



## **Metro** | *Making a great place*

East Metro Connections Plan Steering Committee  
Monday, April 2, 2012  
Fairview City Hall, Fairview, Oregon

### **Committee members present**

Shirley Craddick, Chair	Metro
Ron Cazares	FedEx
Steve Entenman	East Metro Economic Alliance
Mark Garber	East Metro Economic Alliance
Michelle Gregory	Mount Hood Community College
Tom Hughes	Metro
Jim Kight	City of Troutdale
Susie Lahsene	Port of Portland
Alan Lehto	TriMet
Diane McKeel	Multnomah County
Greg Olson	Multnomah County Bicycle and Pedestrian CAC
Carol Rulla	Coalition of Gresham Neighborhoods
Patricia Smith	City of Wood Village
Dwight Unti	Tokola Properties
Jane Van Dyke	Columbia Slough Watershed Council
Mike Weatherby	City of Fairview
Rian Windsheimer	ODOT

### **Committee members excused**

Shane Bemis	City of Gresham
Jamie Damon	Clackamas County
Diana Helm	City of Damascus

### **Facilitator**

Dana Lucero – Metro

### **Alternates present**

Ron Papsdorf	City of Gresham
--------------	-----------------

### **Metro staff**

Elissa Gertler, Brian Monberg, Dana Lucero, Emma Fredieu, Robin McArthur, Sheena VanLeuven, Tim Collins, Deborah Redman, Brian Harper, Anthony Butzek

### **Call to order and welcome**

Chair Shirley Craddick, Metro, called the meeting to order at 11:34 a.m. Chair Craddick thanked the steering committee and the community for their commitments to the East Metro Connections Plan discussion. She asked the committee members to introduce themselves. After introductions, Chair

Craddick thanked the attendees again for their interest in the project and noted the incremental and collaborative process that will take the project to the finish line. She explained that today's meeting would be about looking at the evaluation factors that are most important to the committee, and using those to drive how projects are advanced, given the limited funding opportunities in the region. Chair Craddick then introduced the Metro staff in attendance. She reminded the committee members and the public of the informational session scheduled directly after the meeting. She opened the floor to questions from the committee members.

Mayor Jim Kight, City of Troutdale, asked what Metro considered the timeline of the study to be. Brian Monberg, Metro, responded that because the study comes out of the Regional Transportation Plan that looks out to the year 2035, the study would address both the near-term and long-term investments. Mayor Kight commented that the committee would need to focus on the projects that they could complete given the available funding, but might also be able to consider bigger projects in the long-term.

Chair Craddick turned the presentation over to Ms. Dana Lucero, Metro. Ms. Lucero remarked that there would be challenging decisions to be made, but that the finish line for the project plan was in sight. She told the committee that they would need to be efficient with their time during the meeting, but that they would be able to discuss topics in more detail during the informational session after the meeting. Ms. Lucero then outlined the desired outcomes of the meeting: the committee would need to decide which evaluation factors to prioritize over others, and establish an approach to developing an action plan and recommendation. Ms. Lucero asked if there were any questions on the agenda and, seeing none, turned the meeting over to Brian Monberg, Metro.

## **1. Evaluation of candidate projects and weighting of evaluation factors**

Mr. Monberg presented the meeting packet (included as part of this meeting record) to the committee and walked them through the information regarding the project schedule, and updates to the evaluation framework and candidate projects evaluated. Today the committee would discuss how to narrow the list of candidate projects, and the process for how to direct staff to select the strongest projects for the committee to advance. Mr. Monberg reiterated the importance of focusing on what the committee thinks are the right set of outcomes when considering projects for development in the community and the transportation network.

Mayor Patricia Smith, Wood Village, believed that the 238<sup>th</sup>/242<sup>nd</sup> project was no longer being considered because of the cost of the project. She asked whether it was now being reconsidered. Mr. Monberg explained that the steering committee had not yet made a decision on that project but that a technical analysis of the options had been made and the committee would discuss that study later in the meeting.

Mr. Monberg turned to the evaluation framework in the meeting packet and noted the changes that had been made since December 2011. He pointed out the seven factors that had been developed to cover the goals of the plan. He then clarified how the framework and project candidate list was refined by staff in the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) based on the needs analysis, stakeholder input, and the 2007 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). Mr. Monberg acknowledged that input from the influence areas of the plan had also been considered by the staff of the TAC. Based on the decisions at this meeting, the steering committee would direct staff to further refine the project list based on evaluation framework and other considerations.

## **2. Steering committee feedback on weighting**

Ms. Lucero presented the results of the online survey taken by committee members in December 2011 and January 2012 regarding the project evaluation factors. The results of the survey showed that the steering committee should prioritize some evaluation factors over others. Ms. Lucero also presented the results from an online survey taken by the public, and input from the Coalition of Gresham Neighborhoods and the March 14 open house (included in this meeting recording), which also indicated a near consensus that some evaluation factors should be weighted over others.

Ms. Lucero noted that there was general agreement between the steering committee and the public as to which factors were most important. Access and mobility, economic development, and safety and security, scored high on the survey for both the public and the steering committee. Ms. Lucero did point out a difference: the steering committee ranking feasibility high on the evaluation factors to prioritize while the public ranked natural environment as high. Ms. Lucero asked if the results of the surveys surprised anyone on the committee.

Steve Entenman, East Metro Economic Alliance, wondered how many people responded to the public survey. Ms. Lucero answered that less than 100 but more than 50 members of the public responded. Mayor Mike Weatherby, Fairview, asserted that there seemed to be a difference between the survey results and what has been verbalized to the committee regarding economic development. Mr. Entenman was surprised by the difference in how the public and the steering committee weighted the natural environment factor.

Mayor Weatherby wondered if the committee would be looking at the costs of the projects under consideration. Ms. Lucero explained that the feasibility evaluation factor encompassed the cost of the projects and that the steering committee scored that factor high in importance. Mr. Monberg said that costs weren't explicitly listed in the meeting packet but that they could be provided at the next meeting. Because the study comes out of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), the steering committee should focus on recommendations that can be implemented.

Ms. Lucero clarified that the survey and the next exercise will be used to inform technical staff as to what should be prioritized when developing the action plan and recommendation. She directed the steering committee members to indicate with the green, yellow, and red cards as to whether or not they believed some evaluation factors should be prioritized over others. Greg Olson, Multnomah County Bicycle and Pedestrian Citizen Advisory Committee, raised a yellow card. The rest of the committee members raised green cards, indicating that they agreed that some evaluation factors should be weighted higher than others.

Ms. Lucero then listed the four evaluation factors that were rated most important in the results from the steering committee survey: access and mobility, safety and security, economic development, and feasibility. She asked the members to indicate whether or not those four factors should be prioritized over other factors, in no particular order. Alan Lehto, TriMet, and Mr. Olson, raised yellow cards. The remaining members raised green cards, indicating that they agreed that those four factors should be weighted higher than others. Mr. Lehto explained that he raised a yellow card because he wanted to consider the natural environment evaluation factor as well, since the public survey weighted it as a high priority, but that he was generally comfortable weighting the four factors over others. Mr. Olson expressed concern about equity and livability evaluation factors. He argued that the committee needed to be aware of attracting people to live in East County and giving them reliable methods of transportation in the plan area.

Ron Papsdorf, City of Gresham, clarified that the committee would still consider other evaluation factors, even while weighting the top four over others. Ms. Lucero assured him that the weighting of the four evaluation factors did not exclude the other factors from being considered by the committee.

### **3. Priorities for East Metro**

Mr. Monberg explained that the rest of meeting would be spent identifying priorities in terms of projects and project areas. Mr. Monberg directed the committee to a suggested approach in the packet to developing a “prototype” of an action plan and recommendation. First, identify projects that perform well in the four weighted evaluation factors. Second, consider the MOU. Third, address any gaps in priorities. Fourth, incorporate input into the list of projects to advance. Mr. Monberg asked the committee if they had any questions.

Michelle Gregory, Mount Hood Community College, asked how public input would be incorporated in the plan going forward. Mr. Monberg responded that there would be key public input points. Ms. Lucero explained that there would be another online public survey once the committee had a list of recommendations.

There being no further questions, Mr. Monberg presented information on the candidate projects currently under consideration. He directed the committee to page 9 of the packet, the executive level summary of the evaluation findings.

Rian Windsheimer, ODOT, wondered about the level of details in the project evaluations, and how issues of overall system safety or system management would be considered since safety is often an overarching theme of system improvement and not a specifically listed project. He emphasized the importance of making sure safety and system management concerns are addressed and not lost in the process moving forward.

Mr. Monberg agreed, and explained that the level of detail in the executive summary prevented system management and safety aspects of projects from being explicitly described. However, in terms of safety, TAC staff had identified crash corridors and specific safety projects. Mr. Windsheimer encouraged the committee and staff to make sure the TAC and ODOT coordinated their efforts when it came to addressing safety.

Susie Lahsene, Port of Portland, requested that the intersections around the LSI property be emphasized under the access and mobility, and economic development evaluation factors, as well as in the list of candidate projects. Mark Garber, East Metro Economic Alliance, added that it would need to be incorporated into the technical work as well. Diane Mckeel, Multnomah County, suggested that new courthouse facility opening in Rockwood also be taken into account when developing priorities.

Mr. Windsheimer considered the cost effectiveness of improving system management in the plan area prior to implementing roadway improvements. He also wondered how to advance projects that encompassed multiple evaluation factors, and if those should be prioritized over projects that only address one evaluation factor.

Mayor Kight requested clarification on the next steps for the technical staff, and asked if they would be taking projects to the design phase. Mr. Monberg explained that design would be done at a local

level but that the staff would present a broad scope of projects, and an estimate of their costs for the committee to consider.

Mr. Lehto noticed that transit projects on Division were not listed in the packet. Mr. Monberg assured him that the staff had looked at transit as part of the enhanced transit scenario for the entire system. He cited an additional memo on the transit projects under consideration and suggested that the committee consider recommendations that fit with TriMet's program.

#### **4. Summary of system wide evaluation results and results by factor**

Mr. Monberg began an exercise to illustrate how projects might be advanced based on focus areas and the four weighted evaluation factors. He highlighted projects that perform well in the weighted factors to show how a focus area might develop. By the next steering committee meeting, staff will have developed these focus areas and project clusters to present to the committee.

Mayor Weatherby called for a fair distribution of projects and asked what percentage of projects exists south of Powell Blvd. He cited 223<sup>rd</sup> and Marine Drive as an example of a necessary project north of the plan area. Mr. Monberg assured him that the final recommendations from the steering committee need to be informed by the projects in the influence areas, such as those north of Interstate 84. Mr. Monberg clarified, however, that the projects advanced by the committee will be identified within the plan area. Ms. Lucero reminded the committee that their recommendation could include whatever they felt was important as a group. Ms. Lahsene agreed that the committee would need to consider the relationship between work in the plan area and in the influence areas, such as the Columbia Cascade River District.

Committee members discussed concerns that concentrating on multiple smaller projects would not fit the original goal of a broad corridor enhancement, and a north-south, east-west connectivity plan. Mr. Papsdorf, Mr. Windsheimer, and Ms. Jane Van Dyke, Columbia Slough Watershed Council, agreed that the committee should concentrate on addressing the full corridor needs around which they can gather consensus. Mr. Papsdorf argued that the purpose of the study was to incorporate community-wide objectives and corridor improvements, not a set of smaller projects.

Metro President Tom Hughes countered that one criterion to consider is the overall impact the project has on the plan area. He suggested that the committee determine how the multiple small projects benefit the larger corridors and the region. Mr. Windsheimer pointed to page 3 of the packet showing the major corridors. The committee could use that to concept link the smaller projects with the major corridors. Mr. Monberg concluded the discussion by emphasizing that the steering committee's recommendations should achieve the broad system outcomes that are key to the committee.

#### **5. 238<sup>th</sup>/242<sup>nd</sup> study update**

Mr. Monberg directed the committee to the updated findings on the 238<sup>th</sup>/242<sup>nd</sup> project options (included as part of the meeting record). He reminded the committee of their decision to study the three options for improving 238<sup>th</sup>/242<sup>nd</sup> and outlined the main concerns that the committee had expressed. He invited questions. Mayor Kight suggested that the most important question to consider is what the desired outcomes of the 242<sup>nd</sup> improvements are, and whether there is a cheaper solution than building a new road.

Mr. Monberg then introduced Mark Vandehey from Kittelson & Associates to present the results of the study. He explained the three options: 1) 238th remains the same; 2) Some modifications to 238th, sell or retain 242nd right-of-way; 3) Develop 242nd right-of-way from Halsey to Glisan. Mr. Vandehey walked the committee through results of the three alternatives for 238th/242nd and opened the meeting up to questions from the committee. Ms. Lucero suggested allowing members to ask their questions at once, and then go back and answer them one at a time [For the purposes of these minutes, the questions and their answers will be recorded consecutively].

Mr. Papsdorf asked whether some benefits of the other options could be incorporated into Option 2 to eliminate the climbing lane. Mr. Vandehey explained that a hybrid option is a possibility but the study did not include that level of detail.

Mayor Kight remarked that Option 3 might cause more traffic on 242nd. Tim Collins, Metro, explained that there would be more traffic on 242nd. Diane McKeel, Multnomah County Commissioner, asked if it would be difficult to remain within the right-of-way for Option 3 and if any right-of-way would have to be purchased for the project. Mr. Vandehey responded that the study did not include the level of detail necessary to determine exact right-of-way requirements. Ms. Lahsene inquired if a queuing analysis had been done concerning preserving the northbound climbing lane on 242nd. Anthony Butzek answered that the study had not included a queuing analysis.

Mr. Garber wanted to know if there was an alternative way to provide bicycle and pedestrian access if the climbing lane was preserved. Mr. Vandehey reiterated the possibility of a hybrid option but noted that the study had not included it. Carol Rulla, Coalition of Gresham Neighborhoods, addressed the widening of the lanes on 242nd, and whether it would require the committee to permit the use of trucks on 242nd. She wondered if there would be a way to continue to prohibit trucks on that route. Mayor Smith wanted more information regarding the impact Option 3 on surrounding properties. Mr. Vandehey repeated that Option 3 may have difficulties remaining in the preserved right-of-way, but that the study cannot yet confirm that. Ms. Gregory asked if the analysis looked at any the impacts to school bus routes. Mr. Vandehey and Mr. Monberg responded that the study did not include school bus routes specifically, but had analyzed the impact on TriMet buses.

## **5. Other considerations for EMCP**

Mr. Monberg then asked the committee if there were other considerations that staff should take into account when determining which projects to advance. Ms. Lahsene suggested that the committee would find the traffic and capacity analyses helpful.

Mr. Olson inquired as to how projects that perform well in multiple evaluation factors might weigh against projects that perform well in on factor. He also wondered how the evaluation factors would be weighted, and if they would be scored on a 0 to 2 scale similar to the steering committee survey. Mr. Monberg explained that staff would not be using a scoring system but would be taking evaluation weighting into account with values, project goals, the 2007 MOU, and any other considerations from the steering committee.

Ms. Lahsene reminded the committee to consider the short term and longer term solutions and outcomes. Ms. Gregory addressed the safety of Option 3 of the 242nd study, and asked how that would be scored or evaluated. Mr. Monberg briefly explained that if that Option were advanced, it would be built so that it would meet identified safety standards.

Ms. Lucero noted that the official meeting time was coming to a close, and that the TAC would be working on April 4 to begin to build a draft action plan and recommendation based on today's decisions, that the steering committee will discuss at their next meeting on April 18.

**6. Next steps and public comment**

Chair Craddick thanked the committee and presented the next steps for the East Metro Connections Plan. On April 18, the technical staff would be presenting a preliminary action plan for the committee to consider. During the meeting in May, the steering committee will be working to refine and approve that action plan. President Hughes commending the committee for their good work at today's meeting and expressed his interest in seeing how the proposals and project details will be fleshed out. Chair Craddick encouraged committee members to stay for the optional informational session, and take the opportunity to speak with Metro and jurisdictional staff.

Ms. Lucero asked if there were any members of the public who would like to comment. Seeing none, Chair Craddick adjourned the meeting at 1:30 p.m.

**7. Adjourn**

Respectfully submitted,

Emma Fredieu  
Recording Secretary

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR DATE

The following have been included as part of the official public record:

ITEM	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOC DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Meeting Summary	12/14/2011	Meeting Summary – 12/14/11 East Metro Connections Plan Steering Committee	040212emcp-01
2	Agenda	4/2/2012	Meeting Agenda – 4/2/12 East Metro Connections Plan Steering Committee	040212emcp-02
3	Packet	4/2/2012	EMCP meeting packet	040212emcp-03
4	Memo	4/2/2012	242 <sup>nd</sup> alternatives for steering committee consideration as candidate projects	040212emcp-04
5	Handout	4/2/2012	Public feedback results	040212emcp-05