



Clackamas County Community Road Fund Advisory Committee Meeting #3

6-8 p.m., Thursday, Sept. 12, 2019
Development Services Building Room 118,
150 Beaver Creek Road, Oregon City

DRAFT: MINUTES

Attendance

Committee members: Thomas Eskridge, Rich Fiala, Warren Holzem, Stephen Joncus, Glenn Koehrsen, Nathan McCarty, Bill Merchant, James Prichard, April Quinn-McGinnis, Marge Stewart, Patricia Tawney

Committee members unable to attend: Roseann Johnson, Christina Day

Staff: Dave Queener, Karen Buehrig, Ellen Rogalin

I. Welcome

Dave Queener welcomed everyone to the meeting. The minutes of the last meeting were approved unanimously.

II. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair

Dave reviewed the roles of the chair and vice-chair as described in the bylaws. Bill Merchant volunteered to serve as chair or vice-chair. Glenn Koehrsen volunteered to serve as chair or vice-chair, based on which position was not filled by Bill

Thomas Eskridge nominated Bill Merchant to be chair. Rich Fiala nominated Glenn Koehrsen to be vice-chair. Bill and Glenn were elected by consensus.

III. Project Evaluation Criteria

Karen Buehrig noted that the Transportation System Plan process included goals, and projects were rated based on whether they moved the county toward the goals, away from the goals or had not impact. She then reviewed the evaluation measures suggested in the small-group brainstorming session at the last CRFAC meeting and asked for comments.

1. Development

Comments:

- Change “near” to “impacted by” to better reflect the effects development can have on the roads
- Would weight this measure lightly, if we weight the factors
- Development pushes congestion
- Need current crash statistics to reflect updated development
- This criteria doesn’t address rural areas

2. **Safety** – Karen explained that SPIS stands for “Safety Priority Index System” and that the Community Road Fund includes \$500,000 per year for safety improvements.

Comments:

- Improving safety improves everything else
- Safety crashes may be caused by congestion and people getting frustrated
- Safety is important, but need to look at level of severity and tie in with county’s Drive to Zero program
- Try to leverage congestion and safety funds
- Speed limits can be a problem, especially when they vary a lot within a short distance. They can create their own congestion.

3. **Traffic Impact** – The county has data on average daily traffic (ADT) on roads and crash data, as well as anecdotal data.

Comments:

- Is there a measure that shows information about back-up cues?
- Could we do traffic modeling for specific projects to help us know where the congestion is?
- Do we already have data through Metro modeling?
- How do we measure traffic at intersections when roads at two different levels of traffic cross?
- Consider looking at percent increase of traffic.

4. **Commercial/Freight Impacts**

Comments:

- There’s a state study from 2014 with interesting information on the impact of road quality on costs to truck traffic.

5. **No Other Funding Sources** – This category applies more to rural projects, which have less access to other funding alternatives.

Factors to be Considered After Criteria Above are Applied

Karen explained that staff recommends that the following five measures be applied after the first five, listed above.

- Cost-effectiveness – This takes quite a bit of effort to determine, so would like to wait to apply this to the top 15 or so projects once we develop more specific cost estimates.
- Readiness – This information will also be easier to define once a more detailed project scope is prepared for the top-rated projects.

Comments:

- Try to coordinate and get ahead of maintenance, e.g., give a negative number to a project on a road that’s just been paved
- Usually when a capital project follows paving, they don’t have to tear up the whole roadway base.

- Leveraging Funds/Project Synergy – This is the flip side of “no other funding sources available,” so it makes sense to review it after other ratings are complete.
Comments:
 - Watch for state projects that could be related to or coordinated with county projects
 - Try to encourage state to do projects on state roads that will also benefit the county and county roads
- Geographic Equity – This is best looked at after all projects are scored, and in relation to safety and local road paving projects.
- Health Equity – This is about the populations the projects serve, and has been integrated into the review of safety projects.

Karen said staff will adjust the evaluation criteria based on the group’s discussion and apply them to the congestion relief projects.

IV. Next Steps

Dave reviewed the schedule of upcoming meetings and reminded the group that the goal is to present a report to the Board of Commissioners on Nov. 12. Staff will send committee members lists of evaluated congestion relief projects, as well as recommended safety projects and local road paving projects, before the Sept. 26 CRFAC meeting.

Bill noted that we will need to replace the committee member, Bruce Lloyd, who has not attended any meetings.

V. Adjourn -- Bill adjourned the meeting at 8 p.m.