

Minutes - Washington County Committee for Citizen Involvement (CCI) Meeting

7:00 p.m. - 9:00 p.m. Tuesday, February 16, 2016

CCI Members and CPO Leaders attending: Bruce Bartlett (CPO 1) Gary Virgin (CPO 10), Dick Smith (CPO 10), Paul Johnson (CPO 15), Stan Houseman (CPO 3), Jim Long (CPO 4M), Ray Eck (CPO 6), Kathie Koellmann (CPO 6), David Shettles (CPO 7), Marty Moyer (CPO 7), Mary Manseau (CPO 7 Alternate)

Speakers: Dyami Valentine, Christina Deffebach, Washington County Department of Land Use and Transportation

Guests attending: Barbara Rhodes, CPO 9; Sebastian Lawler, Forest Grove

CPO Program Staff: Beth St. Amand, Dan Schauer, OSU Extension Service

1. Welcome, Introductions, Minutes

Chair Jim Long opened the meeting at 7. Self-introductions were given and guests welcomed. Jim reviewed the agenda and meeting objectives.

ACTION: Gary Virgin moved to adopt the January meeting minutes as written, with a correction to a typo Stan noted on the last page. Ray Eck seconded. 10 Ayes, no Nays or abstentions.

2. Draft 2016-17 Long Range Planning Work Program

Washington County Department of Land Use & Transportation (LUT) Planning Manager Andy Back made a scheduling error and was absent. He responded by email during the meeting with his apologies and offered to return to an upcoming meeting.

3. Transportation Futures Study Update

Christina Deffebach, Policy Analyst, and Dyami Valentine, Senior Planner, gave a presentation. Use their Power Point file as an addendum to these minutes (link:

http://extension.oregonstate.edu/washington/sites/default/files/wctfs_cci_2016-02-16_final.pdf)

Key points from staff: The County is being proactive, taking this opportunity to look at a 50-year horizon. This is a study, not a binding policy. It will inform future planning decisions.

The second public participation and comment phase just concluded (online open house and survey).

Two growth scenarios: See the Power Point presentation for the study's two assumed future scenarios. Scenario 2 is for higher growth than Scenario 1.

Assumptions that inform the study: Future travel behavior, technology trends (e.g. autonomous vehicles improve efficiency and safety) and transportation system assumptions. The latter includes new and improved roadways, active transportation (bicycling, pedestrian), intelligent transportation systems (advanced signaling/controls), trip reduction strategies (ride sharing, pricing of both parking and trips / road usage), and transit.

See the Power Point for **future challenges, investment options**, and examples of **demand management** (trip reduction). For **transit enhancements**, there are a half dozen strategies and opportunities to boost access and level of service, increase ridership, etc.

Bike and walking facilities feature more separated facilities on roadways, and more off-street paths.

Major Road Improvements: Slide 22. Visual of road routes targeted for new facilities. It represents the "Around the Mountain" option west of South Cooper Mountain with a new road or improvements on

existing roads, in a red dotted line. Cornelius Pass extends through South Hillsboro to Farmington. Clark Hill Road is improved. Tile Flat is extended. Roy Rogers Road improved. This also realigns Highway 219. New freeway crossings are marked to provide local trip connections (Highway 26 and Tigard Triangle). A new road is shown to extend Evergreen Road into a connection from Hillsboro to Cornelius.

Throughway Improvements, slide 23: The red-dashed line shows a new throughway – similar to the old westside bypass. This is not indicating a particular alignment or location – it is generalized. A lot of regional trips are using TV Highway, which impacts livability to the communities like Aloha and South Hillsboro. Widened facilities include several highways, a Basalt Creek route from Wilsonville / I-5 to 99W, and Cornelius Pass Road extending over the Tualatin Hills and into Portland.

Slide 25: Three Transportation Investment Packages – Each of these will be tested / modeled against the two growth scenarios. **A) Current Plans with Enhanced TDM and Transit; B) Extension of Current Plans with Arterial Expansion; C) Beyond Current Plans with Throughway Expansion.**

Next steps: This spring/summer – Evaluate transportation investment packages. Fall: Final public outreach and participation phase to share and report back on study conclusions, and solicit comments on tradeoffs between investment options. How do these different investments perform in these different scenarios? Christina said she wants to make sure that choices are clear and that we're doing this to learn about what our future needs are.

Questions by CCI members and staff replies and discussions followed. Among the issues raised:

- Gary Virgin commented about freight transport, growth, and economic development trends. Staff replied that both scenarios see an increase in commercial activity, and the assumption is more traffic, more trips, including freight-related trips. Gary would be concerned that density reaches a high point where freight can't get through, and demand for freight changes as a result. Dyami – trends are for rise in shipping, and the goal of continued economic development.
- Sebastian Lawler asked what is in the study for high capacity transit? Staff - A couple things would be considered: extension of the MAX Blue Line to Forest Grove, or bus rapid transit.
- Paul Johnson: There are still a lot of people clustered in places where you can't get on the bus or the MAX. What about the study will allow us to adapt to the kinds of patterns one would expect for vehicle users? Staff – One way to address congestion is to provide more redundancy. More connectivity, more routes.
- Dick Smith: What about political unwillingness to build new roads in rural areas? Salem has to realize it costs quite a bit to not have adequate transportation. Gary: There are hundreds of gravel trucks in front of my driveway. Staff - There are certain procedures we would need to go through for expansion of roads in rural areas. In rural reserves, as you know, it is tougher. This study will look at tradeoffs and see how much political will there is. Tests the appetite, politically, and informs the conversations.
- David Shettles voiced concerns about WES (heavy rail from Beaverton to Wilsonville) being constrained by sharing a freight rail line. Gary added on his concern about the costs of WES. Stan spoke about the need for big regional solutions. Dick voiced his concern that the region's fuel is kept at depots in NW Portland, but fuel cannot pass through tunnels. Also, he said better "peripheral planning" needs to be done around the new growth areas such as South Hillsboro. Staff acknowledged the points.
- Staff: The benefit they see to this study is that the cumulative impacts of all the growth areas are factored in, including build out of the urban reserves after 50 years. It lets them look at what the transportation needs are, and how to meet those demands.

Christina and Dyami closed by expressing an interest of staff to go back to CPOs after the evaluation – in late summer or early fall. Jim and the members thanked them for their presentation and discussion.

2. Returning to Annual Long Range Planning Work Program:

Mary proposed a speaker come out to talk about the sidewalk issue paper. She noted infill development and urban-rural roadways, are Tier 1. Jim is in favor. He noted the next SC meeting on 2/25.

Beth –Noted that the draft work program acknowledged CCI requests. Mentioned the Sidewalks Issue Paper, and March 3 comment period deadline.

Ray – URMDAC meeting tomorrow, with a staff report on the County's (inventory) of sidewalks.

Mary – Follow-up on sidewalk gaps – she feels staff didn't address (in issue paper) a lot of record and empty lot, and the stance that the property owner shouldn't have to build a sidewalk there because the new structure on the empty lot doesn't create any extra traffic. Those lots of record were probably created before 1980-83, when the sidewalk requirement was added to code.

Jim – Asked to clarify the land use ordinance / code study committee. It's Ray, Kathie, Virginia and Mary. They can connect to the CCI Steering Committee. Mary's email is the point of contact:

marymanseau@gmail.com.

ACTION: Jim motions for Work Program committee to look at the LUT Work Program draft's gaps we've talked about, draft a letter and use online work, and bring it to Steering Committee. Seconded by Ray Eck. Voice vote taken: Ayes-10, Nays-0, no abstentions.

4. – Steering Committee nominations and clarifying question on CCI Bylaws

On the CCI bylaws, Jim mentioned working on a revision for allowing inactive CPO areas to have participation. That will take time to bring out a draft, review it, and take action.

Paul – We're talking about membership of CCI, and membership of the CCI Steering Committee. At present, it's as a CPO elected requirement, and to get on the CCI Steering Committee, that criteria has to be satisfied. There are people who are in the inactive CPOs who would like to serve but they don't have an avenue to get there. Do we open it up and allow someone who is not elected to serve on the Steering Committee? Do they have rights to vote? These are the basic issues to be addressed, for CPOs that don't have regular representation.

Kathie – There are some differing views. To me, CCI membership is required for the CCI Steering Committee.

Ray – What are the main duties here? To bring information back to a group. Without an active CPO, there is nothing to report back to. I see no reason to have someone be in the CCI Steering Committee who is not in an active CPO. But to have a CCI member from an inactive area, that's fine.

Sebastian – It's important to have that flexibility.

Mary – Table it until the transition gives more information. The itty bitty details are frustrating and unimportant – if you have people who want to be engaged, open the doors and let them in.

Stan – Agrees, this is public and open. And so is the Steering Committee. I do see another option – if someone's an expert in something we need help in.

Jim – Asked for a straw poll for Mary's suggestion to table the bylaws membership question until more information comes out of the transition. A majority of hands were shown to table it.

ACTION to elect 2016 CCI Officers, who form the CCI Steering Committee. Jim called for any additional nominees. Hearing none, Marty Moyer moved to accept the slate as presented in the agenda.

Slate: Jim Long, Chair; Stan Houseman; Paul Johnson; Bruce Bartlett.

Dick seconded. Vote was by show of hands: 9 Ayes, 0 Nays. Jim abstained. Non-voting guests, Barbara Rhoads and Sebastian Lawler, expressed their support.

Beth and Dan praised the outgoing CCI Steering Committee and acknowledged the contributions of Kathie Koellmann and Henry Oberhelman, who stepped down.

5. Announcements and Updates:

- Beth: 2016 CPO Special Projects funds are available. She handed out packets. Link: <http://extension.oregonstate.edu/washington/cpo-special-projects>
- The new CCI Steering Committee will need to figure out its meeting schedule and location.
- Future CCI topics – Mary would like a sidewalk issue paper speaker.
- Marty praised the current CPO Newsletter’s article on How to Testify and submit Email comments. She wants extra copies made to distribute.
- Sebastian – Handed out the Public Health Advisory Committee 2015 report, and announced that nominations are being accepted for the Public Health Awards.

6. Transition Planning Discussion

Jim: We will have Sia and Philip coming in March. We expect to have some things fleshed out. One of our Steering Committee concerns is when the time is right to comment on program funding. Do you think CCI should take a stance and put a plug into CAO now before any budget deadline comes out? We had a lists of things to improve.

Stan distributed a sheet of the TPT’s recommendations, and the CCI’s 2014 prioritization listings. He wants to match up what CCI did that TPT also came up with, and raise things that CCI brought up which TPT didn’t address. This is so that the CCI’s work is included as the Transition moves forward. For instance, CCI’s 5th point is “Tools and Resources for CPO leaders to deal with community input.” This is in a similar vein to Letters E. and G. in the TPT recommendations.

Stan continues: We talked about boundaries and configurations, and we recognize there was no agreement at CCI, but there’s a need to address it. I don’t want to winnow it down as the 2014 CCI prioritization did, but to ask for the wants and needs, and to think big. Yes, let’s acknowledge that the TPT was a positive but there are some holes in it that need to be filled out.

Sebastian said he agrees. In negotiation, ask for everything. You still get a lot when you negotiate down.

Jim sought the meeting’s level of interest in favor of the Steering Committee send a letter to the County Administration Office? Marty, Mary, and David voiced their general agreement. No one objected.

Action: Motion raised by Jim for the CCI Steering Committee to send a letter to CAO with program improvement ideas.

Discussion: Stan asked if staff can give input about budgeting? Mary replied that it should be put to Sia and Philip, and prep it with them beforehand. Dan said that he and Beth will stay out of that, but coordinators can give you the basic budgeting detail that has been used up to now by OSU and County to budget the program funding in the IGA. Jim said good, give it to the Steering Committee as a baseline.

Motion amended by Jim – the letter is to include a mention of how to request budgetary improvements, increases. Ayes – 10. Nays - 0. No abstentions.

Meeting adjourned at 9:15.

Minutes by Dan Schauer