

Meeting minutes

Meeting: 82nd Avenue Steering Committee meeting #10

Date/time: Thursday, January 25, 2023, 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.

Place: Hybrid meeting held via Zoom and in person at Metro Regional Center, 600 NE Grand

Avenue, Portland, Oregon, Room 328A/B

Members, Alternates Attending Affiliation

Ayman Irfan United Oregon Kristin Hull, *alternate* City of Portland

Rian Windsheimer Oregon Department of Transportation

Councilor Christine Lewis, Co-chair Metro
Councilor Duncan Hwang, Co-chair Metro
JC Vannatta TriMet

Commissioner Julia Brim-Edwards Multnomah County
Kaitlyn Dey Clackamas Service Center

Representative Khanh Pham Oregon Legislature Commissioner Mark Shull Clackamas County

Michael Liu 82nd Avenue Business Alliance

Emeral Bogue Port of Portland Zachary Lauritzen Oregon Walks

Presenters

Melissa Ashbaugh Metro Elizabeth Mros-O'Hara Metro

Attendees

Eve Nilenders Multnomah County
Sarah Paulus Multnomah County
Vikki Payne Multnomah County

Holly Querin Metro Tanja Olson Metro Malu Wilkinson Metro Monica Krueger Metro Hau Hagedorn Metro Jason Nolin Metro **Kate Hawkins** Metro Kelly Betteridge Metro Michaela Skiles Metro Jesse Stemmler TriMet Jennifer Koozer TriMet Michael Kizer TriMet Paulina Salgado Jonathan Plowman

Julia Reed Kiel Jenkins Karen Buehrig Chris Ford

Sandra Hikari

Jorge Sanchez Bautista Peter Meyerhofer

Jacob Loeb Kathryn Notson Mara Krinke Garrison Christian

Brad Jeff Owen TriMet TriMet

Portland Bureau of Transportation

City of Portland Clackamas County

ODOT ODOT

Kimley-Horn

Welcome and Introductions

Metro Councilor Christine Lewis called the meeting to order at 4:07 p.m. and welcomed the attendees by reviewing basic information for the location, providing an overview of the agenda, and started a round robin of introductions. Kristin Hull attended as the alternate for Commissioner Mapps representing the City of Portland.

Approval of December 2023 Meeting Minutes

Approval moved by Commissioner Brim-Edwards, seconded by JC Vannatta. The minutes were approved with one abstention. Councilor Lewis reminded everyone that Robert's Rules does not require members to read the minutes. Zachary abstained because he had not looked at them.

Updates from Partners

Jennifer Koozer, Director of Community Affairs and Engagement at TriMet, gave an update on recent engagement with employees at the airport and Cascade Station in response to questions from the last meeting. Engagement was done in December and January. They reached 84 people via canvassing and a survey. Most employees drive to work. There is interest in more transit but not necessarily from the 82nd Avenue corridor. They will be continuing these conversations to better serve the employees and incentivize transit. A common comment was the need for expanded hours of service. JC explained that TriMet wants to better serve the airport/Cascade Station as a major employment hub. TriMet's planning department is going to prioritize this project to coordinate with their bus network and other projects. Emerald thanked TriMet for the engagement efforts.

Commissioner Shull reported that a new project will go out for bid this summer and start construction next summer: improvements at 79th Place and Johnson Creek Blvd on 82nd Avenue. Sandy Area Transit began bus service from Sandy through Boring to Clackamas Town Center, which highlights the importance of the Clackamas Transit Center.

Kristin reported that an updated concept design for Phase 1 critical fix improvements [on 82nd] will be shared later this month. This work reflects engagement and great work by staff to improve safety and support commercial activity in the 82nd Avenue corridor.

Rian reported that ODOT and the City of Portland have been working on a funding package for the next

phase of the transit project, project development. Kristin elaborated that they are working on Intergovernmental Agreements between Portland, TriMet, and ODOT.

Rian thanked the community for their cooperation with the recent snow and weather. Maintenance could not salt because of rain and the timing was the worst, during the evening rush. The community heard the message and stayed home or delayed trips and this allowed ODOT to keep highways open for emergency vehicles.

Northern terminus staff recommendation (Melissa Ashbaugh, Metro)

There was a short recap of the evaluation criteria which were designed to reflect the projects goals and objectives. The evaluation summary showed Cully scoring the highest across the criteria; and Parkrose TC was also scoring high. Cascade Station and the airport are not scoring as high. The staff recommendation was to narrow down to Cully (preferred) and Parkrose (alternate) which are two good choices. Cascade Station and the airport do not meet as many of the project goals and staff recommended taking them off the table. The next phase will focus on understanding the difference between Cully and Parkrose TC. Staff will focus on cost, design, and outreach, which will be used to further evaluate the two good options on community compatibility and project feasibility to choose a final terminus option.

Melissa gave a short recap on the station analysis work--general station locations were presented by Jesse in December--and then showed the stations related to the two recommended terminus options. For Cully, the bus would travel north, turn left on Killingsworth, and turn around near the Cully triangle at Cully and Killingsworth. For Parkrose, the route would turn right on Sandy.

Next, Melissa explained the proposed stations for each recommended terminus option. For the Cully alignment, staff is recommending stops at both Prescott and Alberta. These stops are close together, ¼-mile spacing. Staff considered removing one, but there are important community connections at both these locations and they wanted to maintain at least ½-mile spacing to the terminus. They considered adding a station at 82nd and Killingsworth, but access and connections were not great, plus the Line 72 rerouted to end at Parkrose TC would continue to service this location. Another station at 72nd and Lombard is close to the Cully terminus, but there are important land uses and high ridership there. For Parkrose, only one stop at Prescott and it is logical spacing, half-way between 82nd and the Parkrose transit center and connecting to another transit route.

Conclusion: the staff recommendation is Cully (preferred) and Parkrose TC (alternate).

Discussion

Question from Zachary: "Preferred" to "alternate" is on a continuum? Can you speak to that?

Answer from Melissa: the reason for preferred and alternate is that Cully is performing better. We want to lock in the information we have now and then use the same evaluation framework and add more information as we continue with this work.

Question from Commissioner Brim-Edwards: Could the positioning change through the next phase? Is that why you want to retain two options?

Answer from Melissa: Yes, exactly. It is possible that they will change in the next phase, especially in community compatibility. There will be a lot more design and cost analysis that could show issues that we cannot see now.

Question from Commissioner Shull: Are you comfortable there is enough area for a terminus at Cully? Is there space for a park and ride?

Answer from Melissa: Yes, we think there is enough space for a terminus facility that works for the

community.

Answer from Elizabeth: We are not expecting space for a park and ride because of the high demand for housing and other uses. The reason we are not choosing Cully right now is that we need to do some more design work and get more community feedback. We want to be respectful to community goals.

Question from Michael Liu: For the new line 72, is it part of the scope of this project to figure out the stops? Will the 72 fill in the gaps?

Answer from Melissa: Yes, we are discussing the stops on Line 72 because the two lines are so interrelated.

Answer from Elizabeth: We know it is important to maintain service on the Line 72—there is a lot of ridership there. The next phase of design work will determine the best routing to connect Line 72 to the Parkrose Transit Center.

Answer from Michael Kiser: service planning and outreach will inform those routing and station decisions as well.

Question from Zachary: Previous conversations have discussed activating public space at stations. Lombard is not a good place for humans. What are the conversations about drawing in Cully Park or overcoming the bisection of the area by Lombard?

Answer from Elizabeth: We will have some work sessions with ODOT and jurisdictions. There are a lot of pressures from different uses, and we need to be sensitive to all the needs. We need to do more research, design, and community outreach to meet pedestrian needs and understand constraints on the roadway designs from the roadway jurisdictions.

Answer from Rian: I have worked on other projects like this one and we will not be able to answer all the questions, especially around land use because this is a complicated project. Not all those questions will be answered in this project, but identifying the needs and issues is an important step. I have seen successful projects and not so successful projects. It is partly about readiness and also about the community's desires. Sorry, that is not a very satisfying answer.

Steering Committee feedback/temperature taking (Metro Councilors/All)

The committee was asked to give a temperature check on the staff recommendation for the northern terminus. This was not a formal vote, just a chance to ask deeper questions and give staff important feedback. There were all green cards for the staff recommendation for the terminus recommendation.

Discussion

Commissioner Brim-Edwards: For TriMet, she noted the lack of bus service to the airport for travelers. MAX is fixed and bus is more flexible for connections. She was a little disappointed to take the airport off the table.

Answer from JC: After more engagement at the airport and Cascade Station, this project will not go to the airport, but TriMet and the Port are working on improved service to the terminal. With 11,000 jobs at the airport, there is a great opportunity. TriMet would love a bus line that comes across north Portland to the airport. Previously, a shuttle from Kenton to the airport was wildly successful. So, we are looking at bringing more service to the airport and the [TriMet] service planning department has it on their list.

Emerald was a green but also supports more transit to the airport. 9600 employees work at the airport and an additional 6000 work along Airport Way, so it is an active corridor. Lots of different people travel to the airport, many employees have to drive, pay for parking, and take a shuttle, which adds time to their commute. The Port is grateful for the train every 15 minutes, but more work needs to be done.

Kristin expressed support for the recommendation and appreciated the further work that TriMet and the Port are doing for improved transit at the airport.

LPA process and timeline (Elizabeth Mros-O'Hara, Metro)

Elizabeth is Metro's project manager for the 82nd Avenue transit project. She proposed a change in the process. In April we still want to lock in the decisions that we have worked through to this point. What is missing is additional design and costing information for the terminus and funding plan. She asked that the steering committee stay on for an extended period. The timeline for the overall project will not change, but the service of the committee will be extended.

The charge of the steering committee is mode, general station locations, alignment, that is paired with a funding plan. We need to do more costing and analysis to get to a high-level funding plan to understand project feasibility and conditions of approval. We must have the high-level funding plan so Metro can adopt the LPA into the RTP, which is a requirement to pursue federal funding. Elizabeth asked the steering committee to stay on to help with the narrowing to one terminus and the high-level funding plan.

Staff will provide a work plan to get to the durable, final LPA. We need to give our partners more confidence, so they are comfortable making financial commitments. The steering committee will need to meet 3-5 times, less than they are now. We need to understand all the tradeoffs before making these final decisions. Elizabeth showed a graphic that showed the overall timeline staying the same, only an extension of the steering committee service for a few more months. Steering committee would still endorse the final LPA and the high-level funding plan. Staff will reach out to each member for feedback about their service and engagement.

Discussion

Question from Rian: Funding, how do you maximize the opportunity? Can we use the investments currently happening on 82nd as match? Is there an opportunity to use other investment as match?

Answer from Elizabeth: we are working with the partners that improving the corridor to understand how we can complement each other's work and not preclude transit work in the same corridor. We are coordinating with our partners. We are trying to be smart to position ourselves for that work to count as local match for the project when appropriate, but we do not have enough information yet.

Rian noted that the challenge is coordinating all the work, improving in the right places, not duplicating, and aligning goals.

Comment from Michael Kiser about the plan for matching funds. In April, the plan is to submit a letter to FTA to move into Project Development. At that point, all money used for design will be available for match. Things that are being constructed now are not matchable.

Follow up from Duncan: Is it a timing thing?

Answer from Michael: Not so much. If FTA has not weighed in, it is not eligible. Things like vehicle acquisition and NEPA work is eligible for match.

Clarification from Kristin about ARPA funds: that money is only being used in Phase One [of Portland's project]. This was an intentional choice for best matching of federal funds [for the transit project].

Question from Emerald: Will we revisit the traffic and potential diversion from tolling on 205 in the future?

Answer from Elizabeth: This is very complicated. We are looking at how best to predict traffic volumes and looking at potential diversion. We are working on it together, using models, testing assumptions together with our partners to come up with what makes sense. We know this work is essential for our

application to the FTA for funding and we need to show our assumptions. The timing is hard because we are learning about tolling in our region. It's new. Also, people are changing their commute patterns since the pandemic. The peak travel period is mid-day now.

Question from Zachary: Will the steering committee see a high-level funding plan by April? Or a high-level budget?

Answer from Elizabeth: We have a draft, but we have not had a chance to ground truth it yet. We have used information from Division Transit Project, but we need more specific information before we share. Not expecting to have it by April, but the next phase will inform a funding plan. The project is shooting for a \$300 million target to maximize the federal contribution.

Answer from Michael Kiser: the design phase will be key to inform the funding plan and we want more certainty before sharing.

Follow-up from Zachary: Will we be discussing the funding sources and the trade-offs?

Michael Kiser confirmed that the committee will be discussing sources and trade-offs.

Comment from JC: Some of the agencies are still working out their budgets internally before they are ready to share. They do not want to put out a number until they are comfortable committing.

Councilor Hwang asked for a show of thumbs on the process change. All thumbs shown were up. Steering committee members are looking forward to the summer off after the April meeting and return in the fall. Elizabeth wants to check in with everyone to get your feedback on the process. Staff will be working with design consultants to bring in more details.

Public Comment

Garrison Christian came to the podium and expressed support for the project, specifically for dedicated bus lanes. He said that we need physical barriers between general purpose lanes and the bus lane to enforce behavior through infrastructure, e.g., Jersey barriers, flex posts, Toronto barriers. General purpose lanes should be narrowed in width to reduce speeds because deaths will continue at higher speeds. Other factors that could be used to reduce speeds are raised crosswalks to slow people down at intersections. He thinks pedestrian access and wider sidewalks is really important for this corridor, especially in places where the pedestrian right of way is 3-4 feet and there is a light pole taking up half the right of way. We need directional ramps, not just diagonal ramps that place people directly into traffic. He suggested closing a lot of driveways because of so many conflicts between curb cuts, pedestrians, and bus lanes. If we cannot install separated bus lanes, then we need camera enforcement. This is a big opportunity with this corridor. He thinks Division FX2 was underdone, and it was a missed opportunity in certain spots.

Next Steps/Adjourn by Councilor Lewis (Metro)

Councilor Lewis thanked everyone for their engagement and appreciated learning about how far we have come and how far we have to go. The next meeting is Feb. 22 for a staff recommendation for mode, general station locations, and narrowed terminus. There will also be a presentation from TriMet on workforce equity efforts on Division Transit Project. In April, the committee will affirm decisions to date. Councilor Hwang will bring treats to the next meeting for his birthday. Meeting adjourned at 5:20pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Tanja Olson, 82nd Avenue Steering Committee Recorder

Attachments to the Public Record, 82nd Avenue Steering Committee meeting, January 25, 2024

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT NO.
1	Agenda	01/18/2024	01/25/2024 82 nd Avenue Steering Committee Meeting Agenda	0125202482ASC-01
2	Document	01/18/2024	82nd Avenue Transit Project Steering Committee December 2023 Draft Minutes	0125202482ASC-02
3	Email	01/18/2024	Attachment 82nd Avenue Transit Project Steering Committee Response to December Questions	0125202482ASC-03
4	Document	08/30/2022	Consensus Decisions Meeting Protocols	0125202482ASC-04