



Clackamas County Community Road Fund Advisory Committee Meeting #8

7-8:30 p.m., Wednesday, January 20, 2021; Zoom

MINUTES

Attendance

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

Staff: Dave Queener, Mike Bezner, Ellen Rogalin

Welcome – Mike welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked them for their service.

Introductions/Agenda Review – Dave asked everyone to introduce themselves, and then reviewed the agenda.

Organizational Issues

- Officers: Bill Merchant was unanimously elected to continue to serve as committee chair; Warren Holzem was unanimously elected to serve as committee vice-chair.
- Membership: There are two vacant positions on the committee.

Community Road Fund Overview (Mike Bezner)

Mike reminded the group that the countywide vehicle registration fee has been in place since January 1, 2020 and, as agreed, 40% of the revenue is apportioned to cities in the county, based on the city's population in the county, and 10% is going into a Strategic Investment Fund to be used for joint county-city projects. (Right now we're looking at road transfers with the City of Canby.) Mike will be checking with the cities on their plans for the funds, and will report back to the committee.

Mike noted that revenue was lower than expected in 2020 because of the pandemic, but those funds will be coming in later. (See attached *Community Road Fund Revenue, January – November 2020*, for details.) If funds continue to be delayed, we will just delay some projects, but don't anticipate the need to cancel any projects because of the delay.

Committee members asked about rumors that the VRF might be rescinded and asked staff to keep them informed. Mike noted that several needed projects are already underway.

County Road Fund Projects (Mike Bezner)

Congestion relief

- Canby-Marquam – the cost has gone up a little; we plan to build in 2022, as originally planned; SDCs (system development charges) are helping fund the project

- Redland Road – in design, design consultant hired, project cost up a little, but close. Probably construction in 2023 instead of 2022.
- Stafford – Our largest project; complex; have hired a consultant; the CRF portion went down and SDCs also support this project. Construction in 2023 or 2024. In the meantime, we’ve changed striping at the intersection to clarify traffic movement and we’re keeping in touch with area residents.
- Amisigger/224 – This project is a little bit further behind schedule; cost estimates went down a little; we’re working on documents to advertise for a consultant.
- Barlow Rd/99E – These plans have shifted a bit to coordinate with the Arndt Rd project. We’ve started talking with the City of Canby; we doing a study and will analyze this intersection and other potential projects related to Arndt to try to get a goal exception.
- Johnson Creek Blvd – This is another big project, combined with paving and safety projects. Construction is planned for 2025; we’ll get started in 2022.
- Welches Road – We’re also using SDCs to help fund this, which reduces the CRF cost a little lower. Because of cash flow, construction will likely not take place until 2025-26; we’ll start the planning in 2022.

Safety Improvements (\$500,000/year)

- These are mostly intersection projects, some of which have already been completed.
- We just purchased software to analyze our entire system for safety projects.
- The Sunnyside Road Safety Audit will be between 172nd and Highway 212.

Local Road Maintenance

- Two project packages already done, wholly paid for by CRF.
- Several more paving packages are planned for summer 2021.
- Paving for the Webster area package will probably slip into 2022 because of the need to fix ADA ramps, which is very expensive. We’ll do the ramps in summer 2021 and paving in 2022.
- As discussed before, we’ve front-loaded local road paving to spend money in early years as we’re getting congestion relief projects ready to go in later years.

Details about the projects supported by the Community Road Fund are in the attached document, *Status of Community Road Fund Congestion Relief Projects: Jan. 19, 2021.*

Discussion/Questions & Answers

- Since Damascus is no longer a city, what’s happening with planning roads in the area? *[We will begin soon to create a transportation system plan (TSP) for capital improvements for those roads, since our countywide TSP was done when Damascus was a city. We’ve already been paving roads in the Damascus area.]*
- How will the Damascus TSP impact the Community Road Fund? *[We will add any new capital projects into Tiers 1, 2 and 3, get your input, score them, and then talk with you about whether any of these new projects might bump an older project.]*

- Are there any thoughts about not adding bike lanes to Stafford because of the terrain and width? *[No, state law requires us to add bike facilities with this kind of improvement, and it has to be on both sides because of the relative narrow width.]*
- New housing developments keep coming in and they impact traffic. How are we going to deal with this? *[We used traffic forecasts when we created the TSP about 8 years ago, so a lot of the development happening now would have been in those projections. We're generally not seeing a need to add lanes on county roads; our problems tend to be under-performing intersections and state highways, which aren't ours. We're also working on a transit development plan for the county.]*
- Beaver Creek, a county road in Oregon City, is a real problem because of all the development on the east side. *[Oregon City is in charge of the zoning in that area and we work with their staff on these issues. A bigger challenge for the county is the Redland/Hwy 213 intersection.]*
- In rural Clackamas County, every time there's a new development, people get in my way going to market. The Upper Highland Road paving did help a lot us. *[The rural/urban interface is one of our biggest challenges. This is more of a planning issue than a transportation issue.]*
- Has the county lost any HB2017 revenue because of the pandemic? *[Yes, we have, but we're doing ok. We've had to push out a few projects by one year.]*

Next Steps

- Dave explained that the next step is to report to the Board of Commissioners, which we hope to do in February or March. It would be great for the CRFAC chair to attend and any other members who are interested.
- The group agreed to meet next in mid or late July.
- Some people's terms will end at the end of June; if your term is ending, let Ellen Rogalin know if you'd like to continue. (Bill, April and Rich said they would like to continue.)

Staff asked committee members what information they would like going forward.

- Status of projects
- Status of the vehicle registration fee
- Information on when the county talks to community groups, business organizations and others in the community, so that we have the option to attend.
- Maps of maintenance project locations

Other Comments

- Make sure people understand transit improvements are not paid by the CRF.
- SDCs have to be spent on infrastructure. Developers pay their share and the rest of the costs have to come from other sources. Legally, funds to support road improvements in front of a development are very strict.

Public Comment

None

Adjourn (Bill Merchant)