



East Metro Connections Plan Steering Committee
Wednesday, December 14, 2011, 2:30 – 4:30pm
Fairview Community Center, 300 Harrison St., Fairview, OR

Committee members present

Shirley Craddick, Chair	Metro
Shane Bemis	Mayor, City of Gresham
Ron Cazares	FedEx
Steven Entenman	East Metro Economic Alliance
Mark Garber	East Metro Economic Alliance
Michelle Gregory	Mt. Hood Community College
Diana Helm	Councilor, City of Damascus
Tom Hughes	President, Metro
Jim Kight	Mayor, City of Troutdale
Susie Lahsene	Port of Portland
Alan Lehto	TriMet
Diane McKeel	Commissioner, Multnomah County
Greg Olson	Multnomah County Bicycle and Pedestrian Citizen Advisory Committee
Hector Osuna	El Programa Hispano
Carol Rulla	Coalition of Gresham Neighborhoods
Patricia Smith	Mayor, City of Wood Village
Dwight Uti	Tokola Properties
Jane Van Dyke	Columbia Slough Watershed Council
Mike Weatherby	Mayor, City of Fairview

Committee members excused

Jamie Damon	Commissioner, Clackamas County
Rian Windsheimer	ODOT

Facilitator

Dana Lucero	Metro
-------------	-------

Alternates present

Kelly Brooks	ODOT
Ron Papsdorf	City of Gresham

Metro staff:

Elissa Gertler, Bridget Wieghart, Brian Monberg, Matt Bihn, Tim Collins, Anthony Butzek, Sheena VanLeuven, and Emma Fredieu

1. Welcome

Chair Shirley Craddick called the meeting order at 2:30 p.m. Chair Craddick thanked the attendees and committee members for their time and expressed her desire that, at the end of this process, East Metro communities present a united front in advocating for their priorities at the regional table. Chair Craddick also reiterated the final decision-making process. The final recommendation will be developed and confirmed by the steering committee, that recommendations will go to each of the plan area's councils, and Metro Council will close the process by adopting the steering committee's recommendation. She noted that project evaluation and recommendations would need to be completed by mid-2012. Finally, she welcomed new member, Michelle Gregory, from Mt. Hood Community College. Chair Craddick ended her opening remarks by introducing Ms. Elissa Gertler from Metro and turned the presentation over to the facilitator, Ms. Dana Lucero, Metro.

1.1 Minutes confirmation

Ms. Lucero presented the July 27, 2011 meeting summary (included as part of this meeting record). With no editions recommended, they were considered final.

Ms. Lucero stated the purpose of the meeting would be to begin the discussion of on-the-ground solutions that address East Metro's current and future transportation needs and seek steering committee input on the evaluation framework, candidate projects to be evaluated and which 238th/242nd options to study. She also stated that the committee agreed to seek consensus for high level decisions, especially among the jurisdictions.

2. Overview of needs and opportunities in 2035

Ms. Bridget Wieghart, East Metro Connections Plan project manager, presented a portion of the needs and opportunities outlined in the meeting work packet (included as part of this meeting record). She summarized the needs and opportunities concerning vehicular congestion, freight, and the national highway system (NHS), and highlighted the key findings and main points from the packet. Mr. Brian Monberg, Metro, summarized existing transit needs, proposed route changes and additional transit services, and future routes to Mt. Hood Community College and Clackamas County. He provided information on the needs and opportunities to increase active transportation systems (walking, biking, and access to transit). Mr. Monberg completed the presentation by summarizing opportunities related to signal timing, system management, and safety, as well as the public survey responses regarding travelling in the East Metro region from the work packet (included as part of this meeting record).

Mayor Jim Kight, Troutdale, asked if there was a difference between the National Highway System (NHS) and Regional Transportation Plan freight designations, and how those designations might impact the creation of boulevard treatments on 257th (as well as impact other potential projects). Ms. Wieghart responded that they are different designations but that they have been confused because they are on the same route. She explained that the regional freight designations do not have set design standards. However, the highest freight designation, the main roadway connector, would tend to have slightly wider lanes and might conflict with some types of pedestrian and main street projects. Ms. Wieghart noted that they are not proposing that any routes in the plan area be designated as a main roadway connector. She reiterated that they are proposing a more distributed network for freight.

Mayor Mike Weatherby, Fairview, commented that the Fairview City Council passed a motion to consider Fairview Parkway as a north-south connector between 26 and I-84 only when it continues south and connects Stark Street (included as part of the meeting record).

Mr. Alan Lehto, TriMet, wanted more information on pedestrian crossings. Mr. Monberg responded that crossings would be considered in creating access to transit and projects dealing with safety.

Mayor Patricia Smith, Wood Village, noted that much of the congestion on the maps appeared to be south of Burnside. She asked if the committee would be discussing that congestion. Ms. Wiegart answered that they are proposing to evaluate congestion both north and south of Burnside.

Ms. Carol Rulla, Coalition of Gresham Neighborhoods, inquired if the committee should review the Fairview City Council motion and show where that area is on a map. Ms. Wiegart responded that they may have an opportunity to do so once they begin discussing projects.

3. What is most important for East Metro at the end of this process?

3.1 Evaluation framework

Ms. Lucero directed the committee's attention to the evaluation framework on pages 16 and 17 of the meeting work packet. She asked the committee to read through the evaluation framework, discuss, and provide input. She stated that Metro would take feedback on the evaluation framework through December 21.

Mayor Smith stated her surprise with the small number of economic development objectives in the evaluation framework, and was curious if it was redundant to have objectives about both pedestrian access and experience. Ms. Wiegart responded that the committee could determine how each criterion was weighted so the weighting and not the sheer number of objectives would determine the importance of the seven factors. The committee could also add to the framework if something is missing. She also remarked that many of the criteria came from the technical advisory committee (TAC) and that they differentiated between the objectives of access and experience.

Mayor Weatherby stated his concern that new evaluation criteria did not align with the original intent of the 2007 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), in which the purpose of the project is economic development. Chair Craddick responded that the original intent was to increase access and mobility, and to evaluate opportunities in light of economic development and other factors. Ms. Lucero added that the committee could choose to emphasize some factors more than others, and that Metro is interested in knowing if the committee feels that there are evaluation criteria that are missing. Ms. Rulla expressed her approval of the evaluation framework as it helps to ensure that projects align with the various goals established by the committee.

Mr. Greg Olson, Multnomah County Bicycle and Pedestrian Citizen Advisory Committee, stated his agreement with Ms. Rulla's comments and preference in considering multiple directions. Ms. Gertler added that the goal of presenting some initial criteria was to help the committee distinguish between which projects would meet multiple criteria simultaneously and therefore, accomplish greater outcomes.

3.2 Candidate projects to be evaluated

Ms. Wieghart introduced the summary of the candidate projects to be evaluated. She noted that East Metro is a large study area so there was a screening process to determine which projects best fit the evaluation framework objectives. She also directed the committee to the results of public outreach and survey that were used during the screening process (included as part of the meeting record).

Mr. Monberg presented the summary of candidate projects to be evaluated (shown in the packet on page 19). He reminded the committee and the public that there would be an optional work session on the candidate projects following the meeting. Mr. Monberg presented the projects by corridor, and asked the committee for feedback.

Mayor Weatherby asked if Stark Street was already up to standard and did not need evaluation since it wasn't mentioned in the summary of candidate projects to be evaluated. Mr. Monberg responded that there were opportunities to affect Stark Street's future capacity flow through intersection improvements and safety outlined later on in the packet.

Mayor Kight asked if some projects would automatically be dismissed due to cost. Ms. Wieghart stated that the evaluation framework does consider cost, so the committee could use that to make a determination. However, cost alone was not a pre-screening criteria.

Ron Papsdorf, of Gresham, stated that it was too early to dismiss any projects and called for looking at all opportunities before taking cost into account.

Mr. Hector Osuna, El Programa Hispano, requested to see more demographic information as they evaluate projects.

Mr. Olson remarked that he would like to see the full list of projects evaluated as there have been examples of funding unexpectedly becoming available.

Ms. Rulla inquired if the project list includes all projects currently on the local jurisdictions' transportation plans or if some have already been excluded. Ms. Wieghart responded that there had been a screening process based on need and that projects that didn't meet a need were not included on the list.

Ms. Lucero stated that the committee and the public could provide feedback on the candidate projects to be evaluated until December 31. She welcomed everyone present to stay for the work session following today's meeting to review the candidate projects in greater depth. She informed the committee and audience members of an online tool for collecting comments that would be available through December.

3.3 238th/242nd study options

Chair Craddick introduced Ms. Gertler to speak about the options that could be studied for 238th and 242nd. Ms. Gertler stated that issues with 242nd need to be resolved today so that the process could progress. She added that Metro needs guidance about the right level of analysis at this

location. Ms. Gertler introduced Mark Vandehey from Kittelson Consulting to present the study options.

Mr. Vandehey presented the committee three different alternatives that they could choose to evaluate in greater detail (included as part of the meeting record). He emphasized that his analysis was cursory and that the committee would need to determine whether to investigate the options more thoroughly with regard to their costs and benefits. 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.

Chair Craddick called for comments on the options. Mayor Kight stated that he did not think that improving 242nd at Halsey would accomplish any goals. He added his support for safety improvements but believed the build options would be disruptive to the community. He noted that the options would have negative implications for the Safeway. Ms. Rulla asked for clarification on that comment and Mr. Vandehey responded that the Safeway would not likely be impacted, but that a more in-depth analysis would need to be done. Commissioner Diane McKeel and Mr. Vandehey discussed where 242nd would intersect with Halsey. Mayor Smith stated her opposition for the third option given its expense, impact on the community, business, and parks.

Mayor Shane Bemis, Gresham, stated that the spirit of the 2007 MOU was to keep politics out of decision-making and to review the challenges from a regional perspective. He stated that he felt some of the mayors appeared to be bringing politics into decision-making process. Mayor Bemis advocated evaluating all the options, looking at the facts independent of politics.

Mayor Smith responded that the 2007 MOU stated that this corridor was intended to be built below grade and that she did not support evaluating a project that from the beginning would be too expensive to implement.

Mr. Olson asked Mayor Weatherby if he would remove Fairview Parkway from the freight network if it was not expanded to Stark (see attachment). Mayor Weatherby responded that he would.

Mr. Olson shared with the committee the positive comments he received regarding the option of extending 242nd. He inquired how much it would cost if the corridor were not studied, but improvements then had to be made to other sections of the area. He also requests clarification on whether the 2007 MOU was a legal document if the committee would continue to rely on it when making decisions. Mr. Mark Garber, of the East Metro Economic Alliance, discussed the process of gathering support for the MOU. Mr. Garber added that the communities on the west side of the region present themselves as a unified body when advocating for project funding. He and Mr. Dwight Unti stated their support for evaluating all three options for the benefit of economic development in east Multnomah County.

Mayor Kight questioned why there had been no conversation about Burnside and Stark issues, and said he would like to spend time focusing on existing roads and problems, many of which are in Gresham. The committee members continued to discuss the value of looking at all of the options versus taking some off of the table due to cost or lack of current capacity problems, and the spirit of the 2007 MOU.

Ms. Lucero described the decision making process for the 238th/242nd options. Metro staff distributed a single green dot sticker to every committee member. Members were invited to place

their dot on one of three choices written on a large sheet of paper: evaluating one option, evaluating two of the three options, or evaluating all of the options.

Following this exercise, Council President Hughes reflected on earlier committee comments about emulating the success of the west side of the region's decision-making processes. He said that the west side of the Metro region had been able to make decisions and secure funding because they presented their projects as a united body with a single message. Council President Hughes said that pursuing priorities that everyone supported would be key to East Metro's success.

Ms. Lucero reviewed the results of the dot exercise and reminded the committee of their agreement to strive for consensus. A majority of the dots were placed under the choice to evaluate all three options. She then began the second phase of the decision-making process and asked committee members to use their colored cards to indicate their level of agreement with studying all three options. The cards expressed:

- Green card – I support this.
- Yellow card – I have concerns or am skeptical but I will not block consensus.
- Red card – I do not support this.

Ms Lucero asked the committee to raise the card of their choice and was met with the following results:

- 2 red cards (Mayor Smith and Mayor Kight)
- 1 yellow cards (ODOT)
- The rest of the members raised green cards.

Ms. Lucero asked Mayor Smith and Mayor Kight to share their concerns and what they would need in order to move them to a yellow card. Mayor Kight said that he had concerns with the funding, as the 242nd extension is too expensive and destructive to businesses and the community. Mayor Smith stated that she also felt the project was too expensive, bad for the park, and bad for businesses.

Ms. Gertler asked the committee if they felt they had consensus. Mayor Smith replied that with so many of the committee in support of evaluating all three options, there was consensus, or at least enough of a majority that we should study it. She added that she would prefer to wait for the results of the study before making a decision on whether she felt comfortable with the options or not. Mayor Kight said that Metro was going to study the 242nd extension, and should proceed, but that he would not support any project that was not good for his community.

Chair Craddick thanked everyone for taking part in the discussion.

4. Next steps

Ms. Wieghart directed the committee's attention to page 3 in the packet and reviewed the next steps in the evaluation process. Due to the technical work, she noted that they were slightly behind the original timeline. Commissioner McKeel stated that the analysis was more important than adhering to a strict timeline. She said that one concern she had about studying 242nd was whether there was sufficient funds to complete the analysis. She requested a budget update at the next meeting.

5. Public comment

Chair Craddick welcomed the public to provide comments to the committee. Ms. Theresa Delaney Davis, a member of the Reynolds School Board and State School Board land use committee, stated that she wanted to know how much of the original budget for the project remained, especially if the committee expanded evaluations into multi-modal options. She also noted that the 242nd corridor extends through much of the school district land and is near an elementary school. She added the school board would have valuable information to contribute to the committee.

6. Adjourn

Chair Craddick adjourned the meeting at 4:27 p.m. and invited the committee to begin the work session (agenda included in the record).

Meeting minutes respectfully submitted by:

Emma Fredieu

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.
1.1	Meeting Summary	7/27/2011	Meeting Summary – July 27, 2011 East Metro Connections Plan Steering Committee	121411sc-01
1	Agenda	12/14/2011	Meeting Agenda – December 14, 2011 East Metro Connections Plan Steering Committee	121411sc-02
2	Memo	12/14/2011	Traveling in East Metro	121411sc-03
3.3	Memo	12/14/2011	242 nd alternatives for steering committee consideration as candidate projects	121411sc-04
2	Packet	12/14/2011	EMCP Plan packet	121411sc-05
6	Agenda	12/14/2011	Agenda for optional work session	121411sc-06
2	Motion	12/07/2011	Fairview City Council motion	121411sc-07
6	Comment card	12/14/11	Card to submit a comment	121311sc-08