

---

# Meeting Minutes

## Gladstone Transportation System Plan (TSP) Update

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting #3

March 23, 2017 – 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, Jacque Betz, Carolyn Gray, City of Gladstone; Lennie Bjornsen, Gladstone School District; Pat Sisul, City of Gladstone On-call Engineer; Steve Williams, Clackamas County; Laura Terway, Oregon City; Kim Sieckmann, Gladstone City Council; Susan Liston, Gladstone citizen; Gail Curtis, Oregon Department of Transportation; Darci Rudzinski, Angelo Planning Group; Matt Bell and Molly McCormick, Kittelson & Associates, Inc..

**Meeting Purpose:** The purpose of Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting #3 was to review and received feedback on Draft Tech Memo 7: Regulatory Solutions and Draft Tech Memo 8: Transportation System Plan (TSP) Solutions and to outline the project's next steps.

**Meeting Summary:** TAC members met on Thursday, March 23<sup>rd</sup> at 2:00 p.m. in the Gladstone City Hall, City Council Chambers to discuss the Gladstone TSP update. Matt Bell and Darci Rudzinski gave a power point presentation and led a discussion on Tech Memos 7 and 8. The meeting materials (i.e. agenda, power point presentation, and Draft Tech Memos 7 and 8) are provided on the project website ([www.gladstonetsp.com](http://www.gladstonetsp.com)). The following provides a summary of action items and discussion topics on the tech memos and next steps.

**Action Items:** the following summarizes action items that resulted from the discussions with TAC members.

- APG to send out an updated version of Tech Memo 7 that addresses Oregon Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) requirements for the TSP update
- KAI to send out an excel file that summarizes the potential improvements identified in Tech Memo 8. TAC members are asked to provide input on the preferred solutions and project location priorities
- APG to consider how the requirements expressed in the TIA standards would affect the downtown area in terms of the preferred solution for the Downtown Revitalization Plan
- APG to ensure development code provides clear direction on the need for pedestrian connections
- APG to update “electric carts” on page 11 and “community development director” throughout the document

- KAI add the Gladstone family center and adjacent transit stops to priority locations for improvement
- KAI to add potential access spacing standards to Tech Memo 8
- KAI to add potential solutions to the Dartmouth Road/Oatfield Road intersection that involve movement restrictions
- KAI to consider impact of utility poles on potential sidewalk improvements
- Laura Terway to share code language from Oregon City with the PMT (public works director waiving requirements)
- TAC to review the table on page 3 of Tech Memo 8 and let the PMT know if other solutions should be further explored for Gladstone
- TAC to provide feedback and fill out the excel file by April 3, 2017.

**Discussion Topics:** The following provides additional details on the actions items.

1. Tech Memo 7: Regulatory Solutions

- a. In addition to reviewing all regulations, standards, and regional/local plans pertaining to Gladstone, zoning and development code needs to be considered as well
- b. The Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP) supports the “auditing” of a city’s zoning and development code
- c. Tech Memo 7 proposes changes to Gladstone’s zoning and development code
- d. In terms of current code, the half-street frontage improvements language could be updated
  - i. Should be covered in the streets and roads section
- e. In Tech Memo 1, two tables with suggestions for policy changes were introduced. The current draft Tech Memo 7 does not address the second table of TPR recommendations
  - i. Darci will provide an updated draft of Tech Memo 7 to the TAC on Friday
  - ii. TIA requirements are particularly important and will be included in the updated draft
- f. Street and road standards
  - i. The TSP will include roadway standards for Gladstone as a whole
  - ii. The Downtown Revitalization Plan will include at least one additional standard for the specific study segment of Portland Avenue
    - 1. The additional standard(s), as well as all other recommendations made through the Downtown Revitalization Plan, will either be incorporated directly into the updated TSP or referenced in the TSP

- 
- g. The city's code will reference elements of the TSP not included in the code
    - i. For example, cross sections will be included in the TSP and not the code
    - ii. Makes it so that both the code and TSP do not need to be updated every time either document is changed
  - h. Bike parking section is new for Gladstone
  - i. Working to make the code help with multi-modal transportation goals of the city
  - j. Reducing parking standards through the Downtown Revitalization Plan
    - i. Parking policies in the code affect small developments that can't provide enough parking to meet policies, leading to a lack of redevelopment
    - ii. If the code allows for other solutions, it could help with revitalization of the downtown area
      - 1. For example, the city could require less parking if a transit stop/bench will be installed by the development or if the development will be creating trips during off-peak or night hours
  - k. Do the code amendments specify whether a private development would be required to provide a public walkway through their development?
    - i. New language is provided on pages 4-6 that seems to support this intention (see page 6, part B for language about connections to other facilities)
      - 1. Specifically on sites where there is not a way to extend public roadways
        - a. If there is not a motorized connection, at least provide a connection for pedestrians and cyclists
      - 2. Consider more rigorous requirements that provide clear direction
  - l. The current Parks Master Plan project is also looking for better connections for pedestrians and cyclists
    - i. The project is nearing the middle of its schedule
    - ii. There is a strong interest in the community for connectivity through walking trails as expressed through open houses
    - iii. The city's code can help with this
      - 1. Use language such as "to/from parks and other essential destinations such as x, y, z"
    - iv. Connectivity is key
      - 1. Do not want to build new trails but rather build the connections between existing trails

- 
- v. ODOT and the state health department have a memo that discusses the way a city's built environment has a big impact of public health
  - vi. Agencies are expected to consider health in their plans and projects
  - m. Some cities have code standards and requirements that the public works director can waive
    - i. Is there anything (such as discretionary criteria) in the Gladstone code to help the public works director to make these decisions, to help prioritize, and to provide consistency?
      - 1. Oregon City is one example where the code provides this option
        - a. Laura Terway to share this code language with the PMT
  - n. For new TIA standards, consider pedestrian trips or person-trips instead of just vehicle trips
    - i. Consider circulation and access for pedestrians as well as the vehicular impacts
  - o. How will the Downtown Revitalization Plan differentiate from the TSP and what are the impacts of each on the other?
    - i. What we put in the TSP and changes to the code should not make it less attractive to develop downtown
    - ii. Darci will look further into this, considering where the Downtown Revitalization Plan preferred solution is and how the two plans and code work together
  - p. Two terms to clarify in Tech Memo 7
    - i. Page 11, second paragraphs – “electric carts”
    - ii. Page 3, second box – “community development director”
      - 1. Should be public works director
      - 2. Need global change throughout document
  - q. Lennie from the school district noted that the family center near the Gladstone senior center generates high transit ridership for people from outside of Gladstone
    - i. Way to help connect everyone to education/health
    - ii. Should be considered a high priority location, especially for transit improvements to/from and at the adjacent existing transit stops
2. Tech Memo 8: Transportation System Plan (TSP) Solutions
- a. TSMO solutions

- 
- i. Committee members are encouraged to review the table on page 3 and let KAI know if there are other options that are interesting to the city/citizens that should be explored further
  - ii. KAI to identify in Tech Memo 8 potential access spacing standards for the city to adopt
  - iii. Locations where access management should be applied have not been identified but there will be potential language for access spacing
    - 1. Access spacing standards will live in the TSP, not in the code
      - a. This structure is reflected in the new code language shown in Tech Memo 7
  - b. Pedestrian solutions
    - i. Enhanced crossing location cannot be explored in detail at the TSP level due to the need for a location-specific study and/or data
      - 1. These locations can be identified for an enhanced crossing and will include cost estimate range for the different applicable treatments
    - ii. Arlington Street example - should the new sidewalks be installed on both sides?
      - 1. Depends on what the city is looking for but would probably be provided through half-street improvements as redevelopment occurs
    - iii. 82<sup>nd</sup> Drive/I-205 southbound ramp terminal example
      - 1. Missing a connection to the old foot bridge near the DMV
    - iv. Beatrice Avenue example
      - 1. Not really safe for public use right now
    - v. It should be noted for all the sidewalk widening and installation projects that the powerlines in Gladstone are set right behind the right of way line
      - 1. Poles (with approximately 4-foot mast arms) are directly in the way if the sidewalks are being widened or if landscape strips are being installed
        - a. This issue has come up with every city widening project
      - 2. Some of the utility poles run power directly to homes
        - a. Adds a lot of cost when considering moving poles
      - 3. Burrowing underground is another option but would involve burrowing to some private homes
      - 4. Both options are costly and would require a balance of priorities

- 
5. Two additional options are meandering sidewalks around the poles or widening sidewalks around the poles, neither of which are preferred
  - vi. Bicycle solutions
    1. Metro just installed several wayfinding signs for the Trolley Trail in the city
  - vii. Transit solutions
    1. The service enhancement plan from TriMet does not cover bringing back service to Portland Avenue
  - viii. Motor vehicle solutions
    1. KAI has considered cutting off Dartmouth Road from Oatfield Road or restricting eastbound left-turns from Dartmouth onto Oatfield
      - a. These solutions will be added to Tech Memo 8
    2. The city Could consider alternative measures such as travel time, especially although Arlington Street
    3. Arlington Street example
      - a. If the Metro model is overestimating the traffic on River Road, another solution is to monitor how the intersection is operating before implementing capacity solutions and only installing safety solutions in the near-term
3. General Discussion
- a. Appreciate the idea of restricting the eastbound left-turn movement from Dartmouth Road to Oatfield Road
    - i. There is some disagreement with this proposed solution
      1. The proximity of Dartmouth Road to the signal at 82<sup>nd</sup> Drive provides gaps for the left-turn movement and southbound vehicles will often create a gap in the queue for left-turn vehicles to pass through
    - ii. Need to think about where the volumes will be re-routed if the movement is restricted
    - iii. Gloucester Street might need a signal if traffic is rerouted there
  - b. There should be a better connection from the I-205 trail into Gladstone
    - i. Bike lane on 82<sup>nd</sup> Drive is full of debris
    - ii. Once you get to Gladstone on the trail, it is difficult to continue into the city or to the river and it can feel dangerous to cyclists
  - c. OR 99E/Arlington Street
    - i. Another idea is to remove the crosswalk on the south leg

- 
1. Would not be effective for those developments on the west side of River Road
  - d. From this update process, it appears that Gladstone does not have a lot transportation system issues (mostly OR 99E and I-205, which are under ODOT's jurisdiction)
    - i. Mostly have internal connectivity issues that Gladstone can improve
    - ii. Interested in how prioritizing will work
      1. Is it more important to prioritize those projects that Gladstone can complete itself?
      2. From ODOT's perspective, projects are not considered unless they are in the affected city's TSP and having a high priority would show ODOT that the project is important to the community
    - iii. Would rather have a complete sidewalk network than wider sidewalks
      1. Fill the gaps before improving the existing sidewalks
      2. There are people who walk down the middle of the road where there are sidewalks gaps because they don't want to jump on and off from sidewalks
  - e. The timing of Gladstone's TSP is convenient in terms of Clackamas County's plans
    - i. The Regional Transportation Plan is being updated and will be asking for project lists from cities in the coming months
      1. Need to know the city's priorities to get on the county's list for potentially funding
      2. A solution does not necessarily need to be picked out to be on the RTP list
4. Next Steps
- a. TAC to provide feedback by next Friday (3/31/17)
  - b. Matt to share an excel file for TAC members to fill out
    - i. Specify preferred solutions for specific locations and project location priorities