

# CLACKAMAS COUNTY TRAVEL OPTIONS PLAN

## Steering Committee Meeting #2 Notes

Tuesday, October 22<sup>nd</sup> | 10:00 – 11:30 AM | [Microsoft Teams Link](#)

### Meeting objective

The intent of the first steering committee meeting is to discuss project vision and goals, with the intent of setting the groundwork for the Project Vision and Goals statement. We also will introduce the plan development efforts, what can be expected in that phase, and how other travel options plans will give us precedent for key portions of our plan.

### Agenda

- I. Short (Re-)Introductions – 5 min.** *Scott*
  - Attendees give their introductions
  
- II. Engagement Plan – 10 min.** *Destree*
  - Destree reviews the project timeline, points out that we are in the vision and goals development phase and drafting of the survey in the engagement plan is beginning. This work informs the subsequent recommendations and plan development.
  - Likely Steering Committee upcoming in early February.
  - No questions from the room regarding workplan.
  - Destree reviews the engagement plan summary
  - Ellen R. asks how we're going to reach underrepresented communities. Destree responds how the engagement plan describes an approach for reaching these groups. Geoff notes that the previous Steering Committee brought up helpful approaches. Scott notes that we added stakeholder meetings and focus groups to identify those groups.
  - Stephanie asks if time of day and purpose of travel will be in the survey. Destree notes that the survey is being drafted and we still have flexibility to include those questions.
  - Sydney asks if incentives will be offered. Scott says incentives or stipends are not currently budgeted for either focus group or survey.
  
- III. Re-Cap of Existing Conditions – 20 min.** *Destree*
  - Destree reviews slide on update since Steering Committee #1, existing conditions memo, TDM Best Practices summary memo, and travel trends summary memo
  - Marne asks if existing conditions memo was sent. Anthony responds it was attached in the supplemental materials section of the meeting packet.
  - No questions from the group on TDM Best Practices Memo
  - Anthony notes that there is an error in the inter-county travel figure where Clackamas is listed twice.
  - Destree reviews the SCOR figure and opens the room for discussion.
    - No initial comment from the room on Strengths.

- No initial comment from the room on Challenges
- Stephanie asks if the suggested TDM ordinance would duplicate the DEQ ECO rule. Geoff responds that part would be duplicative, but part of it is focused on new development. Notionally, regulation is something that could be considered.
- No initial comment from the room on Risks or Opportunities.
- Nicole asks for clarification on inter-agency payment and schedule gaps. Destree responds this was particular to transit. Nicole mentions that transit is not explicitly mentioned, but is implicit throughout.
- Sydney asks to add to challenges that “free parking” within the county is a concern. Marne says employment base demographic is a challenge. There is an internal tool at Metro that segments employers. Many employees have off hours and off days, which makes it difficult to implement traditional TDM programs and transit connections.
- Stephanie notes a challenge thinking of those who commute across county, people like a one-seat ride and it is currently a one connection trip.
- Sara notes a challenge for non-traditional students taking classes after work. How can we support night commuters? Given the size of the county people need to drive. There is a lack of transit getting non-traditional students to Oregon City for night classes.
- Stephanie: three shifts typically last 8 hours and are called, 1st, 2nd, and 3rd shift. 1st Shift usually takes place between the hours of 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. 2nd Shift is worked between 5 p.m. and 1 a.m. 3rd Shift typically takes place between the hours of 12 a.m. and 8 a.m. How can transit serve these trips?
- Will: We’ve had cottage cluster developments where pockets of housing create density but there’s a lack of transit or active mode infrastructure to serve that population. There is a risk here, but unsure how to articulate it. Ellen: The world of parking (at new developments) is changing, it could have a willingness to choose other options.
- Ellen: How do we consider the perceptions of transit versus driving? Cultural perception of driving and transit.
- Marne: how do we accommodate specialize events? Travel options to key events could be under opportunities.
- Leah noted that the list was comprehensive and was right to emphasize more “carrots than sticks” in opportunities. Access to and safety at transit is a challenge to add. How do people get to transit and do they have a reality of safety?
- Darin: WFH is a strength now, but this may change if people return to the workplace by driving.
- Marne: One thing mentioned earlier in the data analysis is the inner-county and outer-county travel. Maybe recognizing or labelling programming and services in terms of those trips. We also see data that WFH folks make more trips overall through discretionary trips.

**IV. Vision and Goals – 30 min.** *Destree*

- a. Vision: Destree reviews the vision and goals definitions for this planning process. Then, she reviews the visions in the complementary plans and Metro and Peer Region plans
  - o The Steering Committee provide their words and phrases to prompt ChatGPT's generation of various vision statements
    - The following vision statement key words were entered into the chat by the Steering Committee: safe and accessible for all, Safe, Health, Options, Thrive, resilience, Responsive, community, connectivity, Ease of use, multi-modal options, Consistency, network, Equitable, movement, easy to navigate, serve people's travel needs, Easy to use, connection, Dynamic and intuitive, convenience, connected, Accessible, mental and physical health, prioritize transit-dependent communities, economy, options, Climate-friendly, work force, efficient and reliable, intuitive, easy to use, knowledgeable about options, inform, encourage, knowledgeable about effects of driving alone, convenient, first and last mile connections, available when needed, awareness, affordable, understandable, well-known
  - o Destree asks the room for feedback on the generated vision. Ellen and Stephanie note the generated vision is too general, it's not about TDM specifically. It is reminiscent of the transportation plan update itself.
    - Ellen asks that the phrase "transportation demand management" should not be in the vision statement.
    - Marne: programs, resources go to students, workers, that is safe, accessible, and equitable. Yes, the network is there, but how do we provide the multimodal system to enable people to use it so people can live their best lives.
    - Sydney: the vision statement should be more people focused, not network/system focused.
    - Stephanie adds another reference point: the vision plan of the state's transportation options plan.
    - Sydney: vision statements are often generic, could we put in specifics that make it identifiable as Clackamas county without saying it?
- b. Goals: Destree reviews the slide with goals from the other documents. Geoff asks if there are concepts that should be higher or lower priority in the TDM options plan.
  - o Ellen: strange to see fiscally responsible at the bottom. We do see goals as focused on system, rather than people. How can we characterize person-centric goals?
  - o Kelsey: Education and awareness is low, but it would be important since this is new to Clackamas County. Geoff notes for this plan it makes sense for education and awareness to be higher up.
  - o Darin: How do the goals of people living in and taking trips in Clackamas County inform these goals at this point?
  - o Stephanie notes "funding structure" (though this is less of a goal) and the importance of marketing travel options to the public.
  - o Ellen: have travel options that are used by people, and how do we get there? That's an overarching goal.

- Sydney: incentives, pricing, outreach and support.
- Nicole: physical accessibility should be a priority goal
- c. Destree says we will refine the draft vision based on reactions to the AI generated vision statements.

V. **Introduction to Plan Development phase –5 min.** *Anthony*

- Anthony reviews the plan development flow chart.
- Marne notes that Metro’s regional tdm and regional first/last mile community connector will be in the field in the Thanksgiving-Christmas timeframe. Scott notes that a January launch may be better.

VI. **Next Steps – 5 min.** *Destree*

- Destree reviews the next steps slide.

**Supporting Documents**

- Engagement Plan – *Final*
- TDM Existing Conditions Memo – *Draft*
- TDM Best Practices Memo – *Final*
- Clackamas County Travel Trends Memo – *Draft*
- Opportunities and Challenges Technical Memo – *Draft*
- Climate Action Plan and Implementation Guide [Draft]– *Selected pages from the Climate Action Imperative and Reduce Community-Wide Emissions sections*
- Walk Bike Clackamas [Draft] – *Selected pages from the Introduction section and Goals and Objections section*

**Attendees and Staff**

**Steering Committee Members:**

Organization	Name
Metro	Marne Duke
SMART (South Metro Area Regional Transit)	Kelsey Lewis
TriMet	Darin Lund
Clackamas County Public & Government Affairs (PGA)	Ellen Rogalin
City of Lake Oswego	Will Farley
Clackamas Community College - Transportation	Sara Ford Oades
ODOT	Stephanie Miller
Get There Oregon	Sydney Cape
Street Trust	Nicole Perry
Clackamas County Public Health - Built & Natural Environment Analyst	Leah Fisher

**Project Team:**

Organization	Name
--------------	------



Clackamas County	Anthony De Simone
Clackamas County	Rob Sadowsky
Clackamas County	Scott Hoelscher
Steer	Destree Lazo Bascos
Steer	Geoff England
Steer	Richard Davis
EnviroIssues	Tay Stone

