



MEETING SUMMARY

MEETING: High Capacity Transit System Plan MTAC/TPAC Subcommittee Meeting
DATE: March 25, 2009
TIME: 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.
PLACE: Metro, 600 NE Grand Ave., Metro Council Chambers

MEMBERS PRESENT

Tom Armstrong	City of Portland Planning
Kenny Asher	City of Milwaukie
Jazmin Casas	FHWA
Jonathan David	City of Gresham
Jon Holan	Forest Grove
Nancy Kraushaar	City of Oregon City
Alan Lehto	TriMet
Mike McCarthy (for Ron Bunch)	City of Tigard
Margaret Middleton	City of Beaverton
Lidwien Rahman	ODOT
Dale Robins	RTC
Paul Smith	City of Portland Transportation
Joe Zehnder	City of Portland Planning

MEMBERS ABSENT

Andy Back	Washington County
Denny Egner	City of Lake Oswego
Elissa Gertler	Clackamas County
Jonathan Harker	City of Gresham
Jane McFarland	Multnomah County
Dave Nordberg	DEQ
Cynthia Thompson	SMART

PROJECT STAFF

Metro	Tony Mendoza, Crista Gardner, Josh Naramore
Project Consultants	Kristin Hull and Brandy Steffen, CH2M HILL
	Tom Brennan, Nelson\Nygaard

I. WELCOME/INTRODUCTION

On March 25, 2009 the fifth MTAC/TPAC Subcommittee meeting was held for the Regional High Capacity Transit (HCT) System Plan project. Ms. Kristin Hull outlined the agenda and stated that the purpose of the meeting was to share the results of the technical evaluation. She stated that this is the first of three meetings that will be focused on this topic and that it will

be an iterative process, so if members had any revisions or questions they could be answered during the meeting or at the next meeting, scheduled for April 9, 2009.

Ms. Hull provided a brief update about the project including the recent local aspirations workshops. She also outlined the April events that will coincide with the launching of the build a system tool and questionnaire on the project web site. Ms. Hull agreed to send an email with the outreach information and dates to the members so that they could distribute it to their constituents.

There were no group communications or public comments.

II. EVALUATION AND DECISION PROCESS OVERVIEW

Ms. Hull outlined the following steps for this phase of the project, including:

- March 25: review results of evaluation, not reaching consensus. Use data as a starting point for further discussion. Public and Subcommittee comments on evaluation results are not incorporated.
- April 9: answer questions and correct mistakes, further discussion on evaluation results. Public comments collected to-date will be shared with the Subcommittee.
- May 14 or 21: further discussion and reach a consensus on recommendations to forward to TPAC and MTAC.

Discussion:

Some members asked where the HCT project fits with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Mr. Tony Mendoza said that the two projects are directly related. Once Metro Council votes on the HCT recommendations in July this process will end and information will be incorporated into the RTP.

III. EVALUATION RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Mr. Mendoza outlined the results from the evaluation process, stressing that this information was for the corridors only, not improvements to the existing lines nor for the corridors outside the region (e.g. Salem). The data on improvements to the existing lines and external lines will be brought to the group at the next meeting. In addition the group will also discuss policy issues regarding HCT mode selection. Mr. Tom Brennan then went through the presentation, pointing out the criteria (safety, 4f resources and use of existing road right of way) that were not scored for evaluation, but will be examined in greater detail in white papers. Mr. Brennan explained that the technical team used five key evaluation criteria to compile an initial technical analysis. These five criteria are highly correlated with other criteria.

These key criteria include:

- Ridership
- Project readiness (current land use and ridership in terms of Transit Orientation Index)
- Local aspirations
- Project cost (capital and operating costs)
- Estimated project fundability based on potential user benefits

Capital Cost Discussion:

- Some members were concerned about the use of the word “median” in the capital cost analysis and wanted clarification if the technical team evaluated travel lanes or medians as the existing right of way. The group discussed the capital cost methodology in detail.
- Some members were concerned that the costs remain possible and realistic to fund.
- The group discussed how the technical team evaluated costs at this higher level. Specifically, Mr. Brennan answered questions about how generic cross sections were used for segments of each corridor, with right of way costs differentiated, but at a high level.
- The group was asked to email the team if there were any other comments regarding corridor level capital cost issues or scores that don't make sense.

Local Aspiration Discussion:

- Some members were concerned about the lack of information for Washington County. The team explained that Washington County had not submitted local aspirations to Metro, so the team could not reflect the county's aspirations in the evaluation. Jurisdictions can still submit local aspirations to Metro. One member noted that identifying local aspirations could be difficult for some jurisdictions because of the periodic review cycle.
- There was also a concern about how industrial land was scored on the criteria C5, Support Regional 2040 Growth Concept. Mr. Mendoza explained that this change was requested by MTAC. Members requested corridors also be scored on the RTP 2040 land use designations.
- A table to cross reference the HCT corridors to the mobility corridors was requested. It was requested that all corridor names in the final report and not be tied to a specific alignment, but focus on end points.
- Other members requested that major show stoppers, including policy issues specifically related to ranking and barriers to implementation be noted in the plan.

Mr. Brennan discussed the initial ranking and priorities, which were shown to the group as a starting point for discussion and are not a recommendation. He stated that it was important to prioritize the corridors based on readiness and cost effectiveness. Tony then spoke to the group about the proposed four-tiered system.

Tiering Discussion:

- Members wondered if corridors would be capable of moving up the tiers. Mr. Mendoza said that the technical process, at the subcommittee, is designed to discuss and weigh priorities. After the technical process is concluded, jurisdictions will work through the system expansion policy to move a corridor to a higher tier. Every four years the tiers would be reviewed when the RTP is updated. This topic will be discussed more at a later meeting.
- The committee requested to include redundancy as a criterion to place less priority serving a center that is already served by HCT.
- The committee requested that corridors not be packaged.
- The group agreed to separate corridors 11 and 34, examining them independently. Corridors 28, 29, and 8 will also be examined separately.
- It was requested by a few members that the technical team provide a recommendation to the group, based on comparing the corridors against all criteria, not just the five key criteria.

- The group would like to see a total score added to table 9. Others wanted to see how the recommendation was reached, not just a total number.
- A GIS map of the environmental issues and equity areas was recommended as a good way to visual this criteria.
- Members discussed the appropriateness of including vision corridors in the RTP since they would likely not be funded in this RTP cycle.

IV. NEXT STEPS

Ms. Hull requested that the members review the memo, look at the scores and then email any questions or editorial comments to Mr. Mendoza by April 1st. Clarifications or answers will be brought to the next meeting. Ms. Hull and let the group know that Metro will poll them for their availability for a May meeting.

Topics to be Addressed at a Later Meeting:

- Financing issues: local jurisdictions funding match vs. TriMet's contribution toward local match.
- Right of way costs from Hillsboro to Forrest Grove seems high; Forrest Grove local aspirations score doesn't seem right.
- Livability issues related to the required mobility standards of roads.

Issues to be Addressed by the Technical Team:

- Disagreement that Industrial Areas are included in the highest land use category (same as Regional Center and Central City).
- Need to provide more information on how each corridor was scored in order to include them in each tier.
- Need to include information about how the corridors can move between tiers over time (communities working together to identify ways to meet HCT goals, etc.)
- Clearly describe how the CRC process fits in with this and how Metro and RTC can work together on bi-state mobility needs (specifically in terms of carrying forward with an AA in the next 4-6 years).
- Need to get all Local Aspirations from jurisdictions – or at least say that they are not interested (just don't leave it blank).
- Terminology for the second tier (Local and Regional Action Corridors) should be rethought.
- Add an additional guiding criteria that addresses consistency with the regional transit concept and redundancy (i.e., centers that are already served by HCT would either be eliminated or scored lower).
- It was requested by a few members that the technical team provide a recommendation to the group, based on comparing the corridors against all criteria, not just the five key criteria.

V. ADJOURN

Seeing no further business, Ms. Hull adjourned the meeting at 12:45 p.m.

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR MARCH 25, 2009

The following have been included as part of the official public meeting record:

TOPIC	ITEM	DOC DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT NO.
I.	Agenda	3/25/09	HCT MTAC/TPAC Subcommittee agenda	
II.	Draft Detailed Evaluation Memo	3/25/09	Regional High Capacity Transit System Plan Evaluation Results - Draft	