

City of Gresham

Pleasant Valley TSP Refinement

STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS SUMMARY

JLA Public Involvement conducted 10 stakeholder interviews with agency staff, elected officials, neighborhood leaders and other interests to support and inform the Pleasant Valley Transportation System Plan (TSP) Refinement project. This report summarizes the interview process and comments and suggestions made by participants.

OVERVIEW

The goals of the interview process were to:

- Engage stakeholders to discuss issues, concerns and desired outcomes for the TSP Refinement process (and in particular the alternatives selection process for the 174th Ave Extension).
- Develop new relationships and maintain and strengthen existing relationships with stakeholders.
- Begin to build community and inter-agency support for the TSP Refinement process.
- Inform the project Public Involvement Plan and Community Advisory Committee (CAC) formation.

Interview questions elicited input on:

- Key concerns regarding congestion and access in the north-sound connection area in Pleasant Valley that stakeholders would like to see addressed through the TSP Refinement process.
- Suggestions on public involvement activities, and who engage in the process.

INTERVIEWEES

Interviewees included a mix of neighborhood, environmental and developer interests as well as technical agency staff and elected officials. Interviewees included:

Community stakeholders:

1. Paul Grosjean, Chair, Portland Pleasant Valley Neighborhood Association
2. Angelene Adler, President, Gresham Pleasant Valley Neighborhood Association
3. Jason Howard, Land Use Committee Chair, Johnson Creek Watershed Council
4. Laura Edmonds, President & CEO, North Clackamas Chamber of Commerce
5. Jim Leeper, Brookside Signature Homes

Agency staff:

6. Karen Buehrig, Transportation Planning Supervisor; Stephen Williams, Transportation Planner; Joe Marek, Transportation Safety Program Manager, Clackamas County
7. Michael Walter, Economic & Community Development Director, City of Happy Valley
8. Tom Mills, Senior Planner; Eve Nelenders, Planner, TriMet

Elected Officials

9. Councilor Shirley Craddick, Metro
10. Commissioner Lori Stegmann, Multnomah County

KEY THEMES

The following are key themes that came out of conversations with stakeholders. The Detailed Comment Summary in the next section provides a more in depth report of all comments.

Key issues for the public

Overall, participants agreed that **congestion is a major concern** in the study area, with travelers coming from many directions that contribute to traffic concerns. Congestion has been an issue here for a decade, and the problem is only getting worse.

Many noted that residents in and around the area are split on their views toward development. Some residents will want the area to **remain more rural**, and **others welcome urbanization** and more development. These groups may have differing views on the TSP Refinement process. In general there is a desire to **consider transportation and land use together**, since the increase in density and development is driving the congestion issues. There was some concern that the proposed roads **cut through farmland**, and could have negative impacts as rural lands are already in short supply.

Several people expressed the need for **interagency coordination** on the project and to address congestion in the area (City of Gresham, City of Portland, City of Happy Valley, Multnomah County, Clackamas County). There are many nearby projects and planning processes that these agencies are involved in, and they should be coordinated together in a holistic effort. (See detailed summary for list of these projects and planning efforts.)

Members of the public are likely to have **questions about construction**: when the roads will be funded, by whom, and on what timeline.

Comments on the 174th Ave Extension

Several people noted that theoretically the 174th Ave Extension **seems like a good solution to the problem of congestion** in the area. Key concerns and questions about the Extension centered on:

- Concern about **impacts to SE Jenne Rd Butte**, including watershed impacts. There were suggestions to try to protect or restore habitat here, as well as human access to the butte. There was also question around Metro policy on building on its natural areas.
- Concern about **condemning property in the McKinley Estates development**.

- Concern that the Extension would **put more traffic onto Powell Blvd**—which is already at capacity.
- Questions about the intended **road classification** of the Extension.
- Questions about **cost**, and which jurisdictions will contribute to the funds.

172nd Ave/SE Foster Rd intersection

Participants agreed that the 172nd Ave/SE Foster Rd intersection needs to be **addressed as soon as possible**. They noted the intersection is a **major safety issue** currently, and addressing the problem is critical.

Public Involvement

Participants made several suggestions and comments about the public involvement process. They suggested various organizations, individuals, and interest types for participation in the Community Advisory Committee and Technical Advisory Committee. They also provided recommendations on avenues for public outreach and notification in and around the project area. These suggestions are outlined in the Detailed Comment Summary.

DETAILED COMMENT SUMMARY

Below is an in-depth report of comments made during the stakeholder interviews.

KEY ISSUES FOR THE PUBLIC

Participants were asked what concerns and comments the public will likely have regarding the Pleasant Valley TSP Refinement project. Comments included:

- Overall, most participants agreed that **congestion is a major concern** in the study area. The roads are mostly two-lane roads, and there is a lot of growth in the 17th Ave area south of the study area. Many people use the area as a “backroad” to I-205. Travelers are commuting from Gresham, Damascus, Happy Valley, and Clackamas Town Center—and all of this contributes to the congestion. They noted that congestion has been an issue here for a decade, and the problem is only getting worse.
- **Relation of the project to increased density and land use planning:**
 - Some residents will want the area to **remain more rural**, and **others welcome urbanization** and more development. The project team should be ready for differing views on the TSP Refinement process.
 - Citizens are **concerned about the increase in density** and lack of roads to support that density. Many citizens would prefer the area to remain more rural and less dense—and will want to discuss this as part of the process.

- There is a group of residents in the Gresham side of Pleasant Valley that **want to see more development**, and were annexed into Gresham because they desire more development. These residents will likely be pleased to know that transportation infrastructure is coming, because they have wanted to see an increase in services and infrastructure for some time.
- There is a group of residents in Damascus that **do not want to see the area develop**, and may be concerned that building new roads will cause even more traffic.
- There is a desire to **consider transportation and land use together**. The increase in density and development is driving the congestion issues. It will be important to provide information about Metro’s density requirements for Pleasant Valley and how they have changed. People will want to see an integrated land use and transportation plan. Is Gresham considering land use and transportation together?
- It will be important to **explain what the original Pleasant Valley Concept Plan/TSP included**. Several participants had questions and comments about the evolution of past planning processes for Pleasant Valley and their relation to the current TSP Refinement, including:
 - Why is the City able to study alternatives that were not part of that original Concept Plan/TSP planning effort? Why is the City revisiting just one geographic portion of Pleasant Valley, and not the entire Concept Plan as a whole?
 - How was the 172nd Ave to 190th Ave Connector approved, since it was not part of the original plan?
 - It would be helpful to clearly show what the current transportation plan is for the Pleasant Valley area—and what changes are proposed under this new planning process.
- **Interest in inter-jurisdictional coordination**. Several people expressed the need for interagency coordination on the project and to address congestion in the area (City of Gresham, City of Portland, City of Happy Valley, Multnomah County, and Clackamas County). There were questions about how the various jurisdictions in the area are involved, and why the process is being led by the City of Gresham. People noted that Pleasant Valley crosses many jurisdictional lines, and portions are planned for annexations in the future; there is some perception that no jurisdiction is really taking responsibility or accountability for investments in the area. One person noted that it is appropriate for Gresham to ultimately be responsible for the projects in the study area, since the area will be annexed into Gresham
- **Coordination with nearby projects and planning processes**: Several people (and in particular agency stakeholders) noted the need for coordination with other projects and planning efforts in the area. Various jurisdictions should think about how to link these processes together in a coordinated way. These efforts include:
 - The City of **Happy Valley is conducting an integrated land use and transportation plan** for its portion of that Pleasant Valley Concept Plan area. The city is combining urban zoning with the planned street system. (This process has a longer timeline than the Pleasant Valley TSP update timeline.)
 - Clackamas County is doing transportation planning for the **former Damascus area** (beginning on January 2018).

- Clackamas County is planning for **transit and freight flow** in the area.
- Clackamas County will be doing transportation planning for the **area between 190th Ave and 222nd Ave.**
- Happy Valley is planning to **connect 162nd Ave from Clatsop to Sunnyside.** This could potentially impact traffic flows on the segment of 172nd Ave south of SE Foster Rd.
- **Columbia to Clackamas (“C to C”) Corridor:** Various jurisdictions (City of Gresham, City of Happy Valley, Multnomah County, and Clackamas County) have been looking at a regional connection between Hwy 212 at the Clackamas River to I-84. This TSP Refinement should be looked at as part of that regional connectivity. A major difficulty is the area where 181st Ave (a five lane arterial) meets Powell Blvd (a two-lane road). In a perfect transportation planning world, there would be a continuous North-Sound continuous arterial, but that doesn’t seem possible here. The realistic solution is to provide people with two North-South options: the eastern alignment (190th Ave) or the western alignment (174th Ave Extension).
- **How will the roads be funded, by whom, and when?** The public will want to know which jurisdiction is paying for road construction, how much it will cost, and how far in the future the roads are planned for construction. One person commented that there is currently a lack of viable funding mechanisms in Gresham. Gresham has a low property tax, federal funding is down, and transportation costs are being largely borne by developers through SDCs—which is not sustainable. It would be reasonable for Happy Valley and Clackamas County to play a role in funding, since their residents make heavy use the roads in the project area. There was also a suggestion to consider a bond measure to help fund roads, with the aid of a bond measure consultant to ensure successful passing of the bond.
- Question about **when Gresham is going to annex the study area** into its City. It seems like Gresham would not be able to build these projects until it annexes the area. Currently, Gresham’s annexation rules are quite rigid; they may need to be more flexible.
- Concern about **farmland impacts:** Cutting through farmland will cause additional congestion and pollution to harvest and crops. The area is a big agricultural community. Will the project reduce the already low availability of farmland?
- It will be important to know the **community effects** of the project. How many homes, businesses and farms will be displaced by the roads? If people are forced to sell their properties, will they get fair market value? Cutting through properties has a major impact on livelihood.
- It will be important to provide information about the **intended road classification** of all of the roads in the study area. People will want to know how many lanes the roads are, and whether they will feel more like neighborhood streets or major highways. The public will be concerned about the **increase in trip generation** that building the roads could cause.
- Consider the **intersection of public health and transportation.** How can this project improve public health, especially when it comes to biking, walking, safety, and improved access to natural areas? It is important to let the public know that the agencies are thinking about public health. Health should be considered both in planning and project development (for example,

conducting a Health Impact Assessment). There should be a budget line item to study health and safety impacts.

COMMENTS ON SPECIFIC ROADS AND ELEMENTS OF THE TSP REFINEMENT

Comments on the 174th Ave Extension

- Several people noted that theoretically the 174th Ave Extension **seems like a good solution to the problem of congestion** in the area. One person said that together, the 174th Ave Extension and 172nd Ave to 190th Ave Connector help create a grid system, which makes for good transportation planning.
- Concern about **impacts to Jenne Butte**. There were several questions and comments about how the project could impact SE Jenne Rd Butte, including:
 - Will Metro allow building on the Metro-owned butte? Metro policy generally does not allow easements or access to its natural areas.
 - Will there be any watershed impact here.
 - If putting a road through SE Jenne Rd Butte goes forward, implement ways to restore and protect habitat on the butte. The City of Portland may have funding for Johnson Creek restoration that could be used to restore SE Jenne Rd Butte. The restoration project could be modeled after the 10-acre restoration project on Powell Butte.
 - Consider whether it is possible to improve human access to the butte.
 - The environmental concern of going through the hillside will be a public concern. The region is proud of all the buttes-and wants to make sure they are protected.
 - Will the project require removing timber here? The environmental community and the general public will be concerned about this.
- Concern that it is **not feasible to build this connector through the hillside**. There is concern that it will be extremely costly to do this, and an inefficient use of public dollars. One person noted that during the 2007 Concept Planning process, the 174th Ave Extension was added on as an idea towards the end of the process. The Community Advisory Committee at that time had major concerns about the feasibility of this project.
- One person noted that it seems like the southern section of the 174th Extension (south of the Giese Rd Extension) could be built with little trouble. The northern part looks difficult due to construct due to topographical constraints. Perhaps the **project could be phased**, with building the southern portion of the extension first, along with the SE Giese Rd extension.
- Concern about **condemning property in the McKinley Estates development** in order to build the line. One person noted that the City of Gresham had previously assured property owners during the 2007 planning process that no properties would be condemned. There is also concern about the cost of buying these properties, in a time when transportation funding seems so limited.

- Concern that the Extension would **put more traffic onto Powell Blvd**—which will not be able to handle this increase in vehicles. Powell Blvd is already at capacity. Will the project also include improvements to Powell Blvd?
- Several people had questions about **what kind of road** the 174th Ave Extension would be. How many lanes will there be in each direction? What is the classification of the road? One person noted that it should at least be a collector road, if not an arterial. Another noted that, from an environmental perspective, would not want it to be like a highway.
- There were many **questions about cost**. For example: how much will the proposed 174th Ave Extension cost, and what funds will be used to pay for it? Which jurisdictions will contribute to the funds? One person noted that the City of Gresham seems to have very little budget to provide services and roads, and questioned the feasibility of funding the Extension.
- Several people made comments about the **use of system development charges** to pay for the extension. One noted that SDCs are fairly low for developments along 190th Ave and south of the study area. Those developments are putting a lot of traffic on the failing 172nd Ave/SE Foster Rd intersection and the congested SE Jenne Rd. Another person was concerned about making developers shoulder too much burden in building transportation infrastructure.
- Question about whether the project would require **relocating the Grange**.
- **Where on SE Jenne Rd** will the 174th Ave Extension connect to?
- From a watershed perspective, there **do not seem to be any environmental challenges** with building the 174th Ave Extension. Kelly Creek runs through the concept area, but it is just a tributary—not the main stream so it is not a big concern. The crossing is more perpendicular, so not very impactful.
- Concern about connector **cutting through farmland**. What is the impact on farms and agriculture? Will any businesses be forced out?
- **Getting public support will be critical**. The extension is going through an area where people have been living for a while—and people see it as their community. It is always an adjustment for a neighborhood to know there is a new road coming through.
- **What is the plan for trips on SE Jenne Rd?** If the 174th Ave Extension is built, is the intent to try to reduce travel on SE Jenne Rd? One person said that SE Jenne Rd should not be the travel road of choice—since it is in the Johnson Creek flood plain. It seems like there will need to be discouragement of use of SE Jenne Rd, or else it would continue to be a congested area. Happy Valley residents (and other residents to the South) currently head north on 162nd Ave, turn right on SE Foster Rd, then turn left on SE Jenne Rd to continue to destinations to the West. Perhaps the project could restrict left turns from SE Foster Rd onto SE Jenne Rd to discourage that traffic pattern. Another participant added that SE Jenne Rd is a safety concern and experiences many traffic accidents; it is a narrow road with blind corners and huge embankments that are not well lit. It makes sense to build an alternate road like the 174th Extension and declassify Jenne Rd as a through route.
- If the extension is built, this would likely also require improving or widening the **section of 174th Ave north of the extension**, as well as improve the bridge over Johnson Creek. This section is currently a two lane road and would need to be improved to handle increased traffic. There is a

also planned soccer complex for the section of 174th Ave south of SE Powell Blvd, which will likely drive even more traffic to the area.

- **Bike/ped safety on SE Foster Rd** is an issue. Will the 174th Ave Extension relieve enough congestion to improve bike/ped safety on SE Foster Rd?
- This route will change the way traffic flows. It will put less traffic on 190th Ave than originally intended in previous planning efforts. Would doing this be more **cost effective than funneling traffic onto 190th Ave and improving 190th Ave?**
- What is the intent of this extension? Who would it serve?
- What will happen with the section of 172nd Ave between SE Foster Rd and the 172nd Ave-190th Ave Connector?
- There are deep ditches on either side of 172nd Ave currently. If cars need to swerve, they would end up in the ditch. This may be a safety concern.

Alternatives to the 174th Ave Extension

Some participants asked questions and provided suggestions for alternatives to the 174th Ave Extension that the project team could study:

- Consider **reducing development growth** in Pleasant Valley as a solution. Reducing development will reduce congestion and the need for more road building.
- Suggestion to focus on **making improvements to SE Foster Rd**. (between SE Jenne Rd and Barbara Welch) as an alternative to building a new Extension. Study innovative solutions such as changing the direction of traffic lanes during morning and evening rush hours. Others recognized that there is no opportunity to widen SE Foster Rd (due to creek on one side and rock wall on other side).
- Question about what the impacts of the **proposed 172nd Ave to 190th Ave Connector** might be. How much traffic could this connector reduce, and would this negate the need for a 174th Ave Extension?
- In addition to the North-South connection, it is important to **look at East-West mobility**. There is limited ability to improve East-West mobility in the entire area between SE Division and SE Sunnyside.
- Are there specific changes that can help the flow of traffic—without having to put in a new road?

172nd Ave/SE Foster Rd intersection

- Many participants noted that the 172nd Ave/SE Foster Rd intersection needs to be **addressed as soon as possible**, either through signalized intersection or traffic circle. It is a major safety issue now, and it is not uncommon to wait up to 30 minutes to make a left turn from 172nd Ave onto SE Foster Rd. One person suggested some interim solution for this intersection (within the next year) while the rest of the planning goes on.

- No participants had concerns about improving this intersection. All recognized the need for this improvement. Several noted that this is one of the few failing intersections, and addressing the problem is critical.
- Would be interesting to know whether there have been traffic accidents at the intersection (**crash data**).
- Question about how this intersection improvement would be funded. Traffic to this intersection comes largely from Clackamas County and Happy Valley, so they should be involved in funding.

172nd Ave - 190th Ave Connector

- **Status of the 172nd Ave - 190th Ave connection:** Michael Walter (Happy Valley) noted that this project is adopted and is in the Happy Valley TSP and city TSDC project list. However, it will not be built until there is more development in that area, which is quite far north of actual development activity. The connector likely will not be constructed for many, many years.
- It seems that this connector will split the traffic, so that people can more easily **choose between two North-South connections** (either 190th Ave as an Eastern route or the 174th Ave Extension as a Western route). Currently, there is only one North-South route. Building the connector should help a lot with congestion. (Travelers headed to Gresham will take the Eastern North-South route; and travelers headed to I-205 will take the Western North-South route.)
- Concern about connector **cutting through farmland**. What is the impact on farms and agriculture? Will any businesses be forced out?

SE Richey Road Extension

- One person said that this would be a good Green Streets demonstration project. There is **active habitat in this area** and on the creek, so there are concerns about building this road in a way that is environmentally friendly.
- The property in this area **has already been developed**. It does not seem possible to put a road through here. There is also a highly sensitive environmental restoration area here.

SE Richey Rd

- This road is a safety issue. There are two 90 degree turns, and accidents occur often. Pleasant Valley Elementary is on this road and there are no sidewalks, which makes it unsafe for children walking to school. The project should look at addressing safety on Richey Rd and perhaps upgrading it to a higher road classification. Alternatively – is it anticipated that building the SE Giese Rd extension and the 172nd to 190th Connector might provide enough capacity, thereby eliminating the need to have Richey Rd as a designated through route?
-

SE Giese Road Extension

- One person asked **why this extension ends at a “T” at SE Foster Rd** rather than joining with the intersection of SE Jenne Rd and SE Foster Rd Roads. It seems like this should be combined as just one signalized intersection.
- A couple of people said this **seems like a good extension** that will improve travel in the area.
- There are some property owners along this route that do not want to develop, and others that do want to develop. It will be important to **involve these property owners** in the process.
- There is a **plan to put sewer lines** in the area of the Giese Rd extension (planned for 2018). Will this help lock in the alignment for the Giese Rd extension? Should the sewer project be coordinated with this TSP effort?

SE 190th Dr/SW Butler Rd intersection

- This **intersection is failing and will need a signal**. Expect that the City of Gresham will condition the developer’s land use application on signaling this intersection.

SE Clatsop St Extension

- One person asked: Will this unload some traffic from SE Foster Rd? How does that affect the need for other improvements? Will this route absorb some of the traffic that would otherwise have used the 172nd Ave-190th Ave Connection? If yes, is the 172nd Ave-190th Ave Connection needed?

SE Sager Rd Extension

- One person asked: Will this route absorb some of the traffic that would otherwise have used the 172nd Ave-190th Ave Connection? If yes, is the 172nd Ave-190th Ave Connection needed?

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ON THE TSP REFINEMENT

Modeling Suggestions

Some technical stakeholders made the following suggestions for traffic modeling:

- When doing traffic analysis, be sure to model all of the connections that are supposed to be part of the 172nd Ave-190th Ave Connection.
- Use the correct growth assumptions for Damascus, which will have less development now because it is unincorporated.
- The Happy Valley transportation/land use concept planning process may revisit some growth and traffic pattern assumptions—which could affect the Pleasant Valley TSP Refinement.

Environmental and Watershed comments

Johnson Creek Watershed Council representatives made the following comments:

- When designing for roads, make it a priority to **build more durable and less impactful roads** rather than cut and fill. Consider building **green streets** where possible. This project has great potential for on-site stormwater treatment, green streets, and fish passage/culverts.
- Support building **private and public fish friendly culverts** to promote safe fish passage, particularly on roads that cross Kelly Creek and SE Jenne Rd Creek. There are grants and other sources of funding available to do this. Johnson Creek Watershed Council's focus for the past few years has been on funding for such culverts, which can open miles of acreage for fish passage. Kelly creek headwater and culvert project will open 3 miles of fish passage, so make sure this TSP Refinement doesn't negatively impact that.
- New roads often mean greater habitat fragmentation, so want to look into that and how to **minimize habitat degradation**. Habitat connectivity and wildlife corridor is important.
- Will the project create a need to do any wetland mitigation? Prefer on-site mitigation.
- Consider how this project can improve human **access to parks and the trails**. There seem to be opportunities to improve access along the Springwater Corridor, and to Powell Butte and SE Jenne Rd Butte.

Transit in the area (input from TriMet)

- There does not seem to be a strong transit market in this area. TriMet generally does not consider extending transit into an area until there is built development, even if plans show lots of future growth.
- The Eastside Service Enhancement Plan (SEP) makes mention of Pleasant Valley as an area to keep track of in the future.
- Current and future planning for transit along 182nd Ave/SW Highland Dr/190th Ave:
 - Currently, transit service exists on 182nd Ave down SW Highland Dr and through South Gresham. In March 2018 this will become two lines.
 - The transit line on 182nd will be upgraded soon to Frequent Service (every 15 minutes, all day, 7 days per week).
 - Every few years, Metro models multiple scenarios as part of its Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update. Under the 2040 Strategic Scenario (i.e., what we would build if we had double the funding expected for the future), there is a vision to extend transit down SW Highland Dr, down SW Pleasant View Dr, then down 190th Ave, onto the 172nd Ave to 190th Ave Connector, onto 172nd Ave, and down into Happy Valley; eventually connecting with another line into Oregon City. Under the Financially Constrained Scenario, there is a vision for transit improvement to the line on 182nd Ave down to Powell Blvd.
- Current and future planning for transit on SE Foster Rd:
 - Line 14: Currently runs from downtown Portland down SE Foster Rd into the Lents neighborhood. Service on this line is likely to be upgraded to more than Frequent Service (buses every 10 or 12 minutes).
 - Line 10: Currently runs from downtown Portland to SE Foster Rd, ending at 136th Ave.
 - Line 73: Currently runs down to 122nd Ave and SE Foster Rd.

- The area east of 172nd Ave and South of Giese Rd is probably not in the TriMet District.

Map questions and suggestions

- Why is Giese Rd Extension shown in blue? Is it not a planned roadway in the TSP? If it is not in the TSP, how is it that it is being studied now?
- Label on map: SE Sager Rd, SE Richey Rd, SE Cheldelin Rd
- Show Springwater trail on map

INPUT ON PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT PROCESS

Community Advisory Committee Involvement

Participants suggested considering the following organizations, individuals, and interest types for participation in the Community Advisory Committee:

Neighborhood and community groups:

- Pleasant Valley Portland Neighborhood Association.
- Pleasant Valley Gresham Neighborhood Association.
- Gresham Southwest Neighborhood Association. Residents in this neighborhood use the project area roads often. Steve Bennet was a suggested representative.
- Karen Hubbard: Previous Portland Pleasant Valley Neighborhood Association Chair who then moved to Happy Valley.
- Linda Bower, who was a longtime chair of Pleasant Valley Neighborhood Association. She lives in Portland side of Pleasant Valley and owns the Bower Property.
- Citizens for a Better Future Group: This is a group of active residents from new neighborhoods in the formerly Damascus area, that are being annexed into Happy Valley (along 172nd Ave further south). Jim Syring has been leader of these “pro-annexation into Happy Valley” groups, and could provide good representation of the residents that live on east side of 172nd Ave, in former Damascus area. (Jim Syring, citizensforabetterfuture@msn.com)
- Someone to speak for Damascus, including representation from residents that support increased development and those that support remaining rural.
- Happy valley representation
- Carol Rulla, President of Coalition of Gresham Neighborhood Associations.
- Pleasant Valley Elementary School President, who is very engaged in local issues.
- The owner of the property on the corner of 172nd Ave and SE Foster Rd (may be Gresham-Barlow). There was discussion about potentially building a school on that land. In any case, it would be worth talking to school districts about what shift they see as far as student population, and how that might affect this project.
- Property owners at the intersection of SE Foster Rd/172nd Ave.

Business and development:

- Developers in the Pleasant Valley area.
- Holt Group: Largest developer in the Pleasant Valley and Happy Valley areas. (Recommend Joe Schiewe, Joe@holtgroupinc.com)
- Business owners. Fred Meyer might have big interest in what happens here. Some local farms might be interested.
- Clackamas Town Center might be interested. They play a role in the congestion here.

Active transportation:

- David Scharfenberg – Pleasant Valley Elementary School teacher who led natural area work around the school. Is a Gresham resident, cyclist, and general advocate for the Pleasant Valley area.
- Active transportation advocates. Suggestions include:
 - BTA member, trail user, or cycling advocate.
 - The SE Jenne Rd Rd/174th Ave study intersection intersects the Springwater Corridor. It might be an access point with the trail, and is a way to access Powell Butte. Friends of Powell Butte may be interested.
 - Gresham Bike/Ped committee representative

Environment and Emergency Management:

- Johnson Creek Watershed Council.
- Emergency management (or at least part of the conversation, if not on the CAC). They have factual data on the length of time it takes for EMS vehicles to get through during congested times. They could provide good input on what ease of congestion could lend to safety.

Technical Advisory Committee Involvement

Participants suggested the following members for the Technical Advisory Committee:

- Representatives of the five coordinating jurisdictions:
 - City of Portland PBOT (April Burtelson)
 - Clackamas County (Karen Buehrig or Steve Williams)
 - City of Gresham (Kathy Kelly)
 - Happy Valley (Michael Walter)
 - Multnomah County
- TriMet
 - TriMet said they would be interested in attending meetings that involve transit, and otherwise can receive/read meeting summaries and materials. Representative would likely be Eve Nelenders – Eastside SEP area planner.
 - Input from Clackamas County: TriMet should be engaged in a key way. If the 174th Ave Extension is built, it needs to be built in a way that meets transit standards (designed for buses). There is so much development and job growth in Happy Valley, and transit coverage in this area will be critical. 172nd Ave/174th Ave seems like an ideal candidate for a major transit corridor.

- Metro Parks and Nature scientist staff that are working on Johnson Creek watershed issues
- Metro Parks and Nature staff with knowledge of Powell and SE Jenne Rd buttes
- Metro transportation and land use planning staff
- Natural resource expertise to speak to creek impacts
- Springwater Corridor Representative
- Emergency services
- Engineering expertise (to temper planning and visioning to what is actually buildable)
- The area is an important regional bike/ped area, so may want bike/ped interest. Ex: Scouters Mountain trail is in this area, and Sunrise multi-use trail will be coming from the east. Michael Walter may be able to speak to this.

Public involvement suggestions

Participants provided suggestions on the kinds of activities and forms of notification the team could use to increase public participation:

- Hold public meetings in Pleasant Valley rather than at Gresham City Hall or other government buildings.
- Use NextDoor to reach out to the public. There is no Pleasant Valley NextDoor but there is a Southwest Gresham NextDoor that Pleasant Valley residents use.
- Post flyers or invitations to public meetings at the Grange, Pleasant Valley Market, Pleasant Valley School, Butler Creek Elementary, and other local gathering areas. Prior to meetings, put out road signs to engage people that might not otherwise attend.
- Conducting tabling at Gresham Farmers Market.
- East County Caring Community is a monthly forum in Gresham that presents a different topic each month. It is run out of the Multnomah County Commissioner's Office. This could be a way to distribute information.
- East Metro County Transportation Committee could be a good group through which to distribute information to surrounding cities. It has representation from Gresham, Troutdale, and Wood Village.

Several participants invited the project team to present briefings at their organizations' meetings, and offered to provide public outreach support:

- The Gresham Pleasant Valley Neighborhood Association invites the project team to present at its December 12 meeting.
- Project team is invited to speak and attend the Johnson Creek Watershed Council board meetings or land use committee meetings. JCWC would want to do outreach about the project, and be an advocate too.
- North Clackamas Chamber of Commerce can share project information and public meeting dates through the Chamber's weekly Monday email that goes out to its membership.
- Elected officials can help with outreach, and the project team should keep them engaged. Multnomah County Commissioner can post updates on Facebook and in the newsletter.

Who else should be engaged?

Participants suggested engaging these additional groups:

- School Districts. School bus traffic causes a lot of congestion in this area.
- Gresham Sustainability Committee
- Gresham Transportation Committee
- Gresham Chamber of Commerce
- Damascus active community members
- Happy Valley residents
- Elected officials in Happy Valley (Mayor)
- Developers should be part of conversation. If SDCs are going to pay for these roads, then they should have a voice.

Key messages to communicate

Participants suggested that the project team communicate the following messages in public information materials, in order to engage a broad cross section of residents and travelers:

- **This project will improve congestion.** Residents connect with messages around reducing traffic and making their commute more bearable. The City is moving forward to address a decades-old problem, and to keep up with the development that has been rapidly moving in over the past few years.
 - Emphasize that this effort will be a major improvement to the current Gresham TSP, which lacks continuous travel connections and seems to have a lot of collector roads that dead end.
 - Congestion comes from the fact that everyone is trying to take one route to I-205 (including residents from Happy Valley, formerly Damascus area, and unincorporated areas that are planned for annexation into Gresham). This process will provide TWO roads to help solve that congestion issue.
 - Paint a picture of “Less time spent in traffic.” People use the 172nd Ave to SE Jenne Rd route as an alternative to I-205 when the freeway is backed up. If the alternative is packed with traffic too, then there is no good solution.
- **Regional connectivity** is important. There is a lack of good North-South connections in this area. Connect this project with the broader “Columbia to Clackamas” concept so that people can see the big picture. Congestion is only going to increase, so now is the time to address the issue.
- Provide messaging that **balances the congestion relief with the community impacts.**
- The original concept planning in Pleasant Valley was to deemphasize SE Foster Rd as a route. But that didn’t happen. This TSP refinement may be an opportunity to try to **reduce traffic on SE Foster Rd.**
- This project is improving the flow of goods, people, trail users, fish and wildlife
- **Environment and natural resources:** Show how the project will protect or save Coho salmon and endangered species. Let people know that SE Jenne Rd is in a flood plain, so should not be

the main through route. We need another, more environmental friendly route—like the 174th Ave Extension.