

Metro | Agenda

Meeting: Lake Oswego to Portland Transit Project CAC #6
Date: Monday, June 21, 2010
Time: 5 to 7 p.m.
Place: Lake Oswego City Hall, council chambers, 380 A Ave., Lake Oswego
Purpose: Review traffic impact analysis
Outcome: Understanding of traffic impacts for the streetcar and enhanced bus alternatives as compared to the no-build alternative

5 p.m.	Welcome <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review agenda• Comments on meeting summary	McPeak
5:10 p.m.	Project development update <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Additional Macadam option economic study• Schedule and decision-making update• CAC recommendation process	Obletz
5:30 p.m.	DEIS traffic findings <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Traffic analysis• Streetcar traffic findings• Enhanced bus traffic findings• Discussion	Cullerton
6:15 p.m.	Roundtable <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Committee comments and discussion	Committee
6:45 p.m.	Public comment	
7 p.m.	Adjourn	

Please note: Public comment will be welcomed at all CAC meetings. Individuals are asked to limit comments to two minutes at each meeting.

Upcoming meeting dates:

July 19, 2010 in Johns Landing

Aug. 16, 2010 in Lake Oswego (date tentative based on membership availability)

Sept. 20, 2010 in Johns Landing

Oct. 18, 2010 in Lake Oswego



Lake Oswego to Portland Transit Project Community Advisory Committee
Monday May 17, 2010
5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.
Waterfront Foursquare Church, 5757 Southwest Macadam Ave., Portland

Committee Members Present

Ellie McPeak, Chair
Beverly Bookin
Mary Beth Coffey
Andrew Franklin
Dave Jorling
Beth Kieres
Bryce Linton
Lydia Lipman
Pascal Pascuzzi
Vern Rifer
Katherine Schultz
Mike Sisavic
Jeremy Solly
Joy Strull

Old Town Neighborhood Association
Johns Landing Owners' Association
Foothills resident
Riverdale CPO
First Addition Neighborhood Association
Willamette Neighborhood Association
Birdshill CPO Chair
Stampher Road/WSL property owner
South Waterfront property owner
Portland Streetcar Inc. CAC representative
Fielding Road resident
Willamette Shores Condos, South Portland
Neighborhood Association
South Waterfront resident , South Portland NA
Evergreen Neighborhood Association

Committee Members Excused

Ed Abrahamson
John Betts
Matt Brown
Heather Chrisman
Paul Graham
Ken Love
Tom Moisan
Eli Morgan
Bob Sack

Bicycle Transportation Alliance representative
McVey South Shore Neighborhood Association
Foothills owner representative
Lakewood Neighborhood Association
LO Downtown retail business owner
South Portland Neighborhood Association
Johns Landing business owner
Riverdale CPO
Old Town Neighborhood Association

Alternate Members Present

Gerik Kransky for Ed Abrahamson
Christe Carlson White for Matt Brown
Kerry Chipman for Ken Love
Pete Nickerson for Eli Morgan

Metro Staff

Karen Withrow, Cliff Higgins, Jamie Snook

Additional Project Staff

Kristin Hull	CH2M Hill, facilitator
Doug Oblatz	Shiels Oblatz and Johnsen, project manager
Brant Williams	City of Lake Oswego
Tom Markgraf	Markgraf and Associates
Mauricio LeClerc	City of Portland
Nancy Gronowski	Portland Parks and Recreation
Ralph Drewfs	Oregon Department of Transportation
Patrick Sweeney	City of Portland
Barabara Smolak	Clackamas County
Ann Becklund	TriMet
Joe Recker	TriMet

I. WELCOME

Chair Ellie McPeak reviewed the agenda and noted that there were a few changes from past meetings. She highlighted that public comment would only be taken at the end of meetings from this point forward, but invited anyone who could not stay until the end to provide comment now since this is a change in protocol.

The group reviewed the April 19 meeting summary from and made the following changes:

- Section IV. Parks and recreational resources key themes: Change the end of the third paragraph discussion un-permitted informal parking areas to having signs that read “No Parking 10 p.m. to 5 a.m.” and note that parking is allowed during the daytime rather than not at all.
- Section VI. Visual Quality and Aesthetics: Intro and Key Themes. Change the seventh paragraph to state “At the Dunthorpe and Riverdale area”.

II. ROUNDTABLE: CAC PROCESS IMPROVEMENT

Chair McPeak requested that group discuss the format of the CAC meetings and suggesting improvements to the group’s processes. The group raised the following suggestions:

- Give the committee more time to provide input and respond to presentation materials.
- Provide more time for free flowing exchange between committee members – roundtable may accomplish this.
- Focus less on ending meetings on time or consider longer meetings.
- Staff should follow up more; currently, the committee provides input but nothing changes.
- Formalize local discussion of local issues outside of meetings by including a time for report out from any local discussions.
- Provide guidance on how CAC can influence decision-making.
- Communicate in ways that move committee forward.
- Provide a summary for entire CAC of issues that are resolved offline.

Staff agreed to review the meeting format and make changes based on committee input.

III. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT UPDATE

Mr. Doug Oblatz provided an update on the project. He told the group that he was concerned that the project team had not clearly communicated the level of information that would be available to support the CAC in developing a recommendation on the preferred alternative at the end of the DEIS. Mr. Oblatz explained that, as with building a house, one decides to build the house or not and where to build it without knowing where each light switch would be. He used this analogy to explain that while the team does not know all the details of the transit alternatives, they will be able to provide decision-makers with enough information to decide among the alternatives.

Mr. Oblatz also briefly addressed a concern about too little information being provided about the enhanced bus alternative. He explained that the enhanced bus alternative would have fewer overall changes in the corridor, so there is less to discuss with respect to some environmental topics. He explained that there would be more information with respect to other topics like ridership, cost and traffic.

Committee Discussion

Ms. Lydia Lipman asked if the committee will receive information about how streetcar and enhanced bus would connect to existing transit service. Ms. Jamie Snook explained that the discussion about connections to existing service would come during the ridership presentation in July or August.

Ms. Lipman asked when the committee would review the finance plan. Ms. Snook told the group that the finance plan would be presented in August.

Ms. Katherine Schultz asked when the group would review travel time data. Ms. Snook explained that travel time would be part of the ridership discussion.

Ms. Lipman asked what would happen if Foothills does not develop as planned or expected. Ms. Snook explained that we would address that issue later in this meeting.

Mr. Vern Rifer asked if the model can be used to test different scenarios like fuel costs or development patterns. Ms. Karen Withrow explained that the model could be used that way, but the project work plan only calls for modeling the build and no-build alternatives using existing assumptions about land use, fuel costs and other factors.

Ms. Joy Strull asked why the study was not considering other bus options with more improvements. Ms. Snook explained that in 2007 the team considered bus rapid transit with bus bypass lanes at the intersections on Highway 43. They found that there were major improvements associated with those changes because the intersection queues were so long. Mr. Dave Jorling noted that LOPAC considered this alternative.

Mr. Rifer asked why all categories of impacts were not being evaluated for all alternatives. Ms. Snook explained that, while all impacts areas will be considered for all alternatives, the table is intended to highlight which impact areas will have the most findings for each alternative.

Mr. Mike Sisavic asked if the bus would be an express service. Ms. Snook explained that it would be similar to express service with fewer stops (13 with the enhanced bus instead of 26 stops on the existing Line 35 bus) and more frequent service.

Mr. Andrew Franklin and Ms. Strull noted that the enhanced bus would be better for some riders but would serve fewer people because the stops farther apart.

Action Taken

None.

III. PRESENTATION – GROWTH FORECASTING ASSUMPTIONS – JOHN CULLERTON, URS

Mr. John Cullerton discussed how growth forecasts are developed and the assumptions that support the growth assumptions. He noted that his presentation is intended to clear up questions that arose at past meetings about how growth would occur in the corridor and how planned growth would affect ridership and traffic forecasts.

Mr. Cullerton began by explaining that planners typically look 20 to 30 years into the future when assessing transportation systems. He noted that in this case a 25-year forecast (year 2035) has been used. He told that group that in 2035, the growth model projects that 1.3 million more people would live in the four county area and that about 7,200 more residents and 2,900 more jobs would be in the Lake Oswego to Portland corridor than are there today. He reminded the group that this forecast is based on current comprehensive planning and does not anticipate land use changes beyond local comprehensive plans.

Mr. Cullerton reviewed specific growth assumptions by segment of the project area and noted that there would be lots of growth in Johns Landing and Lake Oswego and less in the Riverdale/Dunthorpe area.

Mr. Cullerton explained to the group that the growth projections are based on agreed-upon regional household and employment forecasts and include both traffic forecasts and ridership forecasts.

Presentation Questions

Several committee members asked if the population and employment forecasts would change based on the construction of transit options. Mr. Cullerton explained that the forecasted number of jobs and residents in the region and the corridor will not change based on the transit alternatives.

Mr. Kerry Chipman asked how accurate forecasts have been in the past. Mr. Cullerton explained that growth forecasts have been fairly accurate, but that things do change. He noted that Metro has the most sophisticated model in the nation. Chair McPeak noted that a 25 year forecast is never going to be exact.

Ms. Ann Becklund noted that ridership forecasting has been very accurate for the Westside MAX Blue Line and the Interstate MAX Yellow Line; the forecasting the MAX Green Line has been close, but ridership has been a little lower than expected, probably due to the economy.

Mr. Franklin asked how the growth model relates to ridership. Mr. Cullerton explained that the ridership model considers where people live and work and the transportation choices available in those places. The model relies on a travel behavior survey to help determine which mode a person will take.

Mr. Jorling asked if fuel costs are factored in to the model. Mr. Cullerton responded that historically there have not been big changes in travel behavior based on energy costs, so energy costs are not part of today's model. He noted that energy costs may be considered in future models.

Ms. Lipman noted that there is much growth expected in Foothills and that it would be interesting to see the ridership results without the Foothills growth included. Mr. Cullerton noted that the growth assumptions for Foothills were developed with the City of Lake Oswego and could be accomplished within the existing comprehensive plan. Chair McPeak noted that there is significant city support for development in Foothills.

Mr. Rifer asked if the model could test "what if" scenarios related to development patterns or gas prices. Ms. Withrow explained that the model could be used that way, but for transit projects we hold growth assumptions constant and that additional modeling work would be out of the scope of the project.

Action Taken

None.

V. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. R.A. Fontes suggested that the committee reconsider only accepting comments at the end of the meetings. He noted that the committee will not be able to consider the comments of the public in their deliberation if the public can't comment at the beginning of the meeting. He also provided a handout explaining that streetcar will negatively impact bus service in the corridor.

Mr. Robert Shaw asked how much demand is there for transit between Lake Oswego and Washington County instead of to downtown Portland. He noted that many Lake Oswego residents travel to Washington County for work.

Mr. David Cohen, Friends of Tryon Creek State Park, reminded the group that Tryon Creek is in a culvert under Highway 43 and that streetcar will impact Tryon Creek. He noted that this project is an opportunity of urban restoration of the creek.

Ms. Vicki Thomas, Willamette Shores Condos, asked about the 1994 travel behavior survey and wanted to know how large an area was covered with this survey. Mr. Cullerton explained that the 6,000 households surveyed were throughout the Metro area.

Mr. Ian Nichols asked why the ridership forecasts do not reflect more dense development with streetcar than without.

VI. ADJOURN

The next meeting will be June 21, in a Lake Oswego location to be determined, probably at the Lakewood Center. The agenda for next meeting will be reviewed.

There being no further business, Chair Ellie McPeak adjourned the meeting at 7 p.m.

Meeting summary respectfully submitted by:

<SIGN HERE FOR FINAL VERSION>

Dawn Parker, CH2M HILL

Attachments to the Record:

Item	Topic	Document Date	Description	Document Number
1	Agenda	5/17/2010	May 2010 meeting agenda	051710cac-01
2	Meeting summary	5/17/2010	April 2010 meeting summary	051710cac-02
3	Fact sheet	10/23/2010	Transportation Research and Modeling Services overview	051710cac-03
4	Chart	5/17/2010	CAC issues-raised matrix	051710cac-04
5	Public comment	5/17/2010	Submitted by RA Fontes	051710cac-05



PROJECT PARTNERS

- Cities of Lake Oswego and Portland
- Clackamas and Multnomah counties
- Oregon Department of Transportation
- Portland Streetcar Inc.
- TriMet
- Metro



Choosing an alternative

Project partners have been working to develop a transit project that meets future travel demand between Lake Oswego and Portland, supports local and regional land use plans, and garners public acceptance and community support.

The process began with a wide range of alternatives that included bus, rail and river transit as well as widening or using reversible auto lanes on Highway 43. After discussion with the community-based project advisory committee and the public, in addition to technical analysis, the list of alternatives was narrowed to three alternatives: no-build, enhanced bus and rapid streetcar.

For the past few months, project partners have been completing a detailed analysis of the benefits and trade-offs of the three alternatives as well as different design options for the streetcar alternative. This analysis will soon be published for review and comment as the Draft Environmental Impact Statement ahead of the determination of the Locally Preferred Alternative to meet the transit needs of the corridor.

What do you think?

Which mix of benefits and trade-offs from the no-build, enhanced bus and streetcar alternatives offers the best transit option for the corridor?

With the publication of the DEIS expected in August 2010, project partners will ask the public to review and comment on the analysis results during the 45-day comment period to help decision-makers choose a Locally Preferred Alternative.

You'll have a chance to visit open houses and the project website for details about the project and the DEIS analysis, and comment online or at public hearing.

Decision-making timeline

Late August	September	Late September-October	October-December
DEIS published	Open houses	Public hearing	Partner agency action on Locally Preferred Alternative recommendation
Comment period begins		Community advisory committee recommendation	
		Comment period ends	
		Comment report published	



Locally Preferred Alternative

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement analysis allows the public and decision-makers to thoroughly evaluate the alternatives (no-build, enhanced bus or rapid streetcar) and design (route) options that provide the best solutions to transportation needs in the corridor. The DEIS analyzes benefits and trade-offs of the physical characteristics, operating plans, ridership, revenues and social and environmental impacts.

The Locally Preferred Alternative is selected as the favored solution. This alternative will be advanced to preliminary engineering and is further analyzed in a Final Environmental Impact Statement.

The FEIS will respond to the substantive comments received from the public and other government agencies during the DEIS comment period. The FEIS will also define and commit the project to mitigation of impacts as identified in preliminary engineering.

Determining the Locally Preferred Alternative

The project steering committee will consider public comments, the DEIS analysis and recommendations from the community advisory committee and project management group to develop a recommendation on the Locally Preferred Alternative. The steering committee recommendation will be considered by the Lake Oswego and Portland planning commissions and city councils as well as elected or appointed officials at Clackamas and Multnomah counties, Portland Streetcar Inc., TriMet and Oregon Department of Transportation.

Once confirmed by partner agencies, the recommendation will be forwarded to the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation, a 17-member committee of elected officials and agency representatives that make recommendations to the Metro Council on transportation needs in the region. The JPACT recommendation will advance to the Metro Council for final adoption.

Find out more

Learn more about the project, process and previous analyses at www.oregonmetro.gov/lakeoswego.

To sign up for e-mail updates and notifications, send e-mail to trans@oregonmetro.gov or call 503-797-1756.

Community advisory committee

The committee has been meeting monthly since fall 2009 to learn about the topics covered in the DEIS, provide feedback on the analysis, discuss the emerging themes from the data and, ultimately, provide a recommendation to the project steering committee on a Locally Preferred Alternative.

The community advisory committee includes members from the Johns Landing area, the unincorporated areas of Multnomah and Clackamas counties, Lake Oswego and interest groups such as the bicycle, pedestrian and transit-dependant communities.

Community advisory committee meetings are open to the public, and meeting information is available on the project website.