Transportation System Plan Expert Group

A Component of the Portland Comprehensive Plan Update

Draft Meeting Summary Notes

Meeting Date: February 27, 2014

Time: 3:30 - 6:00 p.m.

TEG Members/Staff Attending: Katja Dillmann, Jared Franz, Marianne Fitzgerald, Sam Gollah, Eric Hesse, Phil Healy, Arlene Kimura, Maryhelen Kincaid, Gerik Kransky, Keith Liden, John Mermin, Linda Nettekoven, Lidwein Rahman, Phil Selinger, Peter Stark, Mychal Tetteh, Joe VanderVeer, Pia Welch, Garlynn Woodsong, Justin Douglas, Tim Kurtz, Chris Smith, Courtney Duke, Peter Hurley

TEG Members Absent: Corky Collier, Matt Davis, Allan Schmidt

Other Attendees: Roger Averbeck, Steve Crouch

Facilitator: Jim Owens

Key Points and Outcomes

The TEG was briefed by PBOT staff on the Revenue Options project and the bureau's Two-Year Action Plan, and by Metro staff on the Regional Transportation System, Plan update. Key issues to be addressed in future meetings were preliminarily identified, with the March meeting to focus on project evaluation criteria and prioritization and on draft revenue forecasts. For this upcoming meeting, the TEG will also be responding to the question of how the TSP can best be used by the public.

Introductions and Housekeeping Items: (3:30 pm)

Description: Following members' self-introductions, Jim Owens reviewed the agenda and itemized background materials for the meeting. He noted that the order of agenda items is being adjusted to accommodate the presentation on PBOT's revenue options prior to that on PBOT's Two-Year Action Plan. Jim asked members to advise of corrections to the TEG roster, noting that there are two "n"s in Katja Dillmann's name.

There were no corrections to the January meeting summary, although Pia requested the opportunity to transmit some minor edits.

Jim reviewed the schedule of upcoming meetings, including:

- March 27 Room 2500B; 1900 SW 4th Avenue
- April 30 Location TBD
- May 29 Location TBD
- June 26 Location TBD

In response to the wide range of site visit options identified at the January meeting, Jim indicated that the current thinking is that a maximum of four site visits could be logistically accommodated. These might include: (1) new Willamette River bridge, Central Eastside (including streetcar), and SE Quadrant Plan study area; (2) Outer Southeast and Gateway; (3) freight transportation at Swan Island or Rivergate and/or view of the system from inside of a truck cab; and (4) Barbur Boulevard and Southwest Corridor Plan. These could be

scheduled either in conjunction with a regular TEG meeting or a separate events. Subsequent to the meeting, Pia Welch submitted the following comments:

> *My suggestion for a movement of goods field trip is to go see New Seasons distribution center or Widmer beer's distribution center. People can relate to the delivery of groceries and beer.*
>
> *One of the best tours I went on was taking the jet boats up the river (during the summer) and talking about all the various points along the river, where the fuel for the city comes in, the terminals, etc.*

Courtney reviewed the proposed schedule for the TSP Update process and indicated that a revised process chart will be provided to the TEG.

Art Pearce, PBOT Transportation Planning Manger, described a restructuring within the Bureau and in the Transportation Planning Division and the varying roles that his staff will play in the TSP Update. Questions/comments included:

- How will the three divisions be interconnected? A: The Director has requested more integration; there will be weekly meetings among the division managers.
- Can an organizational chart be provided to the TEG? A: Yes.

PBOT Revenue Options (3:50 p.m.)
Presenter: Mark Lear, PBOT
Description: Mark described the Transportation Needs and Funding project has having three phases: Phase 1: developing priorities; Phase 2: identifying new revenue sources and refining priorities; and Phase 3: developing a specific proposal. Both statistically-valid and on-line surveys have been conducted, indicating that safety is as high a priority as maintenance, that there is strong support for multi-modal, and that the City should focus on the greatest problems. He noted that federal and state funding is becoming more difficult to obtain and that the City has a $75 million annual maintenance shortfall.
Questions/comments included:

- How does this project relate to the Comprehensive Plan Update, TSP Update, RTP and other current initiatives? A: These are all interrelated, with identification of priorities and revenue sources one layer in a multi-layered cake of transportation planning.
- What has been the response to the surveys from non-English speakers: Unsure, but likely very low. Intending to outreach directly to those groups.
- It is recommended that BPS be contacted for its lessons learned from its Comprehensive Plan outreach and equity efforts.
- Will there be community meetings in N/NE in the next round of outreach? A: Yes.
- Will the sensitivity of funding options be tested? A: Undetermined at this point.
- Where will this project intersect with the TSP Update? A. At three levels: criteria for projects; restructuring of the project list; and making the TSP more usable, including reflecting neighborhood-level projects.

Gerik indicated that programmatic evaluation criteria were developed by PBOT some years ago that could serve as a starting point for project criteria. He will provide them to the group through Jim or Courtney.

It is anticipated that TEG input will be sought on draft products developed in upcoming project phases.

Related Materials:
- PowerPoint presentation

- Rosters for Transportation Needs and Funding Advisory Committee and TAC

PBOT Two-Year Action Plan (4:15 p.m.)
Presenters: Art Pearce, PBOT
Description: Art indicated that a contract has just been signed with Nelson Nygaard to develop an action plan for the bureau intended to help it understand how it currently and how it should prioritize among the many things it does. While focused on prioritizing what the bureau does in the short term (next two-three years), it will likely address longer term issues as well. He described the project as having three steps:

- Step 1: Gather and integrate
- Step 2: Listen
- Step 3: Prioritize

Questions/comments included:
- How will other bureaus be involved? A: PBOT will be involving the key infrastructure agencies and other implementation partners.
- What is the program for updating the plan on a regular basis? A: Unknown at this time.
- What not a five-year or longer plan? A: while the focus is on the near term, the two year timeframe should not be taken literally.
- Will the Action Plan identify priorities for projects or be more programmatic? A: Thematic with key actions.
- Will staffing be shifted to meet the priorities identified? A: It's too early to know.

Art stated that it is his intent to return to the TEG in April to obtain input on issues/considerations to be addressed in the plan.

Public Comment (4:45 p.m.)
Roger Averbeck expressed his appreciation for the opportunity to comment and indicated that he will be interested in hearing about the progress of the two projects. He also stated that it will be important to involve line staff in development of the Two-Year Action Plan.

Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) (4:50 pm)
Presenter: John Mermin, Metro
Description: John explained that Metro is engaged in an update rather than in developing a new RTP, with the focus on projects eligible for federal funding. The draft RTP update should be available for public comment in late March. The City has submitted projects for inclusion on both the federal (financially constrained) and state project lists. A list of proposed changes in the draft 2014 RTP was included in the meeting materials. The updated project list includes approximately 1200 unprioritized projects, both large and small scale. The Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) is comprised of projects from the financially constrained list. Among the questions and comments:

- Have performance targets been revised? A: Only minor revisions are proposed.
- How does Metro ensure that there are not conflicts among projects, e.g. adverse effects on capacity? A: Through coordination with local governments, the public review process, and internal review.
- How does Metro access whether the RFP meets the region's GHG reduction targets? A: A general review is provided; a more detailed review occurs for projects that are funded and moving forward to implementation.
- How does Metro address the disconnect between in planning for interjurisdictional facilities, different treatment of Cornell Road by Portland vs Washington County? A:

Cornell Road is a unique situation given topography, zoning and right-of-way challenges.

Related Materials:
- Fall 2013 2014 Regional Transportation Plan Update
- 2/20/14 Memo: Overview of changes proposed in draft 2014 RTP
- PowerPoint Presentation: RTP Status Update

City of Portland Projects
Presenter: Peter Hurley and Courtney Duke, PBOT
Description: Peter and Courtney explained that the process to develop the list of City projects was primarily internal and involved culling completed projects, modifying projects that are partially completed, and adding a few projects, all of which all of which have had some type of public review. It also entailed coordinating with ODOT and the Port. The mechanism for public feedback will be Metro's public comment period. Projects are identified as constrained or unconstrained and assigned to one of three buckets based upon timing for implementation.

Peter indicated that, at its March meeting, input from the TEG will be solicited on:
- Evaluation criteria
- Revenue projections
- Prioritization process, including how to address multiple projects simultaneously

Questions/comments included:
- Have any unfinished projects been deleted from the City's list? A: No
- Were any constrained projects moved to unconstrained? A: We don't think so but will check.
- Who decides which bucket a project is assigned to: A: Staff.
- Are GIS files available for the various regional projects? A: Not really.
- The RTP is a funny exercise, as it includes both aspirational projects and those under construction. The TIP is where the real money is and where attention should be focused.

Key Issues to be Addressed in TSP Update (5:45 pm)
Presenter: Courtney Duke
Description: Courtney provided a tentative list of issues that PBOT proposes for TEG consideration and an identification of which of these might be addressed over the next several months. Additional topics identified included:
- Two-Year Action Plan
- Revenue Options project
- Vision Zero
- Safety
- Conflicts among policies and between policies and practice
- Recreation transportation as a system plan
- Other TSP required elements: air transportation, water transportation, pipelines, telecommunications

Discussion included building meeting agendas around questions for the TEG to respond to.

Peter requested that, as homework assignment for the March meeting, the TEG come prepared to respond to the question: How do you want to use the TSP?

Related Materials:
- Key Issues and Tentative Agendas, 2/27/14

Public Comment (5:55 p.m.)

Roger Averbeck asked about who decides which time bucket a project is assigned to, as well as what criteria or formula is used to do so. A: These questions were not specifically answered due to meeting adjournment; staff has indicated that they will respond directly to Mr. Averbeck.

Adjourn (6:00 p.m.)

For more information, please contact either Courtney Duke, PBOT at 503-823-7265 or Courtney.duke@portlandoregon.gov or Jim Owens, Facilitator at 503-278-3452 or jim.owens@coganowens.com.