

---

# Meeting Minutes

## Gladstone Transportation System Plan (TSP) Update

Technical Advisory Meeting (TAC) Meeting #2

January 5, 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 and Jacque Betz, City of Gladstone; Greg Fryett, Gladstone Police; Mike Funk, Gladstone Fire Department; Pat Sisul, City of Gladstone On-call Engineer; Vanessa Vissar, TriMet; Steve Williams (for Karen Buehrig), Clackamas County; Laura Terway, Oregon City; Kim Sieckman, Gladstone City Council; Gail Curtis, Oregon Department of Transportation; Matt Bell and Molly McCormick, Kittelson & Associates, Inc.

**Meeting Purpose:** The purpose of Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting #2 was to review and received feedback on Tech Memo 5: Existing Gaps and Deficiencies and Tech Memo 6: Transportation System Needs and to outline the project's next steps.

**Meeting Summary:** TAC members met on Thursday, January 5<sup>th</sup> at 2:00 p.m. in the Gladstone City Hall, City Council Chambers to discuss the Gladstone TSP update. Matt Bell gave a power point presentation and led a discussion on Tech Memos 5 and 6. The presentation was followed by a short poster session where TAC members were encouraged to provide input by writing on poster boards showing the different transportation systems of Gladstone and their needs. The meeting materials (i.e. agenda, power point presentation, and Tech Memos 5 and 6) 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, posters, and next steps.

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

- Identify potential differences in the population and employment projections prepared by Metro and Portland State University (PSU) and implications on travel demand
- Identify local churches as essential destinations and ensure that the needs associated with access to churches have been addressed
- Indicate that the school district currently contracts out bus service to a local provider and that the Summerset Lodge Assisted Living Facility provides local shuttle service
- Identify potential locations for park and rides (PAC identified up to three local churches that could serve as park and rides)

- Identify what Gladstone can do to prepare for High Capacity Transit (HCT) service, including developing policies that support potential HCT within Gladstone
- Identify challenges associated with multi-use paths needs, such as the need for grade changes
- Include trolley trail bridge as a need for the pedestrian and bicycle systems
- Evaluate appropriateness of functional classifications, suggest additional modifications
- Update development code to require development review based on trip generation.

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

## 1. Tech Memo #6: Transportation System Needs

### a. What does “future” mean?

- i. The Metro travel demand model shows less than 1% growth per year in households and more than 2% growth per year in employment

- 1. This amount of change has some impact on how people travel and the traffic volumes throughout the City

- ii. The Metro travel demand model appears to have different results than the recent PSU study on population

- 1. During the last ten years, Gladstone has changed in population by only eight people based on the PSU study

- 2. Where do the Metro numbers come from considering there has not been much change in population in the last ten years (according to PSU) and considering there is little space for further development?

- a. Since Gladstone is already developed, the Metro model must be assuming “full buildout” and some redevelopment

- 3. Should compare the two sources to understand the differences

- 4. Should also consider that household size can greatly impact the population projections

- a. Example: empty nesters occupying a majority of the houses versus new couples/families

- iii. The Metro model is vetted and tested; and is a tool to help project but will not be completely exact

## 2. Essential Destinations Discussion

### a. Gladstone Community Club – community center located across from the grade school

- i. Becoming more of an essential destination; rotary club meets there weekly

- ii. Not currently highly used but trying to get more users from the community

- 
- b. Churches should be added to the essential destinations list
    - i. Need to provide access to churches as well as other destinations
3. Public Transit System Discussion
- a. Do the TriMet future improvement plans include the stop amenity upgrades?
    - i. No, just service improvements are listed
  - b. Will TriMet incorporate the shelter needs into any TriMet plans if they are outlined in the TSP update?
    - i. Not necessarily but the City can advocate for these needs by informing TriMet
    - ii. Some of the locations identified on the needs list might not have ROW for the transit shelters or would affect sight distance
  - c. School bus service is currently contracted out to a local service provider
  - d. The Summerset Lodge Assisted Living Facility also provides local shuttle service
  - e. Need to identify potential locations for Park and Rides
    - i. Have seen good use of church parking lots in neighboring cities
  - f. High capacity transit (HCT) was identified specifically in the scope due to current RTP working group
    - i. HCT in Gladstone could include light rail service or bus rapid transit (BRT), neither of which is provided in this region yet
    - ii. Should identify preemptive actions or characteristics a community needs to support this type of facility being provided
      - 1. Political willingness, community and leadership support
      - 2. The service should be able to benefit many people
        - a. Will there be transit-oriented-development in the future?
      - 3. Support from neighbors for this kind of service
        - a. West Linn, Oregon City, Milwaukie, Clackamas County also engaged and willing
        - b. Need to make the case that this piece of Clackamas County is wanting and needing HCT
    - iii. HCT provides a lot access (especially for jobs) and other benefits
      - 1. Benefits outweigh the perception concerns
    - iv. HCT is already outlined in some plans in other parts of the metro region
      - 1. Gladstone is not currently being considered but can set itself up for consideration in the future

- 
- v. The first question should be if Gladstone supports this and then if other neighboring communities are interested as well
  - vi. It is an opportunity if the community is interested
    - 1. TSP could include a policy that supports it for the future
    - 2. Don't want to conflict with regional partners though
    - 3. Oregon City TSP update from 2014 does have those broad policies suggesting that the city will support this kind of service but HCT hasn't been completely discussed by Oregon City
4. Pedestrian System Discussion
- a. Sidewalks are currently maintained by the property owners; however, major roadway improvements typically include sidewalk improvements
    - i. Could change the Gladstone policy so that it is the City's concern or the City could share the responsibility
      - 1. Can SDCs be used? Or gas tax?
    - ii. The TSP update will still identify sidewalk needs even if it is the property owners' responsibility
  - b. Accessways
    - i. Pat Sisul noted that a lot of the locations listed in the Tech Memos will not easily be constructed into at-grade paths
  - c. Trolley Trail Bridge should be added to the needs
5. Bicycle System Discussion
- a. A lot of the bicycle needs are based off of roadway functional classification, but are the streets classified correctly?
  - b. Although Arlington Street, Dartmouth Street, etc. were found to be BLTS 2 and appropriate to bike on, shouldn't we make them even better and try to capture more of the ridership, potentially including children?
    - i. The City will have to make decisions with these kinds of streets: should they be improved or are the types of facilities appropriate?
6. Motor Vehicle System Discussion
- a. When the solutions are studied, will be noting exactly when (i.e. what year) Arlington Street/OR 99E will exceed mobility standards
  - b. Where will the volumes from the new shopping development enter and exit the site?
  - c. Also concerned with traffic volumes that will result from the Cove development in Oregon City

- 
- i. 244 units in phase 1, which has been studied
    - ii. 195 units for the next phase (but trying to get upgraded to 300 or 400)
  - d. For the City and future development, need the roadway functional classifications and development standards updated
    - i. A lot of examples in Gladstone where traffic studies were not required due to the current standards:
      - 1. Current process involves having an average daily traffic (ADT) limit for each street based on functional classification. If a proposed development does not add enough trips to exceed the established ADT based on the current developments on the street, then the City won't require a traffic study
      - ii. This process is not current. The normal development process now in other cities is based on trip generation (i.e. if the development generates more than XX trips, the development has to complete a traffic study)
  - e. Potential solution from Oregon City to help verify studies completed by applicants:
    - i. Make applicants do a traffic study then charge them to pay for a second consultant to review the traffic study for the City.
  - f. ODOT is aware of the safety concerns at OR 99E/Arlington Street and has been concerned about this intersection
  - g. Where is the pavement condition analysis?
    - i. The City just completed a separate study and it is discussed in TM5
    - ii. Maintenance is normally handled by a separately from the TSP, which normally handles capital improvements
    - iii. Is Gladstone looking at utility fees?
      - 1. Yes but still in the planning phase
      - 2. Suggested to discuss with peers at Oregon City and Milwaukie because they have been aggressive with getting funding for these types of needs
  - h. A majority of the motor vehicle issues are on OR 99E and I-205, should the City still focus on these if Gladstone does not have jurisdiction? Or should Gladstone be focused more on those issues that they have direct control over
    - i. This plan is as important to ODOT and Clackamas County as to Gladstone
    - ii. ODOT won't look at helping with a project if it isn't vetted through the TSP and backed by the community through this process

- 
- i. Are any and all crashes included in the review; does it matter if it was at night; if the pedestrian was wearing black; etc?
    - i. There are not enough pedestrian and bicycle crashes in Gladstone to note trends
    - ii. Oatfield Road/82<sup>nd</sup> Drive issue: right hook crashes with bicycles
      - 1. Eastbound vehicles approach the intersection slowly due to traffic and stops at the light. People do not always look over their shoulder to the right for bicycles when they finally get to the intersection
      - 2. Could make drivers more aware of the fact that cyclists are using these facilities as well (signs, sharrows, a marketing campaign in the City)
  - j. Other modes
    - i. Some interest in water transportation
    - ii. Willamette Falls Legacy project is being worked on in Oregon City, long-term
    - iii. Jet boats could be used to travel from Gladstone
      - 1. There are docks in Milwaukie, Oregon City, and Portland
      - 2. There are jet boat rides from Oregon City to OMSI that take about 10 minutes; could talk to the company about water taxis
7. Next Steps
- a. Committee members to send comments to Jim or Jacque by Friday, January 13<sup>th</sup>
  - b. Community Meeting #1 is upcoming
  - c. Online Community Meeting #1 will be active through two weeks after Community Meeting #1
  - d. TAC Meeting #3 will be February 6<sup>th</sup> 2 – 4 PM
8. Upcoming Community Meeting #1
- a. Scheduled for next week Thursday, January 12, 2017
  - b. Suggested to talk about High Capacity Transit (HCT) to start getting the idea out there
    - i. Help citizens understand where the discussion is today
    - ii. Show the RTP map to describe where improvements and services are being considered
    - iii. Provide understanding of benefits of HCT
    - iv. Show that there are plans in place in the Metro area and partners like Oregon City are already taking action to encourage HCT in the southwest in the future
    - v. Ask citizens about their thoughts on HCT

- 
1. Could have paper surveys or online
  2. Could be just one question on a survey
- vi. Check with Vanessa and TriMet before including this kind of discussion or questions
9. General Discussion and Poster Session Comments
- a. Add Carolyn to TAC invite list
  - b. The intersection numbering in Tech Memo 5 for Figure 9 does not match what is in the document text
  - c. On the website, the link for Tech Memo 2 needs to be updated
  - d. The pipeline discussed in Tech Memo 5 is not the one currently in use; update
  - e. The proposed accessway for Duniway is not possible for at-grade path
    - i. Needs to be raised
  - f. The proposed accessway for Beatrice will not be possible due to the creek
  - g. Jensen Road is closed at River Road to vehicles and is currently used as a trail
  - h. Park Way is not a good candidate for a collector due to steep grade and many curves
    - i. Ridgegate is a possible replacement