

**Meeting Summary  
Milwaukie TSP Update  
Advisory Committee Meeting #3**

**Meeting Overview**

The third meeting of the Advisory Committee (AC) for the Milwaukie Transportation System Plan Update was held on May 16, 2007 from 4:30pm – 6:30pm at the Milwaukie Masonic Lodge.

The purpose of the meeting was to prepare AC members for the next two meetings so that they will be informed decisions-makers during the Alternatives Analysis phase of the project. This involved providing information about the traffic modeling process and key future conditions and problem areas. AC members were also asked to review, discuss, and advise project staff on the proposed project evaluation approach.

The meeting was attended by 21 AC and 7 staff members (see attached attendance list).

**Agenda**

4:30	Welcome & Staff Introductions	Jamie Damon
4:35	Purpose of Meeting	Katie Mangle
4:45	Public Involvement Update	Katie Mangle
5:00	Future Conditions	Carl Springer
5:40	Proposed Project Evaluation Approach	Katie Mangle/Committee
6:20	Next Steps and Announcements	Jamie Damon/Katie Mangle
6:30	Close	

**Introductions**

Jamie welcomed everyone to the third meeting and went through the meeting agenda.

**Purpose of Meeting and Project Update**

Katie gave a project update to AC members. She explained that the next phase of TSP work is to develop plans (e.g. master bicycle plan) and alternatives. She briefly described the status of each working group and workshop's progress.

**Future Conditions**

Carl Springer presented the travel forecasting/modeling process and discussed anticipated growth data for Milwaukie. The Future Forecasting Process is Chapter 4 of the Transportation System Plan. The purpose of the chapter is to describe the forecasting process and how land use changes and growth in and outside of Milwaukie influence travel to, through, and within Milwaukie.

There were several questions and comments during Carl's presentation.

Q: Where did the data for the projected number of Milwaukie employees come? Is this census data?

A: This data came from regional population forecasts not the census.

Q: Do you assume all buildable land is built out by 2030?

A: No. It is how much we expect to be built out by 2030

Comment: It is worth noting that the Damascus area is not growing at the rate that was anticipated.

Q: What time of day is the system at capacity?

A: P.M. peak hour is a good indicator of the capacity of the system

Comment: The Harmony Road Project is not a done deal

Q: How is the model calibrated for errors?

A: The regional model does a good job on the regional system and not such a good job on local streets. We correct the output for the local system in the regional model. This helps the regional model make better forecasts

Comment: How do we factor in the trend of gas prices going up and auto use going down?

Comment: How do we calibrate the model to account for more people living and working locally as opposed to driving greater distances for work?

Comment: The State looked at the issue of increased gas prices to project trends. It showed that as gas prices rose, people moved closer to centers and used transit more.

### **Project Evaluation Discussion**

Katie presented the AC with a list of project evaluation questions and asked them for their comments. Each table had a small group discussion (approximately 15 minutes) followed by a report by each small group to the larger group.

#### Group 1:

Looks like a good approach.

Is it too subjective?

Projects already meet criteria to be on the list.

How will evaluation “Yes, No, Maybe” be weighted?

Maybe “points” for each answer (Y,N,M) and average multiple comments.

Evaluation questions need to reflect goals.

How do you know when you meet the goal?

Maybe need more questions per goal, at least for Livability goal!

Livability likely contains all the other goals.

The word “livability” needs to be in an evaluation question. Maybe define it more . . . biggest challenge is to define “livability.”

#### Group2:

Is using goals a good approach to screening/prioritizing?

More questions related to policies...perhaps: How many policies met under each goal?

Say: Preserving urban trees more so than sidewalks “more healthy and whole” for Goal 1.

Be more specific about projects and policies.  
Livability question was too nebulous.  
Quantify which policies met by each project, e.g. only hit one policy not as good at hitting all 5.  
Evaluation process needs to have more validity, be more defensible.  
Need legs to support the ball...otherwise it can roll anywhere.  
Not scientific enough for “60% of Goal 1 met” but helps for prioritization.  
When comparing projects; furthering policies with investments.  
Weighting policies? Some will weigh higher than others.

### Group 3

It's a start; one way to evaluate projects.  
Need to consider: Do some projects have more value than others?  
Table provides useful information to compare projects to the goals.  
Maybe weight the goals to help identify project priorities.  
Apply the functional classification to the system first to help guide decisions needed for the streets.  
Perhaps link to other projects; how projects help implement other projects in the city/region.  
Projects that meet multiple goals and are cost effective should rise to the top.  
If the table approach is used how do we evaluate the results?  
How will “Yes” “No” “Maybe” answers be used?  
Potentially “prescreen” projects to see which ones meet multiple goals.

### **Next Steps**

- **The next meeting is June 13, 4:30 – 6:30 p.m.**
- **Remember to attend upcoming Workshops and Working Group meetings.**
- **The next two meetings will focus on Alternatives Analysis.**

### **AC Members Present**

David	Aschenbrenner
Kelly	Carlisle
Greg	Chaimov
Mace	Childs
Scott	Churchill
Gail	Curtis
Shari	Gilevich
Neil	Hankerson
Ben	Horner-Johnson
Gary	Hunt
Paul	Klein
Bill	Lake
Dolly	Macken-Hambright
John	Mermin
Todd	Mobley
Young	Park
Dion	Shepard
Charlie	Stephens
John	Trumbull
Mike	Wells
Julie	Wisner