



PLEASANT VALLEY TSP REFINEMENT

CAC Meeting #1 – Meeting Notes

January 10, 2018, 6:30-8:30 p.m.

Pleasant Valley Elementary School, 17625 SE Foster Rd

Meeting Purpose: Provide an overview of the project scope and schedule, discuss committee member roles and responsibilities, gather feedback on the draft goals and objectives, and present the existing and future planned conditions.

Time	Agenda Item	Facilitator
6:30 – 6:45	Welcome and Introductions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ CAC member backgrounds and project interests ▶ City staff / Consultant team 	Jay Higgins, City of Gresham
<i>Sign-in Sheet Attached</i>		
6:45 – 6:55	CAC Member Roles and Responsibilities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ CAC Charter and protocols 	Sylvia Ciborowski, JLA Public Involvement
6:55 – 7:10	Project Background & Schedule Overview <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Project purpose ▶ Project study area ▶ Project outcomes ▶ Project schedule <i>Reference: Factsheet</i>	Susie Wright, Kittelson

Question (CAC): What are the boundaries of different jurisdictions around the study area?

Answer: Map provided in Background Document Review.

Question (CAC): The idea of the 174th extension was floated in the planning of Pleasant Valley. Stakeholders decided that this wasn't a good idea. Why is this being brought up now and what has changed?

Answer: While the 174th extension is not in the TSP, it has been considered in other plans and the need for north/south connectivity and capacity raised.

Metro has included a segment for the 174th extension in its model. We need to define our intentions to Metro – what happens to needed capacity and where does it go. There is still a question about how that capacity gets achieved. The Foster/Powell study from Willamette to Damascus recommends study of the 174th extension. We want to get clarity on this area and understand whether the network can function without the extension and whether we can still serve needs.

Question (public): I assume you have already analyzed other options like widening Jenne Rd instead of cutting a new swath of land?

Answer: We have not yet analyzed that. We want to have chance to discuss options with this group first and hear ideas from the public. This input will guide what we study.

Time	Agenda Item	Facilitator
7:10 – 7:20	Background Document Review <i>Reference: Background Document Review</i> <i>Question: Does the background review accurately reflect all planned roadways for the study area?</i>	Kelly Laustsen, Kittelson
<p><i>Question (CAC): What does red vs orange mean in the Metro map, what does financially constrained mean?</i> <i>Answer: The orange projects are financially constrained and the red ones not financially constrained. Projects that are financially constrained are estimated to be built within the timeline of the plan (20 years) while those that are not financially constrained are further out in their anticipated build date.</i></p> <p><i>Question (CAC): What were the zoning assumptions? Does it include the Happy Valley employment area between Foster and 172nd?</i> <i>Answer: The model work assumes what is allowable under existing zoning and what's in the Metro model. We can look into the employment area referenced further.</i></p> <p><i>Question (CAC): The projects in the RTP plan are all identified as beyond 10 years. Is that realistic?</i> <i>Answer: An explanation of RTP funding was provided, noting that it is based on projections of when projects will be built within certain time spans.</i></p> <p><i>Comments on whether the map on page 24 is the same as adopted PV TSP map. (Yes)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Jenne Rd and 190th do not seem reflected in the map on page 24. (This is because the map reflects new roadways)</i> ▪ <i>Members suggested using the map that came out of the Pleasant Valley District Plan process.</i> ▪ <i>They asked why this earlier map is not being used. Staff responded that the team attempted to develop a simpler map.</i> ▪ <i>Some concern that if the Pleasant Valley concept plan map is used, people may be confused because it includes land use designations and restoration areas—and these are not under consideration by the TSP update process.</i> ▪ <i>The team will verify if there are differences between the PV TSP and PV District Plan maps.</i> <p><i>Group came to consensus: use the PV District Plan map as the basis for what's adopted in the area.</i></p>		
7:20 – 7:35	Public Involvement Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Stakeholder interview summary ▶ Public Workshop and Virtual Workshop #1 <i>References: Public Involvement Plan, Stakeholder Interviews Summary</i> <i>Question: How can we promote the workshop to increase participation?</i>	Sylvia Ciborowski
<p><i>Suggestions for promoting workshop:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>PV Elementary School can send postcard to parents (Angelene can coordinate this)</i> 		

Time	Agenda Item	Facilitator
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Team may want to talk to SW Gresham school about doing outreach to their students/parents. The school feels that since it is not located in Pleasant Valley, the issue is not relevant.</i> ▪ <i>Spread the word with the Centennial neighborhood. There is no neighborhood association active in the area, but might be able to get the word out through Centennial High School and Lynch School.</i> 	
7:35 – 8:00	<p>Project Goals & Objectives</p> <p><i>Reference: Draft Project Goals & Objectives</i></p> <p><i>Question: Do the draft goals and objectives accurately reflect the aspirations of the community?</i></p>	Kelly Laustsen
	<p><i>Comment (CAC – Jason): The goal for “Coordinated Plan” should be expanded to include other agencies and partners such as watershed council. The goal “Livability” should also talk about fish and wildlife movement – habitat fragmentation. The goal “Mobility” should also talk about the movement of fish and wildlife.</i></p> <p><i>Comment (Jay): Could we say minimize habitat fragmentation?</i></p> <p><i>Comment (CAC – Jason): should go beyond minimizing habitat fragmentation to creating connected habitat corridors.</i></p> <p><i>Comment (CAC – Angeline): related to the goal “Feasible Plan,” also need to consider how the plan will be paid for, beyond just costs. A major flaw of the master plan is that it assumes development will pay for it.</i></p> <p><i>Members expressed concern about increased density and associated increase cost of living as a result of all of the development that is occurring.</i></p> <p><i>Members noted it is important to look at what is financially feasible. The plan should not include projects that cannot realistically be built.</i></p> <p><i>Question (CAC): Are we involving Clackamas County and Happy Valley? They should be involved financially.</i></p> <p><i>Answer: Yes – we are keeping Clackamas County and Happy Valley updated through a separate collaborative project we are working on near the study area.</i></p> <p><i>With the additions and considerations above, the group came to consensus that the goals and objectives should guide the project moving forward.</i></p>	
8:00 – 8:15	<p>Existing & Future Planned Conditions</p> <p><i>Reference: Existing & Future No-Build Conditions</i></p>	Kelly Laustsen
	<p><i>Question (Public): Is there a plan for a roundabout at 172nd/Foster?</i></p> <p><i>Answer: Based on our review of existing plans, there has been discussion of a signal or roundabout. We assumed a signal in our future operational analysis.</i></p> <p><i>Question to CAC: Do the existing operational results match what you expected? CAC indicated they seem accurate. The two intersections not meeting standards (Powell/174th and Foster/172nd) are the major concerns in the area.</i></p> <p><i>Question (CAC): How is this process addressing Foster?</i></p>	

Time	Agenda Item	Facilitator
	<p><i>Answer: The future analysis measures the effect of downgrading Foster, as planned in the TSP.</i></p> <p><i>Question (CAC – Angeline): On Foster Road from I-205 to Jenne there are backups from Barbra Welsh to Jenne Road heading east. Would like to know why Portland is looking at Powell which is constrained all the way to I-205 when Foster seems more viable.</i></p> <p><i>Answer (PBOT – Daniel): Will follow up with more info on the decision not to widen Foster.</i></p> <p><i>Members would like to know why Portland is focused on widening Powell, not Foster. They want to understand the Portland plan for Powell Blvd, and the timeline for making improvements. Staff responded that they will look into this reasoning and share with the CAC. They will also send out a link to the website on the topic.</i></p> <p><i>Question (Public): The intersection of 190th/Giese/Butler is not showing any crashes in the report table, but appears to have crashes on the map. This could be due to the name change with the roadways.</i></p> <p><i>Answer: We will look into this and correct any errors.</i></p>	
8:15 – 8:25	Public Comment	Sylvia Ciborowski
	<p><i>Jack Gardner, Gresham SW Neighborhood resident: Southwest Gresham is impacted by the buildout in the Pleasant Valley area. For example, Butler is a critical East-West Rd because there is no other option. If the City continues to allow developers to build what is projected for Happy Valley and Pleasant Valley, traffic will get much worse and travelers will not be able to get to Gresham without traveling on Butler and Towle. There is a lot of congestion on Butler Rd.</i></p> <p><i>John Ridel: The proposed 174th Extension goes through an ESRA, Metro green spaces, and environmental overlay. Building the extension would destroy habitat, which would not meet the habitat goals proposed by the CAC. There are density requirements/goals for the Pleasant Valley area. By building a large extension road, this takes away home sites and the potential to meet those density requirements.</i></p>	
8:25 – 8:30	<p>Next Steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Future CAC meeting dates <p><i>Question: Do meeting dates conflict with member schedules?</i></p>	Susie Wright
	<p><i>Jay will send out email invitations for future CAC meetings. Members can follow-up with Jay regarding any conflicts.</i></p>	

Meeting Packet:

- ▶ Factsheet
- ▶ Background Documents Review Report
- ▶ Public Involvement Plan
- ▶ Stakeholder Interviews Summary
- ▶ Draft Goals and Objectives Report
- ▶ Existing and Future Planned Conditions Report



Sign-In Sheet

Name	Organization	Phone	Email
Jack Ardner	Member SWNA	503 665 4442	jack.joegee1@icloud.com
ACK STRATHERN	SWNA	503 737-7598	SWNAGROUP@gmail.com
Ben Brady	MEMBER	971-537-6386	bradyben@hotmail.com
JASON HOWARD	JEWEL	503-860-9967	geojason@comcast.net
Step Bennett	SWNA	503-491-9511	bennett_19535@msn.com
Joe Schewe	THE HOLT GROUP	503.710-2612	joe@holtgroupinc.com
BRANDON HARER	SWNA	503-936-0567	BRANDON.HARER@COMCAST.NET
Angela Kelly Pitt		503-481-6359	angela.kelly@icloud.com
DALE SHATNER	PVNA	816-812-2839	dale.shatner@gmail.com
Kurt Liebelt	PPNA	503-621-4478	Kliebelt@comcast.net
Greg Leung	CSD	503-890-4713	greg-leung@csd285.org
Jason Lehman	Property Owner	503-720-6098	jasonalehman@yahoo.com
John LEHMAN	Property Owner	503-666-3684	johnlehman@yahoo.com
Stan & Karen Bohnstede	GPVNA	503-367-2434	dr.bohnstede@comcast.net
John Riddell	GPVNA		

Pleasant Valley TSP Refinement Community Advisory Committee (CAC) *Operating Protocols*

Working Draft for Committee Member Review and Discussion

The Pleasant Valley TSP Refinement Community Advisory Committee is a collaborative group. We have developed and agree to the following protocols as a basis for how we will work together.

CAC charter and composition:

The Community Advisory Committee (CAC) provides community-based recommendations as part of the Pleasant Valley TSP Refinement project. The CAC will develop recommendations to the Project Team and the Gresham City Council. All meetings will be open to the public and include a public comment period. The CAC includes a range of neighborhood, environmental, and economic development representatives.

Membership includes:

	Name	Organization
	1 Paul Grosjean	Chair/President, Portland Pleasant Valley Neighborhood Association
X	2 Angeline Adler	President, Gresham Pleasant Valley Neighborhood Association
X	3 Kent Liebelt	Land Use, Gresham Pleasant Valley Neighborhood Association
X	4 Steve Bennett	Land Use Chair, Southwest Neighborhood Association
	5 Karen Hubbard	Happy Valley resident
	6 Linda Bauer	East Portland Land Use & Transportation Committee
	7 Carol Rulla	Coalition of Gresham Neighborhood Associations
	8 Laura Nixon	Principal, Pleasant Valley Elementary
	9 David Scharfenberg	Teacher/Bike Advocate, Pleasant Valley Elementary
	10 Victor Salinas	Executive Director, East Portland Neighborhood Office
X	11 Joe Schiewe	Developer, Holt Group
	12 TBD	Friends of Jenne Butte
X	13 Jason Howard	Johnson Creek Watershed Council
	14 Daniel Newberry	Executive Director, Johnson Creek Watershed Council
	15 TBD	Gresham Transportation Sub-Committee member
X	16 Centennial School District	Property owner 172 nd /Foster
	17 Paul Bieker	Property owner 172 nd /Foster
	18 Chuc Tn Nguyen	Property owner 172 nd /Foster