TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC FACILITIES SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING
ROOM 126, MULTNOMAH BUILDING
501 SE HAWTHORNE BLVD, PORTLAND OR
NOVEMBER 9, 2015   6:30-8:30 PM

MEETING SUMMARY

I.   Welcome and Announcements

In attendance:

Subcommittee Members	Project Team
Andrew Holtz	Rich Faith
Jerry Grossnickle	Jessica Berry
Martha Berndt	Susie Wright
Sara Grigsby	Joanna Valencia
	Kevin Cook
	Rithy Khut
	Matt Hastie

Others in attendance: Carol Chesarek, Steve Baker, Paula Savageau

Rich Faith welcomed everyone to the meeting of this subcommittee and briefly reviewed the agenda. He announced that there will need to be another subcommittee meeting so we will discuss possible dates for that at the end of today's meeting when Joanna Valencia is here. She will be joining us later and should be here around 7:00. He pointed out that there is an addition to today's meeting packet that was not part of the digital copy sent out last week. These are comments he received today that were submitted by the West Hills CAC representatives on the various policies that are on today's agenda. Copies of those comments have been provided to everyone.

II.   Existing Public Facilities Policies

Rich stated that this subcommittee had reviewed the existing public facilities policies from the County Comprehensive Plan at the last meeting and we will continue the discussion with those policies starting with those from the West Hills Rural Area Plan beginning on page 27 of today's packet (page 20 in the previous meeting packet). However, the West Hills delegation's comments received today that have been provided to everyone are asking for revisions to some policies prior to page 27. Does the subcommittee wish to consider those or do you want to stick with the plan and begin on page 27? It was agreed to discuss whatever changes were being requested in the West Hills written comments.

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

- Existing policy 32 from West of Sandy River and strategies 32.3 and 32.4 pertain more to transportation and should be moved there if they are not already addressed by other policy statements. Joanna Valencia would know if the County Road Division already has drainage system design guidelines and standards to accommodate fish passage and address degradation of water quality and fish and wildlife habitat. She can report on that at the next subcommittee meeting.
- Delete the word "preservation" from Policy 2 under storm water drainage (p. 19) but the additions proposed in the West Hills comments should not be made.
- Add the words "or wildlife habitat" at the end of policy 2c on page 19.
- The addition of policy 2g should wait until Joanna reports on whether the County has already adopted drainage system design guidelines and standards.
- Delete the word "other" from Policy 3 under Parks and Recreation Planning on p. 26.
- The addition to Strategy B under Parks and Recreation Planning on p. 27 is unnecessary because the idea is already reflected in the existing conditional use approval criterion: "Will not adversely affect natural resources."
- A member argued for keeping the proposed new general policy about the County's Climate Action Plan and putting it somewhere in the comp plan. Others were unsure such a policy is needed. After some discussion, it was decided to place this topic on the parking lot list and to let staff report back on it after further research.
- The requested changes to Policy 15 from the West Hills RAP on page 28 are unnecessary since this is covered in other policies and strategies elsewhere.
- Revise the second strategy under Policy 15 on page 28 to read as follows: "Promote and provide incentives for voluntary use of conservation easements and habitat protection by property owners."
- Requested changes to Policy 17on page 29 are not needed. No changes approved.
- Policy 12 on page 29 can be deleted because this idea is already reflected elsewhere.
- No changes were made to Policy 60 from East of Sandy River as requested in the West Hills written comments.

Action Taken: Approved the existing public facilities policies with those changes discussed and agreed to at this and the previous subcommittee meeting.

III.   Alternative Analysis

Susie Wright handed out a sheet with definitions of Bikeways and Shared Roadways for purposes of Figure 5A, Draft Bike Plan and the project table. The definitions will give the committee members a better understanding of the map and projects and how these transportation features compare. Susie talked about comments that were obtained from

the Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee and from the September community meetings and how that has influenced the map. There are several bicycle projects on the map and in the table as shared roadway projects but that are shown on the books as stretches of roads with safety concerns and include improvements such as partial or full shoulders. These need to be sorted out to determine whether they should remain as shared roadways or as bikeways. Examples of these projects are numbers 43, 27, 28, 51, and 55. These warrant discussion to determine if the table should be made consistent with the draft plan map.

A comment from the subcommittee was that every project that calls out a 4-foot shoulder should be further reviewed to determine which are safety projects. The project list could also be updated and revised based on the relevant transportation policies. Staff agreed they would evaluate the project list based on a safety audit and guidance from the policies.

Other key comments were:

- Leave #27, Sauvie Island Road Shoulder Improvements, as a shared roadway project on the map.
- Make #28, Reeder Road Shoulder Improvements, a proposed bikeway project on the map.
- Project #32, Cornelius Pass Road intersection improvement. This project has been completed so it should be removed.
- All projects saying, "add shoulders" should be evaluated against the policies.
- Project #44, Skyline Boulevard, should not include speed humps.
- Project #38, Cornelius Pass Road safety improvement should stay on the map.

Susie said she will make the suggested changes to the table and will bring it back for review at the next subcommittee meeting.

Action Taken: No final action taken on the alternatives analysis.

IV. **Existing Transportation Policies**

Jessica Berry went over her memo on revisions to Policies 3, 5 and 6 in response to comments given at the last subcommittee meeting. Major comments about the changes were:

- Policy 3, Strategies B and C should include language about context sensitive design as recommended in the West Hills comments.
- Change "future deficiencies" to "projected deficiencies" in Strategy G of Policy 2. Also, change "culvert improvements" to "wildlife crossing improvements".
- Policy 6, item C – include language about context sensitive design as recommended in the West Hills comments.
- Policy 6, Strategy d – add the following language at the end: "while protecting natural resources and habitat."

- Policy 6, Strategy f – the correct name of the committee is Bicycle and Pedestrian Citizen Advisory Committee, not Community Advisory Committee.

Jessica next referred to her memorandum on existing transportation policies from the October 19 subcommittee meeting and reminded everyone that the memo includes both new policies and existing policies. The new policies have already been reviewed and approved by the full CAC, so these are not really up for discussion this evening.

At its last meeting, the subcommittee got through policy 13 and will continue discussion tonight starting with policy 14. Major comments were as follows.

- Policies 14, 15, 16 and 17 – These are new policies that have already been reviewed and approved by the full CAC at its October 5 meeting, so no changes.
- Policy 18 – Accident rates should not be the only information that is monitored in determining safety improvements. Near accident experiences and perceived risks should also be considered. Include language in the policy statement about experiences and perceived risks.
- Policy 18, strategies – Add a strategy about performing safety audits to identify locations where roadway characteristics increase safety risks and efforts to reduce those risks.
- Policy 19 – The first strategy should be expanded to mention a variety of methods for supporting speed limit enforcement.
- Policy 20 is a new policy that has already been approved by the CAC, so no changes.
- Policy 21 – No change
- Policy 22 – This policy fits better as a strategy under Policy 21. The evaluation criteria should be expanded to include a bullet about wildlife as a factor.
- Policy 23 is a new policy that has already been approved by the CAC, but there should be another bulleted strategy that speaks to wildlife safety.
- Policy 24 – This policy has been reviewed and updated by the County's water quality specialist since the County just went through its NPDES standards. The strategy language is reflective of that.

Jessica stated that there isn't enough time remaining to discuss the health and equity policies that are given in a separate memorandum. We will bring these back at the next meeting for review and discussion.

Public Comment - Paula Savageau commented that safety considerations need to be made where pedestrian trails cross the roads. The slower speed signs that are currently at some of these crossings are not well thought out and create other problems for drivers. It is important to look at the pedestrian crossings associated with trails for the proper signage and safety treatments.

Carol Chesarek had several comments to offer:

- On page 55 Policy 6, item E – Carol thought at the last meeting it was decided to delete "fatal or serious injury" in front of the word "crashes". Committee members agreed that was the decision and Jessica said that leaving it in was an oversight. It will be corrected.
- Page 56 Policy 6, Strategy g – Is this the right place to include a reference to the Wildlife Advisory Committee that will be created under a policy proposed by the air, land, water and wildlife subcommittee. It was decided not to make that change to this strategy because that advisory committee does not yet exist and there is no guarantee that the policy will be adopted to create such a committee. Also, if the duties of that advisory committee to include the opportunity to review transportation projects is spelled out, then it should go with the policy that seeks to create the committee in the first place or in the definition of the committee.
- In one of the old transportation policies from the Rural Westside TSP, there is reference to bike lockers. I didn't see any mention of those in any of the transportation policies and not sure if it should be mentioned somewhere or not. Both Joanna and Jessica agreed that bike lockers could be included in a strategy somewhere.
- Page 68 Policy 22. In addition to wildlife, another factor that should be bulleted as evaluation criteria in the capital improvement plan is climate. Staff can probably identify others that should be listed as well.

Subcommittee members did not object to any of the change that Carol had to offer, so they will be factored in with other changes the subcommittee has discussed tonight.

Action Taken: Approved the existing transportation policies with those changes discussed and agreed to at this and the previous subcommittee meeting.

V.   Public Comment

There was no additional public comment.

VI.   Meeting Wrap Up

Joanna said staff's preference for the next subcommittee meeting would be December 14, although December 7 and 21 or also possibilities. None of the members objected to holding the next meeting on December 14 so that will be the date of the meeting. Rich said he will confirm the availability of this room for the meeting to be held at the usual time of 6:30 – 8:30 p.m. and will let everyone know once it has been confirmed. The topics for the next meeting will be to complete review of the alternatives analysis with a revised project list, come back with clarification on the storm water drainage policy discussed at the beginning of this meeting, and the health and equity policies.

VII.   Adjourn
The meeting adjourned at 8:45 pm.