

# BARBUR CONCEPT PLAN

*Creating a Long-Term Vision for Barbur Boulevard*

## TECHNICAL ADVISORY GROUP MEETING #3 SUMMARY

March 7, 2012  
9:30-11:00 a.m.  
1900 SW 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Room 7A

### **Introductions/Announcements/Schedule Review**

Jay opened the meeting at 9:35 am, and led off the introductions. Attendees introduced themselves.

### **Open House / Survey – what did we hear?**

Morgan Tracy summarized the comments and suggestions staff heard at the open house and subsequent on-line survey. There were no questions or comments from the TAG members. Additional open house comments can be found here:

<http://www.portlandonline.com/bps/index.cfm?c=57178&a=386683>

### **Vision and Goals (version 3) for the Barbur Concept Plan**

Jay reported that the CWG agreed to the latest version of the Vision and Goals. He reminded the TAG that these goals will remain flexible and may be revisited if they are not helpful in evaluating the alternative scenarios.

### **Discussion about capacity, speed, and congestion**

Presentation here: <http://www.portlandonline.com/bps/index.cfm?a=387963&c=55309>

John Fregonese gave the group a short overview of the presentation given to the CWG about traffic speed and capacity, and alternative approaches to roadway design that considers more than just moving cars. Lidwien Rahman objected to John's assertion that removing a traffic lane did not reduce capacity. John clarified that the purpose of the overview was to address the need to slow traffic down in particular nodes to make them more livable and how that would not directly affect roadway capacity. Sean Batty noted that the terms capacity and congestion were being used interchangeably. He suggested taking speed out of the equation and framing the issue as how much congestion are people willing to accept to get to the places they want to go. Dave Unsworth reminded the group that Barbur was linked to I-5, and that Barbur capacity was an issue when I-5 backs up. Judith Gray observed that the presentation information was more tailored to limited access highways, Barbur is different. John agreed, but noted that the road's overall capacity performance was directly tied to intersection performance. Sean countered that solutions to increase capacity at intersections are usually the most detrimental to other travel modes. Lidwien concurred that if you are designing a roadway to solve LOS (level of service) or v/c (vehicle to capacity ratio) then you will get the wrong outcome for placemaking. ODOT gets that, and is not seeking to add lanes to Barbur. John Gillam observed that the reaction to the presentation was receptive at the CWG and helped to lift some misconceptions.

## Creating Alternatives

Presentation here: <http://www.portlandonline.com/bps/index.cfm?a=387964&c=55309>

Julia Reed recounted for the group the work done to date regarding the corridor-wide analysis and design concepts, different potential scenario themes for the corridor, and more specific ideas for each of the seven focus areas. Dave Unsworth noted that high capacity transit is a real wildcard, since turns and access may be restricted depending on the HCT mode and alignment, access for these focus areas will need careful consideration. John Gillam noted that with Interstate Max, access was less of an issue since the grid street layout allowed for around the block left turn movement. Jay Sugnet reminded the group that this will be an iterative process with Metro, as the HCT alternatives are developed, the concepts for Barbur will be revisited to see how the two will be integrated.

Sean Batty inquired what sort of time horizon were these concepts intended to capture. Alex Joyce responded that these were typically over a 25 to 30 year timeframe. Jay Sugnet added that we would be evaluating where the market is today, what the pro-forma gap is to realize these concepts, and from there figure out how long it will take to fill the gap. Similarly, the analysis will help us understand if the presence of a station area or other infrastructure investment makes different alternatives more feasible. Lidwein Rahman noted that the Southwest Corridor work was modeling for population and employment based on a 2035 date. Malu Wilkinson observed that this work will result in an allocation (of jobs and population) for the corridor, but the cities' planning process could affect how this allocation is distributed. John Gillam noted that the corridor allocation approach was better, so that the local plans are not limited by rigid jurisdictional boundaries. Dave Unsworth noted that the allocations may not match the market, that we will want to remove the barriers that impede the vision. In the case of Barbur, zoning is not the problem, it's whether the area is attractive enough to bring along the market demand.

Marianne Fitzgerald observed that she's seen changes in the businesses that were not tailored for the local community, but rather for passers-through. It is the mix of businesses that will make it attractive for local residents to use and enjoy. Sean Batty urged that more mixing of uses is needed in the building typologies. The "retail+housing=good" formula does not go far enough. The thinking needs to be more diversified. John Fregonese responded that we could explore that further, for instance what is the role of corporate office space between Barbur and I-5? Leila Aman suggested that the development types align with greenhouse gas modeling that Metro is performing, so that the data can be more easily compared. Jay reminded folks that we want to keep this at a high level for now, and not get into the development types just yet.

John Gillam wondered about the role of "mid block" pedestrian intersections where the road cross section may be more narrow and easier to cross than at full street intersections (with turning lanes). Lidwein Rahman observed that the focus of this plan is on land use, but you also have to look at circulation. She reminded the group that the Barbur Streetscape Plan included some good information on intersection improvements. Marianne Fitzgerald noted that the building typologies will need a lot of street improvements to support them. Sean Batty cautioned that we shouldn't be showing concepts that don't work, in terms of traffic design or congestion issues. John Gillam also noted that topography is a significant challenge that needs to be considered (noting specifically the extension of SW 13<sup>th</sup> to Multnomah may be topographically constrained). Sean also suggested looking at the impacts of overhead utilities, and possibilities to underground these (on the heels of talking about unrealistic concepts).

Alex Joyce noted that land assembly opportunities are limited on Barbur, with the largest potential site being the 5 acre park and ride lot. Several expressed concern over losing the park and ride site for transit users. Jay noted that adding structured parking may be a cost to

developing the site, or that in combination with other changes in the area (changing freeway on and off ramps for example) that this may not be the most appropriate place for the park and ride. Lidwein Rahman added that we can't talk about the concept of removing I-5 ramps without talking about replacement. Sean Batty offered that any time there are existing transportation issues, people's imagination for land use potential will be stymied by the transportation challenges. He noted that we should stay focused on the land use benefits, but be realistic about what can be achieved with the transportation network.

**Wrap Up and Next Steps**

The next TAG meeting is scheduled for May 2, when we will brief the group on the second community forum, to be held on May 3<sup>rd</sup>.

Meeting adjourned 11:05 am

**TAG Members**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Interest</b>	<b>Present?</b>
Leila Aman	Transit Oriented Development	Yes
Shannon Axtell	Natural Resources and Infrastructure	Yes
Sean Batty	Transit	Yes
Kristin Cooper	Land Use Implementation	Yes
Ann Debbautt	Land Use	Yes
Marianne Fitzgerald	Public Involvement	Yes
Crista Gardner	Transportation	No
John Gillam	Transportation Planning	Yes
Judith Gray	Land Use / Transportation	Yes
Allan Schmidt	Parks and Recreation	Yes
Lidwien Rahman	Transportation	Yes
David Sheern	Housing	Yes
Amin Wahab	Natural Resources and Infrastructure	No
Jeri Williams	Public Involvement	No
Malu Wilkinson	Land Use	Yes
Dave Unsworth	Transit	Yes
Moriah McSharry McGrath	Health	Yes

**Staff and Consultants**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Representing</b>	<b>Present?</b>
Jay Sugnet	Portland Planning and Sustainability	Yes
Morgan Tracy	Portland Planning and Sustainability	Yes
Joan Frederiksen	Portland Planning and Sustainability	Yes
Julia Reed/ Alex Joyce/ John Fregonese	Fregonese Associates	Yes

**Guests**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Name</b>
One Guest (unknown)		