



MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 7, 2016

TO: Linn County TSP Project Management Team

FROM: Carl D. Springer, DKS Associates
Julie Sosnovske, DKS Associates

SUBJECT: Linn County Transportation System Plan | P14180-010
Task 2.3 Project Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting #1 Minutes DRAFT

Meeting Held:

January 5, 2016, 1:30 p.m.
Linn County Courthouse
300 SW 4th Avenue
Albany, OR 97321

Attendees:

Chuck Knoll, Linn County Road Department
Darrin Lane, Linn County Road Department
Olivia Glantz, Linn County Planning and Building
Judge Roark, Linn County Planning Commission
Stanley Boshart, Linn County Planning Commission
Dan Fricke, ODOT
Ron Irish, City of Albany
Ronda Fischer, City of Halsey
Georgia Edwards, City of Tangent
Brian Latta, City of Harrisburg
Barbara Castillo, City of Millersburg
Scott McDowell, City of Brownsville
Teresa Conley, Oregon Cascades West COG
Charlie Mitchell, Cascade West Area Commission on Transportation
Carl Springer, DKS Associates
Julie Sosnovske, DKS Associates

Agenda

1. Welcome & Introductions - PAC members and consultants introduced themselves

2. Project Overview – What Is A Transportation System Plan?

- Many PAC members are familiar with the TSP process. Carl provided a brief overview of what a TSP must and should do.
- Carl mentioned that the “CALM” model will be used for forecasting traffic volumes to 2040 where the model is available. Growth rates will be used in areas not covered by the model – typically rural areas away from major cities. A PAC members asked what the CALM model was. It is the Corvallis/Albany/Lebanon/Millersburg Model that has been previously developed for the AAMPO Regional Transportation System Plan (RTSP).
- Darrin asked if we are required to update the Comprehensive Plan. There was some discussion about what would go in the Comp Plan versus in the TSP, outside the Comp Plan. Olivia said the County is thinking about keeping the policies in the Comp Plan, and otherwise referencing the TSP document.
- Georgia asked how the TSP’s relate to each other. Carl explained that they need to be compatible. Teresa mentioned that the single occupant reduction piece of the RTSP may go to local jurisdictions for approval.
- Carl mentioned the term “Performance Based Planning” and explained that there has been a shift in focus from modal planning, which may have many redundancies, to performance based planning.

3. Public Involvement Plan And The Role Of The Committee

- Carl described the role of the committee, explaining that they represent a variety of agencies and perspectives from throughout the county. The PAC is expected to meet six times throughout the plan process.

4. Presentation and Discussion of Work Completed To Date

a. Planning Goals And How We Measure Success (Tech Memo #4)

- Carl explained that the current generation of TSP’s has generally shifted from modal based goals to performance based goals and that is the direction we are headed with this TSP.
- Darrin indicated that he thinks the new organization of the Goals and Objectives makes sense
- Carl explained that the Evaluation Criteria helps to balance the goals and objectives, giving weight to each goal rather than focusing on specific objectives (e.g. mobility)

b. Background Document Review

- Carl explained that this document helps us understand the plans, policies and project lists that we need to be compatible with.



- Teresa mentioned that she would like to see the AAMPO RTSP and AAMPO Transit Development Plan mentioned, indicating that they are being developed in parallel with this TSP process.
- c. Transportation Funding (Tech Memo #3)
 - Review was not complete prior to meeting – will provide this information to the PAC via email when a draft is available.

General comments:

- Scott M. wants to make sure the plan describes “liquidity” – meaning that project development needs to be flexible depending on growth patterns and other factors that can influence which projects should advance first.
 - There was a lot of discussion about the flexibility of the project lists and the expectation is that the list will be flexible. There will be both “aspirational” and “financially constrained” project lists with flexibility between the two.
 - There was a question about county roadways within urban growth boundaries (UGB’s) and/or City Limits. Darrin explained that it’s the City’s initiative to plan within the UGB and that the roadways are “the County’s until...they become City streets”. The purpose of the Linn County TSP is to address the rural (outside the UGB) portion of the County.
 - Olivia mentioned that a significant portion (90%) of development in the County (near City UGB’s) goes through land use review with the city. Since the City has to approve development, they have input into the process
 - Ron mentioned that several of the Albany projects have changed. Carl said we don’t need to update this document, but he should let us know going forward.
5. Overall Project Schedule And Next Steps
- An overall project schedule was shown and discussed. The next step in the process is to document existing conditions and develop future forecasts, which take some time. It is likely that the group will meet again in late spring.
 - It was determined that PAC members should forward comments to Olivia, for tracking, who would forward them to DKS. [Note: Subsequently, it was agreed that comments should be forwarded to linn-county-tsp-comments@dksassociates.com]

