

TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC FACILITIES SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING  
ROOM 126, MULTNOMAH BUILDING  
501 SE HAWTHORNE BLVD, PORTLAND OR  
OCTOBER 19, 2015 6:30-8:30 PM

## **MEETING SUMMARY**

### **I. Greetings, Announcements and Introductions**

In attendance:

Subcommittee members

Andrew Holtz

Jerry Grossnickle

Martha Berndt

Project Team

Joanna Valencia

Rich Faith

Jessica Berry

Matt Hastie

Kate McQuillan

Kevin Cook

Absent: Sara Grigsby

Rithy Khut

Public in attendance: Carol Chesarek, Steve Baker, George Sowder, Paula Savageau

Rich Faith welcomed everyone to the meeting of this subcommittee and briefly reviewed the agenda. He pointed out that there will need to be another subcommittee meeting so we are looking at either November 9 or 16 to hold it. He asked the subcommittee members if they have a preference. One person could not make it on November 16, but everyone would be able to make Nov 9, so it was decided to schedule the next meeting for that date. Rich said he will check with Sara Grigsby as well, who is currently out of town, will check on room availability and will confirm the meeting date and place by email to everyone.

Rich also pointed out that the packets for tonight's meeting includes email correspondence from several members of the public who attended the last subcommittee meeting. This correspondence was not part of the digital meeting packet sent out last week.

### **II. Existing Public Facilities Policies**

Rich explained that this agenda item is a continuation of the discussion that began at the August 24 subcommittee meeting but was not completed due to lack of time. Since then, Jed Tomkins from the County Attorney's office, has reviewed the policies and offered his feedback. The version in tonight's packet is different from the August 24 because it includes changes based on discussion that occurred at that meeting, based on Jed's comments or based on staff recommended changes. These changes are shown in the document as grey highlighted text.

The following are the major comments and questions that were raised.

- Policy D8 on page 14 relates to equity. The recently adopted Sauvie Island Plan also has policies on equity that should be included in the comprehensive plan.
- Why is policy G on page 14 being deleted? Answer is this is one that Jed Tomkins flagged as not realistic to implement.
- There was much discussion about the policy on Alternative Uses of Public School Buildings and its history. Related to that, policy C3 on page 23 should be more specific in referring to the local community's needs rather than the general area's need. Replace "the area's needs" with "the local community's needs".
- Should there be a policy concerning drones, and if so, is public facilities the appropriate place to put it. No one was sure of the answer, so the decision was to place this topic on the parking lot list and for staff to research it and report back.
- Policy 2 on page 11 should include language about maintaining natural stream channels. The idea is touched upon in the main policy statement but it could be made stronger and clearer as sub-policy item.
- Concern about neglecting access to new recreation areas. When locating new recreational facilities (parks, high use trailheads, etc) encourage use of existing places or attractants. Try to take advantage of existing infrastructure like parking areas. Staff will propose some policy language to capture this idea.
- Policy 17 on page 21. There was concern that requiring mitigation of significant adverse impacts of proposed recreational facilities gives adjacent property owners veto power. It was explained that mitigation is standard for any proposed land use and is not treating recreational facilities any differently than other uses.
- Item B on page 19. What is contemplated by "privately owned and operated recreational facilities"? What type of facilities? These are already spelled out for the resource zones by statute. This question will be further addressed and evaluated as a parking lot item that is looking at conditional uses for all non-resource zones.

At this point it was decided to continue this agenda item to the next meeting in order to provide adequate time for tonight's remaining agenda items. Discussion at the next meeting will pick up on page 20.

**Action Taken** - No final action

### **III. Existing Transportation Policies**

Jessica Berry introduced this agenda item by pointing out that existing transportation policies were part of the subcommittee's August 24 meeting, but that the memo and policies have since been revised. This version incorporates the new transportation policies that the subcommittee approved at its last meeting. Those policies are noted in the memo as having been already been approved and should not be revisited as part of tonight's discussion. There is also a supplemental memo prepared by one of our

consultants that proposes policies related to health and equity as part of the transportation planning.

Major comments on this topic from the subcommittee are as follows:

- The sixth bullet item under Policy 4 pertaining to Active Transportation should include some exception language for when fog line rumble strips may be appropriate. There are some instances when these rumble strips improve safety for bicyclists. The first bullet should include exploring options for passing lanes as well as pull outs.
- Strike Policy 2 because Policy 15 captures the same idea and it is redundant. The one strategy under Policy 2 can be moved up under Policy 1.
- Policy 3 is primarily old policy language that could be shortened. Strategies B and E don't seem to respect context sensitive design in maintaining rural character. The balance isn't there. The strategies should be cleaned up to be less engineering heavy and speak more about context sensitive design, flexibility etc. that achieve the overall goal of using the existing road system rather than building new roads.
- Some of Policy 5 is redundant. The third bullet about Safe Routes to School is also covered in Policies 6 and 7. Policies 5 and 6 could be combined. Some of the lettered items under Policy 6 can either be deleted or moved elsewhere.
- Item A in Policy 6 should also mention access to transit.
- Standards referred to in item D of Policy 6 should also be based on local best practices as well as national and state best practices.
- Item F of Policy 6 shouldn't just speak to reducing fatal and serious crashes, but all crashes. Strike "fatal and serious" and add language about collecting information about perceived safety.
- Item I of Policy 6 should say "Support transportation option programs..." not "option programming". Bicycle tourism initiatives are not appropriate everywhere, particularly in the West Hills, so support for these should be qualified by saying when it is appropriate.
- Strategies A, B and C of Policy 6 seem to be too specific and should speak more to context sensitive design. These should be cleaned up.
- Policies that pertain to safety should take into account near crashes and should reference a broader set of data.
- The term "non-infrastructure programs" in the first strategy of Policy 7 is awkward. Strike the word "non-infrastructure" and qualify the programs as education, encouragement, enforcement, engineering, and evaluation – the five E's.
- There should be a policy about conversion of abandoned railroad lines to trails. For the West Hills Plan there was one under existing Public Facilities policies, but it is being stricken.

- The first strategy under Policy 8 basically repeats the policy. It can be shortened to simply say: “Explore alternatives to routes through the West Hills.”
- Should there be a policy about marine transportation. Freight transportation on the Columbia and Willamette Rivers is critical to the region’s economy. It was decided to place this topic on the parking lot list.
- What does Policy 10 address in transportation alternatives for freight movement? This needs to be flushed out a little more. Policy 10 could be moved up as a strategy under Policy 8.
- Policy 11 should be replaced with or should include the related policy adopted in the Sauvie Island/Multnomah Channel Plan. That policy was approved at the last meeting but has been left off.
- Policy 12 should include specific language about the Westside bypass.
- Strike “traffic calming” in Policy 13 and add “such as Transportation Demand Management (TDM)” at the end of the policy statement.
- Include “access to transit” and “flex-time” as examples of TDM program concepts mentioned in the first strategy under Policy 14.

Given the little time left in the meeting, It was decided to continue discussion of this agenda item at the next meeting

**Action taken** - No final action

#### **IV. Public Comment**

Paula Savageau asked whether the subcommittee had received a copy of an email she had sent to Rich. He could not recall receiving that email, so no the subcommittee did not have it. Paula summarized her concerns about barriers on Thompson Road that are preventing deer from crossing the road. The barriers are along stretches of steep slopes and the deer are hesitant to jump over them because they can’t see what is on the other side. This is a prime example of why wildlife crossings need to be carefully looked at when planning our road system.

Carol Chesarek commented that it is awkward to have to wait until the end of the meeting to make comments on policies the subcommittee discussed much earlier in this meeting. This is a departure from how public comment has been taken in previous meetings. She would rather not have to backup and revisit topics already discussed, but tonight’s format doesn’t allow her a choice in the matter. Her specific comments were:

- The reference to bicycle tourism initiatives under item I of policy 6 seems to be in the wrong place. This policy language relates more to economic development than to the transportation system.
- Regarding the language in strategy A1 of Policy 6, are there roads where the current right-of-way is insufficient that would justify needing to dedicate additional right-of-way as a condition of land development? Her concern is about widening

existing roads contrary to the preferred direction of maintaining rural character by addressing traffic and safety issues without widening or building new roads.

- Would like to see policy language limiting the size of trucks traveling on West Hill roads. Some roads are too narrow and curves too sharp to allow safe use by semis and other freight trucks.

## **V. Meeting Wrap Up**

Joanna stated that based on tonight's discussion, staff will prepare changes to the existing transportation policies for the subcommittee's next meeting. Susie Wright will also be at the next meeting to lead them in further discussion of the alternative's analysis that is undergoing changes based on their previous review.

Rich reminded them that he will check with Sara about the November 9th date for the next meeting as well as the availability of this room for that meeting. He will confirm the meeting information with everyone once everything has been verified.

## **VI. Adjourn**

**The meeting adjourned at 8:44 pm.**

October 22, 2015

Multnomah County Comprehensive Framework Plan (CFP) Update  
Community Advisory Committee

Re: Bikeways in the Corbett area

This letter states our concerns about expansion of bikeways in our area, but we are not opposed to cyclists using our roads and we have a strong interest in their safety while on these roads. Our interest is focused on the effect that the proposed pavement widening would have on the rural character of this community and the impact they could have on some long-established features enjoyed by private property owners.

While the rural environment we cherish attracts recreational cyclists, the local topography discourages community point-to-point travel, including that of school-bound children. Living at the corner of Hurlburt and Evans Roads, we have a front seat view of the major cycling activity in Corbett. We would estimate that at least 95% of cyclists passing our house are from outside the area. This proportion would probably hold true for cyclists on other routes such as the Scenic Highway. We welcome them and want them to feel safe as they travel through.

Our understanding is that the updated CFP, when adopted, will supersede the East of the Sandy River Rural Area Plan(ESRRAP). Bicycle routes and bikeway improvement recommendations will be included in these changes. While the CFP is not committing the County to specific improvement projects, it serves as a document to guide the Transportation Dept. in the scope of right-of-way improvements and allows the County to require certain improvements on projects adjacent to the right-of-ways.

The ESRRAP currently in place is somewhat ambiguous regards bikeways. It designates the following roads as “adopted bicycle routes”: Mershon, Evans, Hurlburt, Knierem and Larch Mtn. Roads and states that these routes should be “accommodated by paving of road shoulders to a width of at least 4 feet and preferably 6 feet.” It also includes the recommendations put forward by NEMCCA in January 1992, including:

- Oppose the inclusion of Corbett area roads in the bikeway plan until such time that the majority of the community would adopt the plan
- Have Bell Rd. removed from the proposed bikeway plan...
- Work to attempt to resolve the issues to the point whereby the plan is implemented when and if a majority of the community would adopt the plan
- Do not condemn private property to provide for bikeways
- Involve NEMCCA and other concerned citizens in the implementation of bikeways.....(more detail regarding notifications and plans)
- Ensure that the interests of equestrians and other forms of alternative transportation are served

It then further states:

“In response to this document, Multnomah County removed Bell Rd. from the bikeway plan, and agreed to the remainder of the recommendations, except that the County did adopt the bikeway routes map without conducting a community election on their adoption.”

The draft CFP update currently includes proposals to reclassify many of the roads between Springdale and Larch Mtn. and the Scenic Highway and Hurlburt Road. Several of these would be classified as “Shoulder Bikeways”.

We have two concerns:

- The updating process vis-à-vis bikeways
- The currently proposed updates to the Bikeway Plan

### **Process**

When adopted, the updated CFP will supersede the East of the Sandy River Rural Area Plan. Given the 1992 resistance of the community to accept the County’s plan for bikeways, the County has the responsibility to involve the community in any further changes to the plan and certainly before any actual construction of bikeway right-of-way work recommended in the plan.

The draft CFP proposes an expansion of the Corbett area roadways to be included in the County’s Master Bike Plan. These appear on the MC Bikeway System Map.

Yet, as far as can be determined from the committee member information available online, there is no representation from the Corbett community. The County has not fulfilled its 1992 commitment to involve the community in the bikeway sections of the CFP update.

### **Proposed Updates**

In our opinion, the proposed bikeways are far too extensive relative to anticipated use by cyclists (see map). The “Shoulder Bikeways” in this plan are defined as having “a minimum of 3 feet, and preferably 6 feet of pavement on each side” of the travel lanes. Implementation of the minimum widths would increase the overall pavement width by 25%. An increase of this much pavement, along with the associated bank cuts, clearing and road base work would dramatically change the rural character of the areas affected. The maximum expansion would increase it by 33% only magnifying the impact.

We attended the October 5 meeting of the CFP Update Transportation committee. Among the policy and strategy language the committee was discussing and editing that night was language related to bikeway design.

We participated in the public comment period at the end of the meeting and raised our concerns as stated above. During the ensuing committee and MC staff discussion, it became clear that 1) changes to the County Bike Plan and System Map had taken place without any Corbett community participation, 2) the changes to the System Map had not been reviewed by the Transportation Committee, and 3) that

the maps in the CFP provide a legal basis for the County to implement and/or require the adopted improvements. Further, we were told that the proposed maps were available online, but so far we have not been able to locate them.

We also learned that there exists, in draft form, language describing a range of alternatives for making safety improvements in road/bikeways that would have less impact than the continuous shoulders described above. These include periodic “pull-outs” that would give cyclists more room on uphill grades and provide more opportunities for motor vehicles to pass cyclists safely. We support these concepts and think they should be considered carefully in light of specific conditions in our area and incorporated in a balanced way to improve cyclist safety without diminishing the overall rural character.

We feel that the CFP Update process must include participation from the local communities that will be affected by the Plan and that the County CFP update team should make changes to the process to accommodate this while the plan is still in its formative stages.

Dave and Kathleen Shelman  
36141 SE Hurlburt Road  
503-927-3063 (Dave)  
503-803-4291 (Kathleen)



Refer to: WEST OF SANDY RIVER AREA PLAN POLICIES

Page 25 of 43

### Policy 32 (transportation section)

**Balance the need of roadway users with potential impacts to the environment, fish, wildlife and agricultural resources and users when applying roadway design standards.**

Strategies:

32.3 Develop and adopt **drainage system design guidelines and standards** to accommodate **fish passage** where appropriate.

32.4 Develop and implement standards for all transportation projects with regard to water quality treatment and detention of runoff from existing and new impervious surfaces to avoid further degradation of water quality **as well as fish and wildlife habitats**.

#### **STORM WATER DRAINAGE**

2. Storm water drainage for new development and redevelopment, including transportation improvements, shall emphasize water quality **preservation, fish and wildlife habitats** and use of natural systems over engineered systems to reduce and filter stormwater runoff in accordance with the following:

Ea. If stormwater will be discharged to a public system, there ~~shall have~~ be adequate capacity in the storm water system to handle the run-off from the development; or

Fb. The stormwater run-off shall be handled on the site or adequate off-site provisions shall be made to accommodate the run-off; and

Gc. The run-off from the site shall not adversely affect the water quality in adjacent streams, ponds, or lakes, or alter the drainage on adjoining lands, or cause damage to adjacent property **or wildlife habitat**.

d. Stormwater infiltration and discharge standards should be designed to protect watershed health by requiring onsite infiltration wherever feasible in order to mimic pre-development hydraulic conditions so that post-development runoff rates and volumes do not exceed pre-development conditions.

e. Apply Low Impact Development Approaches (LIDA) where feasible in order to conserve existing resources, minimize disturbance, minimize soil compaction, minimize imperviousness, and direct runoff from impervious areas onto pervious areas.

f. Protect and maintain natural stream channels wherever possible, with an emphasis on non-structural controls when modifications are necessary.

g. Develop and adopt drainage system design guidelines and standards to accommodate fish and wildlife passage where appropriate.

11/9/15 Packet page 26:

CE3. Encourage the development of recreation opportunities by ~~other~~ public agencies and private entities consistent with wildlife habitat and wildlife corridor protection.

11/9/15 Packet page 27:

## **POLICY 39: PARKS AND RECREATION PLANNING**

~~EB. The Zoning Ordinance should include provisions in the Zoning Ordinance to allow for privately owned and operated recreational facilities as conditional uses in appropriate zones viewed as appropriate by the individual communities.~~ Conditional use evaluation shall include consistency with riparian zone, wildlife habitat and wildlife corridor protection.

New general policy (not just for public facilities): Conditional use evaluations shall include conformance with the goals of the County's Climate Action Plan.

11/9/15 Packet page 28:

### **From West Hills Rural Area Plan**

POLICY 15: ~~Maintain and enhance~~ Support/Implement county policies that help maintain and enhance the natural systems and recreational values of Forest Park and adjacent areas consistent with the City of Portland's adopted Forest Park Natural Resource Management Plan and the county's Climate Action Plan in concert with the City of Portland, METRO, and other agencies. (using language from old strategy below)

~~STRATEGY: Coordinate management of acquired properties in the vicinity of Forest Park to preserve natural resource values consistent with the City of Portland's Forest Park Natural Resource Management Plan to be approved by the City of Portland.~~

STRATEGY: Promote and provide incentives for voluntary use of conservation easements and tax incentives for habitat protection by property owners ~~in lieu of purchase.~~

11/9/15 Packet page 29:

POLICY 17: Consider and mitigate the impacts of proposed recreational facilities on adjacent private properties of all proposed recreational facilities and require applicants to avoid and minimize, and if unable to minimize then to mitigate significant adverse impacts to nearby adjacent properties. Include nearby property owners and neighborhood groups in discussions during all phases of the project.

11/9/15 Packet page 32:

**From East of Sandy River Rural Area Plan**

**>> Propose to delete this policy and strategy and combine with other RAP policies below**

60. ~~Study costs and benefits of burying~~ Work with utility companies that own transmission and distribution lines to bury the power lines to provide more secure power service during emergency situations and improve scenic qualities.

STRATEGY: ~~Multnomah County shall study~~ Determine the costs and benefits of burying power lines in the Corbett community in conjunction with utility and telephone service providers and community representatives. (benefit unclear, and will change over time, drop it)

**Combined version:**

**(Red text is from West of Sandy, B&W text is from East of Sandy policy 60) Policy 33**

Work with utility companies that own transmission and distribution lines to lines to provide more secure power service during emergency situations and encourage preservation of critical view sheds by placing new pipelines and transmission lines in existing rights-of-way whenever possible.

Strategy:

33.1 Enhance and preserve the rural character and scenic qualities of the area by placing utilities underground when possible.

33.2 Coordinate street improvements with utility improvements whenever possible to minimize cost, visual impact and disruption to traffic flow.

(from Rural Westside TSP):

Strategy: develop general guidelines for utility placement within the county right of way that reduces the number of conflicts and cost of implementation

Strategy: coordinate improvements with utility companies through regular status meetings to maintain and preserve the beauty of the rural character of west Multnomah County

(highlights indicate what's unique about each strategy)

## West Hills comments on Transportation Alternatives Analysis Maps and Project list

11/9/15 Packet

page 33:

Figure 5A, Draft Bike Plan

Is Cornelius Pass Road between Skyline and Hwy 30 suitable for a Bikeway? It is home to numerous double and triple-trailers and hazardous materials shipments. It is dangerous for motorists, let alone bicyclists, with little or no shoulder. Comments from the open house question its suitability, we agree. It seems more advisable to rely instead of the eventual rail-to-trail conversion of the parallel railroad track than to designate this section of road as a Bikeway. Even bike passing lanes and pullouts seem unlikely to significantly reduce the hazards posed by trucks and hazardous materials, and full bike lanes are unrealistic given the topography, expense, landslide risk, and harm that would result to natural systems.

Pages 37-38:

Add a new policy or policies: Add centerline rumble strips and reflectors on the following roads in the West Hills: Skyline, Germantown, Cornell, Laidlaw, Thompson, Cornelius Pass, Newberry, Kaiser, Brooks, Springville. (do not include narrow roads with low traffic counts such as Old Germantown where automobiles generally use more than half the road)

Projects 34, 35, 36, 41, 42, 43, 94. Language about adding 4' paved shoulders should be replaced with "Identify and construct bike passing lanes as appropriate"

Project 37. Refer to Corn Pass Safety Study design, not current TSP (which is older).

Project 39. Remove language about widening lanes on curves.

Project 44, 46. Remove projects unless you can identify a useful alternative to speed humps, which the local community DOES NOT WANT. Speed humps are dangerous in ice and snow, make it difficult to safely pass bicyclists, and are not effective.

Project 48. Research and consider installing road sensors and a signal to indicate when there is oncoming traffic, to make the left turn safer. This would be safer and cheaper, and is far more achievable than the currently described left-turn pocket and carving into the adjacent hillside to add sight distance.

Project 49. See comment at top of this page about suitability. Trying to make Cornelius Pass Road into a Bikeway seems inappropriate because we can't limit or eliminate the trucks and hazardous materials. If anything, remove language about adding 4' paved shoulders but leave bike climbing lanes and pull-outs.

Project 94. The Cornell Road Sustainability Coalition recommended adding only an uphill bike lane from NW Portland to Portland Audubon (all within the City of Portland). Extending a bike lane further up the hill runs into many of the same problems as Cornelius Pass – steep slopes with landslide hazards, important riparian zones along Balch Creek, residential driveways that would need to be adjusted, etc. The cost and environmental harm would be staggering. Also, we’ve heard that bikes traveling downhill can almost keep up with traffic, reducing the need. Keep the language about bike climbing lanes and pull-outs. A more intelligent approach (instead of bike lanes on Cornell) is to improve bike facilities on Miller Road between Cornell and Barnes, and facilities on Barnes/Burnside where they’re still challenging but more feasible.

Page 40

Project 32. Corn Pass intersection improvements at Hwy 30. Aren’t these completed? If so, this project can be deleted.

Project 33. Check with residents of Newberry Road about whether they want these speed humps, and defer to their preference.

Add: Project(s) to evaluate roads in West Hills to identify locations that need improved wildlife crossings and then to add the identified improvements to the CIPP project list.

Add: Projects to improve identified deficient fish passage culverts county-wide.

pp. 48-53. We learned during the Cornelius Pass Safety Advisory Committee work that the county’s crash report data does not include all available accident reports from emergency responders and others, so be cautious about relying on it. We also found that small safety improvements (centerline rumble strips!) can be both effective and cost-effective. Portland found that the biggest cause of accidents on Germantown through Forest Park was out of lane travel.

Current functional Classifications for West Hills roads seem appropriate.

# Memorandum

## Comprehensive Plan Update

### West Hills Comments for 11/91/5

November 4, 2015

**To:** Transportation and Public Facilities Subcommittee

**Cc:** Project Team

**From:** Joanna Valencia, Planning and Development Manager  
Jessica Berry, Transportation Planner  
Kate McQuillan, Transportation Planner

**Re:** Policy Recommendations – Revised Policy 3 and Policies 5+6 combined

### OVERVIEW

This memo addresses three previous policies that staff has revised based on input at the October 19<sup>th</sup> subcommittee meeting. Other minor changes will be presented with the approved policies when all the new and existing policies are combined.

### TRANSPORTATION POLICIES

#### **3. Policy (consolidated from Comprehensive Framework plan policies 33a and 34 and 36) - Rename “Transportation Network Development” Policy**

Implement and maintain a balanced, safe, and efficient transportation system using the existing roadway network.

#### Strategies

- A. Review and maintain a trafficway classification system integrated with land uses and travel needs. The hierarchy of functional classifications should be based on trip types and length, traffic volume and travel modes, and access to adjacent land uses.
- B. For capital projects, improve streets in a context sensitive manner with reference to the standards established by the classification system and the Multnomah County Design and Construction Manual.
- C. Implement access management standards established in the Multnomah County Road Rules and the Multnomah County Design and Construction Manual.
- D. Place priority on maintaining the existing trafficways.
- E. Review land use development and condition improvements on County Roads based on functional classification and standards set forth in the Multnomah County Design and

Construction Manual to mitigate impacts. Transportation and land use development review should be coordinated. (what does this mean?)

- F. Implement the land development process adopted in the Multnomah County Road Rules where half-street improvements or dedication of a right-of-way or easements can be required as conditions of a permit for land development abutting a County road.
- G. Maintain inventory of current and future deficiencies on the County's road network as the basis for Capital Improvement Plan and Program, including general roadway improvements, bicycle improvements, pedestrian improvements, and wildlife crossing~~culvert~~ improvements.
- H. Coordinate policy and development review work with Multnomah County Land Use Planning program which regulates off-street parking and loading areas, including parking for vehicles, trucks and bicycles through Multnomah County Code. *(combines a couple strategies in old comp plan policy 36)*

## **6. Policy (Combined propose Active Transportation Policy and Comp Plan 33C: Bicycle and Pedestrian Systems policy) – Rename “Active Transportation Policy”**

Develop and support programs and projects that educate and increase the safety of non-motorized transportation options in the County, and reduce dependency on automobile use and reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by:

- A. Promoting bicycling and walking as vital transportation choices.
- B. Assuring that future street improvement projects on designated bikeways and walkways are designed to accommodate and improve safety for bicyclists, pedestrians and transit users.
- C. Striving to use federal, state, and local best design practices for bicycle and pedestrian facilities in a context sensitive manner when improving County roadways.
- D. Providing for bicycle and pedestrian travel through the development and adoption of a County-wide Transportation Capital Improvements Program (CIP) that includes all the bikeways and walkways identified in the Multnomah County Bikeway and Pedestrian System Maps.
- E. Placing priority on transportation system improvements in the Capital Improvement Plan that reduce the number of ~~fatal or serious injury~~ crashes involving bicyclists and pedestrians, the roadway's most vulnerable users.
- F. Supporting transportation options programs in the region including Safe Routes to School, bicycle tourism initiatives (where appropriate and supported by the local community), the development of future Transportation Management Associations (TMAs), and other programs funded through the Regional Travel Options program.



- G. Supporting programs and policies that increase awareness of transportation options and education about safety on the transportation system for all modes and users.
- H. Supporting the conversion of railroad lines to multi-use paths, such as the Burlington Northern Cornelius Pass Road rail line. *(Newish policy, language borrowed from the West Hills Rural Area Plan)*

### Strategies

The following strategies should be used to implement the County's bicycle and pedestrian system:

- a) Identify a connected network of pedestrian and bicycle facilities and access to transit, which provides the framework for future walkway and bikeway projects. *(moved from original policy)*
- b) Periodically review and update the Multnomah County Design and Construction Manual to include the most up-to-date national, state, and local best practices for the design of bicycle and pedestrian facilities. *(moved and edited from original Policy 6)*
- c) Coordinate with Metro to implement bicycle and pedestrian networks in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), the Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP), and other local transportation system plans. Participate in updates to regional and local transportation plans. *(moved from original policy)*
- d) Continue to support and coordinate with Metro and other partner agencies in regional trails projects that may affect rural Multnomah County, recognizing trails as a vital component to the regional active transportation network while protecting riparian zones, wildlife habitat, and wildlife corridors. *(Moved and edited from Policy 5, general Active Transportation Policy)*
- e) Continue to seek funding for identified bicycle and pedestrian improvements, such as, but not limited to, state and regional grant sources. *(Originally strategy A5, edited)*
- f) Maintain Bicycle and Pedestrian Community Advisory Committee to provide input on Multnomah County Transportation Division projects and programs, including proposed bicycle and pedestrian project criteria and project design. *(Combined previous Strategy C1 and new policy under Policy 5, general Active Transportation Policy)*
- g) Ensure there is a comment, review, and public involvement process for planning, engineering, operations and maintenance projects for the appropriate neighborhood groups and cities within Multnomah County and for the county's Wildlife Advisory Committee. *(Originally strategy C4, edited)*

## Policies drawn from “Compilation of All Existing Transportation Policies”

For 11/9/15 from West Hills

### WEST OF SANDY RIVER AREA PLAN POLICIES

Page 25 of 43

#### Policy 32

**Balance the need of roadway users with potential impacts to the environment, fish, wildlife and agricultural resources and users when applying roadway design standards.**

Strategies:

32.1 Develop a program for retrofitting **drainage facilities** (vs. culverts in new policies – “drainage facilities” seems to cover more types of structures) in conformance with requirements adopted by the National Marine Fisheries Service and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

32.2 **Secure funding** for identification, prioritization and remediation of all deficient stream crossings for fish and wildlife passage.

32.3 Develop and adopt **drainage system design guidelines and standards** (e.g. storm water policies) to accommodate **fish passage** where appropriate.

32.4 Develop and implement standards for all transportation projects with regard to water quality treatment and detention of runoff from existing and new impervious surfaces to avoid further degradation of water quality **as well as fish and wildlife habitats**. (no mention of fish and wildlife habitats in new storm water policies)

32.5 Develop and implement standards for all transportation projects with regard to **protection of existing, and restoration of deficient, riparian buffers** where waters of the state border current and future road and path segments. (can't find mention of riparian buffers in the updated transportation policies)

### RURAL WESTSIDE TSP

Pages 31-33 of 43

Strategy: encourage the placement of **bike lockers** at all park and ride/park and carpool locations. Support and promote their use (Are these important to cyclists? Can't find bike lockers mentioned in updated policies)

Policy: apply roadway design safety standards appropriately by balancing the needs of the traveling public and minimizing negative impacts to the environment

Strategy: Develop and implement a design exception process that considers **the relative and incremental benefits of implementation costs** and impacts to the environment

Cost effective approaches were important to the Cornelius Pass Road Safety Advisory Committee, but can't find any mention of this idea in the updated transportation policies.