



CLACKAMAS COUNTY

Pedestrian & Bikeway Advisory Committee

May 7, 2024 Meeting Agenda

Attendees: Scott Hoelscher and Mya Ganzer, Clackamas County; Kelly Reid and Cody Meyer, DLCD; Nicole Perry, Safe Routes to School; Josephe Edge, Pete Oyler, Bruce Parker, Del Scharffenberg, Steve Adams, Kelli Grover, Mindy

6:35 p.m. – Welcome and Approval of April 2024 Minutes

Joseph Edge vice-chair, introductions.
Quorum not reached; minutes not voted on.

6:38 p.m. – Public Comment

No public comment

6:40 p.m. – CFEC (Climate Friendly Equitable Communities) – Department of Land Conservation and Development

Working closely with Planning and Zoning to implement CFEC, also works with Transportation Engineering regarding Transportation System Plan.

Attempting to update TSP to meet Climate Targets 2050 GHG targets for emission reduction. Cities and counties pick up remainder of GHG by reducing vehicle trips and use, federal and state focus on fuel and electric vehicles.

CFEC rules applies to areas within the UGB.

Program areas: Regional planning, zoning reform, parking reform, community engagement, and transportation planning.

Recognizing historic malinvestment in transportation, uplifting other voices in the discussion. Portland Metro has no deadline for update, ClackCo is undergoing one now.

Plans must emphasize bike and walk transportation, filling active transportation gaps.

Disengaging automotive indicators as primary measurements of transportation planning efficiency.

TSP, how to plan for active transportation: determine key destinations, take a multimodal inventory, identify gaps. ODOT has a contract and will be supporting jurisdictions within the UGB. Key elements: Pedestrian, Bicycle, Streets, and Transit.

Pedestrian System Element: full buildout of a pedestrian system, identify gaps and deficiencies, locations of key pedestrian destinations.

Bicycle System Element: full buildout, gaps and deficiencies, key destinations.

This creates a list projects to fill gaps which are then included in the TSP.

Bicycle system requirements: Minimum requirements for bicycle facilities, option to apply functional classifications, plan for connected network, safe, low stress, direct, and comfortable, serves all ages and abilities.

May use NACTO guidebooks, urban bikeway design guide, designing for all ages & abilities. For state facilities – blueprint for urban design.

Joseph: How are the projects prioritized?

Cody Meyer, DLCD: once the projects are determined, folded into financially unconstrained master list (essentially a wish list), rules governing how projects are pulled from fiscally constrained list, to the fiscally constrained. Pick projects underserved communities (benefit burden), reduced vehicle miles driven, works towards meeting CFEC goals

Joseph: relationship with performance target?

Cody: these are adopted into TSP, and projects may not meet them entirely, but can still be adopted.

https://secure.sos.state.or.us/oard/viewSingleRule.action;JSESSIONID_OARD=JE5V6sxPrtQB9mo5FmbvODPjV6l1LtCqPzhSerDaaCiTqr77OzWU!1884250577?ruleVrsnRsn=307160

Scott: is there a deadline for jurisdictions?

Cody non-Portland metro over 5000, deadline is 2029. Portland Metro doesn't have deadline because the area has been leading the region since the 1990s. At the discretion of Portland Metro cities and jurisdiction.

Kelly Reid: Multimodal inventory will start soon in ClackCo as a part of there TSP update, Milwaukie will also starts, Canby is also going, but not held to CFEC rules.

Cody: reiterates that CFEC only applies to UGB, however other goal 12 of Oregon state planning goals still applies.

Joseph: do jurisdictions have to update TSPs regularly?

Cody: No.

Kelly: cities still do update regularly because of SDCs, and have relevant and the right amount of funding for projects, beneficial for growing communities, so often updated regularly.

Cody: there are fairly regular minor updates for this reason.

Joseph: any more questions?

Thanks to the presenters, this will help set the table as we update the TSP.

7:06 p.m. - Approval of April 2024 Minutes

Quorum is reached, April 2024 minutes unanimously approved.

7:07 p.m. – Hot Spots (Pudding River Chocolate - Canby) – Committee

99E goes right through town, as you travel south you can reach several pleasant low traffic roads for biking.

Marking for bike lane is by the paint, there are no signs.

Steve: is the line 4" or 8"

Bruce: 8"

Ivy street becomes a county road, very busy road in the City, very busy and drivers drive fast.

Elementary School down the road from the road, people regularly park in the area.

Steve Adams: who is the road authority?

Bruce: can we get no parking in the bike lane stickers or flyers, makes the road unsafe,

Scott: I believe this is a county road through the city, where does the county vs city maintenance. He will follow up with committee after.

Bruce: sign it with bike lane, no parking.

Pete: we could paint the curb yellow.

Del: I would have no idea that was a bike lane, people may not know it's a bike lane.

Scott: to be classified as a bike lane, it needs to have appropriate signage. Turns into a buffer bike lane, farther down, as well as a stencil indicating that it is a bike lane, then you exit the city.

Joseph: the City of Canby TSP considers Ivy Street a bike lane on both sides.

Scott: seems to be multiple hot spots, very little signage and indications that bicycle use the road.

Bruce: The whole area needs more signage, indicating that it's a bike lane.

Scott: This is very unclear what it is, it needs to be more clearly marked. Areas with no curb and gutter, exacerbating parking issues. Very little stencil markings. Suggested the hot spot is the whole corridors lack of appropriate signage.

Joseph: how do we handle areas within other jurisdictions? Engage the city transportation department or the cities bike ped committee?

Scott: if it's not a county road, we can draft a letter with recommended solutions of the relevant jurisdictions (as we did with ODOT), reach out to staff about meeting,

Joseph: this sounds like a good solution, since it created traction with the ODOT letters.

Steve: in Wilsonville and Milwaukie, public works in charge of striping and painting, maybe we should reach out to city engineers and public works about adding striping and signage.

Scott: Bruce, have you discussed the Canby PBAC?

Bruce: Yes, they said the jurisdiction is the County.

Joseph: if so, can the county unilaterally make the change?

Scott: we can but tend to collaborate within the city, he will confirm who has jurisdiction, a letter feels appropriate in either case.

Mindy (in the chat): This is where the highway transitions to Ivy St. I believe the county is still the custodian of this section. Traffic often doesn't slow much until the signal at 13th. A city counselor is close relative to the residents. Any help from the county will be a help.

Ivy is the primary north south arterial for the city. City and county are working together on the current project between 99E and S 13th.

Scott: what is the committee recommending?

Bruce: collaborate with the city to add stencils and signage so it is clear that the lane is a bike lane.

Kelli: stenciling at a minimum, and signage would be preferred as an additional solution.

Scott: What would the city of Milwaukie do?

Steve: stencils great reminder after intersection, police departments are reluctant to give out tickets, unless there is a no parking sign. City police are enforcing the no parking, we need to get a feeling of what the city police feel about ticketing and if they will enforce it, even with signs.

Bruce: chief of police is invited to next Canby PBAC meeting.

Steve: we can get an idea of what the police feels about enforcement. We should add stencils where they are supposed to be and then add signage at hot spots where it is particularly dangerous, because it can be harder to get approved.

Bruce: get stenciling first because it is cheap and easy, and then fight for signage later.

Steve: potential for a joint letter between ClackCo PBAC and Canby PBAC to encourage the two jurisdictions to take action.

Scott: When is the next Canby meeting?

Bruce: next week.

Scott: the committee wants to create a letter regarding stenciling, and then fight for no parking signs in hot spots.

Steve: can we get the letter done by next week (next Tuesday) to Canby PBAC?

Mya: yes

Bruce: I motion PBAC writes a letter that we increase stencils and parking signage for Canby meeting next Tuesday.

Bruce: send the letter to Mindy and Bruce, so they can bring it to the Canby meeting.

Joseph: can you get it to us before the weekend? So committee can review.

Scott: we will get something to the committee by the end of this week, and then please review over the weekend, comments in by Monday. We can tweak it and add anything needed before it is reviewed by Canby on Tuesday.

7:38 p.m. – Walk Bike Clackamas Plan (Final Survey and Project Maps) – Scott Hoelscher, Clackamas County Staff

Draft Project Summary broke up by planning sub-areas, specific interest in project list and which ones are prioritized.

People will be able to drop a pin in areas missing a project, or where a deficiency is, and other interactive tools.

6 maps total with corresponding tables of project lists. Colors indicate priority tiers. Green – Tier 1 (Highest) Yellow – Tier 2 (Middle) Red – Tier 3 (Lowest)

Jurisdictional guide in numbers:

CC = Clackamas County Project, ODOT = ODOT, O = cross a jurisdictional boundary

This is still a draft and work in progress.

The table and number guidelines will connect map to table and project list.

Scott: any comments or feedback?

Pete: O1 is an exciting project, as well as O10, and connecting bridges

Scott: analyzing feasibility of bike/ped bridge over I-205 bridge, currently very unsafe do to truck traffic and lack of safe areas for bikes.

Pete: the area is very unsafe

Scott: this project will analyze how we can connect the I-205 path terminus to local streets, we should clarify that and have more specificity about what that project is and will look like.

Del: is the table is priority order?

Scott: no, we are trying to redo to make the maps and tables easier to use and more logical.

Joseph: ODOT 10, shows up on CRC east list but CRC west map.

Scott: survey coming out, will keep you on the loop.

Joseph: stoked to see some of these trail projects, North Clackamas Greenway trail, what is missing is the Kellogg Creek Greenway trail, in the Comp Plan but not here, on the map for

aspirational recreation trails. Is there any plan to make a connection between McNary and Concord?

Scott: only if it's being developed.

Joseph: I feel like there is more opportunities for east-west connections, Oatfield is the connector which is a challenge if you are walking or biking. How can we create vital transportation links via shared streets? We need them to provide solid connections for people. SE Roethe and Austin, CC-69 and Rex Putnam Highschool, the street is at a dead end, maybe the crosswalk should be moved down to the next entrance, so it connects it to more streets, and creates a great shared street, down Gordon street, which connects to the bikeway and other low stress streets, more so then others or having to use Roethe or cross walking over to a dead end street.

Scott: this is great, this is included in the safe routes plan, can also be included in our plan and shared street plan.

Joseph: River Road to Glen Echo, break it into multiple project numbers, and the HDR zoned areas would score high with equity. Would that help with getting it approved as it's a 4.8-mile stretch?

Scott: it was originally broken up but as we simplified, we consolidated, and for funding it doesn't matter.

Joseph: as long as the project description makes clear the different contexts, so it's not lost in translation.

Scott: what would be a natural divider?

Joseph: Oak Grove Boulevard, its very tough going south until you reach the creek.

Steve: if it was divided would the north be prioritized based on the density and demographics?

Scott: we would have to run the numbers, but it could based on the public input and the demographics and communities we would be serving. Maybe we can revisit next meeting since we have more to say?

Bruce: if we go down to the Canby-Barlow area, concerned about geographical equity and there are only two greens, Whiskey Hill and Mulino Road. Doesn't understand why those two were picked.

Scott: this is a draft, what would be your highest priority?

Bruce: CC-28, too fast, small shoulders, connects to the other roads, CC-19 another good road to improve on. Doesn't understand the Whiskey Hill Rd.

Scott: lots of good comments and discussion, should we continue during the June meeting? I can get it cleaned up and resend and we can discuss at next meeting? Devote next meeting to this, shared streets, and hot spots?

Committee confers, we shall discuss at next meeting.

Scott: will update document, and add shared streets. Still in development on bike map. Sign contract on travel options project. Will overview at next meeting or July. Youth bike safety day June 15th, Clackamas County Community College Harmony Campus.

Meeting adjourned at 8:16 pm.

7:45 p.m. – Project Updates | Open Discussion

8:00 p.m. - Adjourn

Staff Liaisons: Scott Hoelscher • Senior Transportation Planner • Dept. of Transportation & Development (503) 742-4533 • scotthoe@clackamas.us | Mya Ganzer • Planner 1 • Dept. of Transportation & Development (503) 742-4520 • mganzer@clackamas.us