



East Metro Connections Plan Steering Committee  
Wednesday, July 27, 2011  
1 to 3 p.m.  
Gresham City Hall, Barlow and Oregon Trail rooms

**Committee members present**

Shirley Craddick, Chair	Metro Council
Tom Hughes	Metro Council
Allan Barry (representing Mike Weatherby)	City of Fairview
Ron Cazares	FedEx
Steve Entenman	East Metro Economic Alliance
Mark Garber	East Metro Economic Alliance
Jim Kight	City of Troutdale
Susie Lahsene	Port of Portland
Alan Lehto	TriMet
Greg Olson	Multnomah County Bicycle and Pedestrian CAC
Diane McKeel	Multnomah County
Hector Osuna	El Programa Hispano
Carol Rulla	Coalition of Gresham Neighborhoods
Ron Papsdorf (representing Shane Bemis)	City of Gresham
Paul Savas (representing Jamie Damon)	Clackamas County
Patricia Smith	City of Wood Village
Dwight Unti	Tokola Properties
Jane Van Dyke	Columbia Slough Watershed Council
Rian Windsheimer	ODOT Region 1

**Committee members excused**

Mike Weatherby	City of Fairview
Shane Bemis	City of Gresham
Jamie Damon	Clackamas County

**Facilitator**

Dana Lucero - Metro

**Metro staff**

Elissa Gertler, Bridget Wieghart, Deborah Redman, Tim Collins, Brian Harper, Sheena VanLeuven and Jenn Tuerk

## **I. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER**

The meeting was officially called to order at 1:07 p.m. by Ms. Dana Lucero, Metro.

Ms. Lucero began the meeting by noting that Ms. Jamie Damon will no longer serve as facilitator for the East Metro Connections Plan Steering Committee meetings. She will rejoin the steering committee as the representative for Clackamas County.

The meeting summary from the April 22, 2011 meeting was provided to the committee by email on May 20. No comments were received. The meeting summary was accepted by the steering committee as part of the record.

Ms. Lucero reminded the committee that they agreed to use first names instead of titles during meetings.

## **II. WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS BY METRO COUNCIL PRESIDENT TOM HUGHES AND CHAIR SHIRLEY CRADDICK**

Metro Council President Tom Hughes thanked everyone for coming together again. His purpose for attending today is to listen to what everyone has to say. Chair Craddick welcomed everyone to the meeting and committee members introduced themselves.

Since the last meeting Chair Craddick spoke with each committee member individually to get their perspective on the plan's progress. She thanked the committee for their feedback and shared recommendations related to process:

- Send out information prior to the meeting.
- Let the information and details guide the study and determine the direction of the project.
- Have a defined goal for each meeting and stay focused.

Chair Craddick reviewed the decisions made at the April 22 steering committee meeting; the committee confirmed the plan goals and operating protocols.

The objective of the July 27 meeting was to refine and confirm a working problem statement. This problem statement presented to the committee was based on current information and what is anticipated in the future. The way the problem is defined will shape the solutions eventually considered. The working problem statement was developed from the existing conditions analysis, the key findings of which were highlighted in the committee's packet (attached to the record). These findings were technically reviewed and vetted by the technical advisory committee (TAC). The steering committee will revisit the working problem statement should new or contrary information be discovered. This working problem statement addresses concerns committee members shared with Chair Craddick.

## **III. TIMELINE AND MILESTONES**

Chair Craddick highlighted phases and key milestones along the East Metro Connections Plan Steering Committee decision timeline (attached to the record). The committee will work to refine the working problem statement. In the fall, the steering committee will evaluate

strategies that anticipate future conditions and potential solutions that support local aspirations. In the winter, the steering committee will consider an implementation plan that identifies phased investments in the plan area. The steering committee will recommend an implementation plan that includes local implementation actions, which will go to the elected councils in the plan area - Gresham, Fairview, Wood Village, Troutdale and Multnomah County.

#### **IV. ANALYSIS, OPPORTUNITIES AND CONSTRAINTS**

Chair Craddick introduced Ms. Bridget Wieghart, East Metro Connections Plan project manager.

Ms. Wieghart introduced the East Metro Connections Plan working problem statement packet (attached to the record). Over the past several months, staff took the project goals and examined them in light of the existing and future conditions in the study area. She presented the preliminary working problem statement that was developed in consultation with the TAC (on page 2 of the packet). Ms. Wieghart walked the committee through the transportation portion of the packet and highlighted key findings that shaped the conclusions drawn in the preliminary working problem statement.

Following the presentation, committee members asked questions of Ms. Wieghart.

- Greg Olson – Asked when future population and employment numbers will be available, if staff knows what types of trucks are using the roads and the timeframe that the safety data was collected.
  - A: Future numbers will be available in September. The current numbers are from March. There are two different truck classifications in the truck counts. The safety data collection period was from 2007-2009.
- Rian Windsheimer – Praised the staff for creating a well thought out working problem statement. He noted that statement should include serving the demand related to future capacity and economic development opportunities.
- Diana Helm – Asked if the freight percentage included Highway 212. She also noted that the project needs to get freight to US 26 from Damascus.
  - A: The travel model looked at the whole region. Future processes will look closer at the specific areas. The Highway 212 corridor plan, to be started later, will look at traffic through Damascus.
- Dwight Unti – Recommended the second paragraph of the working problem statement be moved before the first. Economic and community development should drive the solutions.
- Jim Kight – Commented on the distribution of freight traffic on arterial streets versus the National Highway System route. He noted that the problem statement should not give the impression that we are creating a new corridor.
  - A: Trucks are using all the arterials. For through trips, trucks are not using the freight route the way it was intended. It is not required that they use the freight route, but the failure of the NHS route to function as intended causes problem in other areas. Additionally, there are limits to what can be done on the current NHS route.
- Patricia Smith – Asked if, in the beginning of the project, the plan area included what is now in the influence area (the area north of I-84). Were through trips on 257th reflected in the study? How much of the money budgeted will be spent in plan area and the influence area?

A: The area north of I-84 is in influence area. It is being looked at closely. The Port of Portland is currently engaged in planning for that area. This plan will likely not design solutions for that area.

- Alan Lehto – Noted that he would like to see more context on the safety information.
- Carol Rulla – Commented that the working problem statement’s first sentence uses the word “conflicts,” which implies the whole system is broken. The wording could be toned down changed to “have conflicts.”
- Ron Papsdorf – Noted the transit findings don’t seem to be reflected in the problem statement. The map of the existing transit system is good, but the committee needs more information on service hours in East Metro area to understand if there is an efficient way to distribute transit service.
- Mark Garber – Asked for clarification on “systems operations within regional standards.”

A: Operating within regional standards is when the volume reaches the designed capacity and creates congestion.

- Diane McKeel – Stated the committee should look at the strengths and minimize the problems.

The committee began small group discussions reflecting on the first paragraph of the working problem statement. After ten minutes, Chair Craddick reconvened the committee and Ms. Wieghart presented the key findings related to land use, demographics, economic development and natural resources, which were summarized in the East Metro Connections Plan working problem statement packet.

Following the presentation there were two questions from the committee.

- Susie Lahsene – Asked if, on the economic development map, the colored areas represent employment areas? What are the designations? Are these showing different kinds of designations where we are expecting job growth?

A: Yes, each of the colors represents a different land designation such as industrial, urban renewal and enterprise zones for the plan area. It also includes local aspirations in the study area.

- Ron Papsdorf – Stated the economic development map is confusing since the center and industrial lands overlap. He suggested the creation of a second map with only the enterprise zones.

## **V. PROBLEM STATEMENT**

The steering committee discussed and provided comments on the working problem statement.

- Make it one paragraph.
- The problem statement should lead with economic development.
- The distinction isn’t clear how to achieve economic vitality, livability, opportunity and that transit and transportation can be a means to get there.
- Address the link between capacity and development.
- Mention safety.
- The statement needs more plain English and less jargon.

- Transit needs to be recognized, highlighting that while it's a problem there are also opportunities.
- Don't lose sight of the east/west issues as well as north/south issues, including connectivity to Marine Drive and Sandy Blvd.
- The first sentence needs to be adjusted so it is not stated as a problem.
- Include safety, transit and access to transit, pedestrian and bike resources.
- Economic development is important for existing uses and future uses.
- The National Highway System statement needs to be more of a question and not just a fact.
- Using "economic development and community development are linked to the transportation system" is too passive. Should say "supported by."
- The NHS freight route sentence needs to be restated: trucks need a through route and the current route is not being used as intended. The alternative has design problems and/or conflict with the surrounding development.
- Need to get clarification on the freight problem and address where and how to solve it.
- The volume of through trucks seems really small. It would be helpful to know the volume relative to the rest of the region, which should help us determine the problem.

Chair Craddick summarized problem statement in three components: the current function of the road does not match the land use. There are multiple options that could solve this issue. And the freight route needs to be reconsidered.

Chair Craddick and Ms. Lucero led the committee through confirming changes to the preliminary working problem statement on page 2 of the East Metro Connections Plan working problem statement packet. Chair Craddick asked the committee how close they are to agreement on the statement. The steering committee used green, yellow and red cards to indicate their level of agreement with proposed changes. The colored cards represent:

- Green - I support this, given that we will revisit it if we learn something contradictory.
- Yellow - I've got questions or I'm skeptical about something but I'm not going to block consensus.
- Red - I cannot support this.

The following revisions were proposed and confirmed by the committee:

- Combine the two paragraphs, and lead with the second.
- Include "safety"
- Include "transit" and "access to transit"
- Change "...road system conflicts with..." to "...road system has conflicts with..."
- Change "...development are linked to the transportation..." to "...development are supported by the transportation..."
- Tie future growth and opportunities to additional capacity
- Be clear to support existing uses too
- Flesh out the NHS freight route statement: "resolve the NHS route issue "and "trucks need a through route(s)"
- Use more plain speak

Staff committed to modify the statement based on these revisions and bring back to committee for review.

## **VI. NEXT STEPS**

Ms. Lucero provided a printed summary of recent and upcoming public involvement opportunities (attached to the record). Metro staff will share preliminary objectives with the committee before the next meeting in mid-September or mid-October.

## **VII. PUBLIC COMMENT**

Chair Craddick reminded the committee that at the last meeting there was a question from Ms. Theresa Davis of the Reynolds School District regarding school district involvement. Metro followed up with her to address her concerns about the properties they own in the plan area. The committee will be involving the school districts in a session (“panel of experts”) this August to understand their needs and ensure East Metro Connections Plan supports their future plans. Additionally Metro Council will consider adding an education sector representative to the steering committee.

Ms. Davis was concerned about the participation of school districts. The staff is putting together plans on how to engage the school districts, maybe through a focus group process and looking at adding one more person to the steering committee.

Chair Craddick then opened the floor for public comments.

Theresa Davis: I am a resident and Board Chair of the Reynolds School District. I live in Fairview on 223<sup>rd</sup> where they widened the underpass under the railroad tracks. I am not one of the 66% of East County residents who leave the county to go to work. The Reynolds School is the only district in Oregon that crosses 5 jurisdictions and there is no representation on the committee. Our jurisdiction covers 55 square miles. We began the purchase of an area that is directly affected by this study known as the T47 corridor in 2005. We closed in 2006. An MOU occurred while we were closing. We were notified a year after closing that this piece of land was going to be affected by this study. The study was lying on the books for 20 years and was not funded. That year we withdrew our offer to purchase the adjacent property. In 2009, Representative Matt Wong (then a Troutdale City Counselor) came to me as the Chairman. He told me there had been a vote, and advisement, that they had not vacated our easement at closing because Metro had advised their council that they could be held in violation and incurs penalties or fines for being in violation of the regional transportation study. As we develop long-term efficiencies for student transportation and access, we have a huge stake in this. Legislation has now passed that a kid can go to any choice he/she chooses, so we have a great interest in public transportation. For the record, Fed Ex building is on the former Reynolds Aluminum. Reynolds School has nothing to do with that property.

On the record: This testimony is being submitted today to the steering committee regarding the land owned by Reynolds School District, commonly known as a 242nd easement property. As it is being considered within the regional transportation corridor study, the district has been denied representation by not occupying a seat on the steering committee, but Metro is looking to address that in a focus group instead. I would like to point out again, we are the only district in this study that has land that is going to be directly affected and financially affects our students directly. As a Board of Directors spokesperson, I respectfully request in writing that the

committee and Metro consider removal of our property as a viable option from this plan. I followed all of the technical reports, studies and recommendations from the beginning of the study because I sit as an advisory on the MPAC and that Mattson sits on the JPACT, which is the policy side. It is clear from this review that multiple corridors may be recommended. It's also clear that there will be no funding forthcoming for several years that justifies delaying us further and places more hold on that property. The inclusion of our property at this level, before you get to your initial strategy phase, seriously harms our ability to continue the use of the buildings currently on our site, would impact the relocation of critical student services operating on that site and eliminates our only district meeting center. It harms our financial considerations and use of the property for the intended purpose of future construction of a much needed additional middle and elementary school at that location and is the least viable and most expensive option of the proposed corridors for these reasons. Extensive slope issues affecting structural considerations of road construction, extensive water mitigation issues affecting construction of the road on the property, the necessity of the pig farm to be purchased, which has multiple wetland issues, substantial cost factors to site a road over the railroad tracks, and relocation of the multiple businesses between the railroad tracks and I-84. A decision to remove 242nd our easement, from the plan would allow the Troutdale Council to vacate the easement that was agreed by them to us more than four years ago, which was rescinded when it was discovered Metro had spent allocated reserves to complete the study after many years of postponement. The Troutdale Council is compelled in a very untimely manner to rescind due to the anticipation of the violation of the plan which I described earlier. This information was not disclosed to us and as I said, we would not have bought the land if we had known. Your prompt decision to remove 242nd from the plan for all the reasons cited without allowing further maneuvering of regional political considerations would support the community, support the surrounding property owners, release the school district from harm and is ultimately in the best interest of fiscal responsibility to your regional tax payers. This decision would be just and appropriate. We respectfully make this request for timely action in order to allow our children, families and the public to move forward. Ms. Davis handed out copies of her official testimony to the committee (attached to the record).

#### **VIII. ADJOURN**

There being no further business, Chair Craddick adjourned the meeting at 2:38 p.m.

*Meeting summary respectfully submitted by:*

---

*Jenn Tuerk*

Attachments to the Record:

Item	Topic	Document Date	Description	Document Number
1	Memo	7/27/11	Memo from Chair Shirley Craddick in preparation for the Steering Committee meeting	072711emcp-01
2	Agenda	7/27/11	EMCP Steering Committee agenda	072711emcp-02
3	Document	7/27/11	EMCP Steering Committee decision timeline	072711emcp-03
4	Packet	7/27/11	EMCP Steering Committee working problem statement packet	072711emcp-04
5	Report	7/27/11	EMCP Public involvement progress report	072711emcp-05