

**Meeting Summary  
Milwaukie TSP Update  
Advisory Committee Meeting #2**

**Meeting Overview**

The second meeting of the Advisory Committee for the Milwaukie Transportation System Plan Update was held on March 21, 2007 from 4:30pm – 6:30pm at the Milwaukie Masonic Lodge.

The purpose of the meeting was to update the committee on the technical work completed-to-date; have a focused discussion on the draft Goals and Policies; and hear a presentation on key findings from the existing conditions analysis.

The meeting was attended by 30 people including five members of the public and four children

**Agenda**

4:30	Welcome and introduction of new members	Jamie Damon
	Purpose of meeting and agenda review	Jamie Damon
	Project Update	Katie Mangle
	Presentation on updated Goals and Policies	Katie Mangle
	Round Table Discussion: suggested changes to Goals	All
	Key Findings from the Existing Conditions analysis	Carl Springer
	Next steps	Jamie Damon/ Committee
6:30	Close	

**Introductions, Meeting Purpose, and Agenda Review**

Project team members, including the city staff and the consultant team, introduced themselves and their role in the project. New committee members each introduced themselves and the community, agency, or area of interest they were representing.

Jamie reminded the group of the protocols developed at meeting #1. Jamie also welcomed members of the public at the “Public Table” and encouraged them to participate in the discussions.

A member of the committee had a comment about the meeting summary from Advisory Committee (AC) meeting #1, page 11. The staff response to the comment regarding “Increased density is not the best solution to transit” did not seem to relate to the comment, did it even warrant a response? Also on page 12, it was noted that the staff response to the comment related to river transit (Goal 1, Objective 4) did not include that there was no resolution to the exploration of river transit as part of the South Corridor Alternatives Analysis in 2003.

## **Project Update**

Katie gave the following update:

- The Working Group/Workshop kickoff meeting was held on February 24, 2007 and was attended by approximately 80 people.
- Working Group and Workshop meetings are scheduled for Bike/Ped on March 24; Transit on April 7; Parking on April 12; and Freight on April 13. Meetings will be scheduled soon for Traffic and Street Design.
- All meeting dates and information are posted on the City’s website.
- The web survey will be closing at the end of this week and all AC members are encouraged to respond. As of this meeting, 149 responses have been received.
- The next phase of technical work is the Future Conditions analysis.

## **Goals and Policies Presentation**

Katie presented the updated goals and policies in a power point slide show to help the AC see how their input has been incorporated. Katie emphasized that the work of the AC is to focus on the goals, as this will provide important direction to the Working Groups and Workshops. The Working Groups and Workshops will focus on the policies and action items. A member of the AC asked if the goals were in priority order, Katie said they are not.

## **Goals Discussion**

Jamie led the group through a table and large group discussion to solicit suggested changes to the goals. The group began with a 25-minute discussion at their tables using a worksheet. The work of each table group was to edit each goal and reach a table consensus on what they would recommend and why. Each table group was asked to appoint a “scribe” to capture the group’s input on the worksheet and a “reporter” to report the group’s consensus to the full group. Jamie noted that each table group had a resource person to assist with the discussion. At the end of the 25-minute table work sessions, Jamie asked each group to do a “green sheet consensus” whereby each group simultaneously would hold up a green sheet of paper if their table group had no changes to the proposed goal as written on the worksheet. Those table groups without a green sheet in the air were asked to share their revisions. The combined group’s revisions are as follows. The red indicates new proposed language; the numbers in red indicate a proposed new order of the goals; crossed-out words are suggestions for removal; and bulleted points contain more general comments related to that goal.

**Goal 1 (4) :** Plan, develop and maintain a ~~versatile balanced~~ transportation system that is ~~cost effective and~~ provides ~~efficient alternative (or “diverse”)~~ travel choices. ~~and reduces the number of trips by single-occupant vehicles.~~

- Or have latter part of sentence read “...travel choices allowing people to reduce the number of single occupant vehicles.
- Define “transportation system” and “travel choices” in the policies.

**Goal 2 (7) :** Develop and maintain a transportation system that reduces ~~travel time (or distance)~~ the length of travel and limits ~~(or “manages”)~~ congestion.

- Possibly add language about trip reduction here?
- Possibly combine with Goal 3?
- Do not combine 2 and 3!

**Goal 3 (2) :** Develop and maintain a transportation system that is safe and crime free transportation system.

- Elaborate what we mean by safety in the policies.
- Be sure to include sidewalks, speed cushions, speed control, and reducing transportation corridor crime in policies.
- Include how street design effects public safety in the policies.

**Goal 4 (1) :** Design and construct transportation facilities in a manner that ~~enhances~~ ~~integrates well into~~ the Livability of Milwaukie’s ~~established neighborhoods and business community.~~

- “Enhances” is a fuzzy word – it is too vague.
- Many ways to define livability: social network, low traffic volumes on local streets, safe streets, goods and services readily available, lack of congestion, lack of noise, and lack of cut through traffic.
- “Enhances” is good because if it doesn’t improve it, why do it?

**Goal 5 (9) :** Promote the development of Milwaukie, ~~(or, “the North Clackamas region”),~~ regional, ~~the~~ and state, ~~and the national~~ economies through the efficient movement of people, goods, services, and ~~the distribution of~~ information ~~in a safe manner.~~

- It seems pretty lofty to include the national economy!
- Safety is addressed in Goal 3 – don’t mix.

**Goal 6:** Establish and maintain a ~~context sensitive~~ set of transportation design and development regulations **in a scale appropriate to the local area served (or, “that is sensitive to local conditions”)**.

- Is this addressed in the livability goal? Do we even need this?
- Perhaps move the “design and development regulations up front to be more clear what the purpose of this goal is.
- “Context sensitive” is jargon – doesn’t mean anything to lay people
- This goal is not clear

**Goal 7 (5):** Provide a **sustainable** transportation system that meets present needs while facilitating the needs of ~~without compromising the ability of future generations. to meet their needs.~~

- Concerned that this goal is too abstract, difficult to measure.
- Be sure to add promoting greener street design methods in the policies
- Choices must “do no harm” to the future
- Consider combining 7 and 9

**Goal 8:** Develop a transportation system that is consistent with the City’s Comprehensive Plan **and that coordinates with county, adopted** state and regional plans.

- Do we need to say something about Metro or state mandates?
- Where does land use fit? Jobs/housing balance and open space?

**Goal 9 (3):** Efficiently **allocate** use funding sources to implement recommended transportation system improvement projects ~~recommended in the TSP.~~

- How do we adapt to long term changes? This could be included into Goal 9

**Goal 10:** **Pursue additional and creative funding sources to implement transportation system plan improvement projects.**

- Additional sources could include developer service fees.

In addition, several groups suggested that if the goals are not in priority order, please make explicit in the preamble of the document.

## Existing Conditions

Carl presented the key findings from the Existing Conditions analysis. The Existing Conditions is Chapter 3 of the Transportation System Plan. The purpose of the chapter is to document the existing transportation facilities in the study area, as well as provide a basis of knowledge and a benchmark that is essential for the future assessment of transportation performance in the City relative to desired policies. The group reviewed the draft Chapter 3 and had the following comments:

- The intersection of Linwood, Harmony, and Railroad is a very important intersection to analyze.
- There are a few inaccuracies in the sidewalk inventory.
- The table 3-8 SPIS Ratings, intersection number 4, 19 and 18 don't correspond with the study intersections.
- What does 'AADT' mean? *Staff Response: Average Annual Daily Traffic*
- Will there be more traffic counts taken because there are none on Railroad Ave. *Staff Response: We took counts on streets that turn off of Railroad Ave.*
- Would like to see a graphical representation of the accident data and larger dots.
- Would like to have the appendix available.

Katie encouraged the group to get additional comments to her by April 6.

## Next Steps

- **The next meeting of the AC is May 16, 4:30 - 6:30 p.m.**
- **Remember to attend the upcoming Workshops and Working Group meetings in which you are interested.**
- **The revised goals will be e-mailed to the group.**
- **The next meeting will focus on the Future Conditions analysis and the web survey results.**