



**TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**(Transportation Advisory Board / Technical Advisory Committee)**

**Minutes**

**April 11, 2012**

Vice Chair Tom Fahey called the Transportation Advisory Board (TAB) meeting to order on April 11, 2012 at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers of City Hall, 380 A Avenue, Lake Oswego, Oregon.

Members Present: TAB: Vice Chair Thomas Fahey, Peter Goodkin, Donald McHarness and Heather Peck

TAC: Phill Worth and Erin Ferguson, Kittleson & Associates; Tom Mills, Service Planner, Tri-Met; and Gail Curtis, Planner, ODOT

Excused / Absent: TAB: Chair Gregg Mindt and David Jorling  
TAC: Amy Rose, Metro

Council Liaison: Councilor Jeff Gudman

Guest(s): Skip Ormsby, Birdshill CPO/Neighborhood Association; A gentleman and lady representatives for the Forest Hills Homeowners Association;

Staff / consultant(s) present: Staff: Nancy Flye, Traffic Engineering Technician; Erica Rooney, Assistant City Engineer; Laura Weigel, Associate Planner; Phill Worth and Erin Ferguson, Kittleson & Associates; Sidaro Sin, Development Project Manager, Economic and Capital Development Department; Lt. Scott Thran, LOPD; and Cindy Waggener, Administrative Support

### **Public Comment**

Councilor Gudman clarified that when he had discussed a financing plan for major projects at the February meeting he had not suggested moving the City maintenance facility to the school maintenance facility but that one possible way to pay for a new City maintenance facility could be to have a joint operation with the School District. The School District would sell its existing facility and move to the existing City maintenance facility.

### **Agenda Review**

The committee reviewed the agenda.

### **Updated Draft Goals with Objectives and Evaluation Criteria**

The Committee discussed the April 4, 2012 memorandum from the Project Management Team: "Technical Memorandum 5.2 - Goals, Objectives and Evaluation Criteria." It contained the transportation-related vision statement and listed related draft goals and objectives.

#### **2035 VISION – A CONNECTED COMMUNITY**

We have **safe, efficient** and **convenient** transportation choices. There are frequent and reliable public **transportation options** that make it easy to move around our city and the region. Pathways, sidewalks, roadways and bike routes encourage residents of all neighborhoods to walk and bike safely.

**Goal 1. Safety:** Improve safety for pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders, and automobiles.

**Goal 2. Transportation Choices:** Increase opportunities to comfortably and conveniently walk, bike and take transit.

**Goal 3. Efficiency:** Optimize performance of the existing transportation system while providing adequate access to adjacent properties.

**Goal 4. Convenience:** Design and equip the transportation system to be easy, comfortable and intuitive to use for all travelers.

**Goal 5. Accessibility:** Create a transportation system that provides opportunities for all community members to reach daily needs and services.

**Goal 6. Sustainability:** Provide a transportation system that supports people, places and prosperity for today and future generations.

During the discussion the group noted that Goal 2. Transportation Choices did not mention driving. They asked if Goal 3. Efficiency was about vehicle travel. Mr. Worth confirmed that. They reasoned that if the vision statement talked about the frequency of public transportation there should be a goal related to that. They questioned why the Efficiency goal only mentioned providing adequate access to 'adjacent properties' and did not refer to a larger geographic region, commercial areas or hubs.

The consultant explained that in general terms 'transportation choices' referred to modes other than the automobile because the other modes were not as well developed. He explained a roadway was more efficient in moving traffic when it had very few direct accesses to adjacent land uses along it. The Tri-Met representative cautioned that frequency of service and route planning was closely related to land use and ridership. There had to be enough service to meet the demand without running empty buses. Ms. Weigel advised if the committee recommended adding driving to Transportation Choices the CAC would consider revising that goal at the end of the process. Mr. McHarness supported including 'driving' as one of the transportation choices because the city needed to improve driving in the city. One of the advisors suggested the goal could call for 'increasing travel options.' That could include things like more carpooling and transportation demand management. Ms. Weigel suggested being clear and consistent: If the Efficiency goal was talking about cars then driving should be listed in the Transportation Choices goal. An advisor suggested combining the efficiency and convenience goals. She suggested rewording the Efficiency goal to call for the city to 'optimize performance of the existing transportation system.' She related that since the last TSP better technology was available to improve the performance of a transportation system such as better timing of lights and signs telling people about road conditions. The advisors mentioned things they did not see in the document. It needed to better reflect the interrelationship of transportation and land use. It should address freight movement. The goals could talk about prioritizing activity centers or activity nodes.

The committee then discussed the draft objectives that would help achieve the goals. They highlighted aspects of the following objectives:

#### **GOAL 2 Transportation Choices**

A. Provide a continuous network of pedestrian facilities (sidewalk or multiuse paths) connecting residential areas with each other as well as key activity centers and transit stops.

B. Provide a continuous network of bicycle facilities (bicycle lanes or multiuse paths) connecting residential areas with each other as well as key activity centers and transit stops.

A committee member suggested removing the list in parentheses because bicycle facilities were more than just bicycle lanes or multiuse paths.

#### **Goal 1. Safety**

A. Reduce the number and severity of crashes for all modes.

Ms. Curtis suggested rewording this to call for the city to 'reduce the number of fatalities and the severity of crashes for all modes.' That would correspond with the regional plan's performance measure to reduce fatalities by a certain amount.

## **GOAL 2 Transportation Choices**

C. Improve transit stop amenities to consistently include shelters, lighting and benches.

## **GOAL 4 Convenience**

C. Identify key regional transit routes/services and provide opportunities for bicyclists, pedestrians and motorists to access those routes/services (e.g., park n rides, protected bike biking).

Mr. Mills cautioned that the document had jurisdictional cloudiness and might be too specific when it talked about transit stop amenities and developing routes. Mr. Worth confirmed the objectives were related to partnering with Tri-Met. At the goals and objectives level the aspiration was to create a system that worked. There was not as much concern about ownership and operational responsibilities. Mr. Mills explained that he wanted to make sure the objectives did not create expectations that Tri-met could not meet.

## **GOAL 1 Safety**

C. Integrate safety education, enforcement, and emergency services with engineering solutions.

The Committee suggested rewording this to make it clearer that this objective just listed the four "e's" as types of tools that could be used. It was not necessarily calling for integrating them together, although that happened. Perhaps it could say, 'provide' or 'coordinate' instead of 'integrate'.

Mr. Worth asked Committee members to review the vision, goals and objectives again before the next meeting; attend the open house the next day, if possible; and then provide feedback at the next meeting.

## **Modal Plan Maps and CIP Projects**

The Committee discussed the March 20, 2012 memorandum from the Project Management Team: "Technical Memorandum 4.1 – Modal Plans." The document offered technical information related to street classifications and volumes and roadway design standards and typical cross sections. Then it posed the following discussion questions (page 10):

- *Does the City have or desire >5 lane cross sections on any major arterials? Should the option to provide a 3rd travel lane in each direction be removed?*
- *Should providing an 11' parking/bike lane be an option for some roadways as an alternative to providing 6' bike lanes OR 8' parking lanes?*
- *Should the designs for minor arterials and major collectors be more differentiated?*
- *Have "reduced width" local street cross sections developed since the 1997 TSP been well received? Discuss performance with emergency service providers and garbage/recycling service providers.*
- *Should shared lane markings, buffered bike lanes, or other bicycle treatments be addressed in the design standards?*

The staff advised the city's current standards allowed up to six travel lanes (3 in each direction) plus turn lanes, so there could be a 7-lane cross section. Such a road had never been built in Lake Oswego. The staff asked if the committee would ever want to see that kind of road in Lake Oswego. If not, it likely should be removed as an option. They clarified 'travel lanes' meant vehicle lanes, not bike lanes. The consultant advised that adding more lanes might attract more traffic to that particular roadway. The group observed that wider roads might be counter to the vision because they made it harder for pedestrians to cross and they might attract more pass-through traffic. They did not anticipate that such a wide road it would never happen in Lake Oswego. They did not hear the community calling for it. County Club and Boones Ferry Road would never be that wide. Most of the roads were constrained by the right-of-way. The consultant related that Hillsboro had been expanding Cornell Road to as many as eight lanes, but that had not solved their congestion problem. He said designing for such a large capacity was designing for about an hour in the morning and an hour in the evening. The rest of the day that amount of capacity was not needed. It was a lot of money to spend for a couple of hours a day. Ms. Rooney advised that Kruse Way currently featured four activity lanes

plus turn lanes. If the area became a fully loaded, denser, employment area it might warrant a six lane cross section. She doubted the city would want that. Ms. Flye advised the alternative to expanding the roadway would be to refine the signal corridor. The consultants asked the Committee to continue to think about this.

The group then considered how the design standards should address bicycle facilities. The current TSP did not address them. A committee member related that ODOT's design standards included standards related to bicycle facilities. It also encouraged them. It referred to Portland's unique experiments for bike facilities. Lake Oswego's TSP could refer to the ODOT plan. Ms. Rooney hoped options would be laid out in the TSP so the staff would be able to show them to developers who were required to make frontage improvements.

The consultants asked the group to read and think about Local Street Connections and Access Management (see page 11).

The document discussed the Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan (starting on page 13). It contained the Sidewalk Inventory map and a map of existing Bicycle Facilities. It asked the following questions (see page 19):

- *Are on-street parking lanes and bike lanes currently provided on any streets within the City? Is there desire to accommodate both facilities on some streets in the future?*
- *Where are "shared roadway" facilities currently located (or where were they proposed in the 1997 TSP)?*
- *Does LO have a bike parking requirement in their code?*
- *Should the TSP update incorporate more innovative bicycle facilities such as buffered bike lanes, cycle tracks, or bike boulevards?*

The consultants clarified that a 'buffered bike lane' or a 'cycle track' was where the bike lane was separated from the vehicle lane by a physical divider, not just a paint stripe. Mr. Sin confirmed the code already contained a bike parking requirement. Another committee member saw a need for more bike parking at some of the larger stores in the community. Mr. Sin clarified that the Downtown Parking Plan was only about vehicle parking. Ms. Weigel suggested the committee could look at the existing requirements and determine if they were adequate.

#### *Planned Transportation Projects*

The memorandum contained a table that listed the projects that were currently in the CIP and indicated whether they were funded or unfunded (see page 33). The staff handed out a better map than the one in the packet that indicated where any project that was proposed in a city or neighborhood plan was located. A larger version of the map was posted on the wall. The consultants led the group in an exercise in which each committee member was given colored dots to place on the map to indicate projects they believed the City should prioritize. The consultants advised that the committee would continue to refer to the maps during future meetings. They would look at existing facilities, identify the gaps and deficiencies, and look at how the projects that were on the list could address them. They noticed places where the dots seemed to be clustered: Project 117 – Bike lane on Boones Ferry Road; Project 74 – the Six Corners intersection on Country Club; and Project 49 - a paving project.

When asked if projects had already been prioritized, Ms. Rooney related they were prioritized on different Parks, Engineering and Planning lists. Staff's goal was to pull all the projects together from all the lists and put them into one, prioritized, list. It would be in the next CIP. Councilor Gudman added that the Council desired to have all the projects on one prioritized list.

#### **Preliminary Funding Forecast**

The packet contained a Preliminary Funding Forecast. It was color-coded to show which projects were funded and unfunded. Ms. Rooney advised this did not show all of the projects that would be on the comprehensive list staff was working on. Mr. Worth related that open house participants would be provided with the information so they would gain an appreciation of where the money came from and

how much it cost to do transportation projects. A pie chart illustrated Street Fund revenue sources: the Street Maintenance Fee (billed in utility bills - 50%); fuel tax and vehicle licensing fees (state revenue sharing based on population – 40%); and franchise fees (PGE paid for the right to have their utility in the public right-of-way). Another pie chart illustrated how the money was spent each year.

The committee wanted to know how Lake Oswego compared with other cities and what the value of the total pie was. Mr. Worth recalled Lake Oswego was fourth or fifth highest of the nine or ten cities in the region. Total Street Fund revenue was typically \$5 million to \$5.1 million per year. The most recent forecast showed spending of \$5.2 million to \$5.3 million a year. After spending 35% of it on operations; 41% of it on repaving; 17% on other maintenance (like replacing signs and striping streets) there was 7% left for other improvements (bike lanes, sidewalks, etc. on the project list). Tri-Met, ODOT and Clackamas County might spend money on facilities they owned in the city but not on city-owned roadways.

The consultants listed the cost of different types of projects. The estimates assumed the projects were all done in the existing public right-of-way and the City would not have to buy additional right-of-way.

- Striping a bike lane cost about \$5 per lineal foot, or \$25,000 a mile.
- An 8' wide, asphalt, shared use path cost \$50 a lineal foot.
- A six-foot wide sidewalk with curb and gutter cost just under \$100 per lineal foot.
- Widening a road by six feet for a bike lane and striping it was almost \$150 per lineal foot.
- Widening a road to add another 12-foot vehicle travel lane cost almost \$300 per lineal foot.

The consultants wanted to know if the group felt open house participants would find the information understandable and useful. The committee observed there was a deficit every year and that was not sustainable. Ms. Rooney agreed. She related the city was trying to address the problem through five year planning. State revenue sharing would be quite flat for the next five years. Ms. Curtis suggested showing people a chart that illustrated gas tax revenue was doing down. It was not indexed to inflation and vehicles were getting better mileage. Eventually the issue of how to finance the transportation system would have to be discussed. For the first time in ODOT's history its CIP only had maintenance projects in it. There were no projects to provide new or expanded capacity.

### **Plan for Connected Community Open House**

Ms. Weigel described the materials people would be provided with and how participants would rotate into and out of each of eight stations. They would participate in a dots on the map exercise. The staff planned to give the committee an overview at the next committee meeting.

### **Public Comment**

Skip Ormsby, Chair of the Birdshill CPO/Neighborhood Association, announced the group was hosting a panel discussion on the topic of road tolling the following week. He invited committee members to contact him via his email address [bhrdtolls@gmail.com](mailto:bhrdtolls@gmail.com) for more information. The Committee's ODOT representative clarified that ODOT was putting together a draft policy on tolling, but had not proposed actually doing any tolling. She asked if Ms. Weigel could circulate the draft policy to the committee members. Mr. Ormsby invited anyone to contact him via email.

A representative for the Forest Hills Homeowners Association, wanted to know if the committee would address transit parking at the Safeway store in downtown Lake Oswego. Currently there were no parking facilities there for transit-users bikes or vehicles. That parking got shoved into the neighborhood.

Mr. Sin advised the Downtown Parking Plan focused on short term solutions, but the Plan acknowledged there was an issue related to transit and employee parking that should be addressed over the longer term. The Comprehensive Plan update process would consider transportation related issues.

**TSPAC COMMENTS**

None

**ADJOURNMENT**

The next meeting was scheduled on May 9, 2012. There being no other business Vice Chair Fahey adjourned the meeting at approximately 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Nancy Flye  
Traffic Engineer Technician

H:\TAB\TABMinutes\April 11, 2012

Draft