



East Metro Connections Plan Steering Committee
Wednesday, April 18, 2012
Mount Hood Community College, Gresham, OR

Committee members present

Shirley Craddick, Chair	Metro
Shane Bemis	City of Gresham
Ron Cazares	FedEx
Steve Entenman	East Metro Economic Alliance
Mark Garber	East Metro Economic Alliance
Michelle Gregory	Mount Hood Community College
Diana Helm	City of Damascus
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
Jane Van Dyke	Columbia Slough Watershed Council
Rian Windsheimer	ODOT

Committee members excused

Tom Hughes	Metro
Mike Weatherby	City of Fairview
Dwight Unti	Tokola Properties
Jamie Damon	Clackamas County

Facilitator

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

Alternates present

Lisa Barton-Mullins	City of Fairview
---------------------	------------------

Metro staff

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

1. Welcome

Chair Shirley Craddick, Metro, opened the meeting thanking the committee and audience for their hard work and continued participation. Dana Lucero, Metro, expressed her excitement for the work ahead. She presented the previous meeting's minutes to the committee for approval and then outlined the agenda for the meeting. She notified the committee members that if they were able to reach a decision on the action plan today, they may not need to plan for an additional meeting. Ms. Lucero also reminded the committee and the audience of the optional information session scheduled directly after the meeting.

2. Draft action plan and recommendation

Brian Monberg, Metro, directed the committee to the meeting packet [included in the meeting record] and reviewed the plan timeline on page 2. He explained that after the April 2, 2012 steering committee meeting, the technical advisory committee (TAC) had developed series of investment packages to address the plan needs and goals. Mr. Monberg said that the steering committee would now work to decide which investment packages to advance to the final action plan and recommendation. He pointed out that the investment packages fall into three themes: north-south connections, downtown and employment areas, and overall regional mobility. Each theme addressed the evaluation factors prioritized by the steering committee at the previous meeting. Mr. Monberg reviewed the draft recommendation included on page 3 in the meeting packet. The 4 components of the recommendation include selecting investment packages to advance, working together to advocate for regional funding, recognizing the investments complement other local projects, and recommending Metro amend the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) to include the chosen investments. Mr. Monberg welcomed questions from the committee regarding the action plan.

Diane McKeel, Multnomah County, suggested that downtown and employment areas be specifically cited under economic development. Mr. Monberg agreed, and said that the staff would be more explicit about placing those themes under economic development moving forward.

3. Investment packages

Mr. Monberg then worked through the specific investment packages with the committee, giving an overview of the themes and needs addressed in each package (pages 5 through 9 in the meeting packet). Susie Lahsene, Port of Portland, asked why Gresham Vista was not mapped as an employment area in the investment packages. Mr. Monberg thanked her for her feedback and noted that it was the right kind of feedback to include in the draft action plan and recommendation. Mr. Monberg referenced the detailed project list in the back of the packet that the committee could use when discussing the investment packages.

Mr. Monberg explained that the committee would work in small groups to discuss needed refinements and identify the level of consensus for the investment packages. Metro staff at each table would take notes and record levels of support for the investment packages using the red, yellow, green convention the committee has used during past meetings. The colors 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 commented that the small group discussions would allow all committee members to give input on the investment packages. She noted that the small group discussions would not be used to prioritize any investment package over others, and that consensus on a package would not guarantee that it would be part of the final action plan and recommendation.

For the next 15 minutes, committee members reviewed the investment packages with their small groups and discussed their level of support for the projects with Metro staff. Chair Craddick then called the room back to order. Ms. Lucero asked the facilitators to give a brief overview of the discussions at their tables.

Ms. Lucero presented the outcomes of her table's discussion. She said the committee members wanted to make sure that Clackamas County was involved with the decision-making process, and that the projects eventually chosen would be complementary with the county's plans. They also wanted to be sure Troutdale was comfortable with the scope of projects in their jurisdiction. Committee members emphasized that Gresham Vista should be included as an investment package. Investment packages should reflect the character of the different downtowns. They agreed that signal improvements and a greater transit link to Mt. Hood Community College were priorities.

Brian Harper, Metro, gave a brief overview of his table's discussion. He noted that there was a general consensus among steering committee members regarding the investment packages. Committee members wanted to balance freight needs with pedestrian safety, asked that Clackamas County be involved in the process, called for the inclusion of Gresham Vista, and emphasized the importance of downtown investments. Committee members supported greater system management and an improved east-west transit link in the plan area. Alan Lehto, TriMet, informed the committee that TriMet planned for greater east-west transit and improved bus lines in the corridor. Rian Windsheimer, ODOT, expressed support for balancing the modes of transportation in the plan area at the risk of raising project costs.

Deborah Redman, Metro, presented the discussion at her table. Committee members generally supported the investment packages but wanted to be sure that Clackamas County was involved in the process. They also asked where the downtown investments boundaries were and supported including Gresham Vista to support economic development.

Anthony Butzek, Metro, briefly outlined the discussion at his table, and noted the general consensus in support of the investment packages. Committee members viewed the 181st and 182nd improvement projects as important for future growth and suggested a boulevard treatment be considered by the committee. They cited concerns for right of way acquisition costs, the lack of an east-west connection that would accommodate regional growth, and the need for connections to Gresham Vista and Mt. Hood Community College. Committee members wanted to balance concerns of cost with accommodating future growth in East County. Committee members supported the downtown and economic development investment packages, and emphasized that the Halsey main

street project was a priority. Finally, they discussed the need for a better intersection configuration at Arata and 223rd.

Mr. Lehto informed the committee that any investment in better bus service, such as a transit link to Mt. Hood Community College, would not preclude longer-term high capacity transit investments by TriMet.

Committee members collectively indicated support (green and yellow) for the investment packages.

Ms. Lucero asked the committee if they had any questions or comments and, seeing no further questions or comments, she turned the meeting over to Mr. Monberg.

4. Decision points

Mr. Monberg confirmed the investment packages would move forward into the action plan and recommendation, given the level of consensus reached in the small groups. He then moved to a discussion of the 238th/242nd and 207th projects.

4.1. 238th/242nd

Mr. Monberg reviewed what was discussed April 2, 2012 meeting, presented the current issues and considerations outlined on pages 12 and 13 of the meeting packet. Three options were studied: (1) 238th remains the same, (2) modifications to 238th to remove a lane and widen the two remaining lanes to allow trucks and improve bike/pedestrian facilities, and (3) develop the 242nd right of way from Halsey to Glisan. He then invited Mayor Patricia Smith, City of Wood Village, to present her letter to the committee regarding Wood Village's concerns about the 238th/242nd project [included in this meeting record].

Mayor Smith read her letter to the committee, and described Wood Village's concerns with the 238th/242nd proposals. She emphasized that she wrote the letter speaking for Wood Village. Mayor Smith proposed the committee endorse option 2, which would add bikes and pedestrian facilities, but not slow down freight. She mentioned the importance of each jurisdiction making compromises. Mayor Smith also asked that the preserved 242nd right of way be vacated. Mr. Monberg thanked Mayor Smith for her input. He acknowledged concerns related to option 3 (242nd extension) expressed by other stakeholders. Mr. Monberg commented that the extension may be useful for future development in the area, but might also negatively affect local schools, parks, and businesses. He asked the committee if any options of the 238th/242nd project should be refined or advanced to the action plan and recommendation. Mr. Monberg opened the meeting up to discussion, with Ms. Lucero and Councilor Craddick facilitating.

Mark Garber, East Metro Economic Alliance, asked about preserving the third, or climbing, lane on 238th, putting bike and pedestrian facilities on the east side of the road, and then using the 242nd right of way to create a multimodal trail. Councilor Lisa Baron-Mullins, City of Fairview, wondered if Wood Village would be able to vote on the proposed plan for 238th/242nd. Mayor Jim Kight, City of Troutdale, informed the committee Brian McMenamain and attorney Steve Abel, McMenamains, were currently in attendance. Mayor Kight described McMenamains' potential willingness to donate an

easement for a multimodal trail on the 242nd right of way through McMenamins Edgefield. Mayor Kight also wondered if it was worth the committee's time to advance a project in a community such as Wood Village, if that community had objections to the project. He cited a general level of support within the committee for the 238th improvements and suggested the committee focus its attention on projects with consensus. Mayor Kight also argued for equal contributions and compromises for all of the jurisdictions in the plan area.

Mayor Shane Bemis, City of Gresham, thanked Mayor Smith for her letter. He cited the importance of using data to drive project priorities, and expressed support for improving 238th but did not support removing the climbing lane. He endorsed the proposal of building a multimodal trail through the Edgefield property but did not believe Multnomah County, owner of the preserved right of way, should vacate that right of way.

Carol Rulla, Coalition of Gresham Neighborhoods, asked if a structure would need to be build for the pedestrian and bike path on the proposed multimodal trail. Mayor Kight and Greg Olson, Multnomah County Bicycle and Pedestrian CAC, agreed that switchbacks could be used to build the trail. Mr. Olson added that, looking at the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), he would be hesitant to give up any right of way. Steve Entenman, East Metro Economic Alliance, wanted clarification as to whether the 238th/242nd project was part of the RTP. Mr. Monberg responded that the proposed improvements to 238th and 242nd were not identified as necessary to meet capacity needs through 2035. Mayor Kight wondered why Multnomah County couldn't vacate its right of way if the 238th/242nd improvements were not needed for capacity. Ms. Rulla and Mr. Entenman asked if the capacity needs forecasts for 2035 were based on updated data, given the potential of Gresham Vista and changing rates of population growth. Mr. Monberg assured them that the projects were based on up-to-date data.

Ms. Lucero summarized the input from the committee. She noted that the committee supported advancing modifications to 238th, and supported refining options to keep the climbing lane on 238th. Mayor Smith expressed concerns that if the climbing lane remains, and bike and pedestrian facilities are not added, the committee will not have improved 238th. Mr. Garber suggested improving the lanes on 238th to accommodate trucks while allowing for bike and pedestrian facilities. The committee worked to clarify the options of keeping or losing the climbing lane and the bike and pedestrian facilities.

Mayor Bemis argued that it might be hard to gain public support for adding bike and pedestrian facilities to 238th and removing a lane. He also wanted to be sure that each jurisdiction was contributing equally to the project. Mr. Monberg responded the improvements to 238th could include accommodating freight. Chair Craddick asked the committee if there was support for keeping the climbing lane on 238th and providing multimodal facilities in another area. The committee expressed general support for Chair Craddick's proposal. Mr. Butzek commented that, according to the consultants from Kittleson, in order to accommodate trucks on 238th, the climbing lane would have to be removed, or both lanes would have to be widened to 15 feet, which would involve cutting into the slope. Mr. Butzek added that he did not know what the cost would be to cut into the slope and widen the lanes.

Ms. Rulla asked if the proposal included removing the existing sidewalks on 238th. Ms. Lucero outlined the two options on the table for the committee today: refine the projects based on today's suggestions and input, or make a decision today on which options to advance to the recommendation. Mr. Monberg commented that he wanted to be sure to capture the desired outcomes of the projects, rather than determining the exact designs.

Mayor Smith argued that widening the lanes, removing the climbing lane, and adding bike and pedestrian facilities would result in a safer road, based on the study and the option 2 considerations. She asked that the EMCP technical advisory committee examine her argument and return to the next steering committee meeting with more details.

Ms. Lucero presented the committee with two choices: advance option 2 of the 238th improvement project to the action plan and recommendation, or ask staff to refine the 238th/242nd project to include climbing lane and multimodal concerns. She emphasized that the 238th/242nd project was just one component of many in the EMCP. Ms. Lucero then asked the committee to indicate their level of support for each choice using their red, yellow, and green cards. For the first choice, advancing option 2 of the 238th improvement project, 8 committee members showed their support by raising green or yellow cards. For the second choice, refining the 238th/242nd project, 10 committee members showed their support by raising green or yellow cards. Based on the number of cards raised for the two choices, Ms. Lucero stated that the committee supported refining the 238th/242nd project to include climbing lane and multimodal facilities.

Mr. Monberg thanked the committee and informed them that the staff would present the refinements to 238th/242nd at the next steering committee meeting.

4.2. 207th

Mr. Monberg presented the 207th decision point to the committee. He directed the committee to the meeting packet and presented information about extending 207th (Fairview Parkway) from Glisan to Stark. He asked if the 207th connection should be advanced, or if the staff should work to refine it. Ms. Rulla asked if Microchip had indicated support for the 207th connection. Ms. Lucero explained that they have expressed some concern that it might negatively impact their facilities, but that they have not indicated support or disapproval. Ms. Lucero also mentioned that Abby's Pizza supported the connection and the increased access to their business it might bring. Ms. Baron-Mullins said that Fairview would support the 207th connection as long as Glisan was widened for safety.

Ms. Lucero asked the committee members to indicate their level of support for advancing the 207th connection to the action plan and recommendation using their red, yellow and green cards. 5 committee members raised yellow or green cards, indicating their support of advancing the connection. No members raised red cards. Based on the level of support indication, Ms. Lucero stated that the 207th connection would be advanced the action plan and recommendation.

5. Public comment

Ms. Lucero asked the members of the public if anyone would like to share comments with the steering committee. Ms. Franny Grover, Gresham, stated that she was concerned about safety at 10th

and Hogan, and asked the committee not to remove the climbing lane or accommodate trucks on 238th. She said that 238th was an important route from the freeway to her home, and that she didn't want that commute to be disrupted. Bill Peterson, City of Wood Village, commented that accommodating freight on 238th would not affect system capacity, and that intersections improvements have a greater effect on system capacity. He added that this was why it was not identified as necessary to meet capacity needs in the Regional Transportation Plan.

Ms. Lynn Donahue asked if 238th would be altered north of Halsey near the I-84 junction. She expressed concerns regarding removing land from existing businesses on 238th, specifically a medical facility in the area. Mr. Monberg responded that the committee had looked at creating a 5-lane intersection at Halsey and 238th, but would have to give her more specific information at the next meeting.

6. Adjourn

Councilor Craddick thanked the committee and community members for their work and adjourned the meeting at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

SIGNATURE HERE

Emma Fredieu
Recording Secretary

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR APRIL 18, 2012

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

ITEM	DOCUMENT TYPE	Doc DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Meeting Summary	04/02/2012	Meeting Summary – April 2, 2012 East Metro Connections Plan Steering Committee	041812emcpsc-01
2	Agenda	04/18/2012	Meeting Agenda – April 18, 2012 East Metro Connections Plan Steering Committee	041812emcpsc-02
3	Booklet	04/18/2012	EMCP booklet	041812empsc-03
4	Letter	04/10/2012	Letter to the committee from Mayor Smith	041812emcpsc-04