



172nd / 190th Corridor Plan

Technical Memorandum #2.3 Public Involvement Summary Report August 2011

A. OVERVIEW

This memorandum provides an overview of public involvement conducted throughout the 172nd/190th corridor planning project. As a cornerstone of the planning effort, public outreach and engagement was conducted through 60 stakeholder interviews (20 interviewees in three rounds), five project newsletters, a robust project website with video, area maps and other graphics, public workshops, virtual on-line workshops and outreach to other stakeholders and media. A 20-member project advisory committee appointed to represent diverse perspectives also helped guide the planning process. In addition, a project management team made up of two agency officials from Clackamas County, Metro, and the cities of Damascus, Gresham, and Happy Valley provided final direction to the consultant team and recommendations to the policy makers based on the input from stakeholders, public, and the project advisory committee.

B. BACKGROUND

Background

The area around the 172nd/190th Corridor was added to the Portland Metropolitan Urban Growth Boundary; part in 1998 and the remainder in 2002. The area is planned for urban development at an average density of at least ten units per net buildable acre for the residential areas with some commercial and employment areas envisioned within the City of Damascus. Some of this growth has already begun.

As the transportation system exists today, SE 172nd Avenue and SE 190th Drive lack the needed continuity and capacity to serve future traffic demand created by this anticipated growth. There are limited locations where this type of connection/facility can occur due to topographic constraints and existing development. Planning efforts thus far reveal that there are no other physically viable, cost-effective north-south routes in this portion of the county.

Purpose

The purpose of this project is to effectively address the 172nd-190th corridor congestion and safety problems, serve future north-south traffic, serve expected population growth in Damascus, Happy Valley, the Pleasant Valley Plan Area and Gresham, and serve the growing demand for regional travel.

Public Involvement Goals

Clackamas County, Metro, Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and the cities of Damascus, Gresham, and Happy Valley are committed to an approach that:

- Provides an open and transparent decision-making process conducted through equitable and constructive two-way communication between the project team and the public.
- Provides early and ongoing opportunities for stakeholders to share values, understand the opportunities within the corridor, develop potential solutions and raise issues and concerns that can be considered by the project team.
- Proactively informs and encourages the participation of all stakeholders.
- Builds widespread community understanding of opportunities, constraints, findings and decisions.

C. PUBLIC OUTREACH AND EVENTS

During the course of the project a series of stakeholder interviews, public workshops, virtual workshops, policy-maker briefings, Clackamas Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) briefings, project advisory committee (PAC) meetings and project management team (PMT) meetings were held at important decision points as described below.

Prior to each public meeting, area community members were notified of various participation pathways through a newsletter mailed to the homes, residences and businesses in the project area, media notices and e-mails to interested parties, stakeholders, PAC and PMT. All public workshops and PAC meetings were held at Scouters Mountain Elementary School in Happy Valley

Public Events

Information on each public event follows the summary table below, including the date, number of participants, event purpose, information provided and results of the event.

Public Workshop and PAC Recap	
Workshop #1	Identify Project Goals & Objectives
Workshop #2	Create Preliminary Roadway Alignments (61 Sketches created; 18 Concepts Developed)
Workshop #3	Evaluate 18 Alignment Concepts; Recommend 5 for Further Review
Workshop #4	Evaluate 5 Refined Concepts; Recommend 3 for Further Review
Workshop #5	Evaluate 3 Most Promising Alternatives; Recommend the Preferred Build Alternative

Public Workshop #1 – August 18, 2010

Number of meeting participants: 27

Purpose: gain citizen feedback on the draft project purpose and need and what goals and objectives the corridor plan should address.

Material provided: agenda; comment form; program memo; public involvement plan; draft purpose and need; and 172nd project road map

Results:

In general, comments on the purpose and need were positive and the majority of participants were comfortable with the initially drafted statement. Comments included the need to take freight traffic and commercial development into consideration, questions about the project study area and the need for the project. All comments received were taken into account when finalizing the project purpose and need.

Participants also gave recommendations for what the goals and objectives should address. The project team used this citizen input to help develop the project goals and objectives. A summary of comments is listed below.

- Serve high vehicle demand areas.
- Improve existing access.
- Provide updated safety.
- Straight alignment.
- Consider demand in deciding one vs. two corridors.
- Natural resources / features – limit impact.
- Cost.
- Use existing roads if cost effective with land acquisition.
- Consider how the corridor will serve through traffic.
- Need to accommodate emergency vehicles.
- Defined use of the corridor – commercial impact to residential.
- Consider and define environmental impacts.
- Integration of corridor with existing zoning i.e. comprehensive plans, land use etc.
- Have two corridors: a new corridor that has four lanes with limited access to keep people moving – make this narrow and allow for commercial traffic; with 172nd more rural, bike paths, sidewalks.
- Consider impacts due to construction.

Public Workshop #2 – October 6, 2010

Number of participants: 46

Purpose: create preliminary roadway alignments.

Material provided: agenda, corridor alignment comment form; corridor streetscape comment form; project area maps; and cross-sections handout

Results:

Participants identified their preferred alignments on aerial photos or the 3-D model of the study area. Pictures were taken of each participant's preferred alignment. Each participant also was given the opportunity to use the interactive roadway modeling system which showed their preferred streetscape alternative. These were recorded by photos or in writing. Additionally, participants were asked for feedback on draft goals and objectives developed by the project team.

Participants created 61 different corridor alignment sketches. Based on these suggested alignments and feedback received from the workshop and virtual workshop, the project team developed 18 unique concepts. The alignments fell into two general categories:

- “Transitional” plans that connect 172nd and 190th with a new roadway that is generally aligned southwest to northeast; and

- “System” plans that follow the existing road alignment with new east-west roadways or upgrades of existing roadways.

Participants created streetscape cross-sectional layouts, including two-lane, three-lane and five-lane configurations. All cross-section results included bike lanes and sidewalks or multi-use paths. The project team will use the cross-sectional layouts and comment forms results when developing the final recommended streetscapes. Participants responded to questions on two separate comment forms, one about corridor alignments and another about corridor streetscapes. The corridor alignment comment form included questions about what existing features are most important to avoid, existing and future land uses that will be important to serve with the new alignment and what additional local road improvements should be developed to support the new corridor. The corridor streetscapes included questions about what other roadways examples would be suited for 172nd / 190th corridor, what amenities should be included in the alignment, and if the streetscape should be consistent throughout the corridor or adapt to the surrounding land use. A summary of written comments can be found in Appendix B.

Public Workshop #3 – December 10, 2010

Number of participants: 31

Purpose: evaluate the 18 alignment concepts and recommend five for further review.

Material provided: workbook containing agenda, scorecard, evaluation criteria and detailed description of each of the 18 alignment concepts and 18 streetscape concepts

Results:

Participants were given the opportunity to review all 18 possible concepts, which had been divided into three areas:

- “red” -- recommended for no further review;
- “yellow” -- under consideration for no further review; and
- “green” -- recommended for further review.

Participants were asked to provide a “yes” or “no” to whether each alternative should be recommended for further review.

The project design team had recommended conceptual corridor alignments AT2, AT4, AT6, AS4 and AS9 for further review. Based on feedback received from Public Workshop #3, the virtual open house, and PAC and PMT, the project design team adjusted its recommendation to include AT2 (combined with AS9), AT6, AS10a, AT4 and AT5 (combined with AT7).

- AS10 was originally in the “yellow” group but with a modification suggested by a member of the public it became AS10a and moved to the “green” recommended for further review group.
- AT5 combined with AT7 also moved up from the “yellow” to the “green” group.
- Although AS4 ranked fairly high, it moved to the “red” group due to environmental concerns and incompatibility with the Pleasant Valley Plan.
- Due to low rankings, AS9 also moved to “red”.

A summary of scorecard results can be found in Appendix A. Specific explanations for why a respondent gave a “yes” or “no” to each streetscape and corridor alignment can be found in Appendix B.

Public Workshop #4 – March 30, 2011

Number of participants: 106

Purpose: evaluate the remaining five corridor alignment concepts and help select the three most promising alternatives to be carried forward for more detailed evaluation.

Material provided: workbook containing agenda, scorecard, evaluation criteria and detailed description of each of the five remaining concepts

Results:

Participants were given workbooks outlining the five remaining concepts and were asked if each concept should move on for further review and to rank each of the five. The project design team initially recommended AT2, AT6 and AS10a as the promising alternatives for further evaluation. Based on scorecards and written comments received from the public and the PAC, the recommendation to move AT2, AT6 and AS10a forward for more in depth engineering and environmental analysis was confirmed.

A summary of scorecard results can be found in Appendix A. Specific explanations for why a respondent gave a “yes” or “no” to each corridor alignment can be found in Appendix B.

Public Workshop #5 – July 20, 2011

Number of participants: 58

Purpose: evaluate the three most promising alternatives and help recommend the preferred build alternative.

Material provided: workbook containing agenda, scorecard, evaluation criteria, detailed description of the three most promising alternatives and recommended intersection treatment options

Results:

Participants were given workbooks outlining the three most promising concepts (AT2, AT6 and AS10s) which the project team had refined after conducting a detailed engineering and environmental study. Participants were given the opportunity review and rank the three most promising alternatives and vote on which should be the preferred build alternative.

The project team initially recommended AS10a as the preferred build alternative. The results from the public workshop, virtual open house and final stakeholder interviews show AS10a with a slight lead over AT2. AS10a received a score of 42 while AT2 received a score of 41 and AT6 received a score of 35. These results were presented at PAC Meeting #5 July 27, 2011.

A summary of scorecard results can be found in Appendix A. Specific explanations for why a respondent gave a “yes” or “no” to each corridor alignment and comments on intersection treatments and streetscapes can be found in Appendix B.

Based on its review, the PAC recommended Alternative AT2 as the preferred alternative to the PMT.

Project Advisory Committee

The PAC, consisting of 20 members, provided a balanced representation of interests as well as a communication link with those interests and communities throughout the project. Members were appointed by the PMT and represented these interests:

- Area residents (4)

- Clackamas County Board of Commissioners
- Clackamas County Pedestrian / Bikeway Advisory Committee
- Clackamas County Water Environment Services
- Clackamas Fire District #1
- Clackamas River Basin Council
- Damascus Committee for Citizen Involvement
- Damascus City Council
- Damascus Planning Commission
- Gresham City Council
- Gresham Pleasant Valley Planning Association
- Happy Valley City Council
- Happy Valley Planning Commission
- North Clackamas Chamber of Commerce
- North Clackamas School District
- Sunrise Water Authority
- TriMet

Five meetings of the PAC were held in conjunction with the five public workshops described above. Feedback from the PAC was used to develop the recommended alignments at each decision point in the process building upon community feedback.

Project Management Team

The PMT consisted of members from Clackamas County, Metro and the cities of Happy Valley, Damascus and Gresham. Their role was to oversee the work of the County/staff/consulting team on the project, consider public and stakeholder feedback and to recommend a final corridor to the elected officials in Happy Valley, Damascus and Clackamas County. Throughout the project the PMT was presented with the feedback received from the public workshops, PAC and stakeholders to make their recommendations at major decision points in the process. The PMT met seven times during the course of the project.

Stakeholder Interviews

Individual interviews were conducted with project stakeholders at three points in the planning process. The primary purpose of the interviews was to gain insight into stakeholders' desires for the future uses, alignment, and aesthetic for the corridor. The interviews also afforded an opportunity to keep stakeholders apprised of the planning process. Summaries of the interviewed stakeholders' input were provided to members of the PAC and PMT immediately following each round of interviews to inform decision-making.

The stakeholders that participated in the interviews included individuals with a personal investment in the study area (e.g., business owners, residents, and church clergy with properties in the study area) as well as individuals who represented larger interests in the area (e.g., county department heads, city planning commissioners, and city councilors). Twenty-three stakeholders were invited to participate in the first round of interviews and a few additional stakeholders were invited to participate in subsequent rounds of interviews. Ultimately, 32 individuals participated in at least one interview and the majority participated in three; however, due to substitutions and absences from certain rounds, not all of the stakeholders participated in three interviews. A complete list of interview participants and a detailed summary of the input that they provided is included in Appendix C - Technical Memorandum 2.2: Stakeholder Interview Summary.

Interviews Round #1

The first round of stakeholder interviews was conducted at the start of the project in July 2010. Interviewers began the meetings by presenting the context for the project, including why the study was being undertaken and who was involved. Stakeholders were then asked to describe their current use of the corridor as well as their desires and concerns for the future function of the corridor. Interviewers invited stakeholders to sketch on project maps suggestions of where to locate a connection between SE 172nd and SE 190th. Stakeholders were also asked what features a new connection should avoid. Additionally, interviewers asked stakeholders to provide input on whom else to involve in the planning process and how to effectively reach people in the area with project information.

Interviews Round #2

The second round of interviews was conducted in January 2011 following the selection for further study of five of the 18 preliminary corridor alignment concepts and 11 of the 18 preliminary streetscape concepts. Prior to the interviews, the project team gave stakeholders copies of a January 3, 2011 memorandum summarizing the recommended concepts from Public Workshop #3. At the start of each interview interviewers reviewed with stakeholders maps of the corridor alignments and sketches of the streetscape concepts. Positive and negative feedback on each of the concepts was solicited to refine and evaluate the selected preliminary alignments and streetscapes. Interviewers also encouraged stakeholders to point out anything that they felt the project team was overlooking at this point in the project.

Interviews Round #3

The third round of interviews was conducted in June/July 2011 following the selection of the three most promising alignments. Interviewers began the meetings by reviewing with stakeholders maps of the corridor alignments and a table from Technical Memorandum 8.2 comparing the impacts of the three alignments. The interviewers explained that based on the analysis and feedback to date, the project team was recommending AS10a, but that this alternative depends on a linkage outside the study area—the 187th Avenue extension—being funded and built. Stakeholders were asked how comfortable they would be with AS10a as the recommended alternative, and how they would feel about AT2 as a backup. Interviewers also asked the stakeholders to rank the three most promising alignments and explain the reasons for their preferences. Additionally, stakeholders were invited to suggest improvements to the alignments and to provide feedback on the draft streetscape improvements.

CTAC and city/ county briefings

The team held a number of work sessions/briefings with various local government agencies throughout the project. The purpose of these briefings was threefold: (1) to apprise the affected agencies on the process and results of the project as it was progressing; (2) to obtain feedback from the committee members prior to final decision points; and (3) to ensure that the direction of project remained consistent with the expectations and vision of the local planning bodies.

Dates and agencies included:

7/27/10	Clackamas Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC)
12/16/10	Damascus City Council
2/22/11	CTAC
4/26/11	Damascus Planning Commission
5/3/11	Happy Valley City Council
6/14/11	Clackamas County Board of Commissioners
6/14/11	Gresham City Council

D. FINAL PAC / PMT RECOMMENDATION

PAC Recommendation

Based on extensive feedback from the final round of stakeholder interviews, public and virtual workshops, and taking into consideration local factors that could impact the timely completion of all portions of Alternative AS10a, the project team presented the PAC with AT2 as its recommended preferred build alternative. Through a comment form and virtual open house, the PAC voted to concur with this recommendation.

**As background, at the Open House on July 20th, the project team preliminarily recommended Alternative AS10a as the preferred build alternative. However, that alternative relies heavily on a proposed extension of Foster Road south to Highway 212 in the City of Damascus. Due to a range of factors, the timing and extent of this improvement has become more uncertain. Alternative AT2 also has scored highly in all evaluations of project evaluation criteria and relies less heavily on this proposed connection by relying on SE 172nd Avenue as the primary north-south corridor. For this reason, the project team preliminarily recommends Alternative AT2, while acknowledging all final three alternatives as viable.*

PMT Recommendation

At their meeting on August 4, 2011, the PMT considered the public feedback outlined above. That, with the PAC results, the PMT recommended moving AT2 forward as the preferred build alternative.

APPENDICES

- A. Summary of Scorecard Results
- B. Summary of Written Comments, Public Workshops and PAC Meetings
- C. Stakeholder Interview Summary
- D. Summary of Meeting Dates with Stakeholders, Advisory Groups and Decision-Making Bodies
- E. Newsletters
- F. PowerPoint presentations and sign-in sheets for PAC and public meetings
- G. Website Comments and List of Interested Parties
- H. Digital set of all workshop score sheets, sketches, and comment forms