



September 20, 2016

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting of **Tuesday, September 20, 2016**, was called to order by Chair La Salle at 6:00 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, Thomas Batty, and Bob Mahoney. Gary Johnson and John Anderson were excused. Cedimir Jesic arrived at 6:07pm.

Staff members present included Martin Montalvo, Operations Manager, 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 June 21, 2016 and they passed unanimously.</p>

3. AGENDA ANALYSIS

No changes.

4. CITIZEN COMMENTS

No citizen comment provided.

5. NEW BUSINESS/DISCUSSION ITEM

a. Vanessa Vissar – TriMet Presentation

Vanessa Vissar, Planner for TriMet, provided a presentation regarding the Southeast Enhancement Plan with a handout of the final Southeast Enhancement Plan report.

Major points of the presentation:

- Service District is Washington County, Multnomah County, and Clackamas County.
- Southeast Service Enhancement Plan area is one of the five long range bus

- service plans TriMet is focusing on and Oregon City falls within this area.
- Some highlighted improvements identified in the plan:
 - Increase service and add Sunday service to existing line 32, Oregon City to Milwaukie
 - Create faster and additional service to existing line 79, Oregon City Transit Center to Clackamas Town Center Transit Center.
 - Proposing two new lines called “W” from Clackamas Town Center and “X” from Happy Valley.
 - Improvements to existing line 35 from west side of river into Oregon City and on into Downtown Portland.
- Service planning budget process is a year-long process. Proposals this fall would go into effect the following fall.
- Due to budget constraints, improvements would be made gradually over time in increments to reach TriMet’s final long-term vision.
- \$4.3 million of new revenue to put towards new service over the next 10 years and will help get closer to the long-term vision, but, also, has to be put towards the operations of a couple of high capacity transit for the Powell Division Transit Development Project (Portland to Gresham) and the red line extension to Hillsboro. This limits the number of dollars put towards other improvements.
- Service Planning Guidelines are applied to improvements to measure how well they performed and meet ridership demand and projected demand.

Ms. Vissar discussed the Service Enhancement Plan Proposal Matrix handout she provided to the TAC. She highlighted line 32 and the proposal to increase frequency and adding Sunday service. TriMet has identified what days of the week it would operate and how frequently. The matrix breaks down what the ridership was in 2015 and what it is after the orange line opened.

Mr. La Salle asked about drop in ridership for line 32 between Spring, 2015 and Spring, 2016.

Ms. Vissar explained that ridership has dropped throughout the entire district and not just the specific line. One reason could be fuel prices and more people could be driving right now.

Mr. David asked why two columns were labeled “projected additional daily ridership”.

Ms. Vissar said that she accidentally mislabeled one of them, but said to look at the first column labeled “projected additional daily ridership”. She believed the second column could be “number of riders per vehicle hour”, but she would have to go back and check and get back to the TAC members. Something not previously mentioned is the Community/Job Connector Service which would consist of Federal funds to help determine need in a neighborhood and use a third

operator to operate the system. Third operator service is much more affordable.

Mr. Mahoney commented that service improvements are always up to the amount of funding.

Ms. Vissar agreed that cuts had to be made during the recession, but tried to spread the cuts around so it didn't affect too much in one area or one specific community.

Mr. La Salle asked about the public outreach phase and how that is performed.

Ms. Vissar said they do an annual service plan. Based on the priorities that are heard they will put out a draft proposal. They try to reach as many residents and riders as possible and could even go to talk to riders on buses and mass transit to ask what is and is not working. Online outreach will be done and they are open to suggestions on how to reach as many people as possible.

Mr. La Salle suggested contacting the neighborhood associations. He noted the improvements to the Holcomb Blvd route and was interested in knowing why they decided to increase service to that area.

Ms. Vissar responded that it was based on the need in that area. TriMet knows there is a lot of demand on that stretch of route and meet those need.

Mr. La Salle says people on that route have been ecstatic and wants to know if there are plans to bring service out to South End Rd.

Ms. Vissar said that it has been recognized as an area that is needing service and can be seen as such on the map of services needed.

Mr. Mackenroth had a question about the need of express service from Oregon City to the Tigard and Tualatin area. He would still like to see that as a new service that should be looked at even though there is limited funding for new services.

Ms. Vissar noted that is an area that would benefit Oregon City, but with limited funding there needs to be a list of priorities to determine what the most important needs are for the City.

Mr. Mackenroth said he would not put express service to Tigard/Tualatin over improving existing lines, but that action is needed.

Ms. Vissar asked if the TAC's preference is to put funding towards existing lines.

Mr. Mackenroth reiterated that there are residents of Oregon City that have to get to the hospital in Tualatin and people with jobs in Tualatin and Tigard. The only

way to get there is on the freeway.

Mr. Jesic asked about what happened with expanding the Orange line all the way to Oregon City.

Ms. Vissar said she was not a part of that effort, but that there was some concern with that by the County. It could still be revisited in the future to meet Metro's long range vision for the region. One more cost effective approach TriMet has been looking at lately is bus rapid transit which is, basically, light rail on wheels, and it would be more cost effective.

Mr. Lewis added that because of the vote against expanding the rail system into Clackamas County TriMet has been looking into light rail options in other regions that are more interested. He, also, wanted to verify if the data on the matrix that says it is for line 35 was actually for line 33.

Ms. Vissar confirmed the data is for line 35 and not 33 because line 33 just went through a round of improvements and is performing well so it is not part of the long range vision. Line 35 is included because it goes from Oregon City to Downtown Portland. Line 33 data can be included if requested.

Mr. Lewis mentioned that City Commission is beginning to look at goals and under Enhance Livability, Goal 3 there was a goal to enhance transit service in Oregon City and feel like a lot of this has been accomplished. He feels like we are on a path and it does not necessarily have to be a Commission goal to continue looking at this.

Ms. Vissar asked if the TAC could prioritize these goals from the matrix handout, so she could take them back and advocate for them.

Mr. Mackenroth said he was most interested in improvements to line 32.

Ms. Vissar mentioned that they began some improvements on line 32 this last year and have heard a lot of positive feedback.

Mr. Mackenroth asked what the current thinking is on using the shoulders at the more frequently used stops.

Ms. Vissar said that TriMet knows there is a high need for more comfortable arrangements at the side of the bus stops and the Bus Stop Department often has a small budget to work with and bases it on the ridership at the actual stop. If there are areas that are not receiving what he thinks is needed, she can take back that information for him.

Mr. Mackenroth said that the stops that he sees looks like they have not been touched in a while. It would help to have some weather protection in the winter.

Asked if there could be a neighborhood buy-in program and work with the bus department to get what they need.

Ms. Vissar said that she can connect with the correct staff at TriMet to look at high ridership and see if these stops qualify for improvements.

Mr. Mackenroth mentioned an old bench at 5th Street and Monroe Street that needs upgrades. He is not sure whose responsibility it is to maintain.

Mr. Mahoney asked if TriMet has thought about creating a cell phone application that can record ridership or demand at a specific location because cell phones have GPS locations and there could be a way to record data such as routing, time, and ridership.

Ms. Vissar said TriMet is about to get a bunch of new, great data as they roll out this program. They will offer more electronic ticket options and ability to tap a card with ticket information. It might not be as robust as what Mr. Mahoney is suggesting, but it will be better than what they have today.

b. Carl Springer – SDC Presentation

John Lewis provided a PowerPoint presentation regarding the Transportation System Development Charge (SDC) Update with the help of Carl Springer, DKS Associates.

Major points of the presentation:

- The City held several SDC community forums to talk about the SDC's and receive business community input and opinion on the current SDC and non-residential developments.
- Has taken a hard look at the SDC project list and what needed to be added.
- DKS Associates did the 2009 and 2012 SDC updates; DKS with the help of FCS Group will do current updates and analysis.
- The TAC goal and bylaw is to look at the transportation list and TSP every five years.
- The project list needs to be amended to include projects such as the Linn Avenue Corridor Plan and the Concept Plan.
- Not proposing to change methodology.
- DKS has already completed the Cost of Capacity Expanding Projects and the Peak-Hour Growth Vehicles

Carl Springer discussed how after the TSP was completed Metro provided a template on how they wanted each city to do cost estimates, and, in turn, a more comprehensive study was performed to meet their expectations. As projects were looked at, again, recently some of the costs of these projects went up quite a bit.

Peak-hour growth is how much transportation volume can change, not what it is today. Hopefully, the next time a TSP update is done the models for transportation will be smarter.

Mr. Lewis said the bike pedestrian information is a little ambiguous and Metro has been asked to help with that piece.

Mr. Jesic asked what the information looks like for other cities of similar size.

Mr. Lewis responded by saying that is the question they have asked Metro right now. They said they can help and provide us an update.

Mr. Springer said they use Metro's model to do the TSP so they went back through this process and queried that process.

Mr. Lewis said the timeline for adopting the new SDC list would take several months, and hope to bring it to City Commission after the first of the year. The process is moving fairly quickly so he wanted to bring the preliminary update to the TAC now.

Mr. Springer explained the project list provided as a handout to the TAC members. Projects listed as "D" are driving projects and projects listed as "W" are walking projects that involve sidewalks, pedestrian crossings, and are standalone walking projects.

Mr. David asked if federal dollars be broken out by projects, because it could increase

Mr. Lewis said these are average numbers and does not specify which part would be federally funded.

Mr. Springer continued with the matrix and pointed out that there are, also, bike, safety, and crossing projects. Crossing projects help pedestrians cross the road. "FF" is considered a "family friendly" project. They have seen a lot of interest in shifting funding to biking and family friendly projects. He mentioned the fee for Pedestrian and Biking goes up because there are way more projects geared towards them.

Mr. Jesic asked for explanation of the city responsibility column on the matrix.

Mr. Lewis said that the city responsibility column specifies funds that cannot be provided by anyone else. There are contingencies built into all of these projects.

Mr. Jesic asked if these are present or future dollars.

Mr. Springer responded that they are present dollars for 2016.

Mr. Lewis said that the problem with this is that when the TSP was reviewed, a lot of the projects were preexisting and raised by the community. Often times, a project is

considered necessary and added to the list without the project budget and bottom line researched first. They become more manageable if there is a way to help fund these. These SDC's can be a responsible tool to help fund these projects.

Mr. Springer mentioned that it might be a good idea of resurveying the surrounding communities to see what they charge for SDC's because he doubts they have gone down.

Mr. David said it might be nice to have one more chart showing what the results would be. People will want to know what the end result costs are for these projects because it does not tell a developer what it is going to cost them.

Mr. Lewis responded that for a one, two, or three bedroom the cost to the developer is all the same. The cost would be different for a multi-family residence. The hard cost to compare is that of commercial development because there are so many variables.

Mr. Mahoney said he would be interested in the average cost per project by summing up the growth cost share of all the projects and dividing by the number of projects within the matrix.

Mr. Springer said it would be roughly about two-thirds. In most cities it is more like half.

Mr. Mahoney asked how my "systems" the System Development Charges (SDS'S) are referring to. The projects on the list are in regards to transportation, but he asked what other systems the charges cover.

Mr. Lewis responded that there are, also, sewer, water, storm, and parks.

Mr. Mahoney asked how the costs are divided between the different systems.

Mr. Lewis responded that a similar analysis is performed for each of these systems. Other system charges might be based on growth numbers and cost to the system where transportation is measured by peak-hour trips.

Mr. Jesic asked what the total SDC charge, aggregate of everything, would be for a single family residence.

Mr. Lewis said it was approximately \$26,000. The building department is provided the calculations and SDC costs by the Public Works Department. For commercial properties, the building department provides all of the details and then the costs are calculated based on the developer and development details for the project.

c. Public Works Report

i. Updates on minutes of last TAC meeting.

Mr. Lewis provided an update based on a review of the TAC meetings from last meeting. He provided an update on the request to change the name of the TAC and said he doesn't feel the name should be changed after looking at the bylaw goals.

He followed-up on the several residents that testified about vibrations on Linn Avenue. The Linn Avenue project bid were opened and mobilization will begin next week. Sewer work will begin soon. He asked the project manager to take a closer look during the work, take photos, and get a better assessment of what is really going on.

ii. Drive Safe Oregon City Campaign

John Lewis provided an update on the struggle of distribution of the decals. The CIC did not meet in September so he thinks it hindered communication and distribution by the neighborhood associations.

Mr. La Salle agreed that he hasn't seen much action. He knocked on doors and asked his neighbors which of the three decals they would like on their garbage can; only one person turned him down.

Mr. Lewis asked Mr. La Salle to attend the CIC meeting in October to check in with the members about passing out these decals. He felt the CIC members felt like they were being asked to do something they didn't volunteer to do.

Mr. Batty said that his neighborhood association Chair said he was not sure how to go about distributing these campaign decals.

Mr. Lewis said that Mr. Anderson had asked about a Neighborhood Traffic Management Plan, but we do not have one. He sent an email to staff for Clackamas county agencies that meet monthly seeking out other Neighborhood Traffic Management Plan. He has already received a couple of responses on that and will share those with the TAC at a future meeting.

iii. Planning Discussion with Laura Terway

Mr. La Salle provided an update regarding annexations in the City now that the State changed the law saying you do not need a vote by the citizens, only City Commission. There are currently three different concept plans for the city – Park Place Neighborhood, Beaver Creek Road,

and South End Road. Since the new law, he thinks the City will see a lot of builders wanting annexations. Park Place will be the first with a large annexation into the City. He met with Laura Terway about approaching the Planning Commission and giving them an update on the Park Place Concept plan because it will be the first of the three concept plans to be developed. The development stage will be when they become involved in it and it is important that the planning commissioners know in advance what is being proposed by developers. A developer has already addressed the Park Place Neighborhood Association, but Laura Terway was not aware of this information yet.

Mr. Jesic asked if a developer is responsible for paying for a new road and any necessary improvements if the developer builds a property that heavily affects transportation and the ability to reach the new development.

Mr. Lewis said typically the developer is responsible for all the onsite improvements whether it is requiring an arterial or residential street going to the property. They would be required to build the infrastructure and pay SDC's. They can ask for reimbursement for some of those costs associated with the larger scale items such as an arterial that is already on the City's list to improve or add. Currently, the City is designing a sewer line to be extended down Beavercreek Road because, along with the LUBA, not having utilities out that direction is what is hindering the Beavercreek Concept Plan from developing. It is unusual for a City to take on a design like that.

Mr. La Salle said his interest in this, besides living in Park Place, is that it is the first concept plan area to be developed for any large area. Park Place is unique in its topography. The other two concept plans are pretty much flat areas. If the City can get this done right in Park Place then they can easily get it done right in the other locations. He wants to try and get a jump on this before it is too late. The Steering Committee was planning on attending the next Planning Commission meeting to give them an update on the Park Place Concept Plan.

Mr. Mahoney mentioned how the State Legislature has really changed the dynamics of land use with their adjustments to annexation and procedures. The engineers, planners, and architects used to be more involved, but now it feels like there are many attorneys involved with the amount of money in these projects. Now it becomes a legal process.

Mr. Lewis, also, wanted to give an update on the 12th St and Washington St intersection. DKS completed their analysis of the intersection and it can be found on the City's website. The warrants for the intersection, only two were met, and two others were very close to being met. They felt they

would be met soon here. The City is moving forward with KPFF to complete the design for a signal at that location. Some of it is SDC fundable. Also, the 2017 PMUF construction planning is beginning three months earlier than usual so physical construction can begin earlier in the year.

iv. Summer Construction Update

Mr. Montalvo provided an update on the PMUF projects done this summer. Only received a few phone calls about the paving, especially around the Library. The work is finishing up over the next two weeks. The 15th Street Waterline project is moving along and has about another five weeks of construction. The only other transportation related project is the 5th Street Sanitary Sewer Improvements. They are working with the contractor to minimize the impacts to traffic.

Mr. La Salle asked for an estimate on how long Main Street would be closed.

Mr. Lewis said the Main Street Extension would be closed all winter and won't be back open until the beginning of 2017 because of all of the construction work and grading that has to be done. He quickly mentioned that Martin Montalvo, Lisa Oreskovich and Bob La Salle volunteered at the National Night Out to discuss the Drive Safe Oregon City Campaign.

Mr. La Salle mentioned that he felt there was a lot of interest.

v. Fuel Tax Ballot

John Lewis provided an informational PowerPoint presentation regarding Clackamas County's fuel tax ballot measure.

Key points were:

- It is a \$.06 a gallon fuel tax that would be applied to fuel stations within Clackamas County.
- It would be in effect for seven years.
- The County elected to split the proceeds with the cities within the County. 40% would go to the cities and 60% would go to the County.
- That represents an estimate of just under \$600,000 a year for Oregon City, or \$4,000,000 over seven years.
- County has proposed seven paving packages on County roadways outside of Oregon City to use the fuel tax funds on.
- Looking at using the City funds on community safety, a money match for grant funds, signal programming, Safe Routes to School

projects, and better opportunity to work with developers.

Mr. David asked if there has been any analysis done on the gaps in the sidewalk for the Safe Walks to School.

Mr. Montalvo responded that they did an infill analysis within the GIS system to see where the sidewalk needed to be completed within a one mile radius around the walking distance to a school. The biggest concern is that where most of the sidewalk infill needs to be done, there are stormwater improvements, as well. This makes the project more expensive.

Mr. David said it would be nice to get a prioritized list and some type of plan.

Mr. Montalvo said the difficulty with putting a list together is that the City can come up with funds for the sidewalk improvements and is not overly complex, but the stormwater improvements are much more difficult.

Mr. Lewis agreed that the City has good data, but it's not culminated in an adopted study which would be something we could pursue.

6. COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. La Salle mentioned the TriMet informational.

Mr. Lewis mentioned the Library Grand Open House on Saturday, October 15th from 12:00pm-3:00pm. He briefly mentioned the I-205 paving project between I-5 to the river to be done Summer 2017.

7. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Mr. La Salle asked to add the nominations for officers for next two year term.

8. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at approximately 7:55 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lisa Oreskovich
Administrative Assistant