be asking them for their input as well.

Cyndi Lewis-Wolfram – is information being pulled from the Oak Grove area planning to tie in with this area? There will be people that will want to get to this area from the Light Rail in Milwaukie. Are we considering that connection?

Dan Johnson – we have not worked on it through Urban Renewal, but getting direct connections from Green Line to PMLR is a need. There have been discussions with TriMet about buses that run from one to the other. We are looking at connections through our NCRA district and working with Milwaukie to make pedestrian section connections.

Consensus was reached to use the CRC Pedestrian/Bike Plan for Work Program development.

➤ *Transportation/Street Network AON*

Larry Conrad talked about the Transportation System Plan (TSP). It's been 12 years since the County has updated their TSP, which is supposed to be done every 5 years. Clackamas County has over 1400 miles of roads and as a comparison the County is bigger than the State of Rhode Island. They are creating a master list of all projects set out in various plans, which currently has just less than 1000 projects. The list will be refined as the process moves forward. Stakeholder meetings have been ongoing. The next meeting for this area is September 10th in the morning at the Development Services Building in Oregon City.

Cam commented that there is very little funding available to build the TSP projects. For example, ODOT only has \$65 million for Region 1, which includes five counties, for the next three years meaning only about \$22 million per year. In the Town Center urban renewal area there is money so this is critical to zero in on the highest priorities. The recommendations from this committee are very important for the discussions in the TSP.

The committee was informed that Metro is changing the Level of Service (LOS). They are of the opinion that you can have more congestion in these areas than is currently allowed. The data we will share is very general; it deals with capacity, not safety. It is difficult to look at that information and determine what the actual impacts will be. We will analyze how the traffic from one intersection affects the queuing at the next few intersections around that one.

Cyndi Lewis-Wolfram asked for clarification of the methodology Metro is requiring and if it was put through a public process, or shared with the citizens in the area. Larry said it was through a Metro public process.

Cyndi – What can be done if the citizens have issue with the increased congestion in the area? She thought the whole purpose was to alleviate congestion.

There was discussion about the State Standards for highways and if the standards that apply for Burns are the same that apply in the Portland area. Short answer: Yes

Metro's Framework Plan calls for more density, which cannot be met with the current standards so with this new rating more density is allowed. This is good news unless you are stuck in traffic. The modified LOS standard also assumes a better multi-modal system.

Martha suggested that better traffic enforcement at intersections might improve movement as any delay will create backups.

There was discussion about a need for a shuttle service in the area.

Larry Conrad said they are working with Metro on travel time reliability analysis – i.e. how long it takes to get from point A to point B. It is hard to plan when the travel time keeps increasing. Shelly suggested a cross analysis because what might be safer for autos, might not be safe for pedestrians.

➤ *Transportation/Street Network Mapping Exercise*

Dan Johnson explained the large maps of the Clackamas Regional Center at each table and asked each group to talk about the area and give us their opinions on transportation issues. We know the area has deficiencies but we want to know where you see issues or gaps in transportation as it relates to capacity, congestion and in safety.

There were two tables with an even amount people and they spent 30-40 minutes identifying areas on the map they felt had issues or deficiencies. Dave will compile all of the notes and comments and bring it back to the group for further discussion at the next meeting.

Next meeting: September 19, 8am at the Aquatic Park.
The meeting adjourned at 9:45 a.m.