



March 15, 2016

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting of **Tuesday, March 15, 2016**, was called to order by Chair La Salle at 6:01 PM in the Commission Chambers at Oregon City Hall, 625 Center Street, Oregon City, Oregon.

Committee members present included Chair Bob La Salle, Vice-Chair Henry Mackenroth, Gary Johnson, Thomas Batty, John Anderson, Bob Mahoney, Jonathan David, Bob Mahoney, and Steve Johnson. Cedomir Jesic was excused.

Staff members present included John Lewis, Public Works Director; and Lisa Oreskovich, Administrative Assistant.

2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

<p>Mr. La Salle moved to approve the minutes of February 16, 2016 and they passed unanimously.</p>

3. AGENDA ANALYSIS

John Lewis noted that he was adding the selection process for the STIPP by presenting a spreadsheet showing the scores received on projects submitted.

4. CITIZEN COMMENTS

Louisa Gonyou, McLoughlin Neighborhood Association, provided thanks for working hard on traffic issues. She looked at the Transportation Master Plan and wanted to ask what the different between the two collector streets were.

Mr. Lewis explained that the attached Master Plan was in regards to the Public Works Operations Center and that it was not the overall Transportation Master Plan; they are two separate documents and plans.

Ms. Gonyou said how the attached plan (Operations Center Master Plan) was a beautiful plan, but does not depict our current streets. She mentioned she would, also, like an update on the Drive Safe Oregon City Campaign.

5. NEW BUSINESS/DISCUSSION ITEM

a. Public Works Report

i. Operations Center Master Plan

Mr. Lewis discussed the Operations Center Master Plan update. He has proposed scaling back the amount of staff at the updated Operations Center which would then allow for a smaller footprint. The attached traffic report is from 2009 and they depict plans much greater traffic than the scaled back version. The Public Works Department would go back through land use process again with the updated plan. They would then probably do an updated traffic analysis, as well. The 2009 Operations Center Master Plan has received full approval from the Planning Commission, but City Commission has its own notice of decision.

Mr. Anderson asked if Mr. Lewis could indicate in an abbreviated which buildings would not be built if there will be a reduction in the amount of staff at the new Operations Center.

Mr. Lewis responded that the original intent was to demolish the buildings on the Lower Yard and build an administrative building and provide customer parking. The large vehicles would be parked in the Upper Yard. Acquisition of the Armory was in the initial plan. City Commission came back and said a better job needed to be done of preserving the area and the trees in the Upper Yard. The new plan would not include the removal of the rock and Oak tree outcrop. The design has the truck parking in the Lower Yard and smaller vehicle parking on top. The fleet shop would be in the Upper Yard and could possibly be housed in what is now the Armory because the intent is still to utilize that building. There will no longer be a four story building between the Lower and Upper Yards. This new design proposes housing less employees and flip flopping the design and traffic pattern from the previous design in 2009.

Mr. David asked if the fleet shop is housed on the upper level what the pavement condition with heavy traffic up there looks like.

Mr. Lewis responded that a private property goes through the site and is pretty much gravel road. John Adams goes into a neighborhood and will need some work.

Mr. La Salle asked more about the purchase of the Armory.

Mr. Lewis noted that the City has not made any offer, but we have first right of refusal from the State, and they have been interested in selling to the City.

Mr. La Salle asked if there were any protected trees or groves on the upper lot.

Mr. Lewis said there were not any protected tree groves on the site, and that none of the trees have been removed, for what it is worth.

Mr. La Salle asked if the fueling station would be in above or underground storage tanks.

Mr. Lewis responded that there would be a small amount of storage and not a drive up station like in the previous plan. Fuel is needed for existing emergencies and there is a site at Mt. View currently that can be utilized.

Mr. La Salle pointed out that on pages 7 and 10 the history of the Armory references Company D as being housed in the building. He knows of at least two other units that have been housed there and feels that the history of the building should be more accurate in the description.

Mr. Mahoney asked if the legal status of the portion of the upper lot considered a park has been established and finalized, or if it has gone before LUBA by appeal of the McLoughlin Neighborhood Association.

Mr. Lewis responded that LUBA kicked it out and sent it to Circuit Court for a decision to be made and the neighborhood has appealed that decision. The City has submitted documents to move the process forward.

Mr. Mahoney asked if it will affect progress of this site.

Mr. Lewis responded that the City will not turn any soil before that decision, but will move forward with planning and getting it approved.

Mr. David asked if the City would consider doing natural gas when adding fueling stations and suggested partnering with another organization like the garbage company to share the asset.

Mr. Lewis responded that it is definitely an interest that we want to look at in detail. The challenge is converting the old fleet equipment to natural gas, or having to purchase new vehicles. Martin Montalvo did a study and found it is a great idea if the access to fuel is convenient. Currently, the neighborhood is not happy about the idea of a natural gas or diesel station on site at Public Works.

Mr. Mahoney asked if would be more economical to convert, or end up costing more money than the savings of using natural gas. He mentioned that supply is a concern, as well.

Mr. Lewis agreed that supply is a concern. He mentioned that a better option would be to go to a station and acquire fuel. If there was a fueling station offering natural gas then the City would look at switching more closely.

ii. Drive Safe Oregon City Campaign

Mr. Lewis provided an update on the stickers for the recycle bins/garbage cans/yard debris bins. The stickers cost \$5.98 per decal and are 8 ¾" by 13" in size. B & B Leasing will sponsor half the cost. The order will be for 1,500. B & B Leasing's logo will be added to the decal graphics since they are a sponsor. Public Works will work with the McLoughlin Neighborhood Association for the pilot program.

Mr. La Salle asked if the Transportation Advisory Committee budget of \$5,000 was an annual or a biannual allocation.

Mr. Lewis said that he believed it was a two year allocation for fiscal years 2015 and 2016. His thought on allocation and distribution of the decals would be dependent on the CIC's funding for each neighborhood association. He likes the idea of having the neighborhood associations' help with distribution, and it makes more sense to focus on neighborhood collectors and arterials than on cul-de-sacs where there is little speeding.

Mr. Mackenroth asked about distribution based on garbage pick-up so the decals are displayed multiple times a week. That way you see them on more than one day during the week. He suggested looking at what areas of the main roads pass through certain neighborhoods during collection days so they are on view longer than just one day a week.

Mr. La Salle felt 1,500 decals in just the McLoughlin neighborhood would be too much and that they should be spread out throughout the neighborhoods.

Mr. Lewis responded and said that the City will be purchasing a year supply to be distributed citywide and not just the McLoughlin neighborhood.

Mr. Mahoney said the city needed a strategy and thought they should be distributed to residents on collectors and arterials first.

Mr. Lewis said that he agreed with that statement. He said that the City can work with B & B Leasing to have collection date information to better distribute to the neighborhoods.

Mr. Anderson said that the City should put together guidelines for distribution based on the suggestions presented today.

Mr. Lewis noted that the CIC does distribution and allocation based on the number of households and asked if the TAC would be okay with distributing the decals in a similar manner.

Mr. La Salle said that idea sounded fine with him.

Mr. David asked about having B & B distribute them.

Mr. Lewis responded that they do not want to put them on garbage cans themselves. They support the idea, but do not want to take part in distribution or placing decals on garbage cans.

iii. Molalla Ave and Willamette St Intersection

Mr. Lewis spoke with TAC about the prompt action by the Street Department to respond to a resident concern forwarded from the Police Department regarding the crosswalk at Molalla Avenue and Willamette Street intersection. A “Pedestrian Ahead” sign was added to the intersection and branches were trimmed to provide better visibility. He wanted to point out that the Public Works Department is responsive and prompt to address resident concerns.

iv. Fir Street Speed Sign Placement

Mr. Lewis followed-up with the TAC regarding Gaffney Lane Neighborhood Association’s request the prior meeting to improve speed signage on Fir Street. Public Works trimmed back branches obstructing signs and placed, more prominent speed limit signs.

v. Hwy 213 and Glen Oak/Caufield

Mr. Lewis mentioned that Mr. Montalvo spoke with ODOT about the intersection of Hwy 213, Glen Oak and Caufield. ODOT responded that this intersection is at capacity and that there are adjustments to be made, but they require a decision from the State Transportation Engineer. They said the changes were high cost and that there is more work to be done to find a solution at this intersection. Another intersection of discussion was Gaffney Lane at Molalla Avenue where the Gaffney Lane Neighborhood Association had asked for a dedicated left turn and there are some signal controller changes that would need to be done in order for this change to occur. The County technician said they didn’t want to make that adjustment without a traffic analysis for recommendation on safety which would cost between \$5,000 and \$6,000. Last intersection of discussion is

Char Diaz and the request for a crosswalk. The City had applied for a grant a few years before and didn't get that funding and Char Diaz was one of the locations the City was hoping to put in a crosswalk and a median. The problem with just striping crosswalks is that it makes a false sense of security for pedestrians trying to cross. The City wants to look at street lighting, as well, and building new ADA ramps because you shouldn't have a crosswalk without access for wheelchairs.

Mr. Mahoney asked if the crosswalks are designed for those with disabilities.

Mr. Lewis responded that signalized intersections are designed for those with disabilities because they have buttons to press and sounds, and he is told that people that are visually impaired are very familiar with their routes and typically do not cross at an unsignalized crosswalk.

Mr. David asked if the intersections have truncated domes to help with those with visual impairments.

Mr. Lewis said that is true, but the Char Diaz intersection does not have the truncated domes. Some of this intersection does not have sidewalk, but there is a walkway. He believes this intersection is a good location for a project and a crosswalk. It would be nice to see sidewalk improvements wrap all the way around and probably place a rapid flashing beacon.

Mr. David said he is not familiar with this location and wanted to know why the site is not entirely developed.

Mr. Lewis explained that it is developed, but the single family resident at that location was probably in place when it was still a state highway.

Mr. David said that in his opinion completing a small project such as this can really improve the sidewalk system. He said this might be a good project for Sheila Lyons and could find her contact information.

Mr. La Salle asked how much sidewalk cost per running foot.

Mr. Lewis responded that he needed to think about that answer because it depends a lot on where you are at, if there is a curb, are there requirements for street lights, etc. There are a lot of variables. A typical 5ft sidewalk would be about \$30 a lineal foot. One section the City would like to complete with sidewalk is Gaffney Lane. This project will be done in-house.

Mr. David noted that he had once done an analysis on missing links in sidewalk network systems and used schools as the primary target and

showed the priorities based on the schools. It was an easy sell because everyone wants children to be safe.

Mr. Lewis responded that they have done an analysis that shows the gaps.

vi. Jaywalking

Mr. Lewis wanted to follow-up on Mr. Gary Johnson's comment about changing the jaywalking code. He agreed that the City of Oregon City's reads more confusing than other cities.

Mr. Gary Johnson says this subject has been bothering him for a while and he sees bus stops on Leland Road and no crosswalks and this invites them to jaywalk. Many neighbors are jaywalking while getting mail, as well. Marked crosswalks are safer than unmarked crosswalks and he agreed, but he, also, feels in residential neighborhoods it is safer to cross midblock than in an intersection with unmarked crosswalk. This is because you only have to look for cars coming from two directions and not four directions. He wanted to bring this up and reviewed the four City codes provided in the agenda. He thinks the three that have crossing at a distance is preferable, but is not familiar with the procedure.

Mr. Lewis responded that he agrees with Mr. Gary Johnson. He is not sure how much the Police Department enforces jaywalking because people cross the street in front of City Hall all the time. He would like to package it with other larger code changes since it is a small change.

Mr. Gary Johnson proposed the motion to forward proposed revision to the jaywalking code to the Planning Department so they can package it with other larger changes at the same time and to use similar language as the City of Portland. Mr. Anderson seconded the motion and no one opposed.

vii. PC/TAC Joint Session

Mr. Lewis reminded everyone that the joint work session between the TAC and Planning Commission is set for April 11th at 7pm.

Mr. La Salle asked to receive the Planning Commission Chair's contact information.

viii. STIPP Grant Scoring

Mr. Lewis presented a copy of the scoring spreadsheet for the project the City submitted for the STIPP Grant. He explained the City's project was

not selected and that competition was heavy. He explained the creation of the Region 1 ACT which includes Clackamas County. The ACT members scored these 21 projects for the STIPP Grant. The City's project scored very well across the region, but tied for sixth place. Based on the funding, the top five projects were funded within the 150% list. This means it is at 150% of funds and 50% will have to be lopped off. Scorers scored them on a scale of 1 to 21 with 1 being the favorite/best and 21 being least favorite. The City's estimated project costs were \$2.4 million with a 32% match.

Mr. Mackenroth said that he thought that some of the projects submitted could be follow-ups to projects already funded before and could be an additional phase. Other projects look like they could improve their communities, but not their counties. It looks like there could be way more to this scoring and funding than what meets the eye.

Mr. La Salle said that it was interesting was the amounts of matching funds and he would have thought the higher the matching funds for a project, the better it would have scored, but that was not the case.

Mr. Gary Johnson asked if a representative was from the Trailblazers.

Mr. Lewis responded that he thinks that one of the representatives was affiliated with the Trailblazers. Membership of the ACTs was decided by another group called C4.

Mr. David worries that with the new ACT the rural areas will suffer. He, also, advised that Mr. Lewis should be cautious about what he presents and push that the City's project scored well.

6. COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Lewis mentioned that the Planning Department has a Land Use RSS Feed for those interested in staying up-to-date on land use issues. People can register as a subscription to the Land Use RSS and they can be emailed as they come through. TAC members can provide written comments to the Planning Commission if traffic concerns are foreseen.

Mr. Mackenroth mentioned the hospital project and how the traffic analyses that are performed for the Planning Department is based upon the improvements only and that new structure and not the overall traffic impact. This is of concern to him.

Mr. Lewis thinks that the traffic analyses looks at the entire load for the facility and not just the improvements, but he would leave that for the transportation engineers to explain and confirm. He agreed with Mr. Mackenroth that these new structures only add to the traffic demands of the City. He mentioned that if the TAC sees a large project that looks like it will have a lot of traffic impacts then this can be project to Ms. Oreskovich's

attention and be added to the next TAC agenda for discussion. In addition, the City just signed an agreement with ODOT for three projects as part of the condition of the land use approval for the concept plan for the Willamette Falls Legacy project to share next meeting.

Mr. Gary Johnson found information on two land use projects one being a Fred Meyer project. He wanted to know what types of conditions will be imposed on these developments.

Mr. Lewis noted that conditions of approval are usually included in the land use packet provided to the Planning Commission. Projects rarely pass on the first night, usually there are one or more additional public hearings/meetings. Sometimes you will see at least what is in the staff report that goes to public hearing, but it is possible that the conditions of approval might change that night at the public hearing and you would need to be present to learn what they are firsthand.

Mr. La Salle mentioned that sometimes the conditions can be changed based on a citizen's comments such as the development between Ames and Holcomb Blvd.

Mr. Anderson noted that the Willamette Falls Legacy project will have a public event held on March 30th from 3pm-6pm at the Abernethy Center. This is a good opportunity to discuss transportation and traffic changes due to this development.

7. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Mr. Gary Johnson wanted to ask about a policy on putting speed trailers out where they are blocking the bicycle lane.

Mr. Lewis responded that there is not a written policy, but that the City tries not to block the bicycle lane.

Mr. Mackenroth added that some spots requested for radar trailers have little shoulder and it is the only place to put them.

8. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at approximately 7:44 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lisa Oreskovich
Administrative Assistant