



MEETING SUMMARY

MEETING: High Capacity Transit System Plan MTAC/TPAC Subcommittee Meeting
DATE: October 22, 2008
TIME: 9 to 11:30 a.m.
PLACE: Metro, 600 NE Grand Ave., Metro Council Chambers

MEMBERS PRESENT

Kenny Asher	City of Milwaukie
Ron Bunch	City of Tigard
Jonathan David (for Jonathan Harker)	City of Gresham
Dan Drentlaw	City of Oregon City
Denny Egner	City of Lake Oswego
Jon Holan	Forest Grove
Andy Johnson	ODOT
Nancy Kraushaar	City of Oregon City
Alan Lehto	TriMet
Mike McCarthy	City of Tigard
Margaret Middleton	City of Beaverton
Dave Nordberg	DEQ
Paul Smith	City of Portland Transportation
Jessica Trup	TriMet
Ron Weinman (for Elissa Gertler)	Clackamas County
John Putman (for Cynthia Thompson)	SMART
Joe Zehnder	City of Portland Planning

MEMBERS ABSENT

Andy Back	Washington County
Jane McFarland	Multnomah County
Dale Robins	RTC
Satvinder Sandu	FHWA

PROJECT STAFF

Metro	Tony Mendoza, Crista Gardner, Karen Withrow, Ross Roberts, Cliff Higgins, Kim Ellis
Project Consultants	Kristin Hull and Brandy Steffen, CH2M HILL Tom Brennan, Nelson Nygaard

I. WELCOME/INTRODUCTION

On Oct. 22, 2008 the third MTAC/TPAC Subcommittee meeting was held for the Regional High Capacity Transit (HCT) System Plan project. The meeting summary was approved.

Mr. Alan Lehto announced that TriMet is beginning discussions about appropriate uses for bus rapid transit (BRT) and will share information with the group in the future.

II. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Ms. Karen Withrow updated the group regarding the first Think Tank meeting which was held on Oct. 7, 2008. Mr. Ross Roberts encouraged the group to attend future Think Tank meetings. Mr. Tony Mendoza mentioned that a ten-minute presentation from the meeting will be posted on the project website.

III. SCREENING CRITERIA

Mr. Mendoza outlined the revisions that were made to the screening criteria based on the comments collected during the previous subcommittee meeting as well as TPAC and MTAC meetings. He stated that the major purpose for the screening criteria was to narrow down the alternatives that should be evaluated in more detail. The results of the screening criteria will be shown in a scorecard fashion, allowing for group discussion. The results will not be weighted.

Discussion: The group was concerned about the difference between current and future ridership measures. After much discussion, the group agreed to reduce confusion and use the same measures for existing (2005) and future (2035) ridership. A question was raised about how congestion would be evaluated. The group decided against using a five-point scale to examine mid-day and evening peak periods, and include a volume-to-capacity ratio to evaluate segments along each corridor. The group agreed to use a cursory overlay of sensitive water quality and natural resource areas as related to the alternatives for the environmental screening criteria. Corridor costs will recognize geological costs and constraints. The wording for equity will be changed from “good/moderate/poor” to something along the lines of “does/slightly/does not promote equity.” The group decided that geographic equity would be examined at the political level rather than through the screening or evaluation criteria analysis.

There was concern that the 2040 criteria of building high capacity transit to town and activity centers would create double-counting benefits (also counted as ridership) for those areas. The group decided that with the four changes listed above, the screening criteria were acceptable. The issue of double counting would be considered as the group evaluates the results of the screening process, when they can see whether the results indicate a problem.

IV. EVALUATION CRITERIA

Ms. Crista Gardner highlighted the broad level issues that were raised during the Think Tank meeting in addition to the issues raised by the public and policy makers. Mr. Tom Brennan presented a brief explanation of the draft evaluation criteria. The goal of the presentation was to introduce the group to the draft criteria so that they could discuss them further at the next meeting, when they will make a recommendation on the criteria to use.

Discussion: The group raised several issues and questions for the project team to consider. Answers will be brought back to the next meeting:

- Consider federal and non-federal funding sources and the wording/processes required during evaluation.
- Will modes and corridors be evaluated at the same time? (Mr. Mendoza mentioned that the group would be asked to help determine what modes high capacity transit includes.
- How are safety and security measures related to the planning and evaluation stages? They seem to be related to design and relevant at a greater level of detail.
- Health should include more than bike and pedestrian access. What other factors can be used to determine health?
- What maintenance and lighting issues will be raised?
- How do the environmental criteria relate to Portland issues and 4(f) regulations?
- Are golf courses considered part of 4(f) protected areas?
- VMT (vehicle miles traveled) reduction is a significant indicator of environmental affects.
- Could the “Oregon Shines” benchmarks be used for this project as well?
- How will the economics of the line be considered? Will it be related to the number of riders on a platform in an hour (how productive a line is) or the total operating/capital costs?
- Will freight savings be included (improved travel conditions for freight due to congestion reduction on nearby facilities)?
- Would it be possible to find measures indicative of the Federal Transit Authorities criteria, but name them based on local issues?
- How will we present the findings to the public?

V. CORRIDORS TO BE ADVANCED THROUGH SCREENING

Mr. Mendoza presented maps showing the consolidation of new corridors that were suggested by the public, both those connecting with the central city and those connecting suburb to suburb. He explained that these additional corridors will pass through the screening criteria along with those originally modeled in RPT Scenario B (transit investment scenario). Ms. Kristin Hull asked if the group thought anything was missing and suggested that they send an e-mail to Ms. Withrow if they wanted to suggest any other corridors. Mr. Mendoza noted that the Subcommittee will have an opportunity to help determine which corridors remain through the “Evaluation” screening.

VI. NEXT STEPS

Ms. Hull reminded the Subcommittee members to continue thinking about the evaluation criteria for the next meeting. Members were asked to respond to the e-mail about scheduling the next meeting on Nov. 14, possibly a three hour meeting. The group was encouraged to send any additional thoughts about the evaluation criteria to Ms. Withrow before the next meeting.

VII. ADJOURN

Seeing no further business, Ms. Hull adjourned the meeting at 11:45 a.m.

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR OCTOBER 22, 2008

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

TOPIC	ITEM	DOC DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT NO.
I.	Agenda	10/22/08	HCT MTAC/TPAC Subcommittee agenda	102208HCTSUB-01
I.	Meeting summary	9/12/08	Regional High Capacity Transit System Plan Subcommittee meeting summary	102208HCTSUB-02
II.	Public outreach summary	10/16/08	HCT System Plan public outreach summary (summer/fall 2008)	102208HCTSUB-03
III.	Memo	10/16/08	High capacity transit screening criteria	102208HCTSUB-04
IV.	Memo	10/21/08	Detailed HCT evaluation framework – Draft for discussion	102208HCTSUB-05