82ND AVE TRANSIT PROJECT

Meeting: 82nd Avenue Transit Project Community Advisory Committee #14

Date/time Wednesday, July 29 6:00 p.m. to 7:30 p.m.

Location: PCC Southeast, Community Hall Annex, 2305 SE 82nd Ave, Portland, Oregon

Members

Jessica Curtis	Clackamas Town Center
Kaitlyn Day	Clackamas Service Center
Sokho Eath	IRCO
Terry Epperson	82nd Avenue Resident
Ana Gonzalez	Verde
Meghan Humphreys	82nd Avenue Resident
Jay Jones	North Clackamas Chamber of Commerce
Zachary Lauritzen	Oregon Walks
Eden Melgar	82nd Avenue Resident
Thomas Ngo	The Street Trust
Franklin Ouchida	TriMet Committee on Accessible Transportation

Facilitator

Shabina Shariff	TriMet

Presenters

Katie Nelson	TriMet
Jesse Stemmler	TriMet

Other staff

Peter Craig	KPFF
Crystal Loggins	TriMet
Shoshanah Oppenheim	TriMet

Welcome and Introductions

Shabina Shariff welcomed the attendees, reviewed the agenda, and provided an overview of the meeting space and logistics.

Housekeeping

The Small Business Summit was postponed and rescheduled for September 24. Staff will provide additional information for members to share with their networks and communities.

Public Comment

82ND AVE TRANSIT PROJECT

No one came forward to comment.

Policy and Budget Committee Meeting Update

Staff gave an update on the recent Policy and Budget Committee meeting. Discussion included the project schedule, 60% design and cost milestone, coordination with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), critical project milestones, and the need to align project scope with the available budget.

The committee also discussed seven potential scope reductions as contingency planning in the event of a significant project cost increase or other financial risks.

Project Update

Staff provided an update on the 60% design review, coordination with partner agencies, cost analysis, and project risk review.

Staff noted that the project was preparing for upcoming risk-readiness activities and the grant application process.

Discussion

The CAC values each member's individual opinion. In an effort to promote free discussion and collaboration during the meeting and to solicit as much feedback as possible, the notes do not attribute specific comments to specific CAC members. CAC members do not vote or make formal recommendations to TriMet. Views and opinions of the CAC are shared in reports to the Policy & Budget Committee and other audiences.

Question on ODOT design review and whether another round of review would be required.

Staff explained that the project was in the second phase of the design exception review process.

Question on project readiness and what the current FTA coordination and review process indicated about the project's readiness and funding prospects.

Staff described the ongoing review process and the work needed to prepare for the grant application.

Question on PBOT coordination and whether changes or improvements previously made by PBOT were incompatible with the upgrades required for the project's stations.

82ND AVE TRANSIT PROJECT

Staff responded that TriMet had been coordinating closely with PBOT. Some paving work is needed immediately adjacent to station locations and concrete bus pads to ensure the surrounding pavement is in suitable condition.

Comment on more information needed about existing pavement conditions, the expected lifespan of the roadway, and the rationale for including paving improvements in the project scope.

Discussion on potential opportunities to defer improvements or identify other projects and funding sources that could address some of the work.

Question regarding how staff would determine which improvements should be reduced or deferred if the project faced a larger budget gap.

Staff noted that the team would consider the trade-offs associated with each option and seek to preserve the project's core transit performance, safety, and reliability.

Question on why reducing BAT lanes could result in substantial savings when the lanes may appear to consist primarily of pavement markings.

Staff explained that the costs involve more than paint and can include related roadway work and other elements.

Question regarding how the project team would ensure that improvements were deferred because of funding constraints would not be dropped permanently.

Staff noted that the committee and community could continue advocating for these priorities and that documenting them would be important. Staff also referenced the Division Transit Project, where contingency savings allowed some previously deferred scope to be restored.

Comment on the importance of maintaining pedestrian comfort, accessibility, and safe access to transit.

Question regarding whether portions of the Cully terminus improvements could be deferred while retaining the essential functions of the terminus.

Staff discussed the potential to move from an off-street terminus at the Cully Triangle to an on-street terminus. The on-street option could avoid constructing a dedicated operator restroom, with a potential alternative of leasing restroom facilities. However, the option would introduce additional bus circulation and travel time and differ from the community's previously expressed preference for an off-street terminus.

Members discussed whether changes to these elements could provide cost savings while maintaining the essential function and accessibility of the stations.

Question regarding how the team would compare the estimated savings from each option and determine how much each reduction would contribute toward closing the budget gap.

Question regarding when the project team would know whether additional scope reductions were necessary and when deferred improvements might be reconsidered.

Staff explained that the extent of any reductions would depend on the remaining funding gap and that each option would need to be evaluated in light of its trade-offs.

Members discussed the importance of communicating their priorities and concerns, particularly regarding the impacts of potential scope reductions and the need to maintain accountability for improvements that might be deferred.

Staff noted that the project was preparing for upcoming risk-readiness activities and the grant application process. Construction was anticipated to be less than a year away, making the next several months an important period for design and coordination.

Staff reported that the project cost estimate remained approximately $346 million, near the current budget target. The team was evaluating potential savings and considering how the scope might need to change if a funding gap remained.

Upcoming Outreach

Staff announced an upcoming open house to be held in September.
Staff also reported that work is underway on a construction communications plan for businesses and community members along the corridor. Additional information will be shared as the plan develops.

Adjourn