



AGENDA

MILWAUKIE PLANNING COMMISSION
Tuesday, September 10, 2013, 6:30 PM

MILWAUKIE CITY HALL
10722 SE MAIN STREET

- 1.0 Call to Order - Procedural Matters**
- 2.0 Planning Commission Minutes** – Motion Needed
- 3.0 Information Items**
- 4.0 Audience Participation** – This is an opportunity for the public to comment on any item not on the agenda
- 5.0 Public Hearings** – Public hearings will follow the procedure listed on reverse
 - 5.1 Summary: Transportation System Plan (TSP) Update
Applicant: City of Milwaukie
File: CPA-13-03
Staff: Brett Kelper
- 6.0 Worksession Items**
- 7.0 Planning Department Other Business/Updates**
- 8.0 Planning Commission Discussion Items** – This is an opportunity for comment or discussion for items not on the agenda.
- 9.0 Forecast for Future Meetings:**
 - September 24, 2013
 - 1. Public Hearing: CPA-13-03 Transportation System Plan (TSP) Update
continued
 - October 8, 2013
 - 1. Public Hearing: AP-13-01 Pendleton Woolen Mills Parking Appeal
 - 2. Worksession: Murals Project Code *tentative*

Milwaukie Planning Commission Statement

The Planning Commission serves as an advisory body to, and a resource for, the City Council in land use matters. In this capacity, the mission of the Planning Commission is to articulate the Community's values and commitment to socially and environmentally responsible uses of its resources as reflected in the Comprehensive Plan

1. **PROCEDURAL MATTERS.** If you wish to speak at this meeting, please fill out a yellow card and give to planning staff. Please turn off all personal communication devices during meeting. For background information on agenda items, call the Planning Department at 503-786-7600 or email planning@ci.milwaukie.or.us. Thank You.
2. **PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES.** Approved PC Minutes can be found on the City website at www.cityofmilwaukie.org
3. **CITY COUNCIL MINUTES** City Council Minutes can be found on the City website at www.cityofmilwaukie.org
4. **FORECAST FOR FUTURE MEETING.** These items are tentatively scheduled, but may be rescheduled prior to the meeting date. Please contact staff with any questions you may have.
5. **TIME LIMIT POLICY.** The Commission intends to end each meeting by 10:00pm. The Planning Commission will pause discussion of agenda items at 9:45pm to discuss whether to continue the agenda item to a future date or finish the agenda item.

Public Hearing Procedure

Those who wish to testify should come to the front podium, state his or her name and address for the record, and remain at the podium until the Chairperson has asked if there are any questions from the Commissioners.

1. **STAFF REPORT.** Each hearing starts with a brief review of the staff report by staff. The report lists the criteria for the land use action being considered, as well as a recommended decision with reasons for that recommendation.
2. **CORRESPONDENCE.** Staff will report any verbal or written correspondence that has been received since the Commission was presented with its meeting packet.
3. **APPLICANT'S PRESENTATION.**
4. **PUBLIC TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT.** Testimony from those in favor of the application.
5. **NEUTRAL PUBLIC TESTIMONY.** Comments or questions from interested persons who are neither in favor of nor opposed to the application.
6. **PUBLIC TESTIMONY IN OPPOSITION.** Testimony from those in opposition to the application.
7. **QUESTIONS FROM COMMISSIONERS.** The commission will have the opportunity to ask for clarification from staff, the applicant, or those who have already testified.
8. **REBUTTAL TESTIMONY FROM APPLICANT.** After all public testimony, the commission will take rebuttal testimony from the applicant.
9. **CLOSING OF PUBLIC HEARING.** The Chairperson will close the public portion of the hearing. The Commission will then enter into deliberation. From this point in the hearing the Commission will not receive any additional testimony from the audience, but may ask questions of anyone who has testified.
10. **COMMISSION DISCUSSION AND ACTION.** It is the Commission's intention to make a decision this evening on each issue on the agenda. Planning Commission decisions may be appealed to the City Council. If you wish to appeal a decision, please contact the Planning Department for information on the procedures and fees involved.
11. **MEETING CONTINUANCE.** Prior to the close of the first public hearing, *any person* may request an opportunity to present additional information at another time. If there is such a request, the Planning Commission will either continue the public hearing to a date certain, or leave the record open for at least seven days for additional written evidence, argument, or testimony. The Planning Commission may ask the applicant to consider granting an extension of the 120-day time period for making a decision if a delay in making a decision could impact the ability of the City to take final action on the application, including resolution of all local appeals.

The City of Milwaukie will make reasonable accommodation for people with disabilities. Please notify us no less than five (5) business days prior to the meeting.

Milwaukie Planning Commission:

Lisa Batey, Chair
Clare Fuchs, Vice Chair
Scott Barbur
Sine Bone
Shaun Lowcock
Wilda Parks
Gabe Storm

Planning Department Staff:

Steve Butler, Planning Director
Ryan Marquardt, Senior Planner
Li Alligood, Associate Planner
Brett Kelter, Associate Planner
Alicia Martin, Administrative Specialist II



MILWAUKIE

Dogwood City of the West

To: Planning Commission

Through: Stephen Butler, Planning Director

From: Brett Kelter, Associate Planner

Date: September 3, 2013, for September 10, 2013, Public Hearing

Subject: File #: CPA-13-03 2013 Transportation System Plan (TSP) Update

Applicant: City of Milwaukie

ACTION REQUESTED

Recommend that City Council approve the proposed amendments to the Milwaukie Transportation System Plan (TSP), File # CPA-13-03, with the proposed ordinance and recommended findings in support of approval (see Attachment 1 and Exhibit A).

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The City's Transportation System Plan (TSP) is an ancillary document to the Milwaukie Comprehensive Plan. The TSP implements the State Transportation Planning Rule's requirement for local governments to complete long-range multi-modal transportation plans. The City's first TSP was adopted in 1997, with an extensive update in 2007.

State law requires the City's TSP to be consistent with Metro's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The current RTP, most recently updated in 2010, includes several new concepts and standards and has a forecasting horizon of 2035 (the current TSP has a forecasting horizon of 2030). The City has until December 31, 2013, to demonstrate that the TSP is consistent with Metro's 2035 RTP.

A. History of Prior Related Actions and Discussions

- **September 5, 2013:** Public meeting to discuss draft of updated TSP document
- **August 27, 2013:** Staff briefing to Planning Commission in preparation for public hearing
- **July 23, 2013:** Staff briefing to Planning Commission on status of TSP Update project
- **June 3, 2013:** Public meeting to discuss prioritization of TSP projects

- **April 17, 2013:** Open House event to kick off public engagement process
- **February 12, 2013:** Staff briefing to Commission, presenting drafts of specific TSP chapters
- **November 2012:** Staff briefing to Commission on nature and scope of proposed TSP update project
- **December 2011:** Metro notification of requirement for TSP compliance with 2035 RTP
- **December 2007:** Adoption of revised TSP (Ord. #1975, Land Use Files CPA-07-01, ZA-07-01)
- **July 1997:** Adoption of first TSP (Ordinance #1820, File CPA-96-01)

B. Project Scope and Approach

The primary motivation for updating the TSP at this time comes from the State's requirement that jurisdictions in the Metro region maintain consistency between their TSPs and the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). At the beginning of this update project, staff assessed the TSP with respect to the new requirements of Metro's 2035 RTP and concluded that the 2007 TSP already addresses many of the new requirements. However, there are a few issues that need some minor adjustment. Throughout the project work to date, staff has operated with the philosophy that the new Metro requirements can be addressed with a "light touch" approach to updating the TSP. Therefore, the principal components of the 2013 TSP Update have included the following:

- Adjust the TSP's planning horizon year from 2030 to 2035
- Confirm that the master plans for the various modes (i.e., pedestrian, bicycle, public transit, etc.) will help the region move toward meeting its performance targets for 2035, including reductions in congestion, percentage of single-occupancy vehicle trips, and vehicle-miles traveled per capita
- Emphasize pedestrian and bicycle connectivity to transit stops
- Update existing maps, tables, and text to reflect current conditions
- Add the known PMLR alignment to master plan maps
- Remove completed projects and update project descriptions
- Reassess project priorities and update the funding forecast for project implementation

If a more thorough update had been necessary, the City would have needed to budget more money and staff time, and a more far-reaching public involvement component would have been developed. In March 2013, City Council did direct staff to expand the public engagement process, particularly for the reassessment of project priorities. Staff held a public Open House event on April 17, followed by a public meeting on June 3, to provide information about the update project and to solicit specific thoughts and comments about transportation priorities for the City.

Although it may be tempting to delve more deeply into the intricacies and details of complex transportation issues, staff wishes to emphasize the limited project scope and the "light touch" approach, especially now that the City is entering the adoption stage of the TSP Update process.

REVIEW OF THE TSP DOCUMENT AND MAKING A RECOMMENDATION

A. TSP Structure

The 2007 TSP is comprised of 14 chapters, with an appendix that includes supplemental information.

Chapters 1-4 are introductory and set the stage for the information presented in the rest of the document:

- Chapter 1 Executive Summary
- Chapter 2 Goals and Policies
- Chapter 3 Existing Conditions
- Chapter 4 Future Forecasting Process

Chapters 5-9 address 5 basic modes of the transportation system:

- Chapter 5 Pedestrian Element
- Chapter 6 Bicycle Element
- Chapter 7 Public Transit Element
- Chapter 8 Auto Street Network Element
- Chapter 9 Freight Element

Chapters 10-12 examine specific issues related to the functioning of the transportation system:

- Chapter 10 Street Design Element
- Chapter 11 Neighborhood Traffic Management Element
- Chapter 12 Downtown Parking

Finally, Chapters 13 and 14 focus on implementation of the plan:

- Chapter 13 Funding and Implementation Plan
- Chapter 14 Transportation Planning Rule Implementation

The following appendices provide additional explanatory materials and/or data:

- Appendix A Public Involvement Summary
- Appendix B Prioritized Master Plan Project List
- Appendix C Conceptual Design Options
- Appendix D Glossary of Technical Terms
- Appendix E Levels of Service (LOS) Descriptions
- Appendix F Traffic Data

B. Proposed Amendments to TSP

Attachment 2 of this staff report provides a summary of the proposed 2013 TSP Update amendments. Some revisions are suggested for almost every chapter, though the proposed amendments are more substantial for some chapters than others.

For example, very few or no changes are proposed to Chapters 1, 2, 10, 11, and 14. Chapter 1 is a synopsis of the entire document and summarizes key recommendations, which are similar to those from 2007. Chapter 2 outlines the City's goals and policies for transportation, which remain essentially unchanged from the 2007 update. Chapter 10 provides basic information about street design options, but more detail and guidance can be found in the City's Public Works Standards and no changes are proposed in this part of the TSP. Chapter 11 presents principles and tools for neighborhood traffic management, none of which have changed since 2007. And Chapter 14 is a placeholder for any proposed changes to the zoning code or

comprehensive plan that are necessary for the City to show compliance with the State's Transportation Planning Rule. Metro has indicated that the proposed amendments to the TSP alone will be adequate at this point in time, however, so no additional amendments to the zoning code or comprehensive plan are proposed.

Chapter 3 is being revised to reflect current conditions, so proposed changes are primarily factual in nature. Chapter 4, which involves traffic demand models and forecasts, has been updated to shift the TSP's forecast horizon from the year 2030 to 2035 and so also represents a type of "factual" change (based on simply running the models).

The most substantial changes being proposed are those in relation to Chapters 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, and 13. The project lists for all modes have been reviewed and updated in response to public comments and new understandings of current needs. See Attachment 3 for a summary of the proposed changes to project priorities.

CONCLUSIONS

Staff's recommendation to the Planning Commission is as follows:

- *Vote to recommend that City Council adopt the proposed amendments to the Transportation System Plan and related exhibits.*

Given the size, complexity, and detail of the Transportation System Plan (TSP), staff is prepared to collect and discuss additional suggestions for specific adjustments to the draft amendments, based on commissioner and public comment. If refinement is needed, the Commission should advise staff of specific requested changes to the proposal. Once the Commission feels that all needed refinements have been identified, the group should vote to make a recommendation to Council.

CODE AUTHORITY AND DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

The proposed amendments are subject to the following provisions of the Milwaukie Zoning Ordinance, which is Title 19 of the Milwaukie Municipal Code (MMC), and the Milwaukie Comprehensive Plan (MCP):

- MMC 19.902 Amendments to Maps and Ordinances
- MMC 19.1008 Type V (Legislative) Review
- MCP Chapter 2 Plan Review and Amendment Process, Objective #1 Amending the Plan
- MCP Chapter 5 Transportation, Public Facilities, and Energy Conservation

The proposed amendments are subject to legislative review, which requires both the Planning Commission and City Council to consider whether the proposal complies with the code sections shown above. For legislative actions, the Planning Commission assesses the application against the review criteria, evaluates testimony and evidence received at a public hearing, and makes a recommendation to City Council. City Council will hold another public hearing to consider the Commission's recommendation, evaluate any additional testimony and evidence, and make the final decision on the proposal.

The Planning Commission has the following decision-making options:

1. Forward a recommendation to City Council to approve the proposed amendments and ordinance as proposed.
2. Forward a recommendation to City Council to approve the proposed amendments and ordinance with modifications.
3. Continue the hearing to further evaluate the proposed amendments and ordinance.
4. Deny the proposed amendments and ordinance. This would have the effect of leaving the TSP inconsistent with Metro's 2035 RTP.

Recommendation Deadline

Because this application is a legislative proposal, there is no deadline by which the City must make a final decision on the application. However, Metro has given the City a deadline of December 31, 2013, to demonstrate that the TSP is consistent with Metro's 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

There is some flexibility in the project schedule at this point, though it is limited if the City is to meet the December 31st deadline for Metro compliance. An additional Planning Commission meeting is possible if deemed necessary, but the result would be that the remaining timeline will become even tighter. Beyond the Planning Commission meeting on September 10, the adoption process would continue with the following timeline:

- **September 24, 2013:** Second meeting by Planning Commission (if necessary)
- **October 1, 2013:** Pre-adoption briefing to City Council (work session)
- **October 15 & November 5, 2013 (tentative):** Adoption hearings by City Council
- **December 31, 2013:** Deadline for demonstrating compliance with Metro's 2035 RTP

COMMENTS

Notice of the proposed legislative changes was posted at City Hall, Ledding Library, and the City's Public Works office on Johnson Creek Boulevard, as well as online at the City's website. A draft of the proposed amendments to the TSP was posted online at the City's website, with hard copies made available to the City's various Neighborhood District Associations (NDAs). The following is a summary of the comments received by the City since the proposed amendments were made available for public review on August 20. See Attachment 4 for further details.

- **Linda Hedges, Secretary and Land Use Committee member, Hector Campbell NDA:** Question about whether there should be a project to make seismic upgrades to local bridges. Note that there was never an agreement by NDA leaders to provide matching NDA funds to the Walk Safely Milwaukie Program, listed as a project in Chapter 11 (Neighborhood Traffic Management).

Staff Response: ODOT makes regular inspections of the various bridges in Milwaukie and will identify issues or concerns that can be added as specific projects as needed. A correction to the Walk Safely Milwaukie Program project listing will be made, removing the NDA matching funds language as suggested.

- **Pat Russell, resident of unincorporated Milwaukie (15989 SE Bilquist Circle):**
Comments about various transportation projects in Clackamas County related to the Harmony Rd corridor, Sunnybrook Extension, and Three Creeks area.

Staff Response: The County is in the process of updating its TSP, for which these comments are more appropriate.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachments are provided as indicated by the checked boxes. All material is available for viewing upon request.

	PC Packet	Public Copies	E- Packet
1. Draft Ordinance	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Exhibit A: Recommended Findings in Support of Approval – <i>to be provided in a supplemental or subsequent packet</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Exhibit B: Proposed Amendments to Transportation System Plan (Underline/Strikeout Version) – <i>already distributed to PC & public</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Explanation of Proposed TSP Amendments	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. Proposed Changes to Project Priorities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. Public Comments	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Key:

PC Packet = paper materials provided to Planning Commission 7 days prior to the meeting.

Public Copies = paper copies of the packet available for review at City facilities and at the Planning Commission meeting.

E-Packet = packet materials available online at <http://www.milwaukieoregon.gov/planning/planning-commission-88>.

ORDINANCE NO. _____

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MILWAUKIE, OREGON, AMENDING THE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN, AN ANCILLARY DOCUMENT OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, TO MAINTAIN COMPLIANCE WITH THE STATE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING RULE AND REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (FILE # CPA-13-03).

WHEREAS, City's Transportation System Plan (TSP) was last updated in 2007, with a forecasting horizon to the year 2030; and

WHEREAS, the most recent Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) was adopted by Metro Council in 2010 and utilizes a forecasting horizon to the year 2035; and

WHEREAS, the State Transportation Planning Rule requires that local jurisdictions maintain their TSPs to be consistent with the applicable RTP; and

WHEREAS, Metro informed the City in December 2011 of the need for the City to demonstrate that its TSP is consistent with the 2035 RTP; and

WHEREAS, all legal and public notices have been provided as required by law, in addition to efforts to educate community members more broadly about the proposal; and

WHEREAS, on September 10, 2013, the Planning Commission opened a public hearing on the proposed amendments and, on September 24, 2013, approved a motion to recommend that City Council adopt the amendments; and

WHEREAS, the City Council opened a public hearing on October 15, 2013, and finds that the proposed amendments are in the public interest of the City of Milwaukie and will ensure that the TSP remains compliant with the 2035 RTP and the State Transportation Planning Rule.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY OF MILWAUKIE DOES ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Findings. Findings of fact in support of the amendments are attached as Exhibit A.

Section 2. Repeal and Replacement. The 2007 Transportation System Plan is repealed and replaced with the new 2013 Transportation System Plan as presented in Exhibit B.

Section 3. Amendments. The Transportation System Plan is amended as described in Exhibit C (strikeout/underline version).

Read the first time on _____, and moved to second reading by _____ vote of the City Council.

Read the second time and adopted by the City Council on _____.

Signed by the Mayor on _____.

Jeremy Ferguson, Mayor

ATTEST:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
Jordan Schrader Ramis PC

Pat DuVal, City Recorder

City Attorney

Document6 (Last revised 2/6/2008)

Explanation of Proposed TSP Amendments

(for public review draft made available August 20, 2013)

GENERAL NOTES

- The current draft is presented in ~~strikeout~~/underline format. The starting point is text and figures/tables from the current (2007) TSP. Text to be deleted is struck out; text to be added is underlined.
- Project lists:
 - Master Plan lists were reorganized to group projects according to priority (High, Medium, or Low).
 - Action Plan lists were amended to include map reference numbers (where applicable) and project costs.
 - Projects that have been completed or that are very near completion have been removed from project lists.
- Project costs:
 - Project costs are order of magnitude estimates. More detailed cost estimates will be developed as projects mover closer to implementation.
 - Project costs have been adjusted for inflation from 2007 dollars to 2012 dollars, using info from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics for the Consumer Price Index (CPI). New info on the CPI for the first half of 2013 should be available as of mid-August and may be used to further update project costs to 2013 dollars.
 - Project costs were rounded using the following principles: (1) if under \$1 million, round to nearest \$10,000; (2) if over \$1 million, round to nearest \$100,000; (3) if over \$10 million, round to nearest \$1 million); (4) if a cost ends in 5 or higher, round up, if under 5, round down.
- Figures:
 - Two copies were created for every full-page map or chart figure: (1) an **original 2007 figure** with notes that highlight revisions made to the figure, and (2) an **updated 2013 figure** that includes those revisions.
 - Refer to the notated 2007 figure for descriptions of all changes.
 - Refer for the updated 2013 figure for a clear and complete view of the new figure.
 - Some figures received only minor modifications to data, like updated city boundaries or street alignments.
 - The following figures are new to the 2013 version of the TSP:
 - Figure 5-1b Pedestrian Master Plan – Downtown Inset
 - Figures 6-1, 6-2, 6-3, 6-4, 6-6, and 6-7
New images showing different types of bike facilities and traffic calming measures
 - Figure 6-8b Bicycle Master Plan – Downtown Inset
 - Figure 8-2b PM Peak Corridor Capacity Assessment (Volume/Capacity)
 - Figures 13-1, 13-2, and 13-3
Pie charts showing projected revenue, costs, and spending distribution
 - The Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail and the Trolley Trail are represented as existing conditions on all figures. Both will still be under construction when the 2013 TSP revision is published, but the final alignment has been determined.

CHAPTER 1 – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Various sections updated to include the rationale and purpose for the 2013 update of the TSP.
- Most of the key recommendations for each mode remain the same, with a few minor edits.
- Most figures are duplicates of the master plan maps in other chapters and were updated accordingly.

CHAPTER 2 – GOALS AND POLICIES

- No substantial changes are proposed to the goals and policies—only one small addition to Goal 5, Policy a.

CHAPTER 3 – EXISTING CONDITIONS

- Includes adjustments to the text, figures, and tables as needed to accurately portray the current conditions.
- As a result of properties annexing into the city in areas that are poorly served by transit, the portion of Milwaukie land area that is greater than ¼ mile walking distance to the nearest bus stop has increased slightly (from 13% to 15%).
- Some categories of parking types have changed. The long-term on-street category was removed because long-term parking is considered 4 hours or greater, but no on-street parking currently exists that allows parking for more than 4 hours.

CHAPTER 4 – FUTURE FORECASTING PROCESS

- The forecasts in this chapter have been updated to shift the TSP’s forecast horizon from the year 2030 to 2035.

CHAPTER 5 – PEDESTRIAN ELEMENT

- Changes to proposed projects and priorities, influenced by public input and staff assessment, as well as Tacoma Station Area Plan and downtown light rail station area projects.
- Downtown inset map shows more detail.

CHAPTER 6 – BICYCLE ELEMENT

- Changes to proposed projects and priorities, influenced by public input and staff assessment, as well as Tacoma Station Area Plan and downtown light rail station area projects.
- “Bike Boulevard” concept has been renamed “Neighborhood Greenways” to acknowledge the multi-modal benefits of bike boulevard improvements, for traffic calming and pedestrian safety.
- “Cycle Tracks” have been added as a potential facility design for consideration.
- Images of each type of bicycle facility design have been included for clarification.
- Downtown inset map shows more detail.

CHAPTER 7 – PUBLIC TRANSIT ELEMENT

- New proposed bus services, including a Downtown Loop Bus and a Neighborhood Loop Bus.

CHAPTER 8 – STREET NETWORK ELEMENT

- Changed the name of this chapter from “Auto Street Network” to “Street Network” for readability.
- Forecasts in this chapter have been updated to shift the TSP’s forecast horizon from the year 2030 to 2035.
- Figure showing Functional Classifications (Figure 8-1) was moved forward from its former location to the place where it is first referenced in the text. Figure 8-1 was updated to show only existing classifications because there are no proposals to change the classification of any streets.
- Several figures were renumbered for clarification and simplicity.
- Two intersections were added for study since 2007: King/42nd and Monroe/Linwood.

CHAPTER 9 – FREIGHT ELEMENT

- Minor changes to reflect completed or newly proposed projects.

CHAPTER 10 – STREET DESIGN ELEMENT

- No proposed changes.

CHAPTER 11 – NEIGHBORHOOD TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ELEMENT

- Very minor changes to update wording and more accurately portray traffic management process.
- Renamed the “Neighborhood Pedestrian and Traffic Safety Program” as “Walk Safely Milwaukee Program.”

CHAPTER 12 – DOWNTOWN PARKING

- Edited to document changes in downtown parking management practices since 2007:
 - Finance Department responsibility for parking permit program
 - Identification of need for Residential Parking Permit program and steps to implement
- Future projections of parking demand and supply were removed, as they only forecasted to 2013.
- Figure 12 -1 Preferred Parking Locations map was updated for clarity and accuracy.
- Policy recommendations were edited to reflect emphasis on Residential Permit Program and Downtown Parking Management system.
- Removed the following recommendations that have been executed since 2007:
 - Improve/streamline the process for purchasing permits (completed 2007)
 - Strengthen Move-to-Evade enforcement policy (completed 2009)

CHAPTER 13 – FUNDING AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

- A Consolidated Action Plan (Table 13-3) has been added to present all of the projects identified as top priorities from the Action Plan lists for the various modes.
- Within the Prioritized Master Plan Project List (Table 13-4), projects have been reorganized and updated by High-Medium-Low priority and the project costs have been updated to 2012 dollars.

CHAPTER 14 – TRANSPORTATION PLANNING RULE IMPLEMENTATION

- Removed recommended changes to Milwaukie Municipal Code that have been completed.
- No new code changes are proposed as part of the 2013 TSP Update.

APPENDICES

- No changes to Appendices A-E.
- Appendix F (Traffic Data):
 - Metro Model Data Output removed where required by new confidentiality policy (pages F-1 to F-6).
 - Added or replaced new study intersection data as applicable (pages F-61, F-77, F-78, F-121, F-123, F-124).
 - Added 2035 PM Low-Build (Financially Committed) Future Volume Forecasts table (page F-125).
 - Replaced SPIS (Safety Priority Index System) data for ODOT roadways Highway 224 and 99E (pages F-149 to F-154).
- New = Appendix G (NDA Information)
 - In response to public suggestion for information relevant to each Neighborhood District Association (NDA), maps were created to show NDA boundaries on the following master plan figures:
 - Pedestrian Master Plan
 - Bicycle Master Plan
 - Public Transit Master Plan
 - Street Network Master Plan
 - Freight Master Plan

Maps with NDA boundaries can be used to identify all projects that affect a specific neighborhood and facilitate discussion about neighborhood transportation priorities.

Proposed Changes to Project Priorities 2013 TSP Update

During the process of updating the various TSP project lists there were 5 types of possible actions to take on specific projects:

1. **Elevate Project Priority** = Some projects have risen in priority since 2007, based on public comment/suggestion as well as staff's evaluation of how the project fits into the larger transportation system.
2. **Reduce Project Priority** = Some projects have fallen in priority since 2007, based on public comment/suggestion as well as staff's evaluation of how the project fits into the larger transportation system.
3. **Maintain Project Priority (Despite Suggestion)** = For some projects, a change in priority was suggested but, after evaluation by staff, the current priority is proposed to remain unchanged (rationale provided below). These proposals would not normally show up in the strikeout/underline version of the proposed document, so they are outlined in Table 3 for full disclosure.
4. **Add New Project** = New projects were assigned a priority based on any public comment/suggestion as well as staff's evaluation of how the project fits into the larger transportation system.
5. **Remove Project** = Projects that have either been completed since 2007 (or are very close right now) or are no longer deemed necessary to improve the transportation system.

Summary

- Total number of projects listed in 2007 TSP (not including items in Regional Projects list) = 128
- Number of projects with public suggestion to change priority = 47
 - Number of projects recommended to be elevated in priority = 19
 - Number of projects recommended to be reduced in priority = 9
 - Number of projects to maintain same priority despite suggestion = 19
- Number of new projects = 28 (*including 17 TSAP projects*)
- Number of deleted projects = 20

The following 5 tables list the various types of projects described above and provide some rationale for the staff recommendation.

Table 1 – Elevate Project Priority

Project	TSP Chapter(s)	2007 Priority	Public Proposed Priority	Staff Proposal	Rationale for Staff Recommendation
Harmony Rd Sidewalks (Linwood Ave to City Limits)	Pedestrian	Low	Med or High	High	Elevate to High = While there are still many questions to be answered regarding vehicular improvements in this area, the need for sidewalks should be made a priority.
Hwy 224 Intersection Improvements at Oak St	Pedestrian	Low	High	High	Elevate to High = Improvement of crossings of Hwy 224 is critical to improving safety/usability of pedestrian routes.
Hwy 224 Intersection Improvements at Monroe St	Pedestrian	Low	High	High	Elevate to High = Improvement of crossings of Hwy 224 is critical to improving safety/usability of pedestrian routes.
Hwy 224 Intersection Improvements at Harrison St <i>(includes suggestion for pedestrian over-crossing of Hwy 224 at Harrison St)</i>	Pedestrian	Low	High	High	Elevate to High = Improvement of crossings of Hwy 224 is critical to improving safety/usability of pedestrian routes. Change is consistent with High ranking of Freight project to grade-separate Harrison St from railroad tracks, which would require grade separating at Hwy 224 as well, providing an improved pedestrian facility.
Intersection Improvements of all Hwy 224 crossings (x5)	Pedestrian	Low	High	High	Elevate to High = Improvement of crossings of Hwy 224 is critical to improving safety/usability of pedestrian routes.

Table 1 – Elevate Project Priority

Project	TSP Chapter(s)	2007 Priority	Public Proposed Priority	Staff Proposal	Rationale for Staff Recommendation
River Rd Sidewalks	Pedestrian	Low	High	High	Elevate to High = With the Trolley Trail and light rail coming online, this project has increased in importance for making safe connections.
43 rd Ave Sidewalks	Pedestrian	Low	Med or High	High	Elevate to High = Important connection of residential area (including multi-family units) to commercial area (King Rd Shopping Center); would add to new sidewalk section constructed in 2010.
Intersection Curb Ramp Improvements	Pedestrian	Low	Med	High	Elevate to High = Enhancing curb ramps is critical to improving the existing sidewalk network and complying with ADA
International Way Sidewalks	Pedestrian	Low	High	High	Elevate to High = Sidewalks on at least one side of the street are a priority for improving the network in this area.
Kronberg Park Trail	Pedestrian & Bicycle	Low	High	High	Elevate to High = Construction of ped-bike bridge w/ light rail makes this connection more timely and critical, and modifies the original project concept.
Stanley Ave Neighborhood Greenway	Bicycle	Med	High	High	Elevate to High = Route is an important north-south connector; multi-modal focus; connection to Springwater Trail and bike lanes on King Rd.
Intersection Improvements at Linwood Ave & Monroe St	Bicycle	Low	Med	High	Elevate to High = In conjunction with Neighborhood Greenway project, improving this intersection is critical for making the link into Clackamas County.
Lake Rd Bike Lanes	Bicycle	Low	High	High	Elevate to High = Filling in gaps improves the connection to the new light rail station downtown.
Bicycle-friendly Street Grates	Bicycle	Low	High	High	Elevate to High = Should be a normal part of City Street crew's standard operations until there are no longer safety concerns with that aspect.
Stanley Ave Connectivity at King Rd	Street	Low	High	High	Elevate to High = The crossing of King Rd is a key element of making the Stanley Ave Neighborhood Greenway work for multiple modes.
Stanley Ave Connectivity at Monroe St	Street	Low	High	High	Elevate to High = Enhancing this intersection is key to the Neighborhood Greenways on Monroe and Stanley.
Milwaukie Transportation Management Association Program	Transit	Low	n/a	High	Elevate to High = This program would address some downtown parking issues. (Staff suggestion)
Bike-Ped Overpass at Railroad Ave to International Way	Pedestrian & Bicycle	Low	Med or High	Med	Elevate to Medium = Especially if ped/bike/transit improvements happen on Railroad Ave, it will be important to provide better connectivity to International Way employment area.
Oatfield Rd Bike Lanes	Bicycle	Low	High	Med	Elevate to Medium = Filling in gaps improves the connection to new Lake Rd facilities and downtown.

Table 2 – Reduce Project Priority

Project	TSP Chapter(s)	2007 Priority	Public Proposed Priority	Staff Proposal	Rationale for Staff Recommendation
King Rd Boulevard Treatments (42 nd Ave to Linwood Ave)	Pedestrian	High	Low	Med	Reduce to Medium = Much of King Rd already has sidewalks and there are other important streets that don't have sidewalks and need them. However, King Rd is a major transit route and many of the existing sidewalks do not meet ADA standards, which limits the usefulness of King Rd as a connector to transit.
Logus Rd Sidewalks (43 rd Ave to 49 th Ave)	Pedestrian	High	Low	Med	Reduce to Medium = Sidewalks were constructed on Logus Rd between 49 th Ave and Stanley Ave in 2009. It is still important to fill in more sidewalk gaps along this school route, but perhaps not before building sidewalks at other key locations.
Downtown Streetscape Improvements	Pedestrian	High	Low	Med	Reduce to Medium = Perhaps not as pressing a need as some other pedestrian projects, but still important as part of the overall effort to improve downtown.
Springwater Trail Completion ("Sellwood Gap")	Pedestrian and Bike	High	Med	Med	Reduce to Medium = Continue to support Portland's efforts to close the gap, but not a top priority for the bike system since the Springwater connection through Sellwood neighborhood works.
Franklin St Sidewalks (42 nd Ave to 45 th Ave)	Pedestrian	Med	Low	Low	Reduce to Low = With the closure of Campbell Elementary, this project is not as critical for making a safer school connection.
Pedestrian Walkway Signage	Pedestrian	Med	Low	Low	Reduce to Low = Providing signage is not as critical as actually building sidewalks in various key locations.
Intersection Improvements at 42 nd Ave & Harrison St	Street	Medium	Low	Low	Reduce to Low = Updated data shows an improved forecast for intersection's Level of Service in 2035.
Railroad Ave Capacity Improvements	Street	High	Low	Low	Reduce to Low = Other improvements to Railroad Ave remain high (resurfacing, ped/bike facilities, bus line) but capacity improvements (i.e., widening to 3 or more lanes) are not a high priority due to relatively low congestion on this road.
Downtown Parking Signage	Parking	Medium	Low	Low	Reduce to Low = Project is not as important as making physical improvements to existing parking areas and the downtown streetscape.

Table 3 – Maintain Project Priority (Despite Suggestion)

Project	TSP Chapter(s)	2007 Priority	Public Proposed Priority	Rationale for Staff Recommendation
McLoughlin Blvd Sidewalks (especially Kronberg Park to Washington St)	Pedestrian	Med	High	Keep as Medium = Not critical, since Trolley Trail on west side of McLoughlin provides an alternative. Project potential becomes much higher with reconstruction of the Kellogg Bridge on McLoughlin Blvd.
29 th Ave/Harvey St/40 th Ave Neighborhood Greenway	Bike	High	High	No change = Participants in the June 3 public meeting suggested promoting this project to "High" status because it was a significant vote-getter in the earlier part of the meeting. After the meeting, staff verified that this project is already a "High" priority project in the current TSP.
Lake Rd Sidewalks (fill gaps to Oatfield Rd, to Freeman Way)	Pedestrian	Med	High	Keep as Medium = Adding to the network of recent improvements on Lake Rd is important but not as critical as other projects.
Intersection Improvements at Harrison St & Hwy 224	Street	Med	High	Keep as Medium = No significant change in intersection function since 2007.
Public Parking Structure (downtown)	Parking	Med	High	Keep as Medium = There is an ongoing discussion about downtown parking and impacts from light rail. More information and study of the issue (including coordination with South Downtown planning) is needed before moving forward on this project. Other Parking projects could be implemented first (for less money) to improve usage of existing parking.
Linwood/Flavel Bus Service	Transit	Low	Med	Keep as Low = As long as Linwood Ave sidewalks remain a Low priority, it does not seem critical to increase bus service in an area that is not identified as "transportation disadvantaged").
Monroe St Neighborhood Greenway	Bike	High	Med	Keep as High = Critical east-west connector through Milwaukie; multi-modal focus; opportunity to partner w/ Clackamas County on east end; connection to light rail downtown.
Downtown Public Parking Lot Improvements	Parking	Med	Low	Keep as Medium = Proposed improvements would enable greater use of existing facilities prior to building new facilities.
Pedestrian Walkway Amenities	Pedestrian	Med	Low	Keep as Medium = Amenities along key walking routes enhance their usability.
Most Bicycle & Transit projects	Bicycle & Transit	Varies by Project	Low	No changes in response = It is important to set priorities within each mode, to identify the most important components to improve first. How much or whether bicycle and transit projects are funded compared to projects for other modes is to be determined by City Council.
McLoughlin Blvd Intersection Improvements at 17 th Ave	Street	Med	(Remove)	Keep as Medium = No significant change in intersection function since 2007.
Harrison St Capacity Improvements (32 nd Ave to 42 nd Ave)	Street	Med	(Remove)	Keep as Medium = Harrison St is classified as an Arterial and should be improved to a higher standard. The City's Street Design standards provide some flexibility for how Harrison St could be improved.
Johnson Creek Blvd and 42 nd Ave Signalization	Street	Low	(Remove)	Keep as Low = The neighborhood does not want a signal, but a signal is warranted and this project should remain on the list, at least until we see how traffic is affected by light rail.
Traffic Calming on King Rd* (36 th Ave to 42 nd Ave)	--	--	(need)	Do not add to TSP = Should be a project considered by Walk Safely Milwaukie program.

Table 3 – Maintain Project Priority (Despite Suggestion)

Project	TSP Chapter(s)	2007 Priority	Public Proposed Priority	Rationale for Staff Recommendation
Traffic Calming improvements on River Rd at Lark St (e.g., permanent speed-warning sign and/or roundabout)	--	--	(need)	Do not add to TSP = Should be a project considered by Walk Safely Milwaukie program.
Signage Redirecting Traffic to Downtown via Hwy 224 & 17 th Ave	--	--	(need)	Do not add to TSP = ODOT has control over signage along Hwy 224.
Seismic upgrades to City bridges	--	--	(need)	Do not add to TSP = ODOT conducts regular inspections of the various bridges and will identify issues or concerns that can be added as specific projects as needed.
Bike-Ped connection to Lake Oswego (using existing trestle bridge)	--	--	(need)	Project is already listed in TSP as Regional Project (as Tillamook Branch Trestle Trail Study)
TSAP = Connection from 29 th Ave bike route to Springwater Corridor	--	--	(need)	No new project = The need is already represented by Neighborhood Greenway project for 29 th Ave, a High priority.

Table 4 – Add Project

Project	TSP Chapter	Public Proposed Priority	Staff Proposed Priority	Rationale for Addition
TSAP = Stairs/improved connection from Springwater Corridor to PMLR station	Pedestrian & Bicycle	High	High	Add as High = Important connection to make to new Tacoma Station for light rail.
TSAP = Improvements to access at Springwater Corridor to connect to west end of Sherrett St (paving)	Pedestrian & Bicycle	High	High	Add as High = Improving the existing neighborhood connection to Springwater Corridor is critical.
TSAP = Improved connection from Springwater Corridor to Pendleton site (long ramps from each side)	Pedestrian & Bicycle	High	High	Add as High = Preferred alternative (of 3 options) in Tacoma Station Area Plan.
TSAP = Improved connection from Springwater Corridor to Pendleton site (widened trail undercrossing)	Pedestrian & Bicycle	--	High	Add as High = Another alternative for connecting to Pendleton site (with 2 other options).
Intersection Improvements at McLoughlin Blvd & 22 nd Ave	Pedestrian & Bicycle	High	High	Add as High = New project to address safety concerns that will be aggravated when light rail bridge and Trolley Trail are completed.
Kellogg Creek Bike-Ped Bridge	Pedestrian & Bicycle	--	High	Add as High = Critical to provide a connection to the downtown light rail station from south side of Kellogg creek (Kronberg Park).
Downtown Loop Bus (to Park Ave & Tacoma St PMLR stations) <i>(includes connecting Southgate Park & Ride with Tacoma Station)</i>	Transit	High	High	Add as High = Public meetings showed strong support for the idea of establishing this kind of local transit service.
Neighborhood Loop Bus (eastern neighborhoods to downtown)	Transit	High	High	Add as High = Public meetings showed strong support for the idea of establishing this kind of local transit service.
Railroad Avenue bus service to Clackamas Town Center and points further east	Transit	--	High	Add as High = Separate this project from street-widening project on Railroad Ave and add to list of transit projects. ¹
TSAP = Truck signage and intersection improvements at Ochoco St	Freight	High	High	Add as High = Ochoco St provides a key connection to McLoughlin Blvd within the Tacoma Station.
TSAP = Improvements to Main St	Pedestrian & Bicycle	High	Med	Add as Medium= Important to make safe connections from downtown to new Tacoma Station, but existing facilities make it not critical.
TSAP ² = Improved connection from Springwater Corridor to McLoughlin	Pedestrian & Bicycle	High ³	Med	Add as Medium= Important to improve the connection to Springwater Corridor, but not as critical with existing path available.

¹ Railroad Ave Improvements – The Street project to widen Railroad Ave to 3 lanes has been removed because it is not clear that a center turn lane is warranted. However, projects to provide pedestrian and bicycle facilities remain on the list. The SSMP-funded resurfacing/rebuilding of Railroad Ave is still scheduled to happen by summer 2015.

² TSAP = Tacoma Station Area Plan, adopted by City Council in July 2013. The TSAP included a list of proposed transportation improvement projects.

³ For TSAP projects, the TSAP Advisory Committee recommended whether a project should be considered a high priority or just a need.

Table 4 – Add Project

Project	TSP Chapter	Public Proposed Priority	Staff Proposed Priority	Rationale for Addition
TSAP = Ped/bike safety & crossing improvements at Ochoco St and Milport Rd with McLoughlin Blvd (full intersection improvements)	Pedestrian & Bicycle	High	Med	Add as Medium= Multi-modal crossing improvements are important but not as high a priority as other ped-bike projects.
TSAP = Improve bike/ped connections from and within neighborhood to the west along Ochoco St & Milport Rd	Pedestrian & Bicycle	High	Med	Add as Medium = These connections will become more important as the Tacoma Station Area redevelops.
TSAP = Bike/ped connection from eastern neighborhoods	Pedestrian & Bicycle	High	Med	Add as Medium = Will be important to make a better connection to Tacoma Station Area as the area redevelops, but initially, other project to improve the existing connection to Tacoma Station via Springwater Corridor are more important.
International Way Bike Facilities = Bikeways and signage connecting downtown core with International Way business park	Bicycle	--	Med	Add as Medium = Bike lanes could provide useful connection in area underserved with bike facilities that has many employers. Signage plan already includes signs on International Way.
TSAP = Pedestrian overcrossings of McLoughlin Blvd (Umatilla St)	Pedestrian & Bicycle	High	Low	Add as Low = Umatilla crossing is in Portland; not critical and can be offset by other projects to improve facilities.
TSAP = Additional local street connections	Street	--	Low	Add as Low = These connections will become more important as the Tacoma Station Area redevelops.
TSAP = Future Portland Bike Share station and car share spaces at PMLR station	Regional Projects	--	Low	Add as Low = Important to support these efforts, but the proposed Bike Share station is in Portland and other projects are more important.
TSAP = Construct bike-ped bridge over Johnson Creek along Clatsop Street at 23 rd Ave	Pedestrian & Bicycle	High	Low	Add as Low = This project would significantly improve connection to Tacoma Station Area for neighborhoods to the west and north, but making other new connections on higher volume travel routes are more important.
TSAP = Bike/ped connection between McLoughlin Blvd and west end of Stubb St	Pedestrian & Bicycle	--	Low	Add as Low = Useful connection to improve bike/ped facilities in station area, but other routes with higher volumes of riders and pedestrians are higher priorities.
TSAP = Local street improvements to Stubb, Beta, Ochoco, Hanna Harvester, and Mailwell	Street	--	Low	Add as Low = These improvements will become more important as the Tacoma Station Area redevelops.
TSAP = Improved connection from Springwater Corridor to Pendleton site (tunnel under trail)	Pedestrian & Bicycle	--	Low	Add as Low = Third alternative (most costly) for connecting to Pendleton site.
Intersection improvements to all crossings of McLoughlin Boulevard	Pedestrian	--	Low	Add as Low = Existing crossings are adequate but could be improved; some of the need for improvement is addressed with proposed new undercrossing at Kellogg Creek.
Bike-Ped path on Sparrow St, connecting River Rd east to Trolley Trail	Pedestrian & Bicycle	Med	Low	Add as Low = Important to improve connectivity to Trolley Trail, but other projects in this area are more critical.

Table 4 – Add Project

Project	TSP Chapter	Public Proposed Priority	Staff Proposed Priority	Rationale for Addition
Intersection Improvements at McLoughlin Blvd & Washington St	Pedestrian	High	Low	Add as Low, as one project to improve all McLoughlin intersection crossings = Improve safety of existing crossing (time to cross, visibility). Important, but a new undercrossing (with replacement of Kellogg Creek bridge) makes it not as critical as other projects.
Bike-Ped Overpass over McLoughlin Blvd (connecting River Rd with downtown)	Pedestrian & Bicycle	High	Low	Add as Low = Existing crosswalk at River Rd will provide an at-grade connection to Kronberg Park.
Intersection Improvements at 42 nd Ave & King Rd	Street	Med	Low	Add as Low = Intersection was improved with small CIP project in 2007-08.

Table 5 – Delete Project

Project	TSP Chapter(s)	2007 Priority	Rationale for Deletion
Bike Route Signage	Bike	High	Project completed
Railroad Crossing Improvements at Harrison	Freight	High	Project completed
Railroad Crossing Safety and Quiet Zone Project	Pedestrian & Street	Med & High	Project completed
Railroad Crossing Improvements at 21 st and Adams	Freight	Med	Project completed
Railroad Crossing Improvements at Monroe	Freight	Med	Project completed
Railroad Crossing Improvements at Washington	Freight	Med	Project completed
Railroad Crossing Improvements at Oak	Freight	Med	Project completed
Main Street Bike Lanes	Bicycle	Med	Project proposal changed based on findings of Tacoma Station Area Plan. Bike lanes are not likely to be feasible, but a multi-use path that runs along Main St has been proposed as a replacement.
Railroad Crossing Pedestrian Improvements at Oak	Pedestrian	Med	Project completed
Springwater Trail Paving Project	Bicycle	Med	Project completed
Intersection Improvements at Harmony and Lake	Pedestrian	Low	The intersection is under Clackamas County jurisdiction; local community does not support rebuilding the intersection at this time; project for major intersection improvements is on Regional Projects list. ⁴
Intersection Improvements at Linwood and Harmony	Bicycle	Low	The intersection is under Clackamas County jurisdiction; local community does not support rebuilding the intersection at this time; project for major intersection improvements is on Regional Projects list. ⁴
Harmony Road Grade Separation and Realignment at Linwood	Street & Freight	Low	The intersection is under Clackamas County jurisdiction; local community does not support rebuilding the intersection at this time; project for major intersection improvements is on Regional Projects list. ⁴
Springwater Trail Ramp Improvement at McLoughlin	Pedestrian	Low	Project deleted and replaced by more specific package of proposed improvements from Tacoma Station Area Plan.
Trolley Trail Signage	Bicycle	Low	Project completed
Intersection Improvements at Adams and 21 st	Bicycle	Low	Light rail construction is scheduled to improve this intersection.
21 st Ave Bike Lanes	Bicycle	Low	With light rail construction, bike lanes are not feasible or safe on 21 st Ave; shared sidewalk facility on east side provides some alternative; westbound bike traffic will also be directed onto Main St from Lake Rd.

⁴ Projects for improvements on roads leading up to the intersection (on Harmony, Railroad, Linwood) remain on the list. Those projects will improve the intersection crossings where appropriate (e.g., for pedestrians, for bicycles).

Table 5 – Delete Project

Project	TSP Chapter(s)	2007 Priority	Rationale for Deletion
Milwaukie Light Rail Extension or High Capacity Transit Improvements	Transit	--	Project in progress and nearly complete
Portland Traction Company Multiuse Trail (Trolley Trail)	Regional Projects	--	Project nearly complete
Tualatin-Portland Commuter Rail Extension Study	Transit	Low	Move this project from Transit chapter to list of Regional Projects.

Kelver, Brett

From: Linda Hedges <linda@hammy.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 21, 2013 10:34 AM
To: Kelver, Brett
Cc: Rice, Jason
Subject: RE: public review draft of TSP now available

Thanks Brett. I think I missed looking at Chapter 13's tables (my eyes were getting a bit blurry by then!!) I'll take a look.

The approach to the seismic issues seems adequate. I just thought that, having heard some of the most current predictions about our unreadiness to survive a big earthquake, the city might want to make sure that it addresses the assessment in addition to whatever ODOT does. But you know, that's my little flag to wave. I imagine others who think bike paths are important want the same amount of attention paid to their projects.

I noticed last night that there is a section under the Neighborhood Elements that still refers to the WSMP having its funding matched by NDAs. That is not correct and it should be removed. I'm going to be raising this at PSAC tonight and the NDA Leadership meeting next week. None of the leaders who were active in 2007 recall agreeing to that. and certainly none of the NDAs have the means to provide more than a contribution toward any project, given the cost of most of our projects in the \$30k range and upward. I realise that the WSMP is unlikely to be resurrected in the next couple of years but the text of the TSP ought to be accurate anyway.

thanks for all the efforts that you and your department have gone through to update the TSP.

Linda

From: Kelver, Brett
Sent: 8/21/2013
To: 'Linda Hedges' <linda@hammy.org>
Subject: RE: public review draft of TSP now available

Thanks for the note, Linda.

Regarding your first question, there is a grouping of the most highly prioritized projects in Table 13-3 in Chapter 13. This is the "Consolidated Action Plan List," a new table intended to compile all of the top-priority projects on the Action Plans from the various modes and show them in one place. I am not proposing to add the specific voting results from the June 3 meeting (as you have noted previously, that was a very small sample), although input from that exercise was useful in reevaluating the various Action Plan lists. The Prioritized Master Plan Project List shown in Table 13-4 is the entire list of all TSP projects, grouped together by priority (High, Medium, Low).

Regarding your suggestion to address the seismic issues related to the bridges under the City's jurisdiction, what I understood from talking with Jason is that ODOT conducts regular inspections of the various bridges and will identify issues or concerns that we can then identify specific projects for. So, I think that your concern can be addressed on two fronts: (1) as an ongoing maintenance and monitoring issue outside the TSP, and (2) as a specific TSP project(s) if/when an actual need to upgrade any of the specific bridges is identified. In other words, it is an important issue, it doesn't seem like a separate study is needed at this time because there is already a regular inspection process, and we are not aware of a specific bridge that needs to be replaced or

upgraded at this time because of seismic deficiencies. Maybe Jason can correct me or add more if necessary, and we can look again at adding something TSP if I'm off-base on this one. Thanks for raising this issue.

Brett Kelter, AICP
Associate Planner
City of Milwaukie

From: Linda Hedges [mailto:linda@hammy.org]
Sent: Tuesday, August 20, 2013 7:39 PM
To: Kelter, Brett
Subject: Re: public review draft of TSP now available

Brett
What is your intention in regard to listing the prioritization of projects? They all appear to have been deleted.

I did not find anywhere the inclusion of efforts to update the city's road infrastructure to meet seismic standards. Was this considered to be outside of the framework of the TSP or is it not viewed as important or have I missed reference to it?

Thanks
Linda Hedges

From: Kelter, Brett
Sent: 8/20/2013
To: "Kelter, Brett" <KelterB@milwaukieoregon.gov>
Subject: public review draft of TSP now available

Hello,

The latest draft of the proposed updates to the Transportation System Plan (TSP) is now available for public review. You can access the document from the City's website at this link: <http://www.milwaukieoregon.gov/planning/transportation-system-plan-2013-update-draft>. Because the document is so large, there are links for each individual chapter. If an item does not have a link, there are no changes proposed at this time.

We are still working to prepare some additional documents that may help explain or outline the changes being presented. I will get those up on the project website as soon as possible and will send a follow-up note when they are ready.

A hard copy of the draft document is available for viewing at City Hall, at Ledding Library, and at the Johnson Creek Blvd office. As per standard City procedure, one hard copy is also being provided to each of the Neighborhood District Associations (NDAs). For NDA pickup – Thinking of geography and the Hwy 224 divide from downtown, I have left a copy for 3 of the NDAs (Historic Milwaukie, Island Station, and Lake Rd) at the front counter at City Hall. I am holding copies for the Ardenwald, Hector Campbell, Lewelling, and Linwood NDAs here at our Johnson Creek Blvd office, but if it would be easier for an NDA representative to pick up their copy at City Hall, please let me know and I will get it down there as soon as possible.

There have been some requests to provide more hard copies of the document for review, and I hope to have a response sorted out soon. The TSP is a very large document—on one hand, it may be easier for some folks to review something so large in hard-copy form; at the same time, there is considerable labor and expense involved in printing copies for review. For now, if you are an NDA that feels strongly about needing a second

Kelver, Brett

From: Pat Russell <flanagan112@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 22, 2013 3:33 PM
To: Kelver, Brett
Cc: Cyndi Lewis (NCCA) Wolfram; Lisa Milwaukie Neighborhood BATEY; Dolly (Milwaukie/Linnwood Group Macken-Hambright; David (Milwaukie/Homewood area) Aschenbrenner; Herrigel, JoAnn
Subject: RE: public review draft of TSP now available

Brett, I appreciate the update on the City's TSP.
 I am interested in TSP relationships to

-- the KFC Initiative

and

--the Harmony Road Corridor (especially ultimate sizing, purpose, lanes, crossing the r/r)

and

--the long range function of the Milwaukie Expressway and adjoining circulation needs.

HARMONY ROAD CORRIDOR

The county TSP update now recognizes a need to work with the city on the Harmony Road Corridor and has designated further study of the SW area of the regional center. I am still concerned that the staff are promoting a major crossing of the r/r in the Linwood/Harmony/Lake/Railroad Avenue area that might see up to five lanes near the intersections (or various alternatives). My feeling is that they are giving themselves too much leeway and we will end up with more "push back" from the neighborhood and environmental community. The county's TSP update project listing does not reflect the city's prior recommendations that the primary traffic corridor between the regional center and points west into/out of Milwaukie be the Milwaukie Expressway and SE 82nd Avenue. I think there needs to be better language in the project descriptions. This will be critical when we ask METRO to update/modify the RTP. Personally, I think a two lane bridge ought to be the solution (and very short left turn lane[s]) and commuters and freight companies will either find a new route (Expressway) or rethink their peak travel window. Even METRO's planning for "acceptable" V/C projections, Metro and agencies are still planning for peak conditions. What would it look like at non-peak hours like 9:30am or 2pm, etc. Agencies are finding that ideal CIP is hard to come by in this age of dwindling resources.

SUNNYBROOK BLVD EXTENSION

As for Sunnybrook Extension, the Metro modeling did provide reasonable justification that the extension isn't necessary based upon acceptable V/C levels at the intersections nearby. However, that won't dispel some of the county political push (among some electeds) to design for LOS A intersections. Even though the PAC and staff recommended that it be removed from the projects list, many of us remain on alert this fall during the planned county hearings. I hope Milwaukie Electeds and Administration push to make sure Sunnybrook Ext doesn't become the Phoenix devil of Three Creeks.

REGIONAL TRAIL, NCP, Harmony Campus/Three Creeks Natural Area

I am also concerned about the so-called regional trail planned along the Harmony Corridor. So far, no one can explain to me where this regional trail starts, where it would go (except it somehow shows up in North Clackamas Park and then on Harmony Road and then through the Harmony Campus where the existing

frontage road to the Aquatic center is --and then from the Aquatic Center to SE 82nd Avenue). The bluff is still a sensitive area from Linwood Ave east, and even along Lake Road from the R/r to Milwaukie Expressway (where ever which way its going to go). Also if its a big deal, then it should be separated from the r/r road crossing. I would even recommend removing the campus frontage road (between the signal and the Aquatic parking lot) and direct access further north so that we can "reconnect" the oak grove that was severed by the frontage road. At the very least, I would support removing the roadway foot print and recreating it as a 12 foot reduced structural section to support the bike/ped pathway.

STEWARDSHIP COMMITTEE FORMATION, Harmony Unified Campus

We need to form a stewardship committee for the Harmony Unified Campus/Three Creeks Natural Area and adjoining open areas. I think CCC administration would now support such a group as they (I believe) have legislature funding to build an \$8 million addition to the Harmony Campus. As the city has been discussing potential annexation of this area (or a portion of it), the city could take the lead to promote citizen involvement through the city's NDA's and such a Stewardship type org. the Natural Area is far from "natural" and has become "pushed" to accept area runoff to solve upstream "lack of planning" (and now need for depaving or a lot more detention/ground water recharge). It will be a key beaver habitat (which it has been over the years) and will need to support salmon recovery (one of the "jewels" of open space in the Kellogg Mt. Scott watershed--just as North Clackamas Park should be). The clarification of ownership of the lowlands from the county Development Agency to CCSD#1 (and with the current IGA with NCPRD) has been helpful, but that transfer did not include the r/w of the ill-fated Sunnybrook Extension (to my knowledge). So our "natural area" is pulled in many directions. It really needs an integrated planning approach among the agencies with a good deal of community direction. I know our agencies have funding problems. But ignoring the need to integrate long range multi-agency planning is not the solution.

MILWAUKIE EXPRESSWAY CORRIDOR PLANNING

The beginning of Phase One Sunrise Corridor JTA construction puts more focus on the lack of adequate long term planning for the Milwaukie Expressway Corridor and the challenge of r/r crossings and need for connectivity being affected by these two major barriers. Last I looked in the city's TSP and the county's was funding for such planning. However, its not on ODOT high priority list--so the burden falls on local agencies and limited METRO planning resources. With all the CRC talking and WESTSIDE BYPASS pressure, the Milwaukie Expressway corridor gets pushed into the background. Our former CPO (North Clackamas Citizens Association) has been on record that the ODOT and county solutions along the expressway are not acceptable yet. But most of their "solutions" do not serve our neighborhoods south of the Expressway and don't help industry and businesses on the north side (east of the city's International Business Park).

By the way our neighborhood is likely to get a lot of **unwanted short-cutting out of area traffic by people wanting to avoid the congestion during** the freeway and Expressway construction over these next few years. No obvious solutions except don't drive during peak commute hours. I am going to ask our public safety engineers in the county to place vehicle counters on some of our neighborhood through streets to see if the freeway construction is increasing traffic on our neighborhood through streets. My guess is the construction may also affect some travel patterns through Milwaukie. I haven't heard of any ODOT engineers saying they are looking at it. During the ODOT open house last week (August 22nd) I raised that very concern. The ODOT administration's reaction was nothing. I frankly feel they operate in a vacuum and have very little accountability. However, during our MAPIT planning, it appears that some of the issues have got their attention and they at least try to attend a few meetings and listen (though not promising much).

I look forward to the city's TSP open house on Sept 5th and will try to attend. South downtown Milwaukie certainly is in transformation.

Pat Russell

15989 SE Bilquist Circle, Milwaukie, OR 97267

Phone Messages (503) 656-9681

Pat's CELL 503-317-6456

Email: ppeartrussell@gmail.com or flanagan112@hotmail.com

flanagan112@hotmail.com

From: KelperB@milwaukieoregon.gov

To: KelperB@milwaukieoregon.gov

CC: ButlerS@milwaukieoregon.gov; wheelerg@milwaukieoregon.gov; KimmellJ@milwaukieoregon.gov;

MurthyM@milwaukieoregon.gov; AlligoodL@milwaukieoregon.gov; MarquardtR@milwaukieoregon.gov;

MartinA@milwaukieoregon.gov; RiceJ@milwaukieoregon.gov; RagelB@milwaukieoregon.gov

Subject: public review draft of TSP now available

Date: Wed, 21 Aug 2013 01:01:52 +0000

Hello,

The latest draft of the proposed updates to the Transportation System Plan (TSP) is now available for public review. You can access the document from the City's website at this link:

<http://www.milwaukieoregon.gov/planning/transportation-system-plan-2013-update-draft>. Because the document is so large, there are links for each individual chapter. If an item does not have a link, there are no changes proposed at this time.

We are still working to prepare some additional documents that may help explain or outline the changes being presented. I will get those up on the project website as soon as possible and will send a follow-up note when they are ready.

A hard copy of the draft document is available for viewing at City Hall, at Ledding Library, and at the Johnson Creek Blvd office. As per standard City procedure, one hard copy is also being provided to each of the Neighborhood District Associations (NDAs). For NDA pickup – Thinking of geography and the Hwy 224 divide from downtown, I have left a copy for 3 of the NDAs (Historic Milwaukie, Island Station, and Lake Rd) at the front counter at City Hall. I am holding copies for the Ardenwald, Hector Campbell, Lewelling, and Linwood NDAs here at our Johnson Creek Blvd office, but if it would be easier for an NDA representative to pick up their copy at City Hall, please let me know and I will get it down there as soon as possible.

There have been some requests to provide more hard copies of the document for review, and I hope to have a response sorted out soon. The TSP is a very large document—on one hand, it may be easier for some folks to review something so large in hard-copy form; at the same time, there is considerable labor and expense involved in printing copies for review. For now, if you are an NDA that feels strongly about needing a second copy to review, or if you are an individual for whom it is difficult to review the document online, please let me know so that we can gauge the need and determine a reasonable course of action.

This draft version is the same one that the Planning Commission will be using to start its preparations for the upcoming hearing on TSP adoption. We are holding a worksession with the Commission next Tuesday, August 27. You can see the agenda and short staff report for the worksession here: