Meeting Minutes

Gladstone Transportation System Plan (TSP) Update

Technical Advisory Meeting (TAC) Meeting #1

October 20, 2016 – 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Gladstone City Hall – 525 Portland Ave, Gladstone, OR 97027

Meeting Organizer: Matt Bell, Consultant Project Manager

Meeting Attendees: Jim Whynot and Jacque Betz, City of Gladstone; Greg Fryett, Gladstone Police; Mike Funk, Gladstone Fire Department; Pat Sisul, City of Gladstone On-call Engineer; Chris Myers, Metro; Karen Buehrig, Clackamas County; Laura Terway, Oregon City; Gail Curtis, Oregon Department of Transportation; Matt Bell and Molly McCormick, Kittelson & Associates, Inc.; Darci Rudzinski, Angelo Planning Group

Meeting Purpose: The purpose of Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting #1 was to introduce TAC members to the project, review and receive feedback on draft Tech Memos 1 through 4, and to outline the project's next steps.

Meeting Summary: TAC members met on Thursday, October 20th at 2:00 p.m. in the Gladstone City Hall, City Council Chambers to discuss the Gladstone TSP update. Jim Whynot, the Gladstone Public Works Director, introduced the project team and asked TAC members to describe their experience updating TSPs in their own communities. Matt Bell gave a power point presentation and led a discussion on tech memos 1 through 4. The meeting materials (i.e. agenda, power point presentation, and tech memos 1 through 4) are provided on the project website (www.gladstonetsp.com). The following provides a summary of the discussion on the tech memos and next steps.

1. Tech Memo #1: Policy Framework and Code Review – Tech memo #1 summarizes the plans, policies, targets, and standards that are applicable to the City of Gladstone's Transportation System Plan (TSP) update.

    a. Include a TOC for the memo

    b. What are we trying to achieve (regional, statewide) with these policies?

        i. Safety and efficiency

        ii. Provide transportation options

            1. Driving should not be the only option available

            2. Want to lessen dependency on the single occupancy vehicle

            3. This push is now coming from the region as well as the state (where that focus has been previously seen from)

a. Looking forward 20 years and Gladstone is part of a regional push toward multi-modal transportation systems

   iii. How land use and transportation fit together

      1. People want to live near their destinations

         a. This was a big focus in Oregon City's TSP

         b. Designing for the future

   iv. Meet regional objectives/targets

   v. Reflect needs of the City

      1. Needs to be a local plan

   vi. Economic vitality

      1. There is only so much money; how do you choose which projects are prioritized?

         a. Big projects that take a majority of the available funding or lots of smaller projects

   vii. Health and physical activity

      1. How can it be connected to transportation?

      2. How can you use the existing network connections to the City's advantage?

      3. Safe routes to school

      4. There are lots of parks available in Gladstone and access to two rivers

c. Gladstone has a great network of streets and existing sidewalk, including several major entrance points

   i. Suggestion to check where roads transition from a county road to a city road

   ii. I-205 and 99E congestion will be an important considerations as well

d. Should any other documents be reviewed or considered for the TSP update?

   i. None brought up

2. Tech Memo #2: Project Goals and Objectives and Evaluation Criteria – Tech Memo #2 identifies the project goals, objectives, and evaluation criteria that will be used to guide the development of the TSP update.

a. Try to use more reader-friendly language

b. Focus on safety for all modes and connecting to schools

c. Goal 1: Safety

      i. Objective C

          1. Provides a solution instead of being presented as a goal, too prescriptive

          2. Don't necessarily want separation in every situation

          3. Would like C to be a more general so that innovative and outside-the-box projects can be considered

          4. Focus on safety for all travel modes

          5. "Reduce conflicts for all travel modes" (possible new wording for objective c)

d. Would like more explanation of where the multimodal focus is coming from: Heard the idea of taking vehicles away and wanting everyone to walk and bike, but there would be many years of push back from people who want personal vehicles.

      i. Clarification: not saying that people will not be allowed drive

          1. The focus is on providing more transportation choices

          2. How do we connect the city?

          3. Providing options to those who don't want to be driving and getting those people out of personal vehicles

              a. Focus on decreasing demand this way instead of adding more and more capacity

          4. All about choices because the options to address congestion are limited

              a. The state doesn't have money to put into this issue

              b. Shifting modes is one of the most cost-efficient ways to address congestion

      ii. Where does the focus on non-auto modes come from

          1. Previous TSPs in the region and state were heavily auto-focused

          2. Region would now like to address all modes instead of just one

          3. Multimodal transportation systems are one of the things that support the best communities

              a. The region and state are looking at research being done and trends that are occurring

e. Goal 1: Safety

      i. In Clackamas County, safety might be driving slower

      ii. In Gladstone, high speeds coming into Portland Ave are a concern

      iii. Pedestrian connectivity

      iv. Narrow streets are difficult to maneuver for fire engines

        1. Wide streets can have some negative safety effects in terms of speeds

        2. Need to find the happy medium where engines can maneuver themselves but where drivers are not encouraged to speed

f. Want to highlight that these goals are for the proposed/evaluated projects (not necessarily those that will become policies for the city)

g. Goal 2: Mobility

    i. Objective A

      1. Can it be flipped to be positive?

        a. Improve access to other travel modes

    ii. Objective B

      1. Why is there a focus on just the state system in the context of Gladstone?

        a. When I-205 is backed up, Gladstone is affected

          i. Technology/variable signage in the future should help guide people through the right routes when these events occur

        b. Educate the general public of the greater picture

      2. Try to get to the intent of the objective

        a. Intent is to have drivers use local streets for local trips and regional streets for regional trips

        b. Want an efficient system and to distribute the trips

        c. Want to enhance the ability for citizens to access state facilities

        d. Want to reduce reliance of regional traffic on local street

      3. Need to think about where the destinations and stores are located

      4. Could potentially fold mobility into one of the other goals

        a. Darci –it should stay separate since there are regional goals that need to be met and considered

h. Goal 3: Accessibility and Goal 4: Connectivity

    i. This is a multimodal goal, including autos

    ii. Could potentially combine accessibility and connectivity so it is not overlapping

    i.   Goal 5: Coordination

        i.   This is a fatal flaw analysis; need to establish this coordination

        ii.   List of projects that support coordination or connection to other agencies' facilities

        iii.   Can combine RTP and state as shown in the evaluation criteria

        iv.   Ensure there is no double-counting in terms of the evaluation criteria that artificially increase the score of certain projects

   j.   Financial responsibility

        i.   Objective B

            1.   Cannot control this

            2.   Maybe reword – "identify"

        ii.   Rely more on Objective A

        iii.   Oregon City did "likely to be funded" and "not likely to be funded" lists

        iv.   Objective A could cover maintenance

   k.   If there is some overlap in the goals and objectives, might be double counting for some projects

        i.   KAI to review the list as a whole for this issue

   l.   Other Goals/objectives

        i.   Health could be included in part of connectivity

        ii.   Maintenance could be included as part of financial responsibility

        iii.   Equity is partially covered through accessibility

        iv.   Preservation and maintenance is another goal that is important for Gladstone

            1.   Maybe not just hidden under financial responsibility but as a separate goal

            2.   No true City maintenance over 20-30 years and the infrastructure was not engineered correctly in the first place

               a.   Maintenance needs to be established as a priority

3.   Tech Memo #3: TSP Financial Forecast – Tech Memo #3 summarizes historical revenues and expenditures for transportation in the City and projects the level of funding for implementing projects identified in the TSP.

   a.   There has been a huge change in the administration in the last few years

        i.   The City is trying to update the budget and previous ways of spending money

      ii. Want to spend the right funding on the correct types of improvements and expenditures

  b. Add info for right-of-way and gas tax potential funding

  c. Should any additional information be included or considered in the forecast?

      i. Bike/pedestrian SDCs

4. Tech Memo #4: TSP Methodology and Assumptions – Tech Memo #4 summarizes the methodology and assumptions associated with the existing and future transportation system conditions analysis and identifies key information, such as study intersections.

  a. How were the study intersections chosen?

      i. Intersections were chosen through discussion with the City and state

      ii. Should Webster/Oatfield be included?

      iii. Gloucester/Oatfield?

      iv. The ramps are important to study here because they can influence what ODOT will do in the future (or if they do anything)

      v. 99E/Arlington is flagged in SPIS

  b. Would like to include the pavement condition study that is currently occurring into the TSP

5. Draft Project Flyer

  a. Change date to January 2017

6. General Discussion

  a. Want to set up Gladstone to create more partnerships with neighbors and others in the region

  b. The Cove project

      i. Not a lot of concern previously for that bridge but now it is a big focus

7. Next Steps

  a. Next meeting: December 15th

  b. Community Meeting in January 2017