



Lake Oswego to Portland Transit Project Community Advisory Committee (CAC) # 3
Wednesday, January 20, 2010
5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.
Lakewood Center, 368 S. State St., Lake Oswego, OR

Committee Members Present

Ellie McPeak, Chair
Ed Abrahamson
John Betts
Beverly Bookin
Matt Brown
Heather Chrisman
Mary Beth Coffey
Paul Graham
Dave Jorling
Beth Kieres
Bryce Linton
Pascal Pascuzzi
Bob Sack
Katherine Schultz
Mike Sisavic
Joy Strull

Old Town Neighborhood Association
Bicycle Transportation Alliance representative
McVey South Shore Neighborhood Association
Johns Landing Owners' Association
Foothills owner representative
Lakewood Neighborhood Association
Foothills resident
LO Downtown retail business owner
First Addition Neighborhood Association
Willamette Neighborhood Association
Birdshill CPO Chair
South Waterfront property owner
Old Town Neighborhood Association
Fielding Road resident
South Portland Neighborhood Association
Evergreen Neighborhood Association

Alternate Members Present

Kerry Chipman (for Ken Love)
John Ohman (for Lydia Lipman)

Committee Members Excused

Andrew Franklin
Lydia Lipman
Ken Love
Tom Moisan
Eli Morgan
Vern Rifer
Jeremy Solly

Riverdale CPO
Stampher Road/WSL Property owner
South Portland Neighborhood Association
Johns Landing business owner
Riverdale CPO
Portland Streetcar Inc. CAC representative
South Waterfront resident – South Portland NA

Metro Staff

Jamie Snook
Karen Withrow
Cliff Higgins

Brian Monberg
Gabriela Frask
Jenny Dempsey Stein

Additional Project Staff

Kristin Hull	CH2M Hill, facilitator
Doug Oblatz	Shiels, Oblatz and Johnsen, project manager
Brant Williams	City of Lake Oswego
Ann Becklund	TriMet
Ralph Drewfs	ODOT
Tom Markgraf	Markgraf and Associates
Patrick Sweeney	City of Portland

I. WELCOME

Chair Ellie McPeak began the meeting at 5:06 p.m. She welcomed the committee and reviewed the agenda.

Chair McPeak referred to the November meeting summary and the NEPA overview discussion and list of Draft Environmental Impact Statement topics the committee wanted to discuss. She reminded the group of the public involvement and outreach process and their responsibility to talk to community members in the transit corridor, as well as other interested areas like Sellwood, West Linn with support or coordination from project staff.

Chair McPeak recalled that in November, the committee reviewed the history of transit alternatives analysis with a summary of the three alternatives and variations that remain for consideration. At a separate meeting in early January, several CAC members met with project staff to discuss how the alternatives were narrowed down, why some were chosen and not. In December, members rode on the trolley along the Willamette Shoreline right of way and asked questions to better understand the alternatives and design options being evaluated in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Chair McPeak thanked David Jorling for hosting the December potluck in his home.

There were no questions on the meeting summary.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

R.A. Fontes from Lake Oswego thanked the project team for correcting streetcar trip times to make them more realistic.

III. RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS FROM NOVEMBER MEETING/DECEMBER TOUR

Status of Sellwood Bridge project and coordination

Ms. Jamie Snook and Mr. Doug Oblatz reviewed three memos (included as part of this meeting record). Ms. Snook referred to coordination between the Lake Oswego to Portland Transit Project and the Sellwood Bridge Project and how they relate to each other. There has been ongoing project coordination between the Sellwood Bridge and the Lake Oswego to Portland study since it started in 2005. Staff has been meeting, at least weekly, with Multnomah County bridge staff and consultants.

The bridge project is in a different stage of the process, having completed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, selected a locally preferred alternative and submitted the Final Environmental Impact

Statement while furthering engineering and design. The transit project is just starting its DEIS, but both project technical staff and decision makers continue to share designs and work together. Design of the proposed west interchange would allow for the streetcar to cross the new bridge, but that potential extension would be addressed separately from both projects.

Ms. Joy Strull asked for specifics about the future bridge and streetcar connection. Ms. Snook replied that the interchange would move cars, bikes, pedestrians and transit. The loop ramp at the western interchange, radius of the curve, and height were all designed to accommodate the streetcar within the Willamette Shoreline right of way. Streetcar and bridge designers have been communicating together.

Mr. Bryce Linton asked about the new bridge's location, size and timeline. Ms. Snook stated that it would be just north of the original location. At 64 feet in width, it would be wider than today's bridge, with one auto travel lane in each direction - the same number of lanes as in the current bridge - and bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The wider interchanges would allow for turn lanes and car movement. If or when streetcar crossed the bridge, it would be on the loop ramp and in mixed traffic on the bridge. Its first phase is to build the new bridge and second phase is to demolish the old bridge. There is no committed funding for the third phase, building the west interchange, and therefore no timeline.

Status of the "forgotten bridge" between Lake Oswego and Milwaukie

Ms. Snook noted the "forgotten" or freight rail bridge that crosses the Willamette River and extends to the Lake Oswego Foothills and lake areas is owned by Union Pacific but operated by Portland and Western. After being asked about extending the Milwaukie light rail to Lake Oswego in 2007, the project team did a quick engineering analysis of the freight tracks, in poor condition in places, and found it would be very expensive to upgrade the tracks as well as difficult and expensive to operate.

TriMet learned from the WES project, Washington County's commuter rail, to expect long negotiations, liability insurance costs and time separation requirements for shared freight and passenger traffic. Coordinating operations with Union Pacific would raise annual costs. If the project did not mix passenger and freight uses, building a new rail line or buying the right of way would be even more expensive. Cost is not the only issue; more ridership is also anticipated on the Lake Oswego line. The purpose of the project is to serve Lake Oswego and local neighborhoods, and the shared line would not address mobility concerns on Highway 43 or in Johns Landing.

Mr. Matt Brown asked about Metro's analysis of how this transit project and the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project come together, whether the team was still looking at a high-speed passenger corridor to Milwaukie and Clackamas county instead of the streetcar when sharing space in the right of way. Ms. Snook explained that Metro's High Capacity Transit System Plan was recently completed and projected over the next 20 years a potential to include an east-west line between Washington and Clackamas County, with the "forgotten bridge" corridor as a promising alternative. Metro's HCT analysis included both projects, and that east-west connection would complement both. ODOT has also looked at this corridor for high speed rail, in terms of ridership but not physical engineering considerations. Ms. Snook also clarified that a streetcar and enhanced bus service comparison in this scenario did not meet the project purpose or ridership goals.

Ms. Beverly Bookins asked whether the decision to run the lines separately was due to the 50-foot centerline rule imposed by Union Pacific policy. Ms. Snook noted this policy only applied to projects

within their right of way. However, if tracks are shared for passengers and freight, there would be an annual lease payment for the use of the right of way. Some freight rails would need to be upgraded to TriMet's standards in order to safely operate passenger rail.

The analysis looked at ridership over the entire line, not broken out between Lake Oswego to Portland or to Milwaukie. Kerry Chipman added that if Johns Landing was not included, there would be a natural ridership reduction. Ms. Snook noted the forgotten bridge alignment addressed Highway 99E but not Highway 43 mobility. Crossing the river twice could deter riders; however, in terms of speed and reliability, light rail to Lake Oswego could be faster. The team did not analyze a scenario with a streetcar to Johns Landing and light rail to Milwaukie and then to Lake Oswego.

Chair McPeak added that a focused project on the west side of the river corridor from Lake Oswego to Portland would make more use of limited federal finances than adding the river section across and fixing the bridge. The streetcar and light rail were compared side by side at a preliminary feasibility level. Ms. Kristin Hull affirmed that the steering committee had already made decisions regarding this information in the last phase. While one option is no build, the forgotten bridge alternative would not be added back to this study.

Ms. Beth Kieres asked whether a westside streetcar and light rail on the forgotten bridge was part of a master plan for mass transit. Ms. Hull notified the committee that Metro's 30-year high capacity transit study is available on Metro's website at www.oregonmetro.gov/goingplaces, and includes this potential high capacity transit alignment. Ms. Withrow added that at least two different routes, Clackamas County to Washington County via the forgotten bridge and further south in the I-205 corridor, as well as ODOT's high speed rail project would be analyzed in the future. Staff will bring copy of the high capacity transit map to the next meeting, and it is available on the web site.

Right of way width map

Ms. Snook stated a consortium of seven government agencies purchased the right of way and all accompanying railroad agreements in 1988. These large maps summarize all of the rights of way along the corridor and include a variety of ownerships: fee simple, fee title and easement for rail purpose only. The designs provide double track where possible and single track in the tightest rights of way, including the narrowest at 17 feet. Mr. Oblatz thanked Metro staff for making the maps and members reviewed them.

Ms. Strull asked about impacted properties and whether land would be taken over by eminent domain. Ms. Anne Becklund replied that Metro and TriMet do a great job analyzing and identifying potential impacts. The federal government has a specific and stringent program on how to talk to and deal with impacted property owners regarding varied access for sidewalk installation, a small strip of land or larger property sections. TriMet's right of way manager would be available to talk about this at another meeting. Mr. Oblatz added that the right of way was preserved in 1988 for potential rail corridor property, so acquisition could happen but would be less prevalent, than on some projects.

Paul Graham referred to the portion of the alignment entering Lake Oswego and the Foothills and asked whether the design options had been coordinated with area property owners. Mr. Oblatz confirmed this process was starting. Staff is identifying footprints in order to assess potential environmental impacts of both the Union Pacific design option and Foothills design option. He mentioned that Mr.

Brown's firm is working with the city of Lake Oswego to look at a plan for an integrated Foothills redevelopment process. The map lines show a range of route possibilities being studied in the DEIS, including both exclusive and couplet loop routes, similar to downtown Portland.

Mr. Bob Sack asked what level of cooperation or negotiation existed with area commercial land owners. Ms. Withrow replied that some representatives met during the summer meetings regarding terminus option selection at Albertsons and the trolley barn. Since then, property owners have been contacted, receive all agendas and are invited to attend meetings.

Mr. Jorling stated that since the streetcar was limited in its grade climbing ability it would be helpful to see a horizontal diagram of how far it could go down in the Foothills area. Mr. Obletz replied that the team could bring a section profile, part of the conceptual design, to show at the next meeting.

Johns Landing options

Mr. Obletz referred to the Johns Landing refinement process narrowing of options memo (included as part of this meeting record). Issues were raised at the Nov. 16 CAC meeting during the alternatives discussion. At a separate Jan. 6 meeting, CAC members Vern Rifer and Mike Sisavic, and CAC alternates Kerry Chipman, Carryanne Conner and staff discussed CAC interest in a hybrid alternative extending one or more of the streetcar design options further south along Macadam, with a continuous alignment past Carolina Street down to Nevada Street. The proposal contends that there is potential for additional redevelopment and density, if the streetcar remains in Macadam for six more blocks, instead of in the right of way, 200 feet to the east.

Mr. Obletz agreed to a quick study adapted from previous economic data that would report results back to the ad hoc group or at the next CAC meeting. If redevelopment potential was significant, the CAC could consider this option as part of the Locally Preferred Alternative recommendation. Including it for further study could require a Supplemental Environmental Impact Assessment. Mr. Obletz pointed out that it would also be an uphill battle against the Oregon Department of Transportation's strong reservation against running the streetcar along Macadam Avenue for any longer than necessary, due to increased traffic impacts near Taylors Ferry Road. There would be no change in the number of stations, but the station would move to Macadam Avenue at Nevada Street.

Station location process

Mr. Obletz explained how staff decided upon studying the station locations shown on the map. The DEIS objective is to define a footprint and assess environmental impact, and station locations grew out of previous processes to address transit travel time, coverage, access and ridership potential. Selected locations may shift or be added depending on committee and resident input and additional information, until Locally Preferred Alternative selection.

IV. TRAIL UPDATE

Ms. Hull reminded members that the trail used to be part of the Lake Oswego to Portland project, but it is now in a separate process. Mr. Brian Monberg helped initiate the refinement study in 2009. Brian noted that this corridor was part of the regional bond measure trail package and the original 40-mile loop vision. It is a back bone link to trails in Johns Landing, Southwest Portland and Lake Oswego. It's a priority in the Lake Oswego trails and pathways master plan, and would extend the bike path network in

Foothills and downtown Lake Oswego north to the Highway 43 corridor. It's also a City of Portland priority, identified in the 2006 Recreational Trails Strategy, as a complement to the Springwater Trail corridor on Portland's east side.

Based on this history, during the 2005-07 alternatives analysis, staff had funds to look at the trail's development potential and how it could complement transit alignments. During the analysis, a number of trail options were reviewed. On the map looking north from the Sellwood Bridge into South Waterfront, improvements could be made to the existing Willamette River Greenway Trail or a trail could be created adjacent to the rail corridor. Looking south of the Sellwood Bridge, there are several alignments with constraints and engineering challenges adjacent to Highway 43 and Willamette Shore Line.

Previous public involvement processes affirmed sustained interest in this trail. After the project steering committee finished the analysis phase, they strategized on cost-cutting project phasing and how to move the trail forward with funding in place. Last year's trail refinement study looked at improving project development and design elements from the analysis, and a series of concept alignments were produced. A cross-jurisdictional technical working group developed evaluation criteria and reported to the committee, and public open houses and stakeholder meetings with non-profit groups all culminated in a decision in early September of 2009. During Highway 43 outreach, residents said the project needs to maintain current vehicle traffic capacity while also adding bike and pedestrian facilities. It needs to be a regional trail that is compatible with local neighborhoods.

Mr. Monberg described three trail connections:

1. South Waterfront to Sellwood Bridge: An existing greenway could be improved while capital street improvements are already underway in South Portland. If more of the streetcar were placed on Macadam Avenue, trail viability in the Willamette Shore Line would be examined in order to understand right of way implications, ownership and development. Staff would look at the overall streetcar project considerations as part of the Locally Preferred Alternative, including improving existing bike capacity through Willamette Park. The South portal project would introduce sidewalks and bike lanes, and the existing greenway in the middle section could be improved. Coordination with the Sellwood Bridge Project and parks departments is also very important.
2. Sellwood Bridge to Lake Oswego: There are currently safety issues and no existing bicycle or pedestrian facilities in this area. There are trail opportunities adjacent to Powers Marine Park. South of the park, additional engineering is necessary to place a facility near Highway 43 and/or by Elk Rock Tunnel, which has user comfort issues in its 1400-foot length.
3. Downtown Lake Oswego: There is a great trails network and also park areas in the Foothills District that could be leveraged to continue north up the corridor. The refinement study looked at this area from a bicycle/pedestrian standpoint and discovered recreation opportunities continuing north, adjacent to Highway 43. For the streetcar alignment, there are two key constraints: Tryon Creek and the existing freight rail berm.

Mr. Monberg summarized that streetcar capital improvements would need to balance opportunity, connectivity and cost needs. The network should be expanded in the north and south where the population's needs are and connect to station areas. Future work program steps and scope of work need to be coordinated between multiple projects and jurisdictions, including the City of Portland, ODOT, two counties and the transit project steering committee. Capital funding opportunities need to

be leveraged. The trail project would be independent of a transit project, but would hopefully run parallel as much as possible. Metro has an active transportation strategy to look at federal and other funding to support pedestrian and bicycling connections. Applications for this corridor have been submitted for approval.

Ms. Katherine Schultz asked about consideration of a floating dock trail. Mr. Monberg replied that during the alternatives analysis, staff discussed the feasibility and looked at engineering of several options, including a bridge at the level of the right of way and a dock. Previous trolley tracks were moved into the tunnel from outside, due to rock fall concerns. There are also grade changes and environmental concerns closer to the Willamette River. Boring a new tunnel would be the most cost efficient, but this would need to be explored with trail users and nearby residents.

Mr. Michael Sisavic asked whether trail decisions were based on the right of way match value and would there be a way to capture this value if it received federal funding. Mr. Monberg replied that land use viability was not yet determined and there were ownership easements and rights to consider, including easements for rail purpose only. Mr. Oblatz asserted that this value could be captured, if the agency accepted the right of way as match, but it would depend on the funding source.

Mr. Kerry Chipman asked whether all three segments would be built at once. Mr. Monberg stated the goal was to do so, but that it was likely that some portions of the 6-mile length would be deferred long term, just like the 17-mile Springwater Corridor, which has had pieces filled in over time. Mr. Ed Abrahamson asked if the streetcar was not selected, could the right of way still be used for a trail alongside the trolley. Mr. Oblatz replied that it was possible, depending on legal status and how the components fit together.

Ms. Withrow offered copies of the steering committee trail recommendations memo and grant application (included as part of the meeting record).

At the next meeting, staff will discuss community impacts in the DEIS, including neighborhood connectivity, walkability and impacted populations. Safety and security topics will include personal security at stations, facilities design and station safety. TriMet will present, and the group discussion will inform the DEIS preparation.

Ms. Withrow is doing a demographics tracking study of this committee, and federal Title 6 rules request information about populations over age 65. She will send out a private e-mail to committee members, asking them to reply whether they are part of this demographic.

V. FEBRUARY MEETING TOPIC/PROCESS

The next meeting was originally scheduled for Wednesday, Feb. 17, 5 to 7 p.m., but has been rescheduled to occur on Monday, March 15, 5 to 7 p.m., location to be confirmed.

VI. SOUTHWEST CHARTER SCHOOL STUDENT PODCAST UPDATE

Mr. Cliff Higgins stated that Southwest Charter School, located in the Johns Landing area, suggested a Metro partnership to create a series of podcasts using the project as a launching point. The first one is now available on Metro's website at www.oregonmetro.gov/lakeoswego. It is 12 minutes long, with four different chapters and focuses on streetcar history in the region and the Willamette Shore Line. The students are doing all of the writing and performing, including online transcripts and they received

no editorial feedback from Metro. They recently met with Oregon Iron Works, while preparing the next podcast, focused on the streetcar building industry in Oregon.

VII. PUBLIC COMMENT

R. A. Fontes stated that while several options would be faster than the streetcar and make the trail cheaper, only a light rail connection would decrease congestion from the eastside. On its own bridge, with bike, pedestrian and bus access, it would be the nucleus of a new system. It takes one hour to go from Milwaukie to PCC Sylvania, but a direct bus takes less than 30 minutes. The WES commuter rail in Washington County is a debacle for bus riders; its current operations deficit is \$3 million a year, or 30,000 bus hour equivalents. MAX operations costs are one-sixth of WES's on an hourly basis. A Milwaukie MAX extension would be cheaper to operate than the streetcar extension because the right of way would be much shorter, about 2 ½ miles versus 6 miles.

Mr. Bob Sack asked whether the project team had any comments regarding the recent FTA announcement about how projects are evaluated or scored. Mr. Obletz replied that no new rule was issued yet, but negotiations were ongoing as part of the transitional federal administration and congress. A new transportation bill is due out this fall. The livability initiative proposed by Congressman Earl Blumenauer and others was having an impact. There'd be a diminished priority for commercial development. Ms. Withrow added that the new rule-making process and standards may or may not apply to this project. The FTA will issue a draft of guidance and rules and hold a comment period.

VI. ADJOURN

There being no further business, Ms. Hull adjourned the meeting at 6:37 p.m.

Meeting summary respectfully submitted by:

Jenny Dempsey Stein

Attachments to the Record:

Item	Topic	Document Date	Description	Document Number
1	Agenda	1/20/2010	January 2010 Meeting Agenda	01202010locac-01
2	Meeting minutes	11/16/2009	LOPTP Community Advisory Committee #2	111609locac-02
3	Meeting packet	1/20/2010	Tour questions and three background memos	01202010locac-03
4	LOPT Trail Memo	9/23/2009	LOPT Trail Project Recommendation	09232009locac-04
5	Active Transportation Corridor	8/14/2009	Lake Oswego to Portland Active Transportation Corridor: Demonstration Project Submission	08142009locac-05