



East Metro Connections Plan Steering Committee
Wednesday, June 6, 2012
Gresham City Hall, Oregon Trail and Springwater Trail Rooms, Gresham, OR

Committee members present

Shirley Craddick, Chair	Metro
Shane Bemis	City of Gresham
Ron Cazares	FedEx
Jamie Damon	Clackamas County
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
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

Alan Lehto	TriMet
------------	--------

Facilitator

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

Alternates present

Steve Kautz	TriMet
-------------	--------

Metro staff

Elissa Gertler, Brian Monberg, Dana Lucero, Emma Fredieu, Robin McArthur, Deborah Redman, Karen Withrow, Katie Shriver

1. Welcome and opening remarks

Chair Shirley Craddick, Metro Councilor, welcomed the steering committee and audience members. She explained that the goal of this meeting was to finalize the recommendation and action plan that the committee would promote to the rest of the region. Chair Craddick noted the limited funding environment and described how the collaborative process of the East Metro Connections Plan (EMCP) would allow the communities in the plan area to better compete for funding opportunities. She thanked the committee for their dedication to the planning process.

1.1 Meeting outcomes and logistics

Ms. Dana Lucero, Metro, directed members to the meeting agenda and noted that public comment period would be at the beginning of the meeting. She summarized the agenda items and explained that, while committee members would be using their green and red cards to mark support for the action plan, they would not be using their yellow cards. Ms. Lucero identified the two decision points for the committee: choosing a plan for the 238th/242nd project and endorsing the action plan.

1.2 Process to date and upcoming milestones

Chair Craddick outlined the work done by the technical advisory committee (TAC) and the steering committee, and the public involvement efforts in east county. She explained that the elected councils of Gresham, Fairview, Troutdale, Wood Village, Multnomah County and Metro would decide whether or not to endorse the EMCP recommendation. After obtaining their endorsements, the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) would be amended to include the recommendation. Chair Craddick then gave an overview of the council endorsement schedule and noted that once the RTP is amended, the east county community can begin targeting funding sources.

2. Public Comment

Chair Craddick invited members of the audience to offer comment on the EMCP. Four audience members addressed the committee.

Mr. Chuck Rhoads, Executive Director of Business Services for Reynolds School District, commented that he had been following the EMCP progress closely and working with Multnomah County Commissioner Diane McKeel. He believed that at 242nd extension would displace programs for students with need, and would interrupt the school district's plans to build an elementary school on land that would be used by the 242nd extension. He explained that the school district would prefer option 1 of the 238th/242nd project.

Ms. Theresa Delaney-Davis, a resident in the Reynolds School District agreed with Dr. Rhoads comment, and argued against the option to extend 242nd. She expressed concerns regarding the cost of an extension of 242nd and advocated a vacation of the easement. Ms. Delaney-Davis also wondered to what extend the EMCP provided north-south connectivity in the plan area, and what the overall costs of the plan have been.

Mr. Travis Stovall, Executive Director of the East Metro Economic Alliance, thanked the committee for their work on the plan. He argued that the EMCP was a critical component for economic development in the east county region. He encouraged the committee to continue to move forward together as a sub-

region, and to take the next steps to pursue funding. He appreciated the committee's open-mindedness toward exploring alternative and possible solutions.

Mr. Mike McMenamin, Owner of McMenamins and Edgefield, described the historical and cultural importance of Edgefield to the community. He thanked the committee for their work to find a solution to the 238th/242nd project.

3. Refinements to action plan

3.1 Updates based on April 18 steering committee discussion

Mr. Brian Monberg, Metro, expressed enthusiasm presenting the final list of identified projects and investment packages to the committee. He directed members to page 3 of the recommendation booklet [included in meeting packet] and outlined changes to the investment packages since the April 18, 2012 meeting. Changes included adding Gresham Vista into the set of economic development investments, adding Edgefield to the Halsey Main Street investment package, and refining other investment packages with jurisdictional staff. Mr. Monberg noted that the TAC would work together to ensure coordination with local projects, such as the Columbia Cascade River District, as they move toward implementation phases and pursuing funding. He opened his presentation up to questions from the committee.

Mayor Mike Weatherby, City of Fairview, asked if local city transportation plans would need to be included in the EMCP. Mr. Monberg replied that the EMCP might complement local transportation plans and that the two are not mutually exclusive. Mayor Weatherby expressed concern that the region north of I-84 was not included in the plan area. Mr. Monberg explained that the committee identified the plan area as between I84 and the Multnomah County line. Projects north of I84 fall outside of the plan area but are considered complementary efforts in the Columbia Cascade River District. Commissioner Jamie Damon, Clackamas County, noted that the Columbia Cascade River District projects fall under related actions in the recommendation booklet.

3.2 Results of final public survey

Ms. Lucero directed the committee to the final public survey report [included in the meeting packet]. She described the wide support for the list of investments that members of the public had indicated on the survey. Ms. Lucero added that many comments in the survey were very specific and would help staff during the project development phase of the EMCP.

3.3 Discussion

Chair Craddick explained that, setting aside the 238th/242nd project, the committee would now decide whether to endorse the remainder of the action plan. She opened the meeting up to questions from the committee and asked them to let her know if they had any concerns. There were no comments or objections from the committee members. Chair Craddick stated that she took their lack of objections to mean that the committee endorsed the action plan, minus the momentarily tabled 238th/242nd project. The committee agreed.

4. 238th/242nd project decision

Ms. Lucero directed the committee to the 238th/242nd project and summarized the list of options up for discussion. Chair Shirley thanked the committee for their work as a group on this project. She specifically

thanked Wood Village and Gresham for their willingness to come to an agreement in support of the EMCP and the 238th/242nd project. She explained that staff had developed refinements to 238th that included a climbing lane and that Mark Vandehey from Kittelson Consultants would be presenting that option.

4.1 Relationship to regional policy

Mr. Monberg discussed page 9 of the recommendation booklet and described the process of updating regional policies to match the endorsed projects. He informed the committee that their decision on the 238th/242nd project would be included in an amendment to the RTP and that this project would be part of the “silver buckshot” approach to supporting the regional grid. Mr. Monberg then introduced Mr. Mark Vandehey, Kittelson Consultants, for a presentation on the results of the 238th/242nd refinement study.

4.2 Technical findings for 3-lane option on 238th: Kittelson presentation

Mr. Vandehey thanked the committee for their efforts and expressed appreciation for the chance to work on the project given his personal connects to the area. He presented the Option 2 refined study results [included in the meeting packet]. Option 2 refined alters the existing 238th to allow for trucks, provides bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Mr. Vandehey explained that the option 2 refined keeps the climbing lane and existing grade, but widens the lanes and adds retaining walls. He added that it can be build within the existing right-of-way. He finished his presentation with a comparison of Options 1, 2, refined 2, and 3. Mr. Vandehey noted that he generated a range of costs for each option, but had not developed the options in enough detail to provide a more specific cost estimate. Mr. Monberg added that no private property would be required for revised option 2.

Ms. Lucero opened the meeting up to technical questions from the committee. Mr. Mark Garber, East Metro Economic Alliance, asked how accurate the cost estimates were for option 3. Mr. Vandehey responded that there was a range of \$35 to \$45 million. Steve Entenman, East Economic Alliance, wondered if the 238th/242nd plan needed to consider sound attenuation. Mr. Vandehey replied that the study had not gone into that level of detail.

Mayor Jim Kight, City of Troutdale, believed the cost estimates for option 3 to be too low. He also expressed concerns about the safety of revised option 2, and wondered if it needed to include additional traffic separation. Mr. Vandehey explained that the lanes had been widened to give ample traffic separation, but that the next level of detail would be to explore options for a barrier between lanes. He also added that the study did not identify 238th as a significant traffic accident corridor, so the widened lanes should mitigate many safety concerns.

Ms. Jane Van Dyke, Columbia Slough Watershed Council, asked if the multimodal sidewalk in option 2 refined would connect with other bicycle and pedestrian facilities at intersections of 238th/242nd. Mr. Vandehey confirmed that they would connect at intersections at the bottom of the hill. He explained that the sidewalk would be 10 feet wide for bicycles and pedestrians to share. He noted that markings on the sidewalk could be used to separate the bicycles and pedestrians but that the study did not explore that level of detail.

Ms. Carol Rulla, Coalition of Gresham Neighborhoods, asked if the 238th/242nd hill would become a bottleneck for traffic if the intersections are improved. Mr. Vandehey replied that the intersections

would continue to be the bottlenecks regarding traffic capacity. Ms. Michelle Gregory, Mt. Hood Community College, wondered if lighting would need to be added for the bicycle and pedestrian facilities in option 2 refined. Mayor Kight informed her that the 238th hill currently had streetlights.

Mayor Patricia Smith, City of Wood Village, thanked Mr. Vandehey for his work on the project and asked him to offer his professional opinion as to whether option 2 or option 2 refined would be better for traffic. Mr. Vandehey noted that both options address multimodal concerns, but that refined option 2 does so more significantly. He added that the climbing lane in option 2 refined provides additional operational benefit as well. Mr. Vandehey believed that there was a definite benefit for option 2 refined and that it would be worth the additional cost. Mayor Smith asked him to clarify that there would be no private property acquisition in option 2 refined. Mr. Vandehey explained that at the current level of detail there did not appear to be any need for private property acquisition. He acknowledged that at higher levels of detail, there may be a need.

Mr. Greg Olson, Multnomah County Bicycle and Pedestrian CAC, expressed concern that a 10% grade may make it difficult for bicyclists to use the multimodal sidewalk, and that the downhill portion of 238th may pose safety issues for bicyclists as well. Mr. Olson appreciated the inclusion of an elevated sidewalk in option 2 refined.

Mr. Entenman asked if the multimodal sidewalk would need to be built on both sides of 238th in the option 2 refined plan. Mr. Vandehey replied that the bicycle and pedestrian facilities would need to be built on both sides, but that the sidewalk structure is optional. Mr. Olson clarified that Multnomah County standards require building the facilities on both sides. Mr. Vandehey added that refinements to option 2 allowed for design alternatives as to the width of the bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Mayor Kight wondered about the minimum required width for the multimodal sidewalk and Mr. Vandehey responded that the standard width is a 4-foot bike lane and 4-foot sidewalk. Mr. Monberg explained that regional standards called for a 12 to 14-foot multimodal sidewalk, but that a 10-foot wide sidewalk was appropriate given the steepness of the hill.

Mayor Weatherby commented that the revised option 2 offered many benefits and that it would be the best avenue to pursue.

4.3 Decision: What project should advance in the 238th/242nd area between Glisan and Halsey?

Ms. Lucero segued into the committee's decision point for the 238th/242nd project. She described the process for indicating support for option 1, option 2, option 2 refined, or option 3. Each committee member would indicate support for one of the options by placing an orange dot sticker under the option of their choosing on a large sheet of paper at the front of the room. Before the committee placed their dots, Ms. Lucero asked for comments on the options. Each committee member gave their opinion of the options.

Mr. Dwight Unti, Tokola Properties, commented that his greatest concerns for the east metro region were economic development and job growth. He was impressed with the collaborative process of the EMCP. He supported option 2 refined and thought that it was a good value given the cost and benefits.

Mr. Steve Kautz, TriMet, believed that option 2 refined provided operational and multimodal benefits. Mr. Ron Papsdorf, City of Gresham, supported option 2 refined. He wondered if the 10-foot wide multimodal paths were too wide given traffic expectations but believed that the value of option 2

refined exceeded its costs. He expressed appreciation for the public input available to committee members and thought that the refinements to option 2 followed the desires of the public. Mr. Garber supported option 2 refined as well.

Mr. Rian Windsheimer's top priority was to allow for freight connectivity throughout the region and was pleased that option 2 revised addressed that priority. Mr. Windsheimer advocated for moving forward with option 2 revised and believed that a 10-foot multimodal path was reasonable. Ms. Susie Lahsene agreed with Mr. Windsheimer. She wished to provide multiple connections to I84 for freight. Compelled by the capacity needs of the corridor, she believed that option 2 refined met those needs and addressed operational concerns. She stated that option 2, the 242nd extension, was not needed.

President Tom Hughes, Metro, advocated keeping the 10-foot wide multimodal path and suggested separating the bicyclists and pedestrians at the end of the hill for safety reasons. His greatest concerns were economic development in east county and increasing access to Gresham Vista. President Hughes believed that option 2 refined satisfies his concerns, and expressed excitement about the prospects of moving toward a solution collaboratively. He identified the EMCP as a standard for working together as a region.

Ms. Gregory agreed with President Hughes and added that Mt. Hood Community College is also concerned about economic development in east county. She argued that option 2 revised best serves the needs of the corridor and was encouraged by the collaborative working process.

Mayor Shane Bemis, City of Gresham, thanked the committee for their work. He argued for prioritizing objective data over emotional responses and believed option 2 refined used data to come to a solution. He expressed concern over Multnomah County vacating the right of way where the 242nd extension could be built. He suggested waiting until the 238th/242nd project is implemented and built before vacating the right of way. He added that he would like to thank former elected officials from the jurisdictions for encouraging work in the EMCP.

Councilor Diana Helm, City of Damascus, was heartened to see the collaboration between the cities in east county and expressed support for option 2 refined. She suggested cabling or an alternative barrier between the street and the multimodal sidewalk to increase safety. Ms. Van Dyke appreciated the increased connections for regional bicycle and pedestrian facilities and supported option 2 refined.

Commissioner Damon was pleased with the collaboration in the committee and the progress made in the EMCP. She supported option 2 refined.

Commissioner Diane McKeel, Multnomah County, thanked the committee for their hard work and looked forward to a conclusion of the ECMP planning process. She expressed support for option 2 refined as an opportunity for economic development. She was agreeable to vacating the 242nd right-of-way to allow the Reynolds School District and McMenamins to develop the area.

Mayor Smith requested a guarantee that the EMCP implementation phase and the vacation of the 242nd right of way will be linked. She stated that the Wood Village City Council called for the linkage.

Chair Jeff Cogan, Multnomah County, acknowledged disagreements on the 238th/242nd project but praised the committee and facilitators for working through the process in a collaborative and open-minded manner.

Mr. Olson argued against vacating the 242nd right-of-way until plans for the area became clear, and stated he would prefer to use the right-of-way for a multi-use path. He suggested that Reynolds school district provide a multi-use path to any schools they plan to build. Mayor Bemis reminded the committee of the other improvements throughout the EMCP that would help with connectivity in east county.

Ms. Rulla advocated for using option 2 refined and for asking Multnomah County to vacate the right of way once the project is built. She expressed concern that option 3 would not be implemented.

President Hughes asked for clarification as to who currently owns the right-of-way. After Mr. Monberg explained that Multnomah County owns the right-of-way, President Hughes suggested that Multnomah County and the cities of Gresham and Wood Village enter into a Memorandum of Understanding and work on a plan that would suit each jurisdiction. Mayor Kight reminded President Hughes that Troutdale would need to be included on any agreements as the right-of-way falls within Troutdale city limits. President Hughes reiterated his suggestion that the jurisdictions begin a process separate from the steering committee to come to an agreement on the right-of-way.

Ms. Lucero explained that once the committee made a decision on the 238th/242nd project, that decision would be included in the RTP. She clarified that the question of the right-of-way could be resolved between amending the RTP and establishing a funding source for the project. Once the project is included in the RTP, the local jurisdictions can work to resolve the issue of the right-of-way.

Mr. Ron Papsdorf, City of Gresham, reiterated Mayor Bemis' argument that the vacation of the right-of-way be linked to the implementation phase of the project. He expressed concern that incentive to work collaboratively will disappear should Multnomah County vacate the right-of-way before the project is completed.

Chair Cogan responded that once the decision on the 238th/242nd project is included in the RTP, the jurisdictions can decide to move forward on the vacation of the right-of-way, and are able to decide whether to link the right-of-way with the implementation phase of the project.

Mayor Smith urged Multnomah County to guarantee they will vacate the right-of-way, and assured the committee that she would work to make sure the project is completed.

Mayor Kight cautioned against missed opportunities for economic development should Multnomah County delay vacating the right of way. He expressed concern over the potential time span between making a decision on which 238th/242nd option to support, and beginning the project implementation phase. He warned the committee that McMenamins may choose not to develop Edgefield if they have to wait for the right-of-way to be vacated.

Mayor Weatherby remarked on the various compromises that the communities have offered to come to an agreement on the 238th/242nd project. He observed that the implementation process for the project may take an extended period of time. He advocated for vacating the right-of-way and allowing business to develop the area in the interim between endorsing the EMCP and building the projects.

Mr. Papsdorf stated that Gresham wanted assurance that pursuing funding for the EMCP would be a priority for the jurisdictions. Commissioner Damon suggested adding assurances that the project is a

priority to the Memorandum of Understanding linking right-of-way vacation with EMCP implementation.

Ms. Lucero then pointed the committee to the four options for the 238th/242nd project written on a flip chart at the front of the room:

- Option 1: No build
- Option 2: Improved 238th/242nd with 2 lanes
- Option 2 refined
- Option 3: 242nd extension

She instructed the committee to indicate the project option they believe should move forward to the EMCP recommendation and action plan by placing their dot under that project's name. All committee members placed their dot under option 2 revised.

5. Endorsement of action plan and recommendation

Chair Craddick presented the final process to confirm the steering committee's endorsement of the EMCP recommendation and action plan. She explained that members would use their green (to confirm) or red (to oppose) card to vote for or against the endorsement. Chair Craddick directed the members to raise their cards. All committee members raised green cards. There were no red cards raised.

6. Next steps: Find funding, build projects

After the committee endorsed the recommendation and action plan, Chair Craddick asked the committee for suggestions for where and how to pursue funding the EMCP. Ms. Rulla suggested continuing to use the jurisdictional staff to advise the communities on where to look for funding opportunities. Mayor Kight remarked that Washington County had hired consultants to explore the possibilities of passing bond measures to pay for projects.

Mr. Papsdorf recommended establishing a collective agreement about project priorities and phasing to keep the jurisdictions on the same page. He argued that the current members of the steering committee would be best suited to develop that agreement.

President Hughes proposed using the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) process to pursue federal funding. He mentioned that JPACT membership may soon include representation from the east metro area. President Hughes reiterated that the sub-region can more competitively pursue funding collectively, specifically when applying for Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recover (TIGER) grants.

Chair Craddick noted the meeting had come to an end. She thank the steering committee for their interest in the EMCP, their willingness to participate, and their good work.

Adjourn

Chair Craddick adjourned the meeting at 3:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Emma Fredieu
Recording Secretary

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

ITEM	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOC DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Meeting Summary	5/14/2012	Meeting Summary – April 18, 2012 East Metro Connections Plan Steering Committee	060612emcp-01
2	Agenda	6/6/2012	Meeting Agenda – June 6, 2012 East Metro Connections Plan Steering Committee	060612emcp-02
3	Memo	6/6/2012	Concept designs evaluated for 238 th /242 nd	060612emcp-03
4	Document	6/6/2012	Action Plan public survey summary	060612emcp-04
5	Powerpoint	6/6/2012	EMCP 238 th /242 nd Concepts – Kittelson	060612emcp-05
6	Booklet	6/6/2012	EMCP Recommendation	060612emcp-06