



OFFICE OF COUNTY COUNSEL

PUBLIC SERVICES BUILDING

2051 KAEN ROAD | OREGON CITY, OR 97045

Billy J. Williams
County Counsel

Scott C. Ciecko
Amanda Keller
Shawn Lillegren
Jeffrey D. Munns
Sarah Foreman
Caleb Huegel
Angela Hajihashemi
Joseph Lucas
Ryan Hammond
Assistants

July 17, 2025

BCC Agenda Date/Item: _____

Board of County Commissioners
Clackamas County

**Adoption of Previously Approved Comprehensive Plan
Amendments ZDO-292 – Walk Bike Clackamas Plan.**

Previous Board Action/Review	Policy Session - April 1, 2025 Public Hearing - May 13, 2025 Continued Public Hearing - June 3, 2025 Continued Public Hearing - June 17, 2025		
Performance Clackamas	3. Build a strong infrastructure		
Counsel Review	Yes	Procurement Review	No
Contact Person	Caleb Huegel	Contact Phone	503-655-8362

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: ZDO-292 is a package of legislative amendments to the Comprehensive Plan that are necessary to adopt the *Walk Bike Clackamas Plan* and to comply with state laws related to transportation planning. More specifically, the amendments:

1. Amend the Active Transportation policies in Chapter 5 of the Comprehensive Plan, the Transportation System Plan (TSP), to ensure consistency between the TSP and the *Walk Bike Clackamas Plan*;
2. Adopt the *Walk Bike Clackamas Plan* by reference into Appendix A to the Comprehensive Plan; and
3. Adopt Appendices A through T to the *Walk Bike Clackamas Plan* by reference into Appendix B to the Comprehensive Plan.

The Planning Commission held a public hearing on the amendments on April 14, 2025. The Planning Commission voted unanimously to recommend approval of ZDO-292 with the modification to add a project in the Rhododendron unincorporated community involving the installation of a new enhanced crosswalk on Highway 26. The *Walk Bike Clackamas Plan* was updated to include this new project, which is numbered E113 and shown on Figure 35 in the *Walk Bike Clackamas Plan*.

The Board of County Commissioners held a public hearing on the amendments on May 13, 2025. Following the staff presentation, the Board heard public testimony and began deliberations. After discussion, the Board voted 3-0 to continue the public hearing to June 3, 2025,

For Filing Use Only

for deliberation and decision only. At the June 3, 2025, continued public hearing, the Board voted 3-0 to once again continue the public hearing to June 17, 2025. At the June 17, 2025, continued public hearing, the Board voted 4-1 to approve ZDO-292 as recommended by the Planning Commission with the modification that the priority of project N303 be changed from Tier 3 to Tier 2. The attached ordinance, and the exhibits thereto, reflect the amendments as approved by the Board.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends that the Board adopt the attached ordinance and the exhibits thereto.

Respectfully submitted,



Caleb Huegel
Assistant County Counsel

ATTACHMENTS:

Ordinance ZDO-292 with Exhibits

Ordinance ZDO-292

**An Ordinance Amending the Clackamas County Comprehensive Plan
to Adopt the Walk Bike Clackamas Plan**

WHEREAS, the County's Pedestrian Master Plan and Bicycle Master Plan have not been updated since they were first adopted in 1996; and

WHEREAS, the County applied for and was awarded a Transportation Growth Management (TGM) grant from the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) in 2020 to concurrently update the 1996 Pedestrian Master Plan and 1996 Bicycle Master Plan; and

WHEREAS, it is a Performance Clackamas goal that, by 2026, 100% of County residents and businesses—where served—have access to safe and affordable infrastructure and multimodal transportation including roads, sewer, and broadband services; and

WHEREAS, Statewide Planning Goal 12 (Transportation) requires cities and counties to plan for connected pedestrian and bicycle transportation networks; and

WHEREAS, OAR chapter 660, division 12, outlines the requirements for Transportation Planning and includes specific requirements for Pedestrian System Planning and Bicycle System Planning; and

WHEREAS, the County conducted a two-and-a-half-year-long planning process in compliance with OAR chapter 660, division 12, to develop the Walk Bike Clackamas Plan, which included community engagement activities throughout the life of the project; and

WHEREAS, after a duly noticed public hearing on May 13, 2025, which was continued to June 3, 2025, and continued again to June 17, 2025, and after considering a recommendation by the Planning Commission following its own public hearing on April 14, 2025, the Board of County Commissioners orally approved the Planning Commission's recommendation with the modification that the priority of project N303 be changed from Tier 3 to Tier 2;

Now, therefore, the Board of Commissioners of Clackamas County ordains as follows:

- Section 1:** Chapter 5 of the Comprehensive Plan, the Transportation System Plan, is amended to ensure consistency with the Walk Bike Clackamas Plan, as shown in Exhibit A, attached hereto.
- Section 2:** Appendix A to the Comprehensive Plan is amended to adopt the Walk Bike Clackamas Plan by reference, as shown in Exhibit B, attached hereto.
- Section 3:** Appendix B to the Comprehensive Plan is amended to adopt Appendices A through T to the Walk Bike Clackamas Plan by reference, as shown in Exhibit C, attached hereto.
- Section 4:** The Findings of Consistency with the Statewide Planning Goals, Oregon Administrative Rules, Metro Regional Transportation Functional Plan, Clackamas County Comprehensive Plan, and Clackamas County Zoning and Development Ordinance in Exhibit D, attached hereto, are adopted as the Board's findings and conclusions supporting the actions described herein.

ADOPTED this 17th day of July 2025
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

Chair

Recording Secretary

Exhibit A
Ordinance ZDO-292
Comprehensive Plan Amendments

Chapter 5: TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN

The Clackamas County Transportation System Plan (TSP) will guide transportation related decisions and identify the transportation needs and priorities in unincorporated Clackamas County from 2013 to 2033. The TSP has been created in coordination with the County's 16 cities, the State of Oregon, area transit providers, and other affected agencies and has been vetted through an extensive public process, including a series of public outreach events and twelve Public Advisory Committee meetings. The public and county staff worked together to develop the following vision for the TSP and six goals to guide implementation of this vision:

Building on the foundation of our existing assets, we envision a well-maintained and designed transportation system that provides safety, flexibility, mobility, accessibility and connectivity for people, goods and services; is tailored to our diverse geographies; and supports future needs and land use plans.

TSP GOALS

- Goal 1: Provide a transportation system that optimizes benefits to the environment, the economy and the community
- Goal 2: Plan the transportation system to create a prosperous and adaptable economy and further the economic well-being of businesses and residents of the County.
- Goal 3: Tailor transportation solutions to suit the diversity of local communities.
- Goal 4: Promote a transportation system that maintains or improves our safety, health, and security.
- Goal 5: Provide an equitable transportation system.
- Goal 6: Promote a fiscally responsible approach to protect and improve the existing transportation system and implement a cost-effective system to meet future needs.

BACKGROUND AND ISSUES

The County's transportation system includes an extensive network of public and private transportation facilities, including roads, railways, airports, pipelines, waterways, and multi-use paths. The system is intended to allow people to travel where they need to go safely and efficiently, while also providing for efficient movement of goods. The County's transportation

system is also intended to support sustainable land use patterns and policies to serve a multitude of public needs without sacrificing air and water quality or creating noise pollution.

Government agencies, public and private service providers, and developers are involved in building and maintaining the County's transportation system. Metro, Portland's metropolitan planning organization, sets general policy guidelines for design, distributes regional funding for certain types of projects within its boundary, and sets standards for the operation of the transportation system located within the Portland Metropolitan Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). All transportation facilities must conform to standards and guidelines outlined by federal, state and, in some cases, Metro regulatory documents.

Clackamas County faces several challenges as it attempts to continue to develop and maintain a safe and integrated transportation system, appropriate for and accessible to all potential users.

- Limited funding: Funding levels for roads, the backbone of the transportation system, have not kept pace with the mobility needs of our society. Limited funding makes it a challenge to balance the need for maintenance and management of existing facilities with the need for building new facilities to accommodate increased trip demand. As a result, the backlog of needed road maintenance and construction projects has grown larger.
- Reducing congestion: Community members help reduce traffic congestion when they choose to take the bus, join a carpool, or bicycle and walk to destinations. Reducing congestion decreases the need for costly road construction projects while improving air quality, neighborhood livability and access to goods, services and employment.

Improving the relationship between land uses and transportation can also decrease reliance on automobiles and reduce congestion. Some ways to improve this relationship are to: alter the site design of new construction at or near major transit stops; increase connectivity in transportation systems; provide better pedestrian and bicycle facilities; use land more efficiently; and encourage mixed-use developments.

- Balancing needs: All land-based modes of travel, except rail and pipeline, must share the public rights-of-way. These modes includes autos, trucks, buses, bicycles, pedestrians and, in some localities, equestrians. Balancing the need for mobility (through movement of traffic) with the need for local movement and access to individual properties often creates design and safety challenges for roadways.
- Safety: From 2005 to 2009, there were approximately 160 fatalities and 1,245 serious injuries in Clackamas County due to traffic crashes. One of the County's goals is to improve the safety of its system for all users and reduce the number and severity of crashes for future years. Developing facilities to accommodate all modes of travel will help reduce conflicts that lead to safety problems for some users. The adopted Transportation Safety Action Plan calls for a 50 percent reduction of fatal and serious injury crashes by 2022.
- Fostering economic growth: Monitoring the effects of transportation on employment and economic activity is important during both good and bad economic times. Of particular significance are the ways transportation can be used as a tool to sustain and promote economic development both in the urban industrial and commercial centers and within the

county's distinctive rural economy, including agriculture, forestry and equestrian facilities.

- Addressing environmental impacts: Development of transportation infrastructure needs to be sensitive to potential impacts to neighborhoods and to the natural environment, in order to create and maintain livable communities, preserve air and water quality, and conserve energy.

The northwest urban area of the County is within a designated Air Quality Maintenance Area (AQMA). Presently the AQMA meets state and federal air quality standards, but federal law requires the region to implement measures to maintain federal air quality standards. Federal law also prohibits significant degradation of air quality in the Mt. Hood Wilderness.

- Ensuring accessibility: In many areas of the County, transportation disadvantaged populations, such as the elderly, disabled or low-income residents, need improved access to public transit and special transportation services. Clackamas County will ensure that new and rebuilt roads are planned and designed to perform all necessary functions, including being accessible to those who choose not to drive or cannot drive.
- Maintaining and improving rural area roads: Clackamas County also is challenged by the responsibility to maintain and develop a safe and functional road network in rural areas. Upgrades to aging rural roadways are needed to enhance safety and accommodate different modes of travel.

TSP ORGANIZATION

To implement the vision and goals and to address the issues identified above, a series of policies have been created to direct the County in its efforts to build and maintain a multi-modal transportation system. Under each policy category, the countywide policies are listed first, followed by the urban policies, and the rural policies.

The policies are presented in this chapter by major topic or transportation mode as follows:

- **Foundation and Framework**: includes policies relating to coordination; safety; equity, health and sustainability; intelligent transportation systems; and transportation demand management
- **Land Use and Transportation**: includes policies relating to the integration of land use and transportation; parking; rural tourism; and scenic roads.
- **Active Transportation**: includes policies relating to pedestrian and bicycle facilities and multi-use paths.
- **Roadways**: includes policies relating to functional classification; urban and rural roadway considerations; project development; improvements to serve development; and performance evaluation and access standards.
- **Transit**: includes policies relating to transit and transit-supportive amenities.

- **Freight, Rail, Air, Pipeline and Water Transportation:** includes policies relating to general freight movement; freight trucking; rail; airports; pipelines; and water transportation.
- **Finance and Funding:** includes policies relating to funding capital transportation improvements and maintenance.
- **Transportation Projects and Plans:** includes policies relating to the 20-year and five-year capital improvement plans. Also identifies Special Transportation Plans that are adopted by reference as refinements of the TSP and plans or studies that need to be completed in the future to support the TSP.
- **Definitions:** relevant definitions for use within this chapter.

The TSP also contains the following components:

- The County's **20-year Capital Improvement Plan:** a complete list of needed transportation-related projects to address gaps and deficiencies in the transportation network (Tables 5-3[a-d]).
- **Tables, Maps and Figures** illustrating the transportation system and street cross sections, and presenting guidelines and standards for developing the system.
- **Background documents** including detailed findings and conclusions relating to the various components of the transportation system (Appendix B).

FOUNDATION AND FRAMEWORK

Clackamas County's transportation networks serve local communities and also tie into regional networks. Creating a transportation system that is safe and accessible for all users must be done within the context of federal, state, and regional regulations. The system needs to be responsive to new initiatives adopted by these regulatory bodies to ensure the development of a complete and sustainable transportation system. It needs to be responsive to new approaches, techniques and measures developed for assessing the performance of the system. Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) and Travel Demand Management (TDM) techniques are two such tools that can be effective in managing the costs of the system and enabling better performance.

Safety is consistently mentioned by citizens as one of the highest concerns related to the transportation system, regardless of individuals' preferred methods of travel. The accessibility of the transportation system for all individuals is also a primary concern. Therefore, prioritizing safety and accessibility is essential in the planning, design, operation and maintenance of the transportation system.

5.A Compliance and Coordination Policies

- 5.A.1 Support intergovernmental partnerships needed to promote coordination and address multi-jurisdictional transportation needs.
- 5.A.2 Work collaboratively with federal, state, regional, and local agencies and with County residents to pursue the County's road safety programs and plans.
- 5.A.3 Work with state and local partners to implement the Oregon Transportation Safety Plan.
- 5.A.4 Coordinate with the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) in implementing the Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP), Oregon Highway Plan (OHP), Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), and with other state transportation planning policies, guidelines and programs.
- 5.A.5 Work with the Oregon Office of Emergency Management to ensure that the TSP supports effective responses to natural and human-caused disasters and emergencies and other incidents, and access during these incidents.
- 5.A.6 **Urban** Coordinate with Metro and local governments to implement the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP), Urban Growth Management Functional Plan (UGMFP), and local transportation plans.
- 5.A.7 **Rural** Pursue formation of an Area Commission on Transportation (ACT) for the portions of Clackamas County outside the Portland Metropolitan Urban Growth

Boundary to facilitate a coordinated approach to addressing issues on the state transportation system.

5.B Road Safety Policies

- 5.B.1 Update the Clackamas County Transportation Safety Action Plan (TSAP) every five years to include necessary changes and document the progress toward the plan's goal of a 50 percent reduction in fatal and serious injury crashes by 2022.
- 5.B.2 Identify transportation system safety improvements that will reduce fatal and injury crashes for all modes of travel and meet the TSAP goal.
- 5.B.3 Address the County's top three crash cause factors of Aggressive Driving, Young Drivers (ages 15-25) and Roadway Departure utilizing education, emergency medical services, enforcement, engineering and evaluation.
- 5.B.4 Support programs, policies, regulations and actions that increase awareness and education about the safety of the transportation system for all users.
- 5.B.5 Support programs that utilize data-driven approaches to improve safety of the transportation system.
- 5.B.6 Align County departments, external safety groups, and other public agencies toward common transportation safety goals.
- 5.B.7 Integrate roadway, safety and traffic data management, health and emergency services data sources.
- 5.B.8 Integrate Highway Safety Manual (HSM) principles into the planning, engineering, design, operation and maintenance of the transportation system.

5.C Equity, Health and Sustainability Policies

- 5.C.1 Support programs and projects, such as pedestrian and bike connections to transit stops, that expand and improve transportation options for residents in areas with identified transportation-disadvantaged populations.
- 5.C.2 Protect neighborhoods, recreation areas, pedestrian facilities, bikeways and sensitive land uses (such as schools, daycare centers and senior centers whose users are more vulnerable to pollution) from transportation-related environmental degradation. Coordinate transportation and land use planning and use mitigation strategies, such as physical barriers and design features, to minimize transmission of air, noise and water pollution from roads to neighboring land uses.
- 5.C.3 Work with public agencies, private businesses and developers to increase and improve infrastructure necessary to support use of vehicles that use alternative fuels.

- 5.C.4 Ensure that programs to encourage and educate people about bicycle, pedestrian, and transit transportation options are appropriate for all County residents, particularly transportation-disadvantaged populations.
- 5.C.5 Build working partnerships between the County's Public Health and Transportation Divisions and utilize tools, such as health impact assessments, to better connect the effects of transportation projects with the health of communities.
- 5.C.6 Support the continued provision of public transportation services to County populations that are un-served or under-served, as well as the network of community-based, transportation services for seniors and persons with disabilities.

5.D Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Policies

- 5.D.1 Implement a wide range of ITS strategies aligned with the TSP vision and goals by ensuring safe, efficient, and equitable mobility for people and goods.
- 5.D.2 Update the ITS Action Plan every five years as part of the County's 5-Year Capital Improvement Program.

5.E Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Policies

- 5.E.1 Implement Transportation Demand Management techniques—including education, encouragement, and enforcement—appropriate for all County residents, in order to increase efficient use of existing transportation infrastructure and minimize congestion and safety concerns by offering choices of mode, route, and time.
- 5.E.2 Support and participate in efforts by Metro, the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), transit providers, and any area Transportation Management Associations (TMAs) to develop, monitor and fund regional TDM programs.
- 5.E.3 Provide adequate bicycle and pedestrian facilities to employment areas to encourage use of bicycles or walking for the commute to work and to improve access to jobs for workers without cars.
- 5.E.4 Support programs that work with schools to identify safe bicycle and pedestrian routes to connect neighborhoods and schools. Seek partnerships and funding to support improvement of these routes.
- 5.E.5 **Urban** Work with County employers located in concentrated employment areas to develop Transportation Management Associations (TMAs) to coordinate and support private-sector TDM efforts and to work toward mode share targets (Table 5-1) adopted in this Plan.

- 5.E.6 **Urban** Establish the following year 2040 non-drive-alone targets for growth concept design types (as identified on Map 4-8):

TABLE 5-1
Year 2040 Non-Drive-Alone Modal Targets

Design Type	Non-Drive-Alone Modal Target
Regional Centers Station Communities Corridors	45-55% of all vehicle trips
Industrial Areas Employment Areas Neighborhoods Regionally Significant Industrial Areas	40-45% of all vehicle trips

- 5.E.7 **Rural** Encourage employers and schools outside urban growth boundaries to implement a range of TDM policies to help their employees and students reduce vehicle miles traveled, maximize use of existing transportation facilities, and increase walking, biking and transit use.

LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION

Integrating transportation plans with land use plans is a key element in effective management and operation of the entire transportation system. Roads support the wide range of land activities that take place in both the urban and rural areas. Because of the diverse nature of activities and land use types found in Clackamas County, it is of particular importance that the transportation systems are designed to accommodate both urban networks and the different needs of rural area users, including providing safe routes for users of all modes to enjoy the rural area's scenic beauty, and for those participating in agri-tourism and activities related to forestry.

Planning for appropriate amounts of parking supports efficient development of the land within communities. Accommodating on-street parking and planning for off-street parking needs are Transportation System Management (TSM) techniques that are consistent with the Metro Region's 2040 Growth Concept, meet the objectives of the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR), and comply with DEQ's Air Quality Maintenance Plan.

5.F Integration of Land Use and Transportation Policies

- 5.F.1 Land use and transportation policies shall be integrated consistent with state law regarding preservation of farm and forest lands.
- 5.F.2 Support efforts to enhance and maintain the function of State highways and County arterials through land use policies, access management strategies, and roadway improvements.
- 5.F.3 Support and promote an integrated approach to land use and transportation planning and implementation that encourages livable and sustainable communities, decreases average trip length and increases accessibility for all modes.
- 5.F.4 Support and promote transportation investments that support complete and sustainable communities as a long-term strategy to reduce reliance on long commutes out of the County to employment destinations.
- 5.F.5 Recognize the County's rural economic engine and the importance of moving goods from rural businesses (including farms, nurseries, livestock, and lumber) to distribution centers.
- 5.F.6 Require changes in land use plan designation and zoning designation to comply with the Transportation Planning Rule [Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 660-012-0060].
- 5.F.7 **Urban** Require changes in land use plan designation within the Interchange Management Areas identified on Map 5-7 to be consistent with the Transportation Planning Rule (OAR 660-012-0060). If the land uses allowed by the new land use plan designation would cause the interchange mobility standards to be exceeded, either the

change shall be denied or improvements shall be made such that the mobility standards are met.

5.G. Parking Policies

- 5.G.1 Set minimum and, where appropriate, maximum limits on allowed off-street parking of motor vehicles relative to building size, location and use, and to adjacent land uses. In the urban area, parking standards shall be coordinated with regional parking requirements.
- 5.G.2 Require new multi-family, commercial and institutional development to provide bicycle parking.
- 5.G.3 Allow shared parking and, where appropriate, on-street parking to be used to comply with parking standards.
- 5.G.4 **Urban** Allow the removal of existing, on-street parking along arterials and collectors to create bikeways, construct travel or turning lanes, or increase sight distance.
- 5.G.5 **Urban** Increase area for on-street parking in residential zoning districts by minimizing the width of driveway accesses.
- 5.G.6 **Urban** Encourage off-street parking in commercial, industrial, and high density residential areas to be located at the sides or rear of buildings, where practical.
- 5.G.7 **Urban** Consider allowing for decreased parking area requirements for development that:
 - provides housing in close proximity to a light-rail station; or
 - is located along a transit route, if the development provides pedestrian, bicycle and transit amenities. See Map 5-8a.
- 5.G.8 **Urban** Consider requiring shared parking within mixed-use development and where adjacent land uses are compatible.

5.H Rural Tourism Policies

- 5.H.1 **Rural** Encourage agri-tourism and other commercial events and activities that are related to and supportive of agriculture, in accordance with the provisions of ORS 215. Mitigation of traffic impacts and other event impacts may be required to reduce the effects of these limited land uses on the County road system.

5.I Rural Scenic Roads Policies

- 5.I.1 Implement a County Scenic Road System that is safe and attractive for all users.
- 5.I.2 Promote the protection of recreation values, scenic features and an open, uncluttered character along designated scenic roads.

Developments adjacent to scenic roads shall be designed with sensitivity to natural conditions and:

- 5.1.2.1 Scenic roads shall have strict access control on new developments.
- 5.1.2.2 Scenic roads should have shoulders wide enough for pedestrians or bicycles, or a separated path where feasible and when funding is available.
- 5.1.2.3 Turnouts shall be provided where appropriate for viewpoints or recreational needs.
- 5.1.2.4 Design review of developments adjacent to scenic roads shall require visual characteristics and signing appropriate to the setting.
- 5.1.2.5 Buildings shall be set back a sufficient distance from the right-of-way to permit a landscaped or natural buffer zone.
- 5.1.2.6 Parking areas adjacent to scenic roads shall be separated from the right-of-way by a landscaped buffer.
- 5.1.2.7 Any frontage roads adjacent to scenic roads shall be separated by a vegetative buffer where feasible
- 5.1.2.8 Underground placement of utility service lines shall be required unless prohibited by the utility service provider.

5.1.3 The following facilities shall be designated scenic roads: *(see Map 5-1 Scenic Roads)*

- Wilsonville Road
- Stafford Road (City of Lake Oswego to Mountain Road)
- Schaeffer Road
- Pete's Mountain Road (Schaeffer Road to the Tualatin River)
- SW Mountain Road, Canby Ferry Road, N. Locust, NE 37th, and Holly Street
- Canby-Marquam Highway (City of Canby to Hwy 211)
- Clackamas River Drive
- Springwater Road (Clackamas River Drive to Hayden Road)
- Hayden Road
- Redland Road
- Fischer's Mill Road
- Marmot Road/Barlow Trail Road/
- Ten Eyck Road/SE Lusted Road from Ten Eyck Road to the County line.
- Lolo Pass Road
- Salmon River Road
- Still Creek Road
- Timberline Road and West Leg Road
- I-205 west of the Willamette River
- Highway 99E from Oregon City to New Era Rd
- Oregon City Bypass (Newell Creek Canyon segment)
- Highway 211 (Canby-Marquam Highway to Estacada)

- Highway 224 (Carver to Barton and south of Estacada)
- Highway 26 east of the City of Sandy
- Highway 35/Forest Service Road 386

5.I.4 Support implementation of the Oregon Scenic Byway System, including the Mt. Hood Scenic Byway and the West Cascades Scenic Byway.

ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION

Recognizing the increasing importance of having multiple ways to travel through a community and through the region has led to an increased awareness for designing transportation systems to safely enhance active transportation modes. “Active Transportation” is defined to include walking, bicycling, ~~and horseback riding~~ and other mobility options, including scooters and electric bicycles.

Walk Bike Clackamas (WBC), adopted by reference in Appendix A, is the county’s combined pedestrian and bicycle master plan. The WBC Plan updates the 1996 Clackamas County Pedestrian Master Plan and the 1996 Clackamas County Bicycle Master Plan. The following six goals guided plan development and served as the basis for establishing the objectives, supportive actions and performance measures of the WBC Plan. The County completed transportation systems planning for pedestrian and bicycle modes in 1995 to implement the state’s Transportation Planning Rule (TPR), particularly the following TPR principles:

- Safety: Improve the safety of people walking and bicycling through safe street design and supportive programs. Land use and transportation are intimately related.
- Accessibility: Ensure walkways and bikeways are accessible to people of all ages, abilities and incomes. Over reliance should not be placed on any one transportation mode.
- Connectivity: Develop and maintain walking and biking routes that provide convenient and clear connections to important community destinations in Clackamas County. Walking and bicycling reduce the number of motorized vehicle trips.
- Sustainability: Overreliance should not be placed on any one transportation mode. Expand and promote walking and biking options that optimize the environment, the economy and community benefits. Compact, mixed-use development encourages the use of non-motorized modes.
- Equity: Focus investments to ensure safe transportation alternatives regardless of age, race, income, gender and ability. Well-planned, properly designed facilities will encourage people to make trips by non-motorized modes.
- Health: Plan and provide infrastructure that allows people to safely walk, run or bicycle for improved health. Facilities for these non-motorized modes are essential for people not having access to an automobile, and constitute desirable elements in a well-designed community that are enjoyed by people who can drive, but choose to walk or bicycle.

~~These principles underlie the development of the Clackamas County Pedestrian Master Plan and the Clackamas County Bicycle Master Plan, both of which are adopted by reference. Both master plans~~ The WBC Plan was prepared under the guidance of the 18-member Walk Bike Advisory Committee and Clackamas County Pedestrian and Bikeway Advisory Committee, which was guided by the following vision:

Walk Bike Clackamas is a comprehensive, long-term roadmap to improve opportunities for

~~people of all ages and abilities walking and biking as they travel in the county. Create an environment which encourages people to bicycle and walk on networked systems that facilitate and promote the enjoyment of bicycling and walking as safe and convenient transportation modes.~~

In addition, ~~t~~The Clackamas County Active Transportation Plan (ATP), adopted by reference in Appendix A, contains priority routes connecting communities in both the urban and rural portions of the County. Development of the principal active transportation routes described in the ATP would provide opportunities for residents to safely bicycle or walk to schools, parks, shopping, and employment centers.

5.J General Active Transportation Policies

- 5.J.1 Coordinate the implementation of pedestrian facilities and bikeways with neighboring jurisdictions and jurisdictions within the county.
- 5.J.2 Ensure an opportunity for a diverse and representative citizen involvement in the county pedestrian and bicycle planning process by ~~sponsoring~~ supporting the Clackamas County Pedestrian and Bikeway Advisory Committee (~~CCPBAC~~) as a forum for public input. Recruit representatives of Communities of Interest ~~transportation disadvantaged~~ populations as part of this process.
- 5.J.3 Monitor and update the Walk Bike Clackamas Plan ~~Clackamas County Pedestrian Master Plan, Bicycle Master Plan,~~ and Active Transportation Plan through data collection and evaluation, and review activities necessary to maintain and expand the programs established in these plans.
- 5.J.4 Support bicycle, pedestrian and transit projects that serve the needs of Communities of Interest ~~transportation disadvantaged~~ populations.
- 5.J.5 Coordinate with pedestrian, bicycle, and trail master plans, and with special transportation plans of the County, Oregon Department of Transportation, the United States Forest Service, Metro, and parks providers to achieve safe and convenient crossings and off-road, multi-use path and trail systems connecting to on-road pedestrian facilities and the bikeway networks.
- 5.J.6 Support the continuation of the “Bikes on Transit” program on all public transit routes.
- 5.J.7 Inform property owners of their responsibilities for the maintenance of sidewalks and pedestrian pathways.
- ~~5.J.8 Identify low traffic volume streets that are appropriate for signing as bicycle routes to enhance safety and connectivity and to supplement the system of bikeways found on the major street system.~~

Support the county's Safe Routes to School to School program.

5.J.9 Use public service campaigns to heighten motorists' awareness of bicyclists and pedestrians' rights and responsibilities.

5.J.10 Seek funding to implement the Event, Campaign and Mode Shift programs identified in the Walk Bike Clackamas Plan.

5.J.911 Rural Support bicycle and pedestrian projects that improve access to public transit stops and provide connections to significant local destinations.

5.K Design Policies

5.K.1 Require bikeways and pedestrian facilities for all new roadway construction or substantial reconstruction, allowing for flexibility to accommodate characteristics of terrain, scenic qualities, existing development, and environmental constraints.

5.K.2 Design and implement innovative bicycle and pedestrian facilities that improve the convenience and safety of these facilities. Use facility types described in the Walk Bike Clackamas Plan-Active Transportation Plan and National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) Urban Street Design Guide as a reference.

5.K.3 Urban- Review development plans to ensure that they provide bicycle and pedestrian access.

5.K.34 Improve the safety and appeal of walking and biking by supporting the development of bikeways and pedestrian facilities and networks on low volume or local roads and off of existing street rights of way.

Identify locations along high traffic and high-speed streets where the existing bicycle facility is not protected or separated, or parallel facilities do not exist. Plan for a transition to protected or separated facility in these locations.

5.K.5 Urban Identify and implement a network of low automobile traffic volume Shared Streets that are appropriate for posted speed reduction and signing as shared pedestrian and bicycle routes to enhance safety and connectivity and to supplement the system of sidewalks and bikeways found on the major street system.

- 5.K.~~4~~
6 **Urban** Identify pedestrian facilities and bikeway improvements necessary to ensure direct and continuous networks of pedestrian facilities and bikeways on the county road system.
- 5.K.~~5~~
7 **Urban** Identify locations where bicycle and pedestrian access is blocked by rivers and other natural barriers and encourage the creation of bicycle and pedestrian facilities to extend across these barriers.
- ~~5.K.6 Urban Review development plans to ensure that they provide bicycle and pedestrian access.~~
- 5.K.~~7~~
8 **Urban** Create a networked system of pedestrian facilities and bikeways connecting cities, neighborhoods, commercial areas, community centers, schools, recreational facilities, employment centers, other major destinations, regional and city bikeways and pedestrian facilities, and other transportation modes. Utilize separate accessways for pedestrian facilities and bikeways where street connections are impractical or unavailable.
- 5.K.~~8~~
9 **Rural** Support the safe movement of equestrians in rural areas.

5.L **Construction Policies**

- 5.L.1 Construct all pedestrian facilities, bikeways, and multi-use paths according to the current County design standards and to the applicable cross section, allowing for flexibility to accommodate characteristics of terrain, scenic qualities, existing development, and environmental constraints, and different designs identified in adopted Special Transportation Plans.
- 5.L.2 Construct all pedestrian facilities, bikeways, and multi-use paths designated on the Planned Bikeway Network (Maps 5-2a and 5-2b); the Essential Pedestrian Network (Map 5-3); and the Active Transportation Plan (Maps 5-12a and 5-12b).
- 5.L.3 Construct interim pedestrian facilities and bikeways, as appropriate, on existing streets that are not built to the applicable cross section and where the construction of full street improvements is not practicable or imminent as determined by the County Planning Director and County Road Official or County Engineer.
- 5.L.4 Where possible enhance or add bikeway facilities during road resurfacing, re-stripping and maintenance projects.
- 5.L.~~4~~
5 **Urban** Require that new development include construction of walkways and accessways within the development and between adjacent developments, where appropriate.

- 5.L.5 **Rural** In Unincorporated Communities, construct walkways adjacent to or within areas of development (such as schools, businesses, or employment centers) and at rural transit stops.

5.M Facilities Policies

- 5.M.1 Encourage the provision of appropriate, supportive facilities and services for bicyclists, including showers, lockers, bike racks on buses, bike repair ~~stations, and~~ maintenance information/clinics, ~~charging stations for e-bikes and and~~ secure ~~bicycle~~ parking.
- 5.M.2 Establish and maintain way-finding ~~signage in both the urban and rural areas~~ ~~systems~~ to facilitate ~~pedestrian and~~ bicycle travel.
- 5.M.3 Install and maintain the signage and bicycle amenities identified in the Active Transportation Plan.
- 5.M.4 **Urban** Encourage the provision of street lighting to increase the visibility and personal security of pedestrians and bicyclists.

5.N Multi-Use Path Policies

- 5.N.1 Support acquisition and development of multi-use paths on abandoned public and private rights-of-way.
- 5.N.2 Collaborate with the appropriate service providers, such as park providers, to plan for multi-use paths that accommodate equestrian facilities where possible.
- 5.N.3 **Rural** Consider multi-use paths where travel lanes or wide paved shoulders along roadways may not provide adequate safety for pedestrians or bicyclists.
- 5.N.4 **Rural** Consider equestrian uses when designing and constructing multi-use paths. Work with local communities and interest groups to plan, develop and maintain multi-use paths that also provide equestrian features. Plan for parking areas at such multi-use paths that support parking needs of equestrians, as well as needs of other path users.
- 5.N.5 **Rural** Establish a program to plan, develop, and maintain multi-use paths in the rural part of the County.

ROADWAYS

The County's road system permits the movement of goods and people between communities and regions, using any of a variety of modes of travel. Roads provide access to virtually all property. They support established communities and serve new development. They connect rural communities and urban neighborhoods. Roads give structure to our urban form, define our commuting patterns and influence our perceptions of what is far away or close at hand.

Creating and maintaining a safe, continuous County-wide road system, which accommodates movement by all travel modes, means setting standards for development of new roads and redevelopment of existing roads, including design and access standards for urban and rural roads. To ensure roads continue to meet the transportation demands of the County, a method to measure the ongoing performance of the system is essential. In response to new technologies and financial constraints, recent changes have been made to these standards on the state and regional levels. These changes are reflected in this TSP.

5.O Functional Classification and Design Policies

- 5.O.1 Designate and develop roadways according to the functional classifications and guidelines illustrated in the County Road Typical Cross Sections (Figures 5-1a through 5-1f, and Figures 5-2a through 5-2f) while allowing flexibility to accommodate characteristics of terrain, scenic qualities, environmental constraints, existing development, and adopted Special Transportation Plans.
- 5.O.2 Designate freeways, arterials, collectors and connectors as shown on Map 5-4a and Map 5-4b. Roadways that do not presently exist but are shown on these maps are shown in approximate locations.
- 5.O.3 Maintain and improve roads consistent with their functional classification, and reclassify roads as appropriate to reflect function and use.
- 5.O.4 Develop and implement traffic calming strategies, appropriate for the road functional classification, that will improve the safety and convenience of travel by all modes, particularly in areas with high crash rates or high rates of bicycle and/or pedestrian activity.
- 5.O.5 **Urban** Consider the Metro Regional Street Design Classifications when designing new county roads or redesigning existing county roads, prior to construction or reconstruction. Map 5-5 shows which roads are designated by each Design Classification.
- 5.O.6 **Urban** Minimize impacts of managing storm water by allowing for Metro's alternative street standards, such as "green streets," as design alternatives.
- 5.O.7 **Urban** Design arterials and collectors to allow safe and convenient passage of buses, bicycles, and pedestrians.

- 5.O.8 **Urban** Streets, alleys, bikeways, pedestrian facilities, multi-use paths, trails and transit stops are allowed uses in all urban zoning districts. Consider all state and County policies relating to these facilities when widening, improving or constructing new transportation infrastructure.
- 5.O.9 **Rural** Plan to support the existing development pattern and through traffic needs of the rural communities, and not to support or promote urbanization.
- 5.O.10 **Rural** Consistent with ORS 215.283(3) and OAR 660, Division 12, County road capital improvement projects may be designed and constructed to improve safety and bring roads up to county standards outside the UGB. If the road capital improvement project is not otherwise allowed and would require expansion of right-of-way exceeding the road improvements allowed in the Agriculture or Forest districts, a goal exception would be required for such a project, as provided for in ORS 215.283(3).
- 5.O.11 **Rural** Streets, alleys, bikeways, pedestrian facilities, multi-use paths, trails and transit stops are allowed uses in all rural zoning districts with the exception of Agricultural and Forest Districts in which they are conditionally allowed by ORS 215.213, 215.283 or OAR Chapter 660, Division 6 (Forest Lands).
- 5.O.12 **Rural** Recognize the importance of resource-related uses such as agriculture and forestry to the local economy, and the need to maintain a transportation system that provides opportunities to harvest agricultural and forest products and deliver them to market.
- 5.O.13 **Rural** Design, construct and reconstruct rural arterials and collectors to allow safe and convenient passage of trucks, buses, pedestrians and bicyclists.
- 5.O.14 **Rural** Support the safe movement of agricultural equipment in rural areas by improving existing roads to county standards and considering design features such as signs, pull-outs for slow-moving vehicles, reduced speeds, and limiting curbs where equipment may move to the shoulder or out of the right-of-way.

5.P **Project Development Policies**

- 5.P.1 Before building new roads or adding capacity to existing roads, consider Transportation System Management (TSM) strategies for using the existing road system, including associated pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and system capacity most efficiently.

TSM strategies include:

- Access Management;
- Alternative/Modified Standards (Performance and/or Design Standards);
- Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) applications;
- Operational Improvements;
- Parking Standards;
- Enhanced Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities; and,

- Road Diet (*For example, restriping a low volume, 4-lane road to a 3-lane configuration with bicycle and pedestrian facilities*).

5.Q Access Standard Policies

- 5.Q.1 Ensure safe and convenient access for bicyclists, pedestrians, and transit users for land uses that are open to the public. Apply access management in a flexible manner to allow reasonable access and balance the needs of all roadway users.
- 5.Q.2 Improve multimodal operations and safety by ensuring that Interchange Management Areas and other access plans and projects are coordinated with multimodal connectivity standards and are designed to support safe and convenient access and travel for all modes, when appropriate.
- 5.Q.3 Support the implementation of state access management standards (OAR Chapter 734, Division 51, as amended, and the Oregon Highway Plan) on state highway facilities and within Interchange Management Areas. Coordinate with the Oregon Department of Transportation for access control on state highways.
- 5.Q.4 If feasible, allow only collectors, connectors, or other arterials to intersect arterials.
- 5.Q.5 Access Standards shall be implemented through the Zoning and Development Ordinance and the County Roadway Standards. Where access management standards are adopted by the County in Special Transportation Plans, those standards shall apply.
- 5.Q.6 Developments should be designed to place driveway accesses on streets with the lowest functional classification or the lowest traffic volume.

5.R Policies on Improvements to Serve Development

- 5.R.1 Require new development to be served by adequate transportation facilities and access points that are designed and constructed to safely accommodate all modes of travel.
- 5.R.2 For new developments and land divisions, require right-of-way dedication, on-site frontage improvements to the applicable standards as shown in the roadway Cross Sections (Figures 5-1a through 5-1f and Figures 5-2a through 5-2f) and the County Roadway Standards, and off-site improvements necessary to safely handle expected traffic generated by the development and travel by active modes. Where roadway standards are adopted by the County in Special Transportation Plans, those standards shall apply.

- 5.R.3 Assess anticipated off-site traffic impacts caused by new developments. The developer may be required to participate financially or otherwise in the provision of off-site improvements, dedications or other requirements.
- 5.R.4 For new development proposed on a site identified on Map 5-6 (*Potentially Buildable Residential Sites >5 Acres in UGB*), require a conceptual street plan that is consistent with requirements of this section and provides for full street connections at intervals of no more than 530 feet, where feasible.
- 5.R.5 Require new development that will require construction of new streets to provide full street connections at intervals of no more than 530 feet, where feasible. If full street connections are not feasible at such intervals, require accessways for pedestrians, bicyclists or emergency vehicles at intervals of no more than 330 feet. Exceptions may be made where there are barriers, including topography, railroads, freeways, pre-existing development, existing easements, or environmental constraints such as streams and wetlands.
- 5.R.6 New development shall accommodate on-site traffic circulation within the boundaries of the site, not by circulating vehicles on and off the site through multiple access points using the public road system. Internal circulation plans should avoid relying on "backing out" maneuvers for new driveways onto all rural arterials and collectors.
- 5.R.7 **Urban** Require implementation of a road network for undeveloped sites illustrated on Map 5-6. Existing roads shall be extended to provide a direct, connected system.
- 5.R.8 **Urban** Where appropriate, develop and implement neighborhood traffic circulation plans for all modes intended to improve circulation while minimizing safety concerns and exposure to air and noise pollution.
- 5.R.9 **Urban** Discourage motor vehicle through-trips on local, connector and collector roads, and encourage bicycle and pedestrian travel on these roads.
- 5.R.10 **Urban** Allow flexible criteria and standards for local streets that are less than 200 feet in length, are expected to carry very low traffic volumes, and are not capable of being extended.
- 5.R.11 **Urban** Private streets may be appropriate in areas with topographic constraints that make construction of a road to County standards not feasible. Private roads are not classified as local roads and are not maintained by the County.
- 5.R.12 **Rural** Discourage through trips on rural local roadways.

5.S **System Performance Policies**

- 5.S.1 For County roads, evaluate transportation system performance and the impact of new development. Use the evaluation methodology in the County Roadway Standards.

- 5.S.2 Evaluate motor vehicle capacity needs for roadways within the urban area using the standards shown in Table 5-2a, except as established below.

Table 5-2a
MOTOR VEHICLE CAPACITY EVALUATION STANDARDS FOR THE URBAN AREA
Weekday Mid-day and Weekday PM Peak Periods

ODOT Roadways and Intersections	Maximum Volume to Capacity (V/C) Ratio		
	Mid-day One-Hour Peak	1 st Hour, PM Peak	2 nd Hour, PM Peak
OR 99E from OR 224 interchange north to county line OR 213 within the Clackamas Regional Center and the Fuller Road Station Community	0.99	1.1	0.99
I-205 I-5 OR 212 OR 224 OR 213	0.90	0.99	0.99
County Roadways and Intersections by Metro Urban Design Type <i>See Map 4-8</i>			
Regional Centers Town Centers Main Streets Station Communities	0.99	1.1	0.99
Corridors Neighborhoods Employment Areas Industrial Areas Regionally Significant Industrial Areas All Other Areas Outside of City Limits	0.90	0.99	0.99

- 5.S.3 Exceptions to the motor vehicle capacity evaluation standards for review of development proposed on property within Metro’s boundary are established as follows:
- 5.S.3.1 Within the Clackamas Industrial Area, no motor vehicle capacity evaluation standards shall apply.
 - 5.S.3.2 For the intersections of SE Park Avenue/OR 99E, SE Park Avenue/SE Oatfield Road, and SE Park Avenue/SE 27th Street, motor vehicle capacity evaluation standards of the Station Community Design Type shall apply.

- 5.S.4 Evaluate motor vehicle capacity needs for roadways in the rural area using the standards shown in Table 5-2b.

Table 5-2b
MOTOR VEHICLE CAPACITY EVALUATION STANDARDS FOR THE RURAL AREA
Weekday, AM and PM Peak Periods

	Maximum Volume to Capacity (V/C) Ratio	
ODOT Roadways and Intersections (based on posted speed and highway classification)¹	1st Hour, PM Peak Period	2nd Hour, PM Peak Period
Unincorporated areas inside city UGBs	0.80 to 0.95	0.80 to 0.95
Inside Unincorporated Communities	0.70 to 0.80	0.70 to 0.80
All other rural areas	0.70 to 0.75	0.70 to 0.75
County Roadways and Intersections outside of Cities	Minimum Level of Service (LOS) or Maximum Volume/Capacity Ratio; Weekday Peak Periods	
	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
Road segments and unsignalized intersections	LOS E	LOS E
Signalized and roundabout intersections	0.90	0.90

¹ See Oregon Highway Plan for details.

- 5.S.5 Exception to the motor vehicle capacity evaluation standards for review of development proposed on property in the rural area is established as follows:
- 5.S.5.1 Within Government Camp Village, no motor vehicle capacity evaluation standards shall apply.
- 5.S.6 The maximum volume to capacity ratio for the ramp terminals of interchange ramps shall be v/c 0.85. (1999 Oregon Highway Plan, OHP Policy 1F Revisions, Adopted by OTC: Dec. 21, 2011).
- 5.S.7 Where more than one motor vehicle capacity standard would apply at an intersection, the standard allowing the higher level of congestion will be used, except for ramp terminal intersections.

TRANSIT

Public transit service is essential for the mobility of many County residents, and provides an affordable option for others who prefer to use it. The County contains five major public transportation systems. Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation District of Oregon (TriMet), the state's largest transit provider, serves generally the western, more urbanized part of the county. The County also is home to four rural transit providers: South Clackamas Transportation District (SCTD) serving the Molalla area, Sandy Area Metro (SAM), Canby Area Transit (CAT) and Wilsonville's South Metro Area Transit (SMART). Clackamas County also directly supports the Mountain Express service which provides public transit to the Hoodland area along the Highway 26 corridor east of the City of Sandy. All of these services provide public transit as well as specialized services for seniors and persons with disabilities (paratransit) as mandated by the American with Disabilities Act.

Clackamas County participates in the development and implementation of the Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan which addresses the services available to vulnerable populations throughout the Portland metropolitan area.

The County can influence the type of service provided and the way new developments interface with transit and provide amenities for transit riders. Busses operated by the six districts, as well as each of the school districts in the county must safely share the county's roads with all other users.

5.T Transit Policies

- 5.T.1 Work with transit agencies to identify existing transit deficiencies in the County, needed improvements, and additional park-and-ride lots needed to increase the accessibility of transit services to all potential users.
- 5.T.2 Emphasize corridor or roadway improvements that help ensure reliable and on-time transit service in the County.
- 5.T.3 Encourage transit providers to restructure transit service to efficiently serve local as well as regional needs.
- 5.T.4 Emphasize transit improvements that improve east-west connections; improve service between the County's industrial and commercial areas and neighborhoods; and best meet the needs of all County residents, employees and employers, regardless of race, age, ability, income level and geographic location.
- 5.T.5 Coordinate with all applicable transit agencies on all new residential, commercial and industrial developments to ensure appropriate integration of transit facilities and pedestrian access to transit facilities.
- 5.T.6 Require major developments and road construction projects along transit routes to include provisions for transit shelters, pedestrian access to transit and/or bus turnouts, where appropriate.

- 5.T.7 Promote park-and-ride lots, transit shelters and pedestrian/bikeway connections to transit. Coordinate the location of these facilities with other land uses to promote shared parking and bicycle/ pedestrian-oriented transit nodes.
- 5.T.8 Coordinate and cooperate with transit agencies to provide transportation for seniors, people with disabilities, and other transportation-disadvantaged populations. Provide continued support for paratransit services as required within a three-quarter-mile distance from fixed-route transit stops.
- 5.T.9 Coordinate transit-supportive, roadway improvements with transit-providers to ensure financing and implementation of such improvements.
- 5.T.10 **Urban** Require pedestrian and transit-supportive features and amenities and direct access to transit for new development.

Pedestrian and transit supportive amenities may include pedestrian/bikeway facilities, street trees, outdoor lighting and seating, landscaping, shelters, kiosks, strict standards for signs, and visually aesthetic shapes, textures and colors. Buildings measuring more than 100 feet along the side facing the major pedestrian/transit access should have more than one pedestrian entrance. Pedestrian access should be provided to connect transit centers or transit stops on bus routes with centers of employment, shopping or medium-to-high density residential areas within one-quarter mile of these routes.

- 5.T.11 **Urban** Coordinate with transit providers to achieve the goal of transit service within one-quarter mile of most residences and businesses within the Portland Metropolitan UGB. Support more frequent service within Regional Centers, Town Centers, Station Communities, and Corridors and Main Streets.
- 5.T.12 **Urban** Work with federal, state and regional agencies to implement ~~high capacity~~high-capacity transit in the regional ~~High-Capacity~~High-Capacity Transit (HCT) System Plan in order to help relieve traffic congestion, provide for transportation alternatives to the automobile, and promote the County's economy. See Map 5-8c for the HCT network in the County.
- 5.T.13 **Urban** Site new commercial, institutional, and multi-family buildings at major transit stops as close as possible to transit, with a door facing the transit street or side street, and with no parking between the building and front lot lines.
- 5.T.14 **Rural** Focus safety improvements near existing or planned transit stops.

FREIGHT, RAIL, AIR, PIPELINE AND WATER TRANSPORTATION

In 2009, Clackamas County adopted “Open for Business – Economic Development Plan (EDP).” This plan provides a comprehensive guiding policy document for the County to improve, diversify and grow the economy in Clackamas County. Crucial to economic development is the infrastructure that supports the businesses and the employees that work in those businesses. Specific goals and actions called out by the Economic Development Plan include:

- Maintain mobility for people and freight in the face of expected growth; and
- Respond to the opportunities and challenges faced by its cities and rural areas, and support them in their efforts to develop quality jobs and businesses,

Freight, rail, air, pipelines and water transportation make significant contributions to the movement of people and goods; improve the quality of life; and support economic development in Clackamas County.

Policies relating to the movement of freight via roads, rail, air, pipelines or water transportation must also respond to new regulations to ensure the highest level of safety.

5.U General Freight Policies

- 5.U.1 Coordinate the planning, development, maintenance and operation of a safe and efficient freight system for all freight modes in Clackamas County with the private sector, ODOT, Metro, the Port of Portland and the cities of Clackamas County.
- 5.U.2 Promote an inter-modal freight transportation strategy and work to improve multi-modal connections among rail, industrial areas, airports and regional roadways to promote efficient movement of people, materials, and goods.
- 5.U.3 Work with the private transportation industry, Oregon Economic Development Department, Port of Portland and others to identify and realize investment opportunities that enhance freight mobility and support the County, regional and state economy.
- 5.U.4 Make freight investments that, in coordination with the County’s economic development strategies, help retain and grow the County’s job base and strengthen the County’s overall economy.
- 5.U.5 Ensure that freight rail lines and truck routes do not have disproportionately negative impacts on sensitive land uses (places where people with increased risk of adverse impacts from exposure to noise and air pollution are likely to gather, such as schools, senior centers, hospitals, parks, housing). Prioritize mitigation efforts for current sensitive land use areas near freight rail lines and truck routes. Mitigate impacts to sensitive land uses by using vegetative buffers, establishing rail "quiet zones," and coordinating land use plans.

5.V Freight Trucking Policies

- 5.V.1 Support the Truck Freight Route System, while not prohibiting the use of other roads for local pickup and delivery of goods and services. (See Maps 5-9a and 5-9b).
- 5.V.2 Improve and maintain the countywide Truck Freight Route System, the Regional Transportation Plan Freight Routes and Oregon Freight Plan Routes, as shown on Maps 5-9a and 5-9b.
- 5.V.3 Consider Heavy and Oversize Freight Movement requirements on State and County facilities when developing plans for transportation improvements and land use changes along freight routes designated as ORS 366.215 Corridors, as shown on Maps 5-9c and 5-9d.
- 5.V.4 Consider the safety of all travel modes that use the Truck Freight Route System when designing improvements to this system.
- 5.V.5 Accommodate freight travel on the Truck Freight Route System by improving facility design and operations.
- 5.V.6 Identify street improvements to reduce delays and to improve travel time reliability on roadways in the Truck Freight Route system
- 5.V.7 Work to improve the safety of Truck Freight Routes for all transportation modes.
- 5.V.8 Support the development of truck layover facilities/staging areas to reduce the conflicts between parked vehicles and adjoining land uses.
- 5.V.9 Utilize Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) solutions to improve safety and operations of freight movement.

5.W Rail Policies

- 5.W.1 Support the safe and efficient movement of goods by rail.
- 5.W.2 Support the reduction of the number of at-grade crossings of arterial and collector streets on main rail lines to reduce conflicts between rail use and other transportation modes, and improve safety.
- 5.W.3 On new or reconstructed arterials and urban collectors, prohibit at-grade crossings of main rail lines without traffic restrictive safety devices.
- 5.W.4 Support expansion and maintenance needed to establish reliable, higher speed (110-125 mph) freight rail service and intercity rail passenger service in the Willamette Valley.

- 5.W.5 Encourage the development of rail-accessible land uses within industrial areas adjacent to main rail lines.
- 5.W.6 Support the development of convenient inter-modal facilities such as ramp, terminal and reload facilities for transfers from truck to rail for long-haul freight movement.
- 5.W.7 Improve the safety and operations of rail transport at at-grade rail crossings and ensure that all at-grade crossings meet the best practices for facilitating safe, multi-modal crossings, as identified in the most recent version of the “Railroad-Highway Grade Crossing Handbook” (Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]).
- 5.W.8 Identify and protect existing and abandoned rail rights-of-way for future transportation facilities and services.

5.X Airport Policies

- 5.X.1 Coordinate with the Port of Portland, the Oregon Department of Aviation, and other affected agencies to implement the Mulino Airport Plan.
- 5.X.2 Coordinate with Marion County, the City of Wilsonville, the Oregon Department of Aviation, and other affected agencies to develop and implement the Aurora Airport Plan.
- 5.X.3 Allow new airports as conditional uses in appropriate zoning districts. Require new public use airports to be located within:
 - one mile of an arterial roadway, and
 - at least one mile away from urban residential areas.
- 5.X.4 Cooperate with the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, Oregon Department of Aviation and Federal Aviation Administration to minimize conflicts between airports and uses of surrounding lands.
- 5.X.5 Require that new airports, airport expansions, or expansions of airport boundaries, except those limited to use by ultra-lights and helicopters, have a runway at least 1,800 feet long and control at least enough property at the end of each runway through ownership, aviation easement, or ~~long-term~~long-term lease to protect their approach surfaces until the approach surfaces are 50 feet above the terrain. Require the runway to be located so as to achieve at least a 20-foot clearance of the approach surface over a county, city or public road.
- 5.X.6 Apply a Public-Use Airport and Safety overlay zoning district to public-use airports, consistent with ORS 836.600 through 836.630, and as shown on Map 5-10.
- 5.X.7 Apply a Private-Use Airport and Safety overlay zoning district to privately-owned, private-use airports that served as the base for three or more aircraft, consistent with ORS 836.600 through 836.630, and as shown on Map 5-10.

- 5.X.8 Recognize privately-owned, private-use airports that served as the base for one or two aircraft on December 31, 1994, as shown in the records of the Oregon Department of Transportation and as shown on Map 5-10.
- 5.X.9 Encourage establishment of heliports in industrial areas in conjunction with state and federal standards for heliport design and location.
- 5.X.10 Support the role Clackamas County airports serve in supporting emergency response and disaster assistance.

5.Y Pipeline Policy

- 5.Y.1 Work with state and federal regulatory agencies, affected communities and pipeline companies to provide safe, quiet, environmentally sensitive, and efficient transport of bulk commodities.

5.Z Water Transportation Policies

- 5.Z.1 Maintain safe and convenient, multi-modal land access to the Canby ferry, and to public and commercial docks and boat ramps
- 5.Z.2 Support efforts to minimize noise and negative impacts caused by river transportation on air and water quality and to habitat for fish migration.
- 5.Z.3 Support the continued operation and maintenance of the Willamette Falls Locks to facilitate water transportation on the Willamette River.

FINANCE AND FUNDING

The vast majority of surface transportation funding in the United States is derived from public sources at the federal, state, and local levels and primarily includes gas and vehicle taxes and fees. For a variety of reasons, including more efficient vehicles, trends toward shortening commutes or carpooling, and a general unwillingness to raise gas tax rates, jurisdictions across the nation are facing decreasing levels of available funding for transportation projects. That, combined with rising construction costs, leads to increasing challenges in finding available funds for all the improvements that are needed to the transportation system.

One way to control costs is to spend wisely by focusing on using and maintaining the transportation systems that exist. The County also is committed to identifying and pursuing potential new funding sources for transportation improvements.

5.AA General Finance and Funding Policies

- 5.AA.1 Support continuation of current (or equivalent) federal, state, and local funding mechanisms to construct and maintain County transportation projects. Identify and pursue new, permanent funding mechanisms to construct and maintain County transportation facilities and to support programs and projects identified in the TSP.
- 5.AA.2 Seek dedicated funding sources to implement active transportation projects.
- 5.AA.3 Establish funding for bicycle, pedestrian and transit projects that serve the needs of transportation disadvantaged populations.
- 5.AA.4 Consider a transportation system development charge methodology that calculates person trips to allow pedestrian, transit, and bicycle projects, as well as motor vehicle projects, to be funded by TSDCs.
- 5.AA.5 To the extent practical, invest unrestricted funding sources in a balanced manner between rural and urban areas.
- 5.AA.6 **Urban** Study creating a transportation facility funding program that establishes a "fee in lieu of" process that may be used by developers to pay for all on-site and off-site transportation facilities required as part of the land development process.

5.BB Maintenance Policies

- 5.BB.1 Emphasize maintenance of existing rights-of-way, with improvements where appropriate, to improve traffic flow and safety for all transportation modes at a reasonable cost.
- 5.BB.2 Determine road maintenance needs and priorities and develop an effective and efficient road maintenance program.

- 5.BB.3 Develop routine maintenance standards and practices for the transportation system, including traffic control devices.

TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS AND PLANS

The County's Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) includes a 20-year plan for needed transportation improvements and the 5-year programmed projects. The CIP was developed through concentrated and intense scrutiny by County staff and several advisory groups. Needed transportation projects were reviewed and analyzed with respect to how the transportation system is expected to function in 2035; how well each reflected the TSP vision and goals; and based on feedback from the public and several advisory committees. The Public Advisory Committee (PAC) developed the final recommendation to the Planning Commission on the project prioritization.

The purpose of the project prioritization was to identify a set of project that could reasonably be expected to be funded over the next 20 years. The funding forecast completed in 2012 indicates that only around 15% of the funding will be available to construct the needed projects. Therefore, the Capital Improvement Plan is divided into three project lists:

- *20-Year Capital Projects*: contains the prioritized list of needed transportation projects that can reasonably be undertaken given the current estimates of available funding.
- *Preferred Capital Projects*: contains a second group of needed, prioritized transportation projects that the County would undertake if additional funding becomes available during the next 20 years.
- *Long-Term Capital Projects*: contains the remainder of the needed transportation projects. Although these projects will be needed to meet the transportation needs of the County in the next 20 years, they are not expected to be funded or constructed by the County.

The CIP will be updated as needed, and additional studies will be completed to optimize the work completed in this TSP by finding new ways to address known problems that cannot be solved by the current CIP. Special Transportation Plans include policy recommendations for a specific geographic areas or transportation facilities within the County Where conflicts exist between provisions of Special Transportation Plans and provisions of Chapter 5, provisions in the Special Transportation Plans take precedence.

5.CC Capital Improvement Plan Policies

- 5.CC.1 Fund and build the transportation improvement projects identified as needed to accommodate and appropriately manage future transportation needs. These projects are found in the following lists: *20-Year Capital Projects* (Table 5-3a); *Preferred Capital Projects* (Table 5-3b); and Long-Term Capital Projects (Table 5-3c). Project locations are shown on Maps 5-11a through 5-11f.

- 5.CC.2 Maintain a current and complete 5-Year Capital Improvement Program (CIP), which contains the programmed transportation projects in priority order, with estimated costs and assigned responsibility for funding. Update and adopt the 5-Year Capital Improvement Program periodically.
- 5.CC.3 Support the construction of prioritized, major transportation improvements in the County as identified by other jurisdictions including the Oregon Department of Transportation, Metro, cities, transit agencies and park providers. The list of needed transportation projects to be built by other jurisdictions is located in Table 5-3d. The project locations are shown on Maps 5-11a through 5-11f.

5.DD Special Transportation Plans and Studies

- 5.DD.1 Designate the following as Special Transportation Plans:
- The SE 172nd Avenue/190th Drive Corridor Management Plan, adopted by reference in Appendix A;
 - ~~The Clackamas County Pedestrian Master Plan, adopted by reference in Appendix A;~~
 - ~~The Clackamas County Bicycle Master Plan, adopted by reference in Appendix A;~~
 - The Walk Bike Clackamas Plan, adopted by reference in Appendix A
 - The Clackamas County Airport Plan, adopted by reference in Appendix A;
 - Transportation elements of the Community Plans and Design Plans included in Chapter 10;
 - The Exception to Statewide Planning Goal 3 (Agricultural Lands), Goal 11 (Public Facilities & Services) and Goal 14 (Urbanization), pursuant to OAR 660, Division 12, to allow for the Arndt Road improvement, which is substantially complete; (For findings of fact and statement of reasons, see Board Order 2003-76.)
 - The Exception to Statewide Planning Goal 3 (Agricultural Lands), Goal 11 (Public Facilities & Services) and Goal 14 (Urbanization), pursuant to OAR 660, Division 12, to allow for the Arndt Road improvement listed as project number 2029 on Table 5-3b and shown on Map 5-11e; (For findings of fact and statement of reasons, see Board Order 2003-104.)
 - The Clackamas County Active Transportation Plan, adopted by reference in Appendix A; and
 - The Clackamas Regional Center Pedestrian/Bicycle Plan, adopted by reference in Appendix A.

5.DD.2 Complete the following studies to develop solutions to previously identified problems.

- 5.DD.2.1 Conduct an alternatives analysis and land use study to identify and consider roadway improvements to address access to I-5 within the southwest portion of the County and capacity deficiencies along Arndt Road (project #1106).
- 5.DD.2.2 For the urban unincorporated area, develop a study to identify potential pedestrian, bicycle, and safety performance standards for use during development review.
- 5.DD.2.3 Develop a circulation study for the area west of the Clackamas Town Center and conduct a Transportation Infrastructure Analysis. (project #1018)
- 5.DD.2.4 Study the I-205 Multi-use Path gap to identify near term solutions for completing the path. (project #1026)
- 5.DD.2.5 Identify bicycle and pedestrian improvements to better connect OR 224 to the Clackamas Regional Center along 82nd Avenue. (project #1032)
- 5.DD.2.6 Work with ODOT and the City of Happy Valley to review the future need for the Sunrise Unit 2 (parallel to Highway 212, between 172nd Avenue and US 26), identified as a future, planned highway corridor.
- 5.DD.2.7 Work with ODOT, Metro, Oregon City, West Linn and any other affected jurisdiction to analyze and develop a solution to the transportation bottleneck on I-205 between Oregon City and the I-205 / Stafford Road Interchange. This process may include undertaking an Environmental Impact Statement to identify a preferred alternative that addresses the transportation congestion and facility operations issues on this portion of the I-205 corridor.
- 5.DD.2.8 Evaluate transitioning from transportation concurrency to safety analysis when a traffic impact study (TIS) is required of new development.
- 5.DD.2.9 Work with Metro and ODOT over five years to develop Alternate Road Capacity Performance Standards, required by Oregon Highway Plan Policy 1.F., to address the following five intersections. These intersections were forecast not to meet the capacity performance standards adopted in the 2013 TSP, and there were no projects identified that could make the intersections meet the standards.
 - SE Harmony Road/SE Linwood Avenue
 - OR 212/SE 172nd Avenue – ODOT Intersection
 - OR 212/SE 282nd Avenue – ODOT Intersection
 - OR 213/S. Henrici Road – ODOT Intersection (traffic signal or roundabout)
 - OR 224/SE Lake Road/SE Webster Road – ODOT Intersection

5.DD.2.10 Plan for an all-ages and abilities network of active transportation corridors that are comfortable for children and seniors. Such a network would involve a focus on safe and low-stress facilities such as protected bikeways; multi-use pathways that are physically separated from traffic on busy streets.

DEFINITIONS

The following definitions apply to usage within Chapter 5.

Airport, Private Use: An airport restricted, except for aircraft emergencies, to use by the owner and his invited guests. The determination as to whether an airport is private or public use is made by the Oregon Department of Aviation.

Airport, Public Use: An airport that is open to use by the flying public, with or without a request to use the airport.

Bikeway: A paved facility provided for use by cyclists. There are five categories of bikeways.

- **Shared Roadway:** A type of bikeway where motorists and cyclists occupy the same roadway area. Shared lane markings should be provided in the roadway to designate the shared use of the roadway by bicyclists and motorists. On shared roadway facilities, bicyclists may use the full travel lane. Two types of shared roadway facilities are:
 - ~~Shared Streets~~**Bicycle Boulevard:** A bicycle and pedestrian facility whereby speed limits on local roads are reduced to 20 mph in a network of connected low volume and low speed roads (typically local or connector roadways) where and bicycles and pedestrians share the roadway with vehicles. Additional elements may include pavement markings; signage; speed bumps and motor vehicle diversion. ~~but bicycle movements are prioritized over vehicle movements.~~
 - **Advisory Lanes:** A bicycle facility where the center travel lane is shared by two-way automobile traffic and shoulder bikeways or bike lanes are provided on each side of the center lane. Vehicles may use the shoulder bikeways/bike lanes for passing but must yield to bicyclists and oncoming motorists.
- **Shoulder Bikeway:** A bikeway which accommodates cyclists on paved roadway shoulder.
- **Bike Lane:** There are three types of bike lanes:
 - **Buffered Bike Lane:** Bicycle lanes with a striped buffer providing greater separation from vehicles than a typical bike lane.
 - **Protected Bike Lane:** Bicycle lanes parallel to the roadway and separated from traffic by a buffer as well as by a barrier such as a landscaped buffer, parked cars, or flexible bollards.
 - **Conventional Bike Lane:** A section of roadway designated for exclusive bicycle use, at the same grade as the adjacent roadway.
- **Bike Path:** A bike lane constructed entirely separate from the roadway.
- **Cycle Track:** An exclusive “grade-separated” bike facility elevated above the street level using a low-profile curb and a distinctive pavement material. Two-way cycle tracks are

physically separated cycle tracks that allow bicycle movement in both directions on one side of the road.

Communities of Interest: Black people, Indigenous people, and People of Color (BIPOC); immigrants; people with limited English proficiency; low-income and low-wealth community members; low-and-moderate-income renters and homeowners; people with disabilities; youth and seniors.

~~**Truck Freight Route System:** A set of identified arterials, collectors and State facilities that support the efficient movement of goods throughout the County.~~

Functional Classification: The process by which streets and highways are grouped into classes, or systems, according to the character of traffic service that they are intended to provide. Functional classifications found in Clackamas County and typical characteristics of each classification follow:

- **Principal Arterials:** (Freeway/Expressway and other designated Principal Arterials). Serves interregional and intraregional trips and carries heavy volume at high speed. Primarily Interstate Freeways and State Highways but also includes other roads designated as Principal Arterials. These roads make up the National Highway System.
- **Major Arterial:** Carries local and through traffic to and from destinations outside local communities and connects cities and rural centers. Moderate to heavy volume; moderate to high speed.
- **Minor Arterial:** Connects collectors to higher order roadways. Carries moderate volume at moderate speed.
- **Collector:** Principal carrier within neighborhoods or single land use areas. Links neighborhoods with major activity centers, other neighborhoods, and arterials. Generally not for through traffic. Low to moderate volume; low to moderate speed.
- **Connector:** Collects traffic from and distributes traffic to local streets within neighborhoods or industrial districts. Usually longer than local streets. Low traffic volumes and speeds. Primarily serves access and local circulation functions. Not for through traffic in urban areas.
- **Local:** Provides access to abutting property and connects to higher order roads. New local roads should intersect collectors, connectors, or, if necessary, minor arterials. Not for through traffic.
- **Alley:** May be public or private, to provide access to the rear of property. Alleys should intersect local roads or connectors. Not for through traffic

Level of service (LOS): A performance measure that represents quality of service of an intersection or roadway segment, measured on an A–F scale, with LOS A representing the best operating conditions from the traveler’s perspective and LOS F the worst.

Major Transit Stop: A transit center, major bus stop, or light rail stop, as identified on Comprehensive Plan Map 5-8a, *Transit, Urban*.

Major Transit Street: A street with a Frequent Service Bus Line, as identified on Comprehensive Plan Map 5-8a, *Transit, Urban*; existing or planned High Capacity Transit, as identified on Comprehensive Plan Map 5-8c, *High Capacity Transit (HCT) System Plan*; or both.

Mode (also “travel mode”): A particular form of travel, for example, walking, bicycling, traveling by automobile, or traveling by bus.

Multi-use Path: A paved path built for bicycle and pedestrian traffic that is physically separated from motor vehicle traffic, and can be either within the road right-of-way or within an independent right-of-way.

Pedestrian Facilities: Sidewalks, pedestrian pathways, or other facilities that are designed specifically for pedestrian use, as identified by functional classification in cross sections (Figures 5-1 through 5-3) or as determined appropriate by the County Planning Director and the County Road Official or County Engineer.

Principal Active Transportation (PAT) Route: Priority routes for pedestrian and bikeway facilities which form the “spine” of the County active transportation network that have been identified in the Active Transportation Plan. PAT Routes provide connection to key county destinations, link rural and urban communities, and connect to Parkways and Bikeways as identified in the Metro Regional Active Transportation Plan. Specifics about the appropriate bikeway and/or pedestrian facility treatments for the PAT Routes are included in the Active Transportation Plan.

Trail: A hard- or soft-surfaced facility for pedestrians, bicyclists, or equestrians that is separate from vehicular traffic. Trails often go through natural areas and are designed to have a minimal impact on the natural environment.

Transportation Demand Management (TDM): Strategies to achieve efficiency in the transportation system by reducing demand.

Transportation Disadvantaged: Persons who, because of physical or mental disability, income status, or age, are unable to transport themselves or to purchase transportation and are, therefore, dependent upon others to obtain access to health care, employment, education, shopping, social activities, or other life-sustaining activities, or children who are handicapped or high-risk or at-risk.

Truck Freight Route System: A set of identified arterials, collectors and State facilities that support the efficient movement of goods throughout the County.

Road: A public or private way created to provide ingress to, or egress from, one or more lots, parcels, areas or tracts of land, or that provides for travel between places by vehicles. A private way created exclusively to provide ingress and egress to land in conjunction with a forest, farm or mining use is not a “road.” The terms “street,” “access drive” and “highway” for the purposes of this Plan shall be synonymous with the term “road.”

Roadway: That portion of a road or alley that has been improved for vehicular and pedestrian traffic.

Rural: Areas that are either (a) outside the Portland Metropolitan Urban Growth Boundary and outside city limits, or (b) inside the Portland Metropolitan Urban Growth Boundary and have a Comprehensive Plan designation of Agriculture, Forest, Rural, Rural Commercial, Rural Industrial or Unincorporated Community Residential.

Urban: Areas that are inside the Portland Metropolitan Urban Growth Boundary, except areas that have a Comprehensive Plan designation of Agriculture, Forest, Rural, Rural Commercial, Rural Industrial or Unincorporated Community Residential.

Volume-to-Capacity (v/c) Ratio: A volume-to-capacity ratio compares vehicle volumes (the roadway demand) with roadway supply (carrying capacity). Volume refers to the number of vehicles using a roadway at a specific time period (and length of time), while capacity is the road’s ability to support that volume based on its design and number of lanes.

Exhibit B
Ordinance ZDO-292
Comprehensive Plan Amendments

Appendix A

MAPS AND DOCUMENTS ADOPTED BY REFERENCE

The following maps and documents have been adopted by reference to the Comprehensive Plan. These documents are available for review at the Clackamas County Planning and Zoning Division.

NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENERGY

- Habitat Conservation Area Maps [Added by Order 2008-197, 1/5/09; Added by Ordinance ZDO-256, 7/18/16]
- Water Quality Resource Area Maps [Added by Order 2008-197, 1/5/09; Added by Ordinance ZDO-256, 7/18/16]
- Board Order 2014-14 (In the Matter of a Comprehensive Plan Amendment, Zone Map Amendment, and Site Plan Review request from Tonquin Holdings, LLC, on property described as T3S R1W Section 04A, Tax Lots 100 and 102) and All Attachments [Added by Order 2014-14, 2/27/14]
- Board Order 2020-16 (In the Matter of a Comprehensive Plan Amendment, Zone Map Amendment, and Site Plan Review request from Cadman Materials, Inc. on property described as T4S R1E Section 07, Tax Lots 500, 600, 700, 800, 801, 1002, 1003 & 1004) and all Attachments [Added by Order 2020-16, 3/12/20]

TRANSPORTATION

- ~~Clackamas County Pedestrian Master Plan [Added by Order 96-362, 5/23/96]~~
- ~~Clackamas County Bicycle Master Plan [Added by Order 96-362, 5/23/96]~~
- Walk Bike Clackamas Plan, June 2025 -[Added by Ordinance ZDO-292, 6/xx/2025]
- Clackamas County Airport Plan [Added by Order 01-256, 11/1/01]
- SE 172nd Avenue/190th Drive Corridor Management Plan, February 2012,

Clackamas County Comprehensive Plan

Revised January 2018 [Added by Ordinance ZDO-232, 3/12/12; Amended by Ordinance ZDO-255, 7/14/16; Amended by Ordinance ZDO-270, 11/27/18]

- Clackamas County Active Transportation Plan, June 1, 2015 [Added by Ordinance ZDO-251, 6/1/15]

COMMUNITY PLANS AND DESIGN PLANS, Clackamas Regional Center Area Design Plan

- Phillips Creek Greenway Framework Plan [Added by Order 98-308, 12/23/98]
- Clackamas Regional Center Pedestrian/Bicycle Plan [Added by Ordinance ZDO-238, 10/15/12]

Exhibit C
Ordinance ZDO-292
Comprehensive Plan Amendments

Appendix B

SUMMARY OF SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT

Citizen and Agency Involvement Program.

Clackamas County Citizen Involvement Program. Comprehensive Plan Chapter 2.

Committee for Citizen Involvement Bylaws.

Committee for Citizen Involvement Roster.

Community Planning Organization Leaders. Lists and maps of CPO areas.

NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENERGY

Clackamas County Energy Project Publications, 1983:

- An Energy Anthology
- Clackamas County Energy Use and Supply Background Data
- Clackamas County Energy Management Plan
- Technical Memorandum, Energy Emergency Planning
- Technical Memorandum, County Buildings
- Technical Memorandum, County Motor Fleet
- Technical Memorandum, County Organization

Clackamas County Resources Atlas, Clackamas County Dept. of Environmental Services, Planning Division. Includes maps of the following:

- General Resources
- Agricultural Land Types and Major Production Areas
- Forest Zones and Vegetative Types
- Cubic Foot Forest Site Classes

Clackamas County Comprehensive Plan

- Forest Ownerships
- Urban Forest Cover
- Detailed SCS Soil Mapping Index
- Unique National and Scenic Features
- Open Urban Land Inventory

Clackamas County Comprehensive Plan

- Park and Recreation Facilities; Historic and Cultural Sites
- Fisheries and Wildlife Habitats
- Aggregate Sites
- Groundwater Studies Index
- Geologic Hazards, Northwest Clackamas County
- River Corridors, Existing Conditions and Management Strategies
- Precipitation and Physiography

Draft Third Biennial Energy Plan, Action Plan and Recommendations, Oregon Department of Energy, October 1988.

Environmental Geology of the Kellogg Creek-Mt. Scott Creek and Lower Clackamas River Drainage Areas, Northwestern Clackamas County, Oregon, M.S. Thesis, Matthew John Brunego, March, 1978.

Federal Land Resource/Management Plans - Mt. Hood National Forest, Draft EIS, U.S. Forest Service, 1988; and Eastside Salem District Planning Area Land Use Plan (Clackamas Unit), Bureau of Land Management, 1982.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat Protection Plan for Clackamas County, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, 1979.

Geologic Hazards of the Bull Run Watershed, Multnomah and Clackamas Counties, Oregon, Oregon Bulletin 82. Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries, 1974.

Geology and Geologic Hazards of Northwestern Clackamas County, Oregon Bulletin 99, Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries, 1979.

Geology and Ground Water of the Molalla-Salem Slope Area, Northern Willamette Valley, Oregon, U.S. Geological Survey, 1967.

Ground Water Resources in the French Prairie Area, Northern Willamette Valley, Oregon, U.S. Geological Survey, 1967.

Ground Water Resources in the East Portland Area, Oregon, U.S. Geological Survey, 1965.

Lakes of the Mt. Hood National Forest, Oregon Dept. of Fish and Wildlife and U.S. Forest Service, N.D.

National Wetlands Inventory, U.S. Dept. of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Individual Quad Maps Covering Clackamas County, 1981 to date.

Clackamas County Comprehensive Plan

1980 Major Water Tables Aquifers Map, supplied by Oregon Dept. of Environmental Quality, N.D.

1984 Census of Agriculture, U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Vol. 1, part 36.

Oregon Air Quality, 1988 Annual Report, Dept. of Environmental Quality, Air Quality Control Division, Portland, Oregon.

Oregon Natural Areas Clackamas County, Oregon, Natural Heritage Program, the Nature Conservancy, 1977.

Oregon Nongame Wildlife Management Plan (Revised Draft), Oregon Dept. of Fish and Wildlife, June, 1984.

Oregon Outdoor Recreation "SCORP '83", State Parks and Recreation, Oregon Dept. of Transportation, 1983.

Oregon's Statewide Assessment of Nonpoint Source Problems, Oregon Dept. of Environmental Quality, 1978.

Planning Background Report, Energy; Clackamas County Dept. of Environmental Services, Planning Division.

Planning Background Report, Natural Hazards; Clackamas County Dept. of Environmental Services, Planning Division.

Planning Background Report, Natural Resources; Clackamas County Dept. of Environmental Services, Planning Division.

Planning Background Report, Rivers; Clackamas County Dept. of Environmental Services, Planning Division.

Preliminary Willamette River Greenway, Royston, Hanamoto, Beck and Abey, 1974.

Regional Urban Wildlife Habitat Maps, U.S. Army Engineer District Portland Corps of Engineers, 1978.

Review of Land, Water, Air Quality and Noise Control, 1980-88, Clackamas County Planning and Economic Development Division, 1988.

Rock Material Resources of Clackamas, Columbia, Multnomah and Washington Counties, Oregon, Oregon Dept. of Geology and Mineral Industries, 1978.

State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan, Technical Documents I, II, and III; ODOT, Parks and Recreation Branch.

Timber for Oregon's Tomorrow, Oregon State University School of Forestry, Beuter, John H.; Johnson, K. Norman; Scheurman, H. Lynn; Research Bulletin 19, January 1976.

U.S. Dept. of Agriculture Forest Service, "Timber Resource Statistics for Northwest Oregon," Basset, Patricia M.; preliminary copies of unpublished report, 1979.

Water Resources Data for Oregon 1976, 1977, U.S. Geological Survey.

Well Hydrographs Clackamas County, Oregon, Oregon Water Resources Dept., unpublished.

Wilderness Management Plan for the Table Rock Wilderness (Draft), U.S. Dept. of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, 1986.

Willamette Greenway Plan, Bureau of Planning, Portland, Oregon, November, 1987.

The Willamette River Greenway, Oregon State Parks and Recreation Branch, Dept. of Transportation.

LAND USE

Comprehensive Plan, Clackamas County, Oregon, Planning Dept., Clackamas County, August, 1974.

Comprehensive Plan, Clackamas County, Oregon, Planning Dept., Clackamas County, June, 1980.

Comprehensive Plan Update, The Sunnyside United Neighbors, June 30, 1988, Revised August 22, 1988.

Comprehensive Plan, Clackamas County, Oregon, Planning Dept., Clackamas County, June 1992.

Let's Build A Revised Comprehensive Plan for Clackamas County, Dept. of Environmental Services, Clackamas County, January, 1979.

Sunrise Center Task Force, Clackamas County, December, 1987.

City of Sandy Urban Growth Boundary Expansion Analysis – Final Report, City of Sandy Planning Department, February 2017.

City of Sandy Urbanization Study – Final Report, City of Sandy Planning Department, January 2015.

TRANSPORTATION

5 Year Transportation Capital Improvement Plan, Fiscal Years 1996-2000, Clackamas County, July, 1996.

Capital Improvement Plan, 5-Year Capital Improvement Program, FY 1998/99 to 2002/03, 20-Year Long Range Transportation Plan, 1998 to 2008, December 1998.

Getting There by Bike, Metropolitan Services District, Metro, 1988.

Handbook for Environmental Quality Elements of Land Use Plans, Air Quality, Oregon Dept. of Environmental Quality, 1978.

I-5/Canby/Highway 213 Access Improvement Study, Clackamas County Dept. of Transportation and Development, 1987.

Oregon Action Plan for Transportation, Oregon Dept. of Transportation, 1989.

Planning Background Report: Transportation, Clackamas County Dept. of Environmental Services, Planning Division, 1979.

Planning With Transit, Tri-Met, 1979.

Public-Private Task Force on Transit Finance, Policy Report, Barney and Worth, Inc., 1988.

Regional Bicycle Plan, Metropolitan Service District, August 1983.

Regional Transportation Plan, Metropolitan Service District, 1989.

Six-Year Highway Improvement Program 1989-1994, Oregon Dept. of Transportation, 1988.

State of Oregon Bicycle Master Plan, Oregon Dept. of Transportation, Highway Division, March 15, 1988.

Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, Oregon Department of Transportation, Highway Division, June 14, 1995.

Sunnyside I-205 Split Diamond Interchange, Clackamas County Dept. of Transportation and Development, 1988.

Sunnyside Road, (I-205 to SE 172nd Avenue) Environmental Assessment. Clackamas County, August 21, 1998.

Sunrise Corridor Reconnaissance Study, Oregon Dept. of Transportation, Highway Division, Region 1, 1987.

A Systems Analysis of Major Regional Transportation Corridors, MSD, 1979.

Transportation Involvement Program, Metropolitan Service District, 1987.

Transportation Plan Background Document, Clackamas County Dept. of Transportation and Development, September 2013.

Clackamas County Transportation Safety Action Plan, Kittelson & Associates, July 2013.

Clackamas County ITS (Intelligent Transportation System) Action Plan, DKS Associates, May 2011.

Tri-Met Five-Year Transit Development Plan, Tri-Met, 1987.

SE 172nd Avenue/ SE190th Drive Corridor Management Plan, Appendix A - Environmental Baseline Report, MB&G, Inc., September 20, 2011

SE 172nd Avenue/ SE190th Drive Corridor Management Plan, Appendix B – Analysis of Preferred Alternative

SE 172nd Avenue/ SE190th Drive Corridor Management Plan, Appendix C – 15% Design Plans, Alignment Alternative AT2, Clackamas County, October 24, 2011

SE 172nd Avenue/ SE190th Drive Corridor Management Plan, Appendix E – Corridor Centerline Survey, November 10, 2011

Clackamas County Active Transportation Plan, Appendices A through F

Damascus Mobility Plan, Kittleson & Associates, Inc., July 27, 2022

[Walk Bike Clackamas Plan, Appendices A through T](#)

HOUSING

A Report to the Board of County Commissioners, Housing Affordability and Homelessness Task Force, December, 2019.

Background Report for the Clackamas County Comprehensive Plan Update 1989, Goal 10 - Housing, Clackamas County Dept. of Transportation and Development, Economic Development Section, 1989.

Clackamas County Regional Housing Need Analysis, EcoNorthwest, September, 2019.

Exploring the Factors that Drive Displacement Risk in Unincorporated Clackamas County: With a Special Look at Manufactured Housing Communities, EcoNorthwest, September, 2019.

Long-Range Planning Issue Paper #2020-1: Housing Strategies Related to Comprehensive Plan and Zoning and Development Ordinance Updates, Planning and Zoning Division, Clackamas County, February, 2020.

Plan for Community Development, Clackamas County Dept. of Environmental Services, Planning Division, 1979.

PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES

Clackamas County School Directory 1988-1989, Education Service District, 1988.

CRA 208 Areawide Wastewater Treatment Management Study, (Volumes 1 and 2, including technical supplements), CRA, 1977.

DEQ Coordination Program Approved by LCDC, Dept. of Environmental Quality, 1978.

Draft Plan for Community Development - Clackamas County, Clackamas County, January, 1979.

Draft Regional Water Supply Plan, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1979.

Drainage Management Flood Damage Reduction Measures, Kramer, Chin and Mayo, 1978.

Drainage Management Planning Manual, Review Draft, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, March, 1979.

Drainage Study for the City of Milwaukie, Oregon, Stevens, Thompson and Runyan, 1970.

Clackamas County Comprehensive Plan

Drainage Study of the Oak Lodge Area, Clackamas County, Stevens, Thompson and Runyan, 1970.

Guide to Water and Sewer Systems, CRAG, 1976.

Interim Guidelines for Storm Water Run-off Management in the Johnson Creek Basin, MSD, 1979.

Inventory of Existing Water Supply Systems for Major Outlying Communities, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1978.

Kellogg Creek Storm Drainage, Clackamas County, CH2M, 1970.

Master Plan Report, Clackamas Community College, 1977 (revised).

North Clackamas Urban Area Public Facilities Plan, Sanitary Sewerage Services, Clackamas County Dept. of Transportation and Development, Planning and Economic Development Division, January 1989.

North Clackamas Urban Area Public Facilities Plan, Storm Drainage Element, Clackamas County Dept. of Transportation and Development, Planning and Economic Development Division, February, 1989.

North Clackamas Urban Area Public Facilities Plan, Transportation Element, Clackamas County Dept. of Transportation and Development, Planning and Economic Development Division, November, 1988.

North Clackamas Urban Area Public Facilities Plan, Water Systems, Clackamas County Dept. of Transportation and Development, Planning and Economic Development Division, February, 1989, as amended on September 3, 1992, by Board Order 92-931.

Sewerage Facilities Plan and Study Treatment and Disposal Element--Tri-City Area, Clackamas County, CH2M-Hill, 1978.

Sewerage Facilities Plan for Mt. Hood Recreational Corridor, Stevens, Thompson and Runyan, 1977.

Solid Waste and Waste Management Ordinance, Clackamas County, 1970, Amended 1973, 1975, 1985, and 1989.

Solid Waste Landfill Study, Clackamas County, CH2M-Hill, 1971.

Statement of Taxes Levied in Clackamas County, Clackamas County Assessor, 1988.

Storm Sewer and Drainage Study of the Lake Oswego Area, CH2M, 1968.

Subdivision Manual, Clackamas County, 1975.

Water and Sewerage for Non-Urban Clackamas County, Clackamas County, 1970 (Vol. 1 and 2).

ECONOMICS

Background Report for the Clackamas County Comprehensive Plan Update 1989, Goal 9 - Economy of the State, Dept. of Transportation and Development, Economic Development Section, 1989.

Economic Development Plan, Clackamas County Dept. of Transportation and Development, 1986.

Tourism Background Report with Appendices, Clackamas County, Dept. of Transportation and Development, August, 1985.

OPEN SPACE, PARKS, AND HISTORIC SITES

Clackamas County Cultural Resources Inventory, Volumes I through XV, Clackamas County, 1984 and 1986.

Clackamas County Historic Landmarks, Unincorporated Urban Area, Clackamas County Dept. of Transportation and Development, June, 1988.

Clackamas County Household Survey, 1978; Portland State University, CPRC.

Maps of the Barlow Road, Mt. Hood to Oregon City, Clackamas County, Oregon, Clackamas County Planning and Economic Development Division, November, 1988.

Metropolitan Area Parks, Metropolitan Service District, 1989.

Metropolitan Regional Recreation Resources 1995 and 2010, Metro, 1988.

Oregon Recreation Trails, State Parks and Recreation, Oregon Dept. of Transportation, 1979.

Our Oregon Trail, A Report to the Governor, Oregon Trail Advisory Council, 1988.

Parks and Recreation for the East Urban Area, Clackamas County Dept. of Transportation and Development, Planning and economic Development Division, 1989.

Plan for Community Development, Clackamas County, Clackamas County Dept. of Environmental Services, Planning Division.

Recreation Economic Decisions, Richard J. Walsh, Colorado State University, 1986.

Recreation, Park and Open Space Standards and Guidelines, National Recreation and Park Association, 1987.

Regional Factbook, Demographic, Employment and Land Development Trends - Portland and Metropolitan Area, Metro, 1988.

State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan, Technical Documents I, II, and III; ODOT, Parks and Recreation Branch.

Strategies for Parks and Recreation, Clackamas County, Technical Memorandum, 1981.

Trails for Oregon, A Plan for a Recreation Trails System; ODOT, Parks and Recreation Branch.

The 2010 Plan, State Parks and Recreation, ODOT, 1988.

The Urban Outdoors, Metropolitan Service District.

COMMUNITY PLANS AND DESIGN PLANS

Clackamas Industrial Area and North Bank of the Clackamas River Design Plan, Clackamas County Planning Department, February 13, 1997.

Clackamas Regional Center Transportation System Plan, Kittelson & Associates, Inc., January, 1999.

Kruse Way Design Plan, Clackamas County Department of Environmental Services, October, 1983.

McLoughlin Corridor Land Use and Transportation Study, Final Report, Clackamas County, June, 1999.

Mount Hood Community Plan, Clackamas County Planning Department, July, 1982.

Sunnyside Corridor Community Plan, Clackamas County Dept. of Transportation and Development, Planning Division, June, 2000.

Clackamas County Comprehensive Plan

Sunnyside Village Plan, Clackamas County Dept. of Transportation and Development,
Planning Division, July, 1996.

Villages at Mt. Hood Pedestrian and Bikeway Implementation Plan, June 2016

Exhibit D
Ordinance ZDO-292

Findings of Consistency with the Statewide Planning Goals, Oregon Administrative Rules, Metro
Regional Transportation Functional Plan, Clackamas County Comprehensive Plan, and
Clackamas County Zoning and Development Ordinance

BACKGROUND

OAR chapter 660, division 12, outlines the requirements for Transportation Planning and includes specific requirements for Pedestrian System Planning (OAR 660-012-0500) and Bicycle System Planning (OAR 660-012-0600). In 1996, Clackamas County adopted a Pedestrian Master Plan and a Bicycle Master Plan, which are included in Appendix A to the Clackamas County Comprehensive Plan. In addition, Chapter 5 of the Comprehensive Plan, the *Transportation System Plan (TSP)*, includes specific policies addressing active transportation in the unincorporated areas of the County.

The *Walk Bike Clackamas Plan (WBC Plan)* is the first full update to the County's Pedestrian Master Plan and Bicycle Master Plan since they were first adopted in 1996. The *WBC Plan* is the result of a two-and-a-half-year-long planning project which created the County's first combined, consolidated bicycle and pedestrian plan. The project goal is to provide a comprehensive, long-term vision for improving walking and biking opportunities in Clackamas County for both transportation and recreation. The *WBC Plan* provides guidance on capital investment priorities and policy to create a balanced, connected, and safe transportation system.

The *WBC Plan* complements other planning efforts including the upcoming *TSP* update and the North Clackamas Parks and Recreation District (NCPRD) Trails Plan. Other recent plans have focused on targeted geographic areas: the *Villages at Mt. Hood Pedestrian and Bikeway Plan* focused on priority active transportation infrastructure improvements in the Mt. Hood area, the *Active Transportation Plan* provided guidance on regional active routes and principal connections between communities, and the *Clackamas Regional Center Pedestrian and Bicycle Connection Plan* prioritized last mile connections from the MAX Green Line terminus. The *WBC Plan* builds on these efforts to identify bicycle and pedestrian needs for County-maintained roads in both the urban and rural areas.

The *WBC Plan* is intended to:

- Provide a comprehensive, long-term vision for pedestrian and bicycle transportation in both the urban and rural areas;
- Address gaps in the multimodal transportation system by updating bicycle and pedestrian investment priorities;
- Address community needs through robust public engagement during each project step; and
- Coordinate with other County planning efforts, such as the NCPRD Trails Plan and the Active Transportation Plan.

Key Project Outcomes

- **Goals, Objectives, Supportive Actions, and Performance Measures:** To guide future decision-making, the *WBC Plan* includes key goals, objectives, and supportive actions. Performance measures to evaluate progress toward implementation are also included in the plan.

- **Priority Projects:** The *WBC Plan* includes 236 key projects, 96.7 miles of new sidewalk, 322.3 miles of new bikeways, and 106.8 miles of new multi-use trails. Projects are organized within five planning areas: McLoughlin, Clackamas Town Center, Northwest County, East County, and South County. Within each area, there are three tiers of priorities: Tier 1 are the highest priority projects, Tier 2 are medium priority, and Tier 3 are low priority. The plan also includes key spot improvement projects such as crosswalks and bicycle signals. No funding allocation has occurred in conjunction with this project. The project only identifies potential projects if money becomes available through grants or other channels.
- **Shared Streets:** Shared Streets are potentially high-use streets for people walking and bicycling in Clackamas County with speeds reduced to 20 mph to enhance public health and safety. Reducing motor vehicle speeds is one of the best ways to increase safety. The Shared Streets program would apply only to local streets that provide important connections within and between neighborhoods, shopping areas, and parks, among other destinations. They would be part of the pedestrian and bicycle network along with bike lanes, sidewalks, and trails.
- **Supportive Programs:** While infrastructure improvements are an important part of making walking and biking safer, supportive programs help build awareness around safety and the rights and responsibilities of everyone using the transportation system. The County currently conducts some programming (Safe Routes to School, for example) that support walking and bicycling. The *WBC Plan* includes several new programs that could help address community desires and complement other investments. The seven potential *WBC Plan* programs are categorized into Event, Campaign, and Mode Shift groupings. The seven programs included in the draft plan are: Open Streets, School Zone Safety, Bicycle Friendly Driver, No Parking in Bike Lane, Micromobility, Bicycle and Pedestrian County, and Street Painting Program.

Project Development

The *WBC Plan* has eight chapters including an executive summary and appendices. The following nine-step process was used to develop the plan.

1. **Public Engagement Strategy:** Document detailing specific engagement activities throughout the life of the project. A combination of traditional and virtual public engagement tools to reach diverse populations and address the needs of residents and stakeholders of all backgrounds were deployed. The public and stakeholders were engaged in a variety of ways, including through a website, printed materials (such as postcards, flyers, and media releases), open houses (in person and/or virtual), online mapping exercise, presentations to community groups, and Project Advisory Committee meetings.
2. **Existing Conditions:** Identification and documentation of existing conditions related to pedestrian and bicycle transportation, including inventory of existing walking and bicycling facilities for the entire County. Existing conditions included crash data from 2016-2020. The analysis focused on fatal and severe-injury crashes. Destinations and other “community attractors,” such as unincorporated communities that have the potential to generate pedestrian and bicycle traffic, were also mapped. Other existing condition components included a review of health conditions data, equity analysis, and adopted plan review.
3. **Public Engagement Milestones:** Four engagement milestones were held in conjunction with the *WBC Plan*. Public engagement took place partially during the Covid-19 pandemic. Due to the pandemic requirements, some of the public engagement was conducted as a virtual, online process. All materials were posted online to improve public access to the process. County staff also used social media platforms such as Facebook and NextDoor to provide updates on the process and notices of the posting of materials. The process included the following four engagement milestones, spaced evenly throughout the project:

- **Milestone #1: Community Conversations.** Four in-person “Community Conversations” were held throughout the County. The focus of these events was to go to locations where people are already gathering. “Bringing information to residents” can allow for more meaningful dialogue and wider dissemination of information. Milestone #1 also included a corresponding online survey. This milestone was designed to build awareness and support for the *WBC Plan*, begin to identify gaps and deficiencies in the walking and biking networks, and understand community priorities to inform project goals and objectives. There were over 110 total participants during the “Community Conversations.”
- **Milestone #2: Virtual Open House and Interactive Map-Based Survey.** This virtual open house explained the project to members of the public and solicited feedback on opportunity locations for new and/or enhanced facilities. Feedback was also requested on the draft goals. There was an interactive map (Wikki mapping) to gather suggestions on needed bikeway, sidewalk, and crosswalk locations. People were asked to drop a pin or draw a line where they felt new improvements were needed. This was called identifying “opportunities and barriers” to walk and bike improvements. Finally, the concept of Shared Streets was introduced, and potential locations were gathered. The virtual open house webpage received more than 900 views. More than 200 people responded to the surveys and shared nearly 800 written comments. Participants shared 270 submissions to the online map tool highlighting barriers and opportunities for active transportation.
- **Milestone #3: In-Person Open House.** This milestone was held at the NCPRD Movies in the Park event. It also included multi-day tabling at the Clackamas County Fair and an online survey. Members of the Clackamas County Pedestrian and Bikeway Advisory Committee volunteered to assist with staffing a *WBC Plan* booth at the county fair. The purpose of Milestone #3 was to:
 - Share findings from the gaps and deficiencies analysis;
 - Present and gather feedback on program priorities; and
 - Obtain feedback on draft pedestrian and bicycle projects, and priority improvements.

The two in-person events attracted 416 visitors. The online survey received 202 responses, with each planning area receiving 40 to 100 comments.

- **Milestone #4: Five Online Surveys Using Metro Quest Platform.** The purpose of this survey was to give the public an opportunity to express their views on the draft plan. Each survey included proposed projects and programs relevant to one of the five planning areas. People were able to respond to as many surveys as they wished. Draft project maps for each planning area were presented. People could comment on specific projects or add suggestions for new or missing projects. Survey respondents were also asked to provide feedback on their preference for potential supportive programs. The online survey received 660 responses.
4. **Goals and Objectives:** Step four consisted of goals and objectives development. Project goals and objectives work together to guide active transportation planning and implementation. This step also included a set of performance measures to gauge progress in meeting objectives and implementing the *WBC Plan*.
 5. **Shared Streets Network Development:** The County now has statutory authority to set the speed limit on certain local roads under ORS 810.180. Using the statute as guidance, the *WBC Plan* project developed a mapped network of Shared Streets, which are local streets that provide important connections within and between neighborhoods, shopping areas, and parks, among other destinations. Shared Streets would be part of the pedestrian and bicycle network along with bike lanes, sidewalks, and trails. Reducing motor vehicle speeds is one

of the best ways to increase safety. The Shared Streets element of this plan would lower speeds to 20 mph on certain local roads. The *WBC Plan* calls for 26 Shared Streets within the urban area of the County.

6. **Gaps and Deficiencies Analysis:** This step involved three data-driven analyses to identify existing gaps and deficiencies in the walking and bicycling transportation network on County-maintained facilities in unincorporated Clackamas County. This step helped to inform project recommendations and prioritization. The three main analyses as part of this step were:

- Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress: The likely amount of stress a bicyclist faces due to roadway and traffic conditions;
- Bicycle Network Analysis: An analysis that measures the connectivity of the bicycle network to destinations on the census block level; and
- Pedestrian Level of Crossing Stress: The likely amount of stress when pedestrians cross at roadway intersections and where trails and multi-use paths intersect road segments.

Additional data informed this analysis, including Replica (a data clearing house for transportation and built environment data) which provided data on the volumes of pedestrian and bicycle activity on County roads. Activity areas that generate pedestrian and bicycle traffic were mapped and analyzed for potential connectivity.

7. **Pedestrian and Bicycle Project Identification:** This step involved developing an initial draft list of walking and biking projects. A base map was created using unbuilt active transportation projects from previous plans, with a focus on identifying new projects specifically in equity focus areas. This basemap showed projects on County-owned streets but included collaboration opportunities within incorporated areas. The County compared unbuilt, previously identified projects to locations with gaps, deficiencies, and needs. “Priority WBC routes and geographies” were also evaluated, which included the following:

- Locations on the vulnerable road user high injury network or near fatal or severe injury crash locations that involved people walking or bicycling;
- Priority Active Transportation Routes;
- The Essential Pedestrian Network;
- The equity focus areas, identified through the *WBC Plan* existing conditions; and
- Locations where members of the public requested improvements via the interactive online map.

8. **Prioritization Methodology:** Step eight consisted of developing a prioritization methodology. Every project was scored based on this methodology, which involved prioritization criteria and scoring for the project list. Proposed projects were scored based on weighted criteria to create a list of high, medium, and low priority pedestrian and bicycle projects. The criteria were based on the *WBC Plan* goals: Accessibility, Connectivity, Sustainability, Equity, and Health. The prioritization criteria were used to rank all projects under consideration in the *WBC Plan*. The prioritization methodology included the following key phases:

- **Phase 1: Criteria Selection:** Select the prioritization criteria that align with plan goals and County policies.
- **Phase 2: Raw Score Assignment:** Confirm the scoring for each criterion and calculate each criterion’s raw score for each project.
- **Phase 3: Tiering Projects:** Sort projects into high, medium, or low priority lists.

9. **Project Prioritization:** The final step involved applying the prioritization methodology developed in Step 8 to all the draft plan projects identified in Step 7. All projects were scored based on quantifiable criteria and sorted into high, medium, and low priority pedestrian and bicycle projects. The criteria for scoring were based on the *WBC Plan* goals, with higher consideration given to the goals identified by the Project Advisory Committee as key project values, indicated in Table 1 below.

Table 1: WBC Plan Goals	
<u>Goals</u>	<u>Key Project Value</u>
Safety	✓
Accessibility	
Connectivity	✓
Sustainability	
Equity	✓
Health	✓

PROPOSED CHANGES TO COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

ZDO-292 includes proposed amendments that would adopt the *WBC Plan* into the County's Comprehensive Plan by doing the following:

- Amending the Active Transportation policies in the *TSP* to ensure consistency with the *WBC Plan*;
- Amending Appendix A to the Comprehensive Plan to adopt the *WBC Plan* by reference; and
- Amending Appendix B to the Comprehensive Plan to adopt Appendices A through T to the *WBC Plan* by reference. The *WBC Plan* appendices include existing conditions data, background information, and other analyses used to develop the plan.

PUBLIC NOTICE & COMMENTS

Notice of the proposed amendments in ZDO-292 was sent to:

- All cities within the County;
- All County Community Planning Organizations (CPOs); and
- DLCD, Metro, and ODOT.

Notice was also published in *The Oregonian* newspaper and online.

ANALYSIS & FINDINGS

1. Statewide Planning Goals:

This section of the report includes Board findings on ZDO-292's consistency with the Statewide Planning Goals.

Goal 1 – Citizen Involvement:

Goal 1 calls for “the opportunity for citizens to be involved in all phases of the planning process” and requires the County to have a citizen involvement program with certain features. ZDO-292 would not amend Chapter 2 of the County's Comprehensive Plan, the

Citizen Involvement chapter. The only Comprehensive Plan amendments proposed in ZDO-292 are to the *TSP*.

Section 1307 of the Clackamas County Zoning and Development Ordinance (ZDO) implements Chapter 2 of the Comprehensive Plan and contains acknowledged procedures for citizen involvement and public notification of land use matters. Consistent with the requirements of Section 1307, notice of ZDO-292 was provided to DLCD, Metro, ODOT, all cities in the County, and all active and recognized CPOs 35 days before the first public hearing. Notice of ZDO-292 and its scheduled hearings was published in *The Oregonian* more than 10 days in advance and has also been posted on County websites. There have been two public hearings: one before the Planning Commission and another before the Board of County Commissioners.

This proposal is consistent with Goal 1.

Goal 2 – Land Use Planning:

Goal 2 requires the County to have and to follow a comprehensive land use plan and implementing regulations. Comprehensive plan provisions and regulations generally must be consistent with the Statewide Planning Goals, but Goal 2 provides a process by which exceptions can be made to certain goals. ZDO-292 does not require an exception to any Statewide Planning Goal. With the proposed amendments, the County's acknowledged Comprehensive Plan will continue to be consistent with Statewide Planning Goals, and the implementing regulations in the ZDO will continue to be consistent with those goals and with the Comprehensive Plan.

This proposal is consistent with Goal 2.

Goal 3 – Agricultural Lands:

ZDO-292 would not amend any Comprehensive Plan policies related to agricultural lands (*i.e.*, those zoned EFU), nor would it change any property's planning or zoning designation or expand any urban growth boundary (UGB) into agricultural lands. ZDO-292 would also not permit any new land uses in agricultural lands.

This proposal is consistent with Goal 3.

Goal 4 – Forest Lands:

ZDO-292 would not amend any Comprehensive Plan policies related to forest lands (*i.e.*, those zoned AG/F or TBR), nor would it change any property's planning or zoning designation or expand any UGB into forest lands. ZDO-292 would also not permit any new land uses in forest lands.

This proposal is consistent with Goal 4.

Goal 5 – Natural Resources, Scenic and Historic Areas, and Open Spaces:

Goal 5 requires the County to have programs that will protect natural resources and conserve scenic, historic, and open space resources for present and future generations. It requires an inventory of natural features, groundwater resources, energy sources, and cultural areas, and it encourages the maintenance of inventories of historic resources. ZDO-292 would not amend any Comprehensive Plan goals, policies, or inventories, or ZDO provisions, related to the protection of natural resources or the conservation of scenic, historic, or open space resources, nor would it allow any new uses that could conflict with an inventoried Goal 5 resource.

This proposal is consistent with Goal 5.

Goal 6 – Air, Water and Land Resources Quality:

Goal 6 instructs the County to consider the protection of air, water, and land resources from pollution and pollutants when developing its Comprehensive Plan. ZDO-292 would not amend any Comprehensive Plan goals or policies, or ZDO provisions, affecting a Goal 6 resource, nor would it modify the mapping of any protected resource.

This proposal is consistent with Goal 6.

Goal 7 – Areas Subject to Natural Hazards:

Goal 7 requires the County's Comprehensive Plan to address Oregon's natural hazards. ZDO-292 would not amend any Comprehensive Plan policies regarding natural disasters or hazards, nor would it modify the mapping of any hazards.

This proposal is consistent with Goal 7.

Goal 8 – Recreational Needs:

Goal 8 requires the County to plan for the recreational needs of its residents and visitors. ZDO-292 addresses County recreational needs by planning for a connected active transportation network that includes a series of multi-use trails in each of the planning areas. The *WBC Plan* calls for a total of 106.8 miles of trails in 4 of the 5 planning areas. The Clackamas Town Center area and the South County area have the most trail mileage, with 38.7 miles and 34.9 miles respectively.

This proposal is consistent with Goal 8.

Goal 9 – Economic Development:

Goal 9 requires the County to provide an adequate supply of land for commercial and industrial development. ZDO-292 would not change the planning or zoning designation of any property. It also would not add any new restrictions to land uses in areas of the County reserved for commercial and industrial development.

This proposal is consistent with Goal 9.

Goal 10 – Housing:

The purpose of Goal 10 is to meet housing needs. ZDO-292 would neither reduce nor expand the County's housing land supply, nor would it add any new restrictions to housing development.

This proposal is consistent with Goal 10.

Goal 11 – Public Facilities and Services:

The purpose of Goal 11 is to ensure that local governments plan and develop a timely, orderly, and efficient arrangement of public facilities and services to act as a framework for urban and rural development. ZDO-292 does not propose any changes to adopted plans for the provision of water, sewer, or other public services.

This proposal is consistent with Goal 11.

Goal 12 – Transportation:

The purpose of Goal 12 is to provide a safe, convenient, and economic transportation system. OAR chapter 660, division 12, implements Goal 12. OAR 660-012-0500 and OAR 660-012-0600 provide rules for pedestrian system planning and bicycle system planning. The County is required to have pedestrian and bicycle mode elements that comply with the OARs. Findings for the relevant Goal 12 rules are presented in the following sections.

OAR 660-012-0500: Pedestrian System Planning

The *WBC Plan* contains a list of pedestrian system projects that address gaps and deficiencies in the network. A Pedestrian Level of Traffic Stress (PLTS) and associated analysis was conducted to identify pedestrian system needs in compliance with this rule.

OAR 660-012-0505: Pedestrian System Inventory

The County conducted an existing conditions analysis at the beginning of the project. Sidewalks were inventoried and mapped for the County road network, in both urban and rural areas. Sub-areas maps for each of the five planning areas were prepared. Within unincorporated Clackamas County, streets without sidewalks account for nearly 92.6% of the total roadway centerline mileage. Arterials are the roadways most likely to have sidewalks on at least one side, while limited access facilities such as expressways and interstates are least likely to have sidewalks. Principal arterials are also most likely to have sidewalks on *both* sides.

OAR 660-012-0510: Pedestrian System Requirements

This rule describes the minimum planned requirements for pedestrian facilities included in the plan. The *WBC Plan* was developed in compliance with this rule. The process used to identify the pedestrian system is described in the Project Development section above.

OAR 660-012-0520: Pedestrian System Projects

The *WBC Plan* contains the pedestrian projects needed to address critical gaps and deficiencies. A particular focus involved safe walking options available for everyone regardless of age, ability, race, income, gender, and background. The County developed a Transportation Equity Index to better understand where communities of interest are living across Clackamas County and to assist project prioritization. The Transportation Equity Index uses the following inputs to identify communities of interest: Black, Indigenous, and people of color (BIPOC); immigrants; people with limited English proficiency; low-income and low-wealth community members; low- and moderate-income renters and homeowners; people with disabilities; youth; and seniors. Census block groups with a Transportation Equity Index score above the County average are considered Equity Focus Areas in the *WBC Plan*. The equity focus was incorporated into the *WBC Plan* in four critical ways:

- 1) *Meeting People Where They Are and When They Can Attend*: “Community Conversations” and other public engagement events were located at events and destinations where residents had already gathered to reach people where they were. The website, on-line survey, and digital campaigns provided opportunities for people to weigh in whenever they had availability.
- 2) *Leading with a Health Equity Framework*: Health and equity were foundational elements of this planning process. The project team consulted the County’s Health, Housing, and Human Services Department on available data to assess baseline health conditions and crafted a Health Equity Framework to understand this project’s potential and responsibility to advance equity and improve health outcomes.
- 3) *Integration with Plan Goals*: Equity was embedded into plan objectives and performance measures and was established as a key criterion for project prioritization and ongoing decision-making.
- 4) *Prioritizing Projects in Places with the Greatest Need*: The Transportation Equity Index identified the distribution of race, ethnicity, linguistic isolation, low income, limited transportation resources, older adults, youth, and disability across the County. Locations with higher concentrations of these groups scored higher during project prioritization.

OAR 660-012-0600: Bicycle System Planning

This rule describes the elements that must be included in the bicycle component of the plan. These elements include a gaps and deficiencies analysis, a mapping of bicycle destinations, prioritized projects, and “adding enhanced facilities” to the active transportation network. The County conducted a planning process consistent with this rule. The planning process is described in the Project Development section above.

OAR 660-012-0605: Bicycle System Inventory

The County conducted an existing conditions analysis at the beginning of the project. Bicycle facilities were inventoried and mapped for the County road network, both urban and rural. There are 101.7 miles of existing bikeways and 29 miles of off-street bikeways (hard surface trails) within unincorporated Clackamas County. Overall, most of the County bikeways are traditional bike lanes. However, in compliance with OAR 660-012-0605, planned bikeways also include protected bike lanes, cycletracks, shoulder bikeways, shared roadways such as Shared Streets, and off-street facilities such as hard surface multi-use trails. Existing bikeway data at the County level does not distinguish between a striped bike lane, buffered bike lane, or separated bike lane. Consequently, these statistics do not indicate the level of protection for existing bikeways.

OAR 660-012-0610: Bicycle System Requirements

This rule outlines the minimum planned bicycle facilities that must be included in plans. In particular, counties must plan for “a connected network of bicycle facilities that provide a safe, low stress, direct and comfortable experience for people of all ages and abilities.” To develop a connected network, the County identified locations for traditional bike lanes, protected bicycle facilities, and separated trails, and it added a new component: Shared Streets. The County’s local street system provides important connections within and between neighborhoods, shopping areas, and parks, among other destinations. The *WBC Plan* creates a hierarchy of mobility and access for people walking, biking, or rolling on local County streets, and it identifies high-use streets where lower speeds may improve public health, equity, and safety. To develop Shared Street components of the bicycle and pedestrian network, a set of prioritization criteria to reasonably and equitably operationalize the system were developed and applied across the urban area. Shared Streets complement bike lanes, multi-use trails, sidewalks, and other bikeways, which enables the County to develop an “all ages and abilities” network in compliance with this rule. The *WBC Plan* also updates the County’s facility design toolkit to include a range of treatments that can be deployed to meet the requirements of this rule.

OAR 660-012-0620: Bicycle System Projects

To identify walking and bicycling projects in unincorporated Clackamas County, the County reviewed and incorporated projects from previous planning efforts, such as the *TSP* and Safe Routes to School Action Plans, and from public comments. The County also identified potential opportunities to collaborate with other agency partners on projects not on County-maintained streets. The County compared the unbuilt, previously identified projects to locations with gaps, deficiencies, and other “geographies,” which included:

- Locations on the vulnerable road user high injury network or near fatal or severe injury crash locations that involved people walking or bicycling;
- Priority Active Transportation Routes;
- The Essential Pedestrian Network;
- The equity focus areas, identified through the *WBC Plan* existing conditions; and

- Locations where members of the public requested improvements via the interactive online map.

Based on this analysis, 237 projects were identified and incorporated into the *WBC Plan*. The number of projects within each planning area and the total sidewalk, bikeway, and trail mileage is shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Number of Proposed Projects in WBC Plan				
Area	Total	Sidewalk Mileage	Bikeway Mileage	Trail Mileage
Clackamas Town Center	103	33.5	56.1	38.7
East County	31	2.2	69.1	24.2
McLoughlin	40	34.3	29.7	-
Northwest County	19	6.9	25.5	9.0
South County	44	19.8	141.9	34.9
Total	237	96.7	322.3	106.8

These projects ensure safe biking and walking options are available for everyone regardless of age, ability, race, income, gender, and background.

This proposal is consistent with Goal 12.

Goal 13 – *Energy Conservation*:

Goal 13 encourages land use plans to consider lot size, building height, density, and other measures to help conserve energy. ZDO-292 would not amend any Comprehensive Plan policies or ZDO provisions regarding energy conservation.

This proposal is consistent with Goal 13.

Goal 14 – *Urbanization*:

The purpose of Goal 14 is to provide for an orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land use, to accommodate urban population and urban employment inside UGBs, to ensure efficient use of land, and to provide for livable communities. The goal primarily concerns the location of UGBs, the establishment of “urbanizable” areas and unincorporated communities, exception lands, and rural industrial uses. ZDO-292 would not modify any UGB or the status or boundaries of any unincorporated community. It also would not modify any urban or rural reserve boundary, allow any new land uses in such reserve areas in a manner inconsistent with state law, change the planning or zoning designation of any property, or allow any new uses in exception lands in a manner inconsistent with state law.

This proposal is consistent with Goal 14.

Goal 15 – *Willamette River Greenway*:

ZDO-292 would not change any existing requirements related to development in the Willamette River Greenway.

This proposal is consistent with Goal 15.

Goals 16-19:

These four Statewide Planning Goals address estuarine resources, coastal shorelands, beaches and dunes, and ocean resources, respectively, and are **not applicable** to Clackamas County.

This proposal is consistent with the Statewide Planning Goals.

2. Metro Regional Transportation Functional Plan

The purpose of the Metro Regional Transportation Functional Plan is to implement efficient transportation systems and establish a set of policies that results in “completion of the transportation system for all modes of travel to expand transportation choices; increasing use of the transit, pedestrian and bicycle systems; ensuring equity and affordable transportation choices.” The *WBC Plan* is consistent with the spirit and policies set forth in the Metro Regional Transportation Functional Plan. Notice of this proposal was provided to Metro to allow a review for consistency with the Regional Transportation Functional Plan. Metro has not submitted any comment on the *WBC Plan*.

This proposal is consistent with the Metro Regional Transportation Functional Plan.

3. Clackamas County Comprehensive Plan

The following two chapters of the County’s Comprehensive Plan are applicable to this proposal.

Chapter 2 – Citizen Involvement:

Chapter 2 of the Comprehensive Plan aims to promote public participation in the County’s land use planning. Its policies largely focus on the County’s CPO program and methods for informing and involving the public. Chapter 2 includes these specific policies:

2.A.1 – Require provisions for opportunities for citizen participation in preparing and revising local land use plans and ordinances. Insure opportunities for broad representations, not only of property owners and Countywide special interests, but also of those persons within the neighborhood or areas in question.

2.A.6 – Seek citizens’ input not only through recognized community organizations, but also through service organizations, interest groups, granges, and other ways.

2.A.13 – Insure that the County responds to citizen recommendations through appropriate mechanisms and procedures.

The public engagement process for the *WBC Plan* has included:

- A project website with multiple surveys allowing the public to share their comments and concerns;
- A Project Advisory Committee consisting of 18 members;
- Project flyers which were distributed to physical locations across the County and sent to interested parties via email;
- Interactive maps that enabled the public to select intersections and road segments and to provide input on issues or suggestions on improvements for the chosen location;
- In-person and virtual open houses; and
- Presentations to the Pedestrian and Bikeway Advisory Committee (PBAC), the Traffic Safety Commission (TSC), and CPOs.

This proposal is consistent with Chapter 2.

Chapter 11 – The Planning Process:

Chapter 11 of the Comprehensive Plan includes policies requiring inter-governmental and inter-agency coordination, public involvement, and noticing. As explained above, all required entities have been notified in accordance with law and have been invited to participate in duly advertised public hearings on ZDO-292. Chapter 11 also contains the specific requirement that the Comprehensive Plan and ZDO be consistent with the Statewide Planning Goals. As explained above, ZDO-292 is consistent with the Statewide Planning Goals.

This proposal is consistent with Chapter 11.

This proposal is consistent with the Clackamas County Comprehensive Plan.

4. Clackamas County Zoning and Development Ordinance (ZDO):

The proposed amendments are legislative. Section 1307 of the ZDO establishes procedural requirements for legislative amendments, which have been or are being followed in the proposal and review of ZDO-292. Notice of ZDO-292 was provided at least 35 days before the first scheduled public hearing to DLCD and other interested agencies to allow them an opportunity to review and comment on the proposed amendments. Advertised public hearings were held before the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners to consider the proposed amendments. The ZDO contains no further specific review criteria that must be applied when considering legislative amendments.

This proposal is consistent with the ZDO.

CONCLUSIONS

The amendments to the Comprehensive Plan proposed by ZDO-292 are consistent with all applicable goals and policies. ZDO-292 is necessary to comply with OAR chapter 660, division 12. ZDO-292 shall, therefore, include the following amendments:

- Amending the Active Transportation policies in the *TSP* to ensure consistency with the *WBC Plan*;
- Amending Appendix A to the Comprehensive Plan to adopt the *WBC Plan* by reference; and
- Amending Appendix B to the Comprehensive Plan to adopt Appendices A through T to the *WBC Plan* by reference.