

Meeting minutes

Meeting: **82nd Avenue Steering Committee meeting #13**
 Date/time: Tuesday, September 10, 2024 | 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.
 Place: Hybrid meeting held via Zoom and in person at Portland Community College Southeast Campus, Mt. Tabor Room 145, 2305 SE 82nd Ave, Portland, Oregon

Members, Alternates Attending

Krishna Anand	United Oregon
Commissioner Mingus Mapps	City of Portland
Kristin Hull, <i>alternate</i>	City of Portland
Rian Windsheimer	Oregon Department of Transportation
Councilor Christine Lewis, Co-chair	Metro
Councilor Duncan Hwang, Co-chair	Metro
Jamie Snook, <i>alternate</i>	TriMet
Commissioner Julia Brim-Edwards	Multnomah County
Kaitlyn Dey	Clackamas Service Center
Representative Khanh Pham	Oregon Legislature
Commissioner Mark Shull	Clackamas County
Michael Liu	82nd Avenue Business Alliance
Zachary Lauritzen	Oregon Walks

Affiliation

Presenters

Melissa Ashbaugh	Metro
Elizabeth Mros-O’Hara	Metro
Jesse Stemmler	TriMet
Sandra Hikari	Oregon Department of Transportation
Anthony Buczek	City of Portland
Paulina Salgado	TriMet

Attendees

Karen Buehrig	Clackamas County
Jeff Owen	Clackamas County
Eve Nilenders	Multnomah County
Sarah Paulus	Multnomah County
Vikki Payne	Multnomah County
Tanja Olson	Metro
Malu Wilkinson	Metro
Monica Krueger	Metro
Jason Nolin	Metro
Kelly Betteridge	Metro
Hau Hagedorn	Metro

Michaela Skiles	Metro
Hau Hagedorn	Metro
Diego Joao Murphy-Mendez	Metro
Kate Hawkins	Metro
Myla Janssen	Metro
John Donahue	Oregon Department of Transportation
Michael Kiser	TriMet
Dameion Samuelson	TriMet
Cynthia Castro	City of Portland
Jennifer John	Parametrix
Mara Krinke	Parametrix
Jordan Lewis	
Joe KM	
Jill Vaughn	
Hector Rodriguez Ruiz	
Joe Hanseling	

Welcome and Introductions

Co-Chair Metro Councilor Duncan Hwang called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m. He welcomed the attendees, reviewed general information for the meeting, and provided an overview of the agenda.

Approval of April 2024 Meeting Minutes 2:37

Approval moved by Commissioner Mark Shull and seconded by Michael Liu. Minutes were approved with no opposition.

Updates from Partners 3:00

Councilor Hwang started with summer updates: PCEF grant application is advancing, TriMet received a Low/No Emissions grant for buses and maintenance facility \$24 million will go for buses for this project, and Portland received a Safe Streets 4 All grant \$9.7 million to improve pedestrian safety, signals, crossings, and education.

Kristin Hull (she, her pronouns, City of Portland) filled in for Commissioner Mapps, who was running late. Kristin elaborated that the grant Portland received is a 2-part grant, some for transit and some for planning on other high-crash corridors and \$2 million to plan for other corridors. There was a recent groundbreaking for 82nd Avenue major maintenance projects, for safe pedestrian crossings, sidewalks, signals, signage, tree planting, greenways, and ADA ramps, and Kristin appreciated the funding that came from the US congressional delegation.

Michael Liu, Fubon Shopping Center and community member. Happy to be here.

Rian Windsheimer, ODOT Region 1, gave 87 interns a tour of ODOT's 82nd Avenue construction project. ODOT started work on paving, medians, and flashing beacon crossings.

Commissioner Mark Shull, Clackamas County. Planning is underway for a new traffic light at 79th and Johnson Creek.

Zachary Lauritzen, Oregon Walks and 82nd Avenue Coalition, apologized for being late and spoke about concerns from businesses about construction disruptions. The coalition is close to a first draft on the Equitable Development Strategy plan and appreciated support from partners to make that happen.

Jamie Snook, Director of Major Projects at TriMet, filled in for JC Vannatta. TriMet received a Low/No

emissions grant from FTA for hydrogen buses, maintenance facilities, and workforce development. PCEF grant is moving forward through a winnowing of projects. The grant will be for transit and sidewalks, street trees, and workforce development.

Representative Kahn Pham is the legislative representative from House District 46, “welcome to my district.” Rep Pham invited the community to a Bike Town Hall this Saturday, starting at Montavilla Yard at 12:30pm.

Kaitlin Dey, Clackamas Service Center, announced that an Annex building is opening later this month, and they are excited to provide showers, laundry/clothing room, and a clinic. Their organization is a major hub for services along 82nd and many clients rely on transit.

Commissioner Brim-Edwards had overlapping meetings, District 3, Multnomah County. No update but thanked everyone for the good work on the grants.

New rep from Unite Oregon, Krishna Anand, looked forward to learning about the project and providing feedback.

Councilor Hwang reported that Co-chair Metro Councilor Lewis was on her way.

LPA Components (Melissa Ashbaugh, Metro) 15:08

Ms. Ashbaugh walked through the LPA (locally preferred alternative) schedule and reminded the group about the project’s purpose: improve speed, reliability, safety, comfort and capacity on 82nd Avenue. The LPA is the charge of the steering committee: mode, general station locations, alignment, and high-level funding plan. Last meeting, in April, the steering committee voted on the mode, general station locations, and alignment with two options for the northern terminus. Ms. Ashbaugh reminded the group that we did not decide about the northern terminus because more information was needed in design and costing. She showed a timeline graphic, highlighted the funding commitment for project development, a design team was engaged to support a vote on the northern terminus in December, and a final vote on the full LPA in April 2025. Then the LPA will go through local adoption with all the jurisdictions. Voting on the LPA could happen earlier if no big tradeoffs occur. The topics in the near future are northern terminus recommendation and vote, key tradeoffs, staff recommendation, and vote on full LPA.

Discussion

Mr. Lauritzen asked if the northern terminus recommendation is just location or will there be design components. Ms. Ashbaugh noted that the staff recommendation will be based on design components and staff can present high-level designs if the steering committee is interested. Mr. Stemmler added that they are early in design but will have alternatives, and design will continue to inform cost and other aspects of the project.

Someone from the audience asked about the design timeline and Mr. Stemmler replied that 30% design is expected by June 2025.

Transit treatments/priority along the corridor (Elizabeth Mros-O’Hara, Metro) 24:33

Elizabeth Mros-O’Hara, Metro, noted that the steering committee will not be voting on the transit treatments as part of the LPA, but staff is aware that folks are interested and want to see the tools and location that are being considered and the project concept. The process for making decisions needs to be clear.

Tools to Speed the bus (Jesse Stemmler, TriMet) 25:54

Jesse Stemmler, project manager for TriMet, noted that design efforts started in July. There are a suite of tools and some tools make a bigger difference. Transit signal priority (TSP) and stop consolidation do a lot. Recently they turned off the TSP on Division and there was a 45% delay at congested intersections. Near-level boarding, high-capacity buses, queue jumps, far-side stations, and in-lane stops will all contribute to the project goals.

This preliminary design phase (15%) is focused on getting to northern terminus selection, defining scope and cost certainty, by assessing high-delay intersections, community engagement, sensitivity for cost, and station footprints. This design phase will go through the end of the year. The next phase will be a deeper dive into the design of this preliminary phase.

Considerations and trade-offs being assessed are benefits, congestion impact, business impact, community benefit, safety considerations, context-specific needs, high traffic delay, narrow right of way (ROW), high volumes of turning vehicles, street trees, generous sidewalks, and access control.

Discussion

Question from Mr. Lauritzen: everyone has different values and selects different tradeoffs. Who makes the decisions about tradeoffs? Mr. Stemmler will use the design work to get feedback from CAC (citizen advisory committee), community engagement, and the steering committee. Mr. Lauritzen pushed to know the decision-maker. Mr. Stemmler noted that the traffic design team will weigh in and consider the community engagement. There is no one person—it is more of a collective decision based on feedback. Ms. Ashbaugh added that the roadway jurisdiction has authority and that is what ODOT and PBOT will speak to in the next segment of this presentation and that should help answer the question. Mr. Lauritzen used ODOT as an example to try to understand who is responsible for weighing the tradeoffs and making the decision. Mr. Buczek pointed out that the next two segments might be helpful to continue this discussion at the end of the presentations.

Commissioner Mapps and Councilor Lewis apologized for being late.

Michael Liu wondered about the impact to east/west traffic from north/south signal priority and what happens at Division where two FX lines will cross. Mr. Buczek is not a signal engineer but explained the bus that arrives to the intersection first is usually given priority. On Division, FX might still have priority. The signal has a logic that directs the bus. Mr. Kiser noted that TriMet is not using TSP to its full capability, and it can be programmed to consider many other factors, like how on time and how full the buses are. Mr. Liu wondered if a light would stay green to clear a bus, and Mr. Buczek said no, they typically have a time cap, a maximum. Mr. Liu asked about the effects to the cross streets and Mr. Buczek noted that there is some delay. The signals can be programmed to let the cross-street recover.

Councilor Hwang remembered the property acquisition list that changed over time which created some anxiety among property owners during Division Transit Project and he wondered what will change in the process to mitigate that anxiety. Mr. Stemmler replied that they weren't there yet, but they learned a lot on Division, the first FX project. They have a much better sense of what they will need for infrastructure, and they will touch base with community at the design milestones. Councilor Hwang recommended not showing too much detail of preliminary design to mitigate anxiety in property owners.

Jamie Snook noted that in terms of transit priority that TriMet has many bus lines that cross 82nd so they will be watching that interaction closely.

Conversations to-date at ODOT (Sandra Hikari, ODOT) 45:03

Sandra Hikari presented the approach to achieving transit priority in the ODOT controlled segments of 82nd Avenue, mostly the two miles within Clackamas County. Northbound in that section already contains a BAT lane. Ms. Hikari explained the options for BAT lanes during this design phase. One option is lane reallocation which is converting an existing travel lane to a bus lane which cars can use only for turning in and out of side streets and driveways. This has been deemed not feasible due to high traffic volumes and the reduction in vehicle capacity that it would create, e.g., on Johnson Creek Blvd, and there is already concern that traffic congestion could back up onto I-205. Therefore, lane reallocation is off the table in the section in Clackamas County.

The project team will look at targeted widening for BAT lanes in the southbound direction. The benefits would be faster and more reliable transit travel times with negligible effects on traffic congestion. Benefits were better than when just looking at BAT lanes through reallocation. Negative impacts that will be considered are increased pedestrian crossing distance, costly right of way acquisition, and ODOT Highway Design Manual mobility targets or a design exception.

Rian, speaking to Zachary's earlier question about who makes the decision: BAT lanes are great for transit speed, but what are the tradeoffs, e.g., cost. Rian agreed that it does depend on who makes the decision and what the considerations are for each group.

Councilor Lewis noted that the regional policy set by JPACT is beyond [ODOT's] mobility target. It focuses on movement of people and goods, a higher standard, instead of vehicle count. Councilor Lewis proposed that the project will need to ask for a design exception from ODOT to meet the Metro standard in the Clackamas County section. John Donahue, ODOT traffic engineer, spoke from the audience that congestion would need to be considered for an exception. Mr. Donahue didn't know the process but agreed it was worth looking at. Councilor Lewis believed this could be a place for an exception to the HDM manual because it focuses on cars over the other modes.

Mr. Lauritzen asked for a sense of the costs involved with widening the roadway, which he acknowledged may not in the steering committee purview, but would be an interesting bit of info. Do we need to know that? What are the financial tradeoffs?

Rian: First, does it work? Second, is it worth it? Add up the costs versus the benefit versus the budget. More info is needed to bring the cost. Ms. Ashbaugh noted that the extra time in the schedule is to be able to explore those tradeoffs. Mr. Kiser thought that by December they would be able to detail the options, the cost of each, and impacts out to 2045. Not all options will be within the budget, but all will be considered in the tradeoffs.

Anthony Buczek, 53:54, City of Portland, Traffic Engineering Supervisor for PBOT, spoke to the City's approach to BAT lanes. They want to prioritize TSP (transit signal priority) because it has a lot of bang for the buck and they want to focus on top delay locations for physical treatments, e.g., widening for BAT lanes. BAT lanes are definitely on the table for the Portland section. They want to explore traffic diversion and lane reallocation for continued improvement in speed and reliability in the future, in case this project does not satisfy everyone's hopes and dreams. They are looking at three types of transit priority: transit signal priority (TSP), lane reallocation, and intersection widening. Key factors that will be considered include traffic volumes, effects on adjacent streets (diversion), physical constraints (narrow roadway), safety, and effect of businesses and buildings. Considerations for BAT lane tradeoffs include increase pedestrian crossing distance, costly ROW, impacts on buildings, and width of roadway. Lane allocation considerations include more than the traffic effects and also include benefits to transit and

community. Traffic is a main consideration. Other considerations include traffic analysis (2022, year of opening 2029, and 2045), diversion analysis, and public engagement. They want to identify where they can install BAT lanes without creating significant diversion and if diversion cannot be avoided, how it can be mitigated. The design decision will be made in consideration of public engagement by the City Engineer in coordination with the PBOT Director and Deputy City Administrator. Decision criteria will be safety, multimodal service levels, community input, and business effects.

Rep. Pham asked about a high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane on 82nd Avenue. Mr. Buczek said it was worth considering. Typically, HOV lanes are installed on a "limited access facility" so he wasn't sure if it would have the same value and couldn't think of an example. Rep. Pham explained that she was thinking about a hybrid of HOV and BAT lanes.

Mr. Windsheimer noted that PBOT seems to have concern about diversion into the neighborhood, but what about diversion onto 205? PBOT will be looking at that too. The models aren't precise but provide good information.

Councilor Hwang wanted to know where the diversion is expected. Mr. Buczek noted that some will go to 122nd Avenue and further west. He is not expecting to push people away from destinations but pushing trips to other routes. Are there nearby arterials that can accept more traffic? Most streets have capacity during most times of day except the peaks. More detail will come after analysis. Ms. Ashbaugh noted that not all diversion is an issue, but diversion onto a greenway, for instance, would create problems.

Ms. Snook thanked partners at the City, ODOT, Metro. TriMet has been working closely with partners to navigate this design process. To answer Mr. Lauritzen's questions, no one person will be making the decisions, but it will be a multi-agency coordination making the decisions together along with the community.

Councilor Lewis had a question about modeling factors for 2045. Ms. Ashbaugh said that is something they are still working out and so don't have a firm answer for that yet. Mr. Buczek noted that, in general, there is more uncertainty in the future the further out you go.

Engagement strategies and updates (Paulina Salgado, Community Affairs for TriMet) 1:09:49

Ms. Salgado noted that the team has been busy doing general project engagement and focusing on the northern terminus engagement. One group, Hacienda CDC, was left off the slide but they talked about the vision of the neighborhood. Feedback was positive for a Cully terminus, but there were concerns about displacement, parking, service for McDaniel High School students, capacity for mobility devices, safety, and unwanted activity. The safety and security issue has been voiced system wide and this is something that TriMet is addressing throughout their service area. There was interest in street improvements, sidewalks, potholes, lighting, trees, and landscaping in Cully. There was interest in bus-only lanes but also concerns about impacts to vehicle traffic. Lastly, there were questions about cost and where the funding would come from.

Engagement has been focused on the Cully terminus since that is the preferred location and they created a Cully Terminus Evaluation Group (CTEG). This group is working with the project team to inform terminus concept designs that align with community vision and priorities. The group will recommend a northern terminus location and preferred design approaches. This group has been meeting monthly, twice so far, and three more in the future. Participants include local organizations and neighbors, including a McDaniel student.

Ms. Salgado described the direction that the CTEG wants to take. They want to provide access to the area and minimize loss of parking on Killingworth. So, the team is looking at both on-street and off-street designs. Hacienda CDC owns the property being considered and most of the residential properties, as well. They are considering separating the pick-up and drop-off locations. Overall, they are

looking to maximize the community benefits and opportunities. One comment that stuck from the first meeting is “I just want to go for a walk after dinner in my neighborhood.” Ms. Salgado showed some pictures of the engagement meetings.

The engagement will continue focusing on the Cully terminus. They will have a focus group in November, reconnecting with the same group from last year, to show some design concepts. The engagement will continue after the LPA vote. They will establish a Community Advisory Committee that will meet regularly. This will be a great space for the community to be in contact with the progress of the project. There will be open houses at every milestone where they will show roll plots and get feedback from the community. The corridor will be divided into three segments and a community affairs coordinator will be assigned to each segment so that neighbors and business owners can get to know the coordinator and feel like there is someone listening to them. There will be one-on-one meetings with business owners and property owners to hear their concerns. There will be mailings about potential station locations. They will be attending neighborhood meetings and tabling at neighborhood events.

Vikki Payne, on behalf of Commissioner Brim-Edwards, asked what engagement was planned for Parkrose. Ms. Salgado explained that the event that they had planned to table at was canceled due to heavy rain and a member of her team is reaching out to Parkrose Neighborhood Association and planning future contact with the community. Ms. Payne offered that [Multnomah County] Commissioner Jesse Beason’s office has been waiting to be contacted about several events coming up in Parkrose. There is about to be a TIF district and Cully has more community-based groups, but she wanted to make sure Parkrose is getting equal treatment. Ms. Salgado was grateful to receive more contact information for Parkrose.

Commissioner Shull wanted to know more about the capacity for parking at Cully. What numbers of parking will be required to eliminate spillover into the neighborhood streets? Mr. Stemmler said they are looking at current parking capacities and recognizing the larger vision of the Hacienda CDC for the Cully neighborhood and considering the feedback from the community. The biggest consideration is the real-life experience, being tactical, and including the larger vision. Ms. Hull noted that they are not considering a park-and-ride facility in this location. Mr. Liu asked if most locations have a park and ride, and Ms. Hull shook her head no. Mr. Stemmler clarified that another reason they are spending a lot of time on engagement in Cully is that Parkrose already has a transit center and so the need to weave a new facility into the neighborhood is not the same in that location.

Mr. Lauritzen commented that this conversation reminded him of a new book called “How Parking Explains The World,” which describes how decisions are made by where we store our vehicles. He is sympathetic to the community and their parking needs and the impact of removing parking. Can we explore all option-- for example, what is the impact of a transit-only Killingsworth? Let people consider this. Mr. Lauritzen hears a lot that the community needs more activated spaces, plazas, and community spaces. Mr. Stemmler agreed to take a look. There will be huge implications on traffic and they have heard strong feelings both ways. Ms. Salgado noted the transit-only concept was discussed and people had concerns about deliveries and people using mobility devices. Already there is some tension about people parking in the event space at Las Adelitas, using it for a loading zone. Some people want that, and some people don’t.

Public Comment

Jordan Lewis came to the front and posed a question about bus priority. He acknowledged that there may not be enough space on 82nd Avenue to convert a lane to transit priority lane, but he asked staff why they were able to do that on MLK and the Burnside Bridge. Mr. Buczek answered that they always look at the impact on traffic (it was easier to give up one of four lanes than one of two), signal operations, the

volumes, dynamics, the system, the benefits on transit--and each one is different. How frequent transit uses the lane is also important. Ms. Hull offered to chat more offline and noted that 82nd is uniquely narrow and she will be talking more at the Bicycle Advisory meeting later if anyone wants to join.

There were no hands raised on Zoom.

Next steps (Co-Chair Metro Councilor Lewis) 1:32:00

Councilor Lewis reminded the committee there will be ongoing engagement, design, and coordination between agencies in the fall. The steering committee meeting in November will introduce the staff recommendation for the northern terminus and will continue engagement at both terminus locations. Lots of work to come, traffic analysis, design analysis, and Metro will work with agencies that will adopt the LPA, to document and guide the process. In December, there will be a vote on the staff recommendation for the northern terminus based on analysis and community feedback.

Commissioner Mark Shull asked about the hydrogen buses. Have we switched from electric to hydrogen, and what is the difference in maintenance and cost? Ms. Snook explained that TriMet has committed to zero emissions by 2040, so we anticipate both battery and hydrogen hybrid. The battery-electric buses have a short range, and they are looking for a more reliable solution in the hydrogen hybrid buses. They will have a mixed fleet. The new Columbia facility will be the hydrogen maintenance hub.

Meeting adjourned at 4:38 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Tanja Olson, 82nd Avenue Steering Committee Recorder

Attachments to the Public Record, 82nd Avenue Steering Committee meeting, September 10, 2024

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	09/03/2024	04/25/2024 82 nd Avenue Steering Committee Meeting Agenda	0910202482ASC-01
2	Document	09/03/2024	82nd Avenue Transit Project Steering Committee February 2024 Draft Minutes	0910202482ASC-02
3	Document	09/03/2024	82nd Avenue Transit Project: Summer 2024 Updates	0910202482ASC-03