



Clackamas to Columbia Corridor Steering Committee Meeting #2

Thursday, September 24, 2020

3:00-5:00 pm

Summary

Zoom link: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82982546803?pwd=S251c3NpaFZJNGF0N0JEWURqWGNSdz09>

Meeting ID: 829 8254 6803

Passcode: 702255

Recording: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MJ5VeMpAzMM&feature=youtu.be>

Attendees:

Clackamas County

- Commissioner Paul Savas – Steering Committee
- Steve Williams – Project Partner

Multnomah County

- Commissioner Lori Stegmann – Steering Committee
- Graham Martin – Project Partner

City of Gresham

- Katherine Kelly – Project Partner
- Jay Higgins – Project Partner

City of Happy Valley

- Councilor Brett Sherman – Steering Committee
- Councilor Jerry Hinton – Steering Committee
- Michael Walter – Project Partner

ODOT

- Seth Brumley – Project Partner

JLA Public Involvement

- Jeanne Lawson – Consultant Team

Kittelson & Associates, Inc.

- Marc Butorac – Consultant Team
- Krista Purser – Consultant Team
- Alec Kauffman – Consultant Team

Meeting purpose:

- Develop final Steering Committee recommendations on packages and sequencing
- Determine next steps

| Time | Topic | Facilitator |
|------|---|--|
| 3:00 | <p>Welcome</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purpose of meeting • Introductions • Agenda overview: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Welcome ○ Updates ○ Outreach Recap ○ Investment Packages, Sequencing, and Funding ○ Plan and Policy Amendments ○ Group Discussion ○ Next Steps | <p>Katherine Kelly, City of Gresham Jeanne Lawson, Facilitator</p> |
| 3:10 | <p>Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public outreach/engagement Online Open House Feedback Overview (April and Jeanne) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 60 participants, 255 unique visitors ○ Location by IP address: Portland (40%), Gresham (23%), Happy Valley (4%) ○ Majority support the need and approach of the project ○ From feedback: need for expediency in completing specific projects including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Package 1, 3, and 4 ○ Commissioner Savas: How did this meeting rank by comparison to other online meetings during COVID-19? ○ Project Team: It is comparable, but the project is not as immediately engaging and attractive as other projects (due to sequencing and funding focus), in addition to the other ongoing current events that may challenge public engagement. ○ Commissioner Savas: (Concern on level of comfort with engagement) Is this level of engagement defensible? ○ Project Team: Metro did additional outreach for the mobility measure. And yes, though engagement may be lower, low input and 255 visitors indicates perhaps many visitors are not concerned with the project's direction. | <p>Krista Purser Jeanne Lawson</p> |

| | | |
|------|---|---------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Revised Sunrise naming to be consistent with Clackamas County usages and added Sunrise Phase 3 – Improvements east of 172nd Avenue ○ Clarified improvements to 172nd/Foster intersection ○ Identified sequencing of projects within each package ○ Identified funding sources for projects ○ Developed plan and policy amendment recommendations to reflect how each agency will accept the C2C Corridor Plan | |
| 3:25 | <p>Investment packages and sequencing</p> <p>Package 1: (Sequence: 2, 3, 5, 9, 20, 14/21)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2, 3, and 5 before the connector is in-place and increases traffic along the corridor • 9 and 20 could also come before 14 to provide safety and mobility improvements • 21 can occur at the same time as 20 if funding were available <p>Package 2: (Sequence: 5, 6, 1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ideally there will be no pause in work between Packages 1 and 2 for Project 5 to reduce mobilization costs • Project 6 should then be completed to improve 190th • Project 1 should be completed once the C2C mainline is established • Project 1: Lower-frequency to start, increase to higher frequency as land use supports it; Transit along entire corridor and connecting 212 <p>Package 3: (Sequence: 21, 22)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project 21 (Sunrise Facility): must be in-place to reduce east-west demand and allow for Project 22 (Rock Creek roundabout) to operate well <p>Package 4: (Sequence: 14, 15)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The order of these improvements may depend on the operational and safety performance of the corridor over time. The corridor segment experiencing more issues should be addressed first to the extent possible. <p>Package 5: (Sequence: 7, 8)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project 7 provides a new roadway extension that promotes development. • Project 8 connects to Project 7 and would lead to no connecting roadway if it went first. <p>Package 6: (Sequence: 18, 4, 23, 11)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project 18 promotes development and increases the likelihood of development-driven projects. • Project 4 provides additional transit improvements on the northern part of the corridor. • Project 23 does not need to be completed in any particular order. • Project 11 should be completed with Project 12, which is in the next package. <p>Package 7: (Sequence: 12, 10, 13, 19)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project 12 connects the Clatsop Street extension from Project 11 with 190th | Krista Purser |

| | | |
|------|--|--------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remaining projects should be prioritized based on the operational and safety needs at the time, and no particular triggers are present among them. <p>Package 8: (Sequence: 16, 17)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project 16 should be prioritized due to proximity to the C2CCorridor; future development in the area would promote development on Tillstrom Road, helping fund Project 17. | |
| 3:45 | <p>Funding strategies and timeline Timelines are dependent on funding availability, but generally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Near-term packages include 1 and 2, and are anticipated in the next 15 years • Mid-term packages are 3 and 4, and are anticipated in the next 10-20 years • Long-term packages are packages 5, 6, 7, and 8, and are anticipated in 15 or more years | Marc Butorac |
| | <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Councilor Hinton: Of the survey responses are there any serious questions about the roundabout, any major valid concerns about the roundabout? • Project Team (Jeanne): Some strongly opinionated members of the public, but no major valid concerns on the roundabout operations. • Commissioner Savas: How will the roundabouts avoid the queueing issues near highway 212 and highway 224? • Project Team (Marc): Short term metro project (local street improvements on 212) should have a significant benefit – 135th bottleneck will be removed by that, Rock creek junction will be a pinch point until Sunrise is complete. The 172nd and Foster Roundabout is metered by the three lanes out of Portland and surrounding roundabouts will dual lanes and are anticipated to meet the need. • Commissioner Savas: Will the backup at Foster SB to 212 impact the roundabout at 172nd/Foster? • Project Team (Marc): There is no near-term fix at Foster/212 until at least Sunrise phase 3, that will be a need now and into the future. • Commissioner Savas: Is there any modeling or phasing to determine what needs to get done by when? • Project Team (Marc): The challenge is funding, may be helped by private development, but this will take at least 15 years to develop and no near-term changes are anticipated. • Project Team (Jeanne): Are there issues with the packaging and sequencing of these projects that could help it? • Commissioner Savas: Concerned about when projects overlap is there a deliberate phasing that takes into account these projects and the safety issues that have occurred? • Project Team (Marc): Packages 1 & 2 are still going to take roughly 15 years, past that we are looking at 10 -20 years for packages 2 and 4, and just from a funding standpoint these packages are unlikely to progress forward quicker than that. • Commissioner Savas: Has worked with ODOT for a long time on 212 and it has been a major concern for a long time. | Committee |

| | | |
|------|---|--------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Team (Marc): ODOTs toolbox to help 212 and 224 interchange is very limited unfortunately. • Councilor Sherman: As Happy Valley grows you will probably see exponential growth near the Sunrise connection (projects 21 and 22), as the Happy Valley downtown shifts to just south of 172nd and Tillstrom intersection (in 10-15 years). • Commissioner Savas: We really can't change that sequencing of Sunrise (2A, 2B, 2C). Sunrise phase 2C is the biggest challenge, there needs to be some kind of safety improvement in the interim. • Project Team (Marc): Timing, there is an immediate need. The upcoming Damascus Mobility Plan project will also address some of these issues, which Steve is working to move forward (Foster/212). • Project Team (Steve): This plan is a point in time plan and each of these projects will go through refinement as they move forward. This is the plan between each agency and a roadmap for future improvements. • Commissioner Stegmann – In agreement, we need funding to move forward, this document is a roadmap. | |
| 4:10 | <p>Plan and policy amendments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies project revisions and incorporations for each jurisdiction and Metro • Discusses development review procedures • Identifies process for acceptance of the C2C Corridor Plan by all 4 partner agencies, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acceptance of agreement by June 30, 2021 • Agencies will accept the plan over the next on their individual timelines over the next 9 months • Incorporation of Plan as applicable within each agency's next TSP update, and ultimately the RTP | Marc Butorac |
| | <p>Discussion: Do you agree with the approach for acceptance?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commissioner Stegmann: Yes • Councilor Hinton: Yes • Commissioner Savas: What if funding comes up sooner for a particular project, out-of-order? Will the plan prohibit that? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Project Team (Marc): There is language in the plan that if different funding opportunities arise for a later project, a jurisdiction could move a project up. • Commissioner Savas: Yes, but let's keep interim safety improvements in mind for expediting. • Councilor Sherman: Yes, this seems reasonable, generally in agreement with the whole package. <p>Is ODOT a Project Partner or sign on the resolution?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not in the same way as other partners, though they've been on board from the TGM side and were involved in the OR 212/Sunrise concept development. They may not sign on the resolution. | Committee |
| 4:50 | Wrap up | Jeanne/Marc |
| 5:00 | Close | |