

# Metro | Agenda

Meeting: Lake Oswego to Portland Transit Project CAC  
Date: Monday, February 7, 2011  
Time: 5 to 7 p.m.  
Place: Waterfront Foursquare Church/Easter Seal Building  
5757 SW Macadam Ave., Portland  
Purpose: Discuss alternatives and elements of CAC final report  
Outcomes: Constructive discussion and shared understanding of tradeoffs between  
alternatives; approval of CAC recommendation to Steering Committee

---

5 p.m.	Welcome <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Review agenda</li><li>• Comments on meeting summary</li></ul>	McPeak
5:10 p.m.	Project development update <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Project update</li><li>• Member interests</li></ul>	Obletz
5:20 p.m.	Project alternative discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• No-build</li><li>• Enhanced bus</li><li>• Streetcar</li></ul>	McPeak/all
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:**

*Feb.15, 2011, if needed to reach a CAC recommendation to the Steering Committee*



Lake Oswego Community Advisory Committee  
Tuesday, January 18, 2011  
5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.  
West End Building - 4101 Kruse Way, Lake Oswego

**Committee Members Present**

Ellie McPeak, Chair	Old Town Neighborhood Association
Ed Abrahamson	Bicycle Transportation Alliance representative
Beverly Bookin	Johns Landing Owners' Association
Matt Brown	Foothills owner representative
Heather Chrisman	Lakewood Neighborhood Association
Mary Beth Coffey	Foothills resident
Andrew Franklin	Riverdale CPO
Paul Graham	LO Downtown retail business owner
Jon Jackson	Birdshill CPO /Neighborhood Association
Dave Jorling	First Addition Neighborhood Association
Beth Kieres	Willamette Neighborhood Association
Pascal Pascuzzi	South Waterfront property owner
Bob Sack	Old Town Neighborhood resident
Katherine Schultz	Fielding Road resident
Mike Sisavic	South Portland Neighborhood Association

**Committee Members Excused**

John Betts	McVey South Shore Neighborhood Association
Pete Collins	South Waterfront resident
Lydia Lipman	Stampher Road/WSL Property owner
Ken Love	South Portland Neighborhood Association
Tom Moisan	Johns Landing business owner
Eli Morgan	Riverdale CPO
Vern Rifer	Portland Streetcar Inc. CAC representative
Joy Strull	Evergreen Neighborhood Association

**Alternate Members Present**

Warren Bacon	For Joy Strull
Kerry Chipman	For Ken Love
Elizabeth English	For Eli Morgan
John Ohman	For Lydia Lipman

**Project Staff**

Barbara Smolak, Jamie Snook, Joe Recker, Doug Oblatz, Ann Becklund, Karen Withrow, Jenn Tuerk

## **I. WELCOME**

Chair Ellie McPeak called the meeting to order at 5:02 pm, noting the majority of the meeting would be spent discussing the project alternatives.

Ms. Karen Withrow next presented the committee with two date options for the February meeting, February 7<sup>th</sup> or February 8<sup>th</sup>. After some discussion, it was decided that the next meeting would take place February 7<sup>th</sup> in Johns Landing.

Chair McPeak asked for any comments on the meeting summary from the December 15 meeting. Questions were asked about the following:

- Ellie McPeak asked what the volume to capacity ratio would be for streetcar as compared to the ratio provided for enhanced bus in the packet handout copy of the Questions and Answers provided to Lake Oswego City Councilors, Question 5, bullet 1.
- Paul Graham noted that mitigation strategies will be developed for these areas regardless of the alternative chosen (enhanced bus or streetcar) but nothing would be done under the no-build.
- Referring to the same Questions and Answers document, a question was raised about Table 1 under Question 2, whether it considering existing or future zoning and development. Ms. Jamie Snook indicated it refers to development that is on the ground now.
- A question was asked about whether someone is proposing a Washington Square size development in Lake Oswego. Project Manager, Doug Oblatz said no, but explained that some have compared potential future development in Lake Oswego to that in Washington Square.

## **II. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT UPDATE**

Mr. Oblatz began his update by reminding those present that the public comment period on the project ends January 31, 2011. He further stated that recommendations for the Locally Preferred Alternative from the CAC, Project Management group and Steering Committee will hopefully be complete at the end of February. He noted that the City of Portland has penciled in the LPA for March 9, 2011 and the City of Lake Oswego is looking at holding two meetings on the subject – first a presentation and hearing which would then be followed by a discussion and decision. Actions by the counties, Portland Streetcar Inc., TriMet and Metro would occur after that.

## **III. PROJECT ALTERNATIVE DISCUSSION**

Beginning the alternatives discussion, Chair McPeak noted that Ms. Withrow would be taking notes on the board as the discussion proceeded and asked that anyone who notices a missed point to please speak up. Ms. Withrow summarized and she asked for any further opinions on the No Build option since the discussion at the last meeting.

A summary of the alternatives discussion is attached (see document number 011811CAC-02).

## **IV. PUBLIC COMMENT**

Mr. Steve White of the Oregon Public Health Institute stated that the health impacts of this project are not evaluated as part of the DEIS but a parallel process looked at key health indicators. The full report and a summary is available on the website and summaries are available at this meeting. To quickly summarize the findings of the health impact assessment, Mr. White indicated that streetcar creates the highest level of health benefit when evaluated across all health factors. However, all transit improves physical activity and therefore health. With streetcar construction there are air quality impacts that would need to be and can be minimized and mitigated.

P. Davis of Lake Oswego stated that he is really concerned about the project cost adding that Lake Oswego already has too much on its plate in regards to cost.

## **VI. ADJOURN**

Before adjourning, Chair McPeak reminded the committee of the date for the next meeting (February 7, 2011) adding that it would be held in Johns Landing.

Ms. Withrow added that she would compile a summary report of the evening's LPA discussion to help with formulating a recommendation to go to the Steering Committee. Ms. Withrow noted that, depending on the outcome of the February 7<sup>th</sup> meeting, it might be necessary to hold one additional meeting before voting on an alternative to advance. She asked that committee members please hold Tuesday, February 15<sup>th</sup> in case further discussion was deemed necessary.

Mr. Sack asked if the committee would be voting on segments or the whole project, Ms. Withrow stated the discussion notes would reflect committee conversation and preferences and act as a starting place for identifying areas of consensus and/or majority/minority opinion.

In regards to the final vote of the committee, Chair McPeak noted that if there is a split the LOPT Steering Committee will look at the number of votes for each alternative, not just the most popular, when making its recommendation.

Mr. Rifer wondered how the vote would occur - would the committee start with discussion on the segments and alternatives and then look at the top two choices? Ms. Withrow noted she would organize the CAC discussion notes based on the outline of a Locally Preferred Alternative that was provided to the CAC by the Project Manager at their October meeting. That is arranged by design option, alternative, station locations and other outstanding issues.

Ms English asked if more information will be provided on project cost and financing. Ms. Withrow noted that, in comparison to similar projects, this project has an equal or greater amount of information about cost and financing given that we are at the DEIS stage of the process.

Katherine Schultz said that we must not lose sight that this a Draft EIS and further details will be worked out related to design, impacts, costs and financing as the process progresses.

Chari McPeak noted that while the recommendation of a Locally Preferred Alternative is a major decision point, it is not the final decision on the project.

Ms. Bookin stated that the CAC is an advisory committee which has been asked to provide input. The time has come to bite the bullet and make a decision on what to recommend.

Mr. Jackson agreed with Ms. Bookin adding that he would like to vote on all three alternatives and not vote further between the top two alternatives.

There being no further business, Chair McPeak adjourned the meeting at 6:58 p.m.

*Meeting summary respectfully submitted by:*

<SIGN HERE FOR FINAL VERSION>

---

*Scott Steyer*

Attachments to the Record:

Item	Topic	Document Date	Description	Document Number
1	Agenda	01/18/11	January 2011 Meeting Agenda	011811CAC-01
2	LPA	01/18/11	Notes from discussion for Community Advisory Committee Recommendation	011811CAC-02
3	LID's	12/23/10	Memo on LID questions raised at the 12/15/2010 meeting	011811CAC-03
4	Letter	12/22/10	Lake Oswego City Council Questions and Answers from Metro Councilor Collette	011811CAC-04

**LAKE OSWEGO TO PORTLAND TRANSIT PROJECT**  
**Notes for Community Advisory Committee Recommendation**  
**DRAFT - February 2, 2011**

---

Below are notes from the last two Community Advisory Committee meetings organized into the general recommendation outline provided by the Project Manager at the October 25, 2010 CAC meeting. As CAC discussion has focused first on design options for streetcar in order to consider a “proposed streetcar concept” alongside the enhanced bus, this outline is organized by streetcar design option, alternatives (enhanced bus, streetcar, no-build), stops/station locations and other outstanding issues.

**STREETCAR DESIGN OPTIONS**

1. Johns Landing: ***support for Macadam In-Street design option***

- Willamette Shore Line:
  - Streetcar on the Willamette Shore Line right of way will impact quality of life (not just noise, vibration and visibility but the intangible quality). If on Macadam, impacts are eliminated.
- Macadam In Street (note: no preference for Macadam Additional Lane option):
  - Streetcar in-street on Macadam puts stops where they need to be to serve neighborhoods and avoids many property impacts.
  - Streetcar in Johns Landing is all about neighborhood redevelopment which means different math for residents who live there – it’s not about cost they’ll pay out but money coming back in property taxes and system development charges to improve the neighborhood.
  - There may be a short-term benefit (use of more of the Willamette Shore Line right of way value) to the Willamette Shore Line design option, but that is unacceptable to Johns Landing residents because it blocks access to the river, has property impacts and doesn’t provide the same benefits. Streetcar has far more benefit to the community if operated in-street on Macadam where the neighborhood wants to see increased development and more transit riders. The thinking there will be more riders than the DEIS predicts since it can’t

count the effects of future development. They see streetcar as a way to increase private investment in development which will, in turn, produce substantially more property taxes and system development charges for investments in water and sewer systems. It can also lead to a better balance of jobs and housing in Johns Landing so some people don't have to commute out of the area to work, further decreasing traffic.

- Because the LID concept being discussed in Johns Landing has always included residential property owners as well as commercial, the cost burden will be spread over more people and will be more reasonable than the recent one in South Waterfront which was difficult for property owners there to bear. All of Johns Landing property owners will benefit for less cost.
- While an LID is not feasible in the unincorporated areas of Clackamas and Multnomah counties and Lake Oswego will need to decide whether to use an LID and how, Johns Landing has a legitimate option to use the LID to recoup right of way costs so that streetcar can benefit the neighborhood and the whole City of Portland.
- With the streetcar alternative running in-street on Macadam Avenue, Bicycle Transportation Alliance wants to see streetcar on Macadam and the right of way used for a bike/pedestrian path. They challenge the condo associations to change current right of way easements to allow that, something they have expressed interest in doing.

2. Riverdale/Dunthorpe: ***support for studying both design options further (Willamette Shore Line and Riverwood Road)***

3. Lake Oswego: ***support for studying both design options further(UPRR right of way and Foothills Road)***

### **ALTERNATIVE (MODE)**

1. No Build

- *Pluses*
  - Maintains transit service within Riverdale neighborhood

- Could consider right of way for bike/walk trail instead
- Less money spent or money could be spent in other corridors
- *Minuses*
  - Head in the sand option – pretends system is okay today and nothing will change in the future to affect corridor conditions
  - Highway 43 corridor remains a choke point
  - Doesn't benefit jobs, development or housing
  - Investment less likely with flexible transit (bus) because development is encouraged by and benefits from improved transit
  - Trends here and world-wide show this value of nearby transit is real and rises over time
  - No opportunity to leverage Federal money
  - Doesn't get value out of Willamette Shore Line Right of Way
  - Urban reserve expanded to include Stafford/Borland neighborhood and it's irresponsible not to plan for better transit
  - Doesn't address effects on environment

## 2. Enhanced Bus:

- *Pluses*
  - Anyone on transit takes cars off the road and makes room for someone else
  - New technology, if proposed in the future for enhanced bus, could reduce air quality affects
  - May be able to use Willamette Shore Line right of way for something else (bike/pedestrian trail)
- *Minuses*
  - Buses get stuck in traffic and frequent headways will be disruptive
  - Doesn't address congestion on Highway 43
  - Frequency of service not as good as streetcar
  - Means loss of service in Johns Landing due to removal of five stops compared to today's service and this will make buses so full that people can't get on
  - Means loss of service due to removal of a stop in Riverdale, leaving a 1.7 mile stretch between the Sellwood and Riverwood stops

- Buses too full (e.g. CAC member boarded bus on bus mall in downtown Portland 1-18-11. By the edge of downtown, bus was “packed.” In mid-Johns Landing, when she got off, bus was still “standing room only” at only 4:20 p.m., not even the peak commute)
- Money is wasted on enhanced bus because buses are well-used now but there is still flat or disinvestment in Johns Landing. Even in economic boom times Johns Landing did not see investment. Property values are flat or decreasing. The retail environment is poor. Residents are coming by the thousands to South Waterfront and could use Johns Landing as a place to find services nearby if there were better travel connections.
- Bus has not generated neighborhood and community preservation or development. Aggressive action is needed to overcome these long-term trends and take advantage of existing locations for residents, services and jobs close to downtown.
- Enhanced bus is the lower volume option at 700,000 riders/year (streetcar is 1.18-1.28 million rides/year)
- Enhanced bus brings 300 parking spaces to the Old Town neighborhood in Lake Oswego without the potential for redevelopment that has been proven to occur with rail investment, like streetcar. Impacts without the benefits.
- Based on a non-scientific email survey completed by some Old Town neighbors, only about 25% like enhanced bus and many did not realize there was a park and ride planned with the enhanced bus alternative.
- Enhanced bus requires \$20 million in local match that cannot include the value of the Willamette Shore Line right of way and makes system development charge revenue in Lake Oswego less likely. According to Williams, Dame and White, property owners in Foothills will not support an LID for enhanced bus. Other sources are more likely required to fund local match.
- Operation and maintenance cost is higher. Over 20 years, this means \$30 million (difference between enhanced bus and streetcar) will be needed from TriMet’s payroll tax or it will be taken away from other service.
- Enhanced bus vehicle holds fewer riders than streetcar and doesn’t last as long. Average useful life of a bus is 12 years while average useful life of a rail vehicle is 40 years.

- Buses pollute environment more than streetcar

NOTE: during the discussion of enhanced bus, a suggestion was made that enhanced bus could be a benefit in combination with streetcar from Portland to Johns Landing and across the Sellwood Bridge. Another suggestion was to add express service to the Line #35 instead of the enhanced bus.

### 3. Streetcar

- *Pluses*

- The streetcar would carry 1,500 more trips a day than enhanced bus which adds up to over 500,000 more trips a year.
- Not leveraging the past investment in the Willamette Shore Line right of way means losing a tremendous opportunity to put its current value to use as local match.
- If you take the capital local match range for streetcar and subtract the capital local match for enhanced bus to get the difference and divide that by the additional operations and maintenance cost required to operate the enhanced bus (\$1.54 million per year, adjusted down by 1/3 to make them 2010\$ not 2017\$), it only takes 18-32 years to pay off the additional capital cost. The streetcar will be operating far longer than that so this is a good investment.
- Streetcars have more seats than buses, actually add capacity and provide a travel option besides Highway 43. More streetcar vehicles could be added to the route in the future. Even those who say traffic isn't that bad today should think to what it will be by 2035.
- Facilitates quality and a variety of housing, access to jobs, and density where we want it (in Lake Oswego), which could have a positive effect on schools and enable all kinds of people will to find it easier to leave their cars at home.
- Streetcar is faster than enhanced bus and will continue to operate fast despite gridlock on Highway 43.
- Streetcar provides a savings in auto delay during rush hour that may be small now but at least moves us in the direction of addressing long commute times.
- Streetcar removes 41-42 tons of CO<sup>2</sup> from the environment daily. This adds up to about 15,000 tons per year, a significant amount.
- Streetcar plugs Lake Oswego into the regional transit system.
- Cost to build streetcar will never be less than it is today
- Streetcar will happen someday and cost will only increase. While waiting, other projects may move ahead in the line for federal resources and we won't have a team at the federal level to support the project and project funding

- Everyone pays their federal taxes and that money is budgeted and spent for programs including New Starts funding for rail projects, whether Portland gets any of the funds or not. This project provides an opportunity bring some federal dollars home to benefit how we grow as a region.
  - We should compete strongly for federal funds. Oregon sends much more money to DC than we get back. Go for it.
  - For the West Linn residents, both enhanced bus and streetcar have some benefits. Streetcar requires a transfer in Lake Oswego but may provide better bus connections to other places (i.e. Beaverton) in the future, emits less CO<sup>2</sup> and is more predictable/reliable. Enhanced bus doesn't require a transfer but gets stuck in traffic.
  - Many professionals live in West Linn and ride transit due to environmental benefits. Thinking about the need to transfer in Lake Oswego, there are many ways to get to the streetcar connection – some may be dropped off, others may walk or bike, others may take the bus and transfer.
  - Leaves more room on 43 for and supports infrastructure for pedestrians and bicycles.
  - Better connects Johns Landing to South Waterfront and downtown.
  - Streetcar is a regional solution that provides connectivity between centers so it makes sense to do now
- *Minuses*
    - Some residents in the Birdshill area think that streetcar is a good project in ideal times but these are not ideal times when schools may close and people are without jobs.
    - Concern about where funding will come from. Lake Oswego has other expensive projects going on.
    - Density and ridership doesn't support transit investment in a dumbbell situation (development potential only at two ends of project). Invest funds elsewhere.
    - Streetcar could increase traffic.
    - Concern about proximity of streetcar tracks to river.
    - To address traffic, streetcar should go on I5, I205.

- Concern that ownership of Willamette Shore Line right of way has influenced analysis in DEIS and that if the right of way wasn't owned, this would be last corridor to have HCT. Maybe the Willamette Shore Line right of way should be sold or used another way.
- Hard to believe Willamette Shore Line is worth about \$80 million. Johns Landing condo values down about one-third in economic recession. Has the value of the Willamette Shore Line decreased by a similar amount?
- Including federal and local funds for capital cost and the operating cost savings of streetcar over enhanced bus (\$1.54 million per year), the capital cost will take time to pay off.
- Lake Oswego residents may not want to see streetcar and new development (per Riverdale/Dunthorpe)

### STOP/STATION LOCATIONS

- Enhanced Bus: ***recommend stops as identified in DEIS***
- Streetcar: ***recommend stop in DEIS plus analysis of two additional or different stops in Preliminary Engineering and the FEIS: Pendleton and in the vicinity of Riverdale Road and the Lewis and Clark trail***

### OUTSTANDING ISSUES

The following additional issues should be considered in Preliminary Engineering and the FEIS:

- Potential revisions to Enhanced Bus conceptual design: ***none noted***
- Study potential revisions to Streetcar conceptual design: ***sidewalk improvements and alternatives to Boundary entry/exit with Macadam In-Street; pedestrian improvement between Carolina and Nevada along Macadam and potential for keeping intersection of Riverwood and Highway 43 open***