

DIVISION TRANSIT PROJECT COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Thursday April 20, 2017, 6:00 p.m. - 7:30 p.m.

Gresham City Hall, 1333 NW Eastman Parkway, Gresham, OR 97030

CAC MEMBERS PRESENT

Heidi Guenin, Public Health Advocate (Committee Chair)

Rick Bartko, Division Midway Alliance

Sydney Mead, Division Clinton Business Association (DCBA)

Thuy Tu, Jade District/APANO

Paul Pappas, TriMet Committee on Accessible Transportation (CAT); Portland Commission on Disability (PCOD)

Michael Harrison, Oregon Health Sciences University (OHSU)

Kari Schlosshauer, Safe Routes to School National Partnerships

John Carr, Southeast Uplift Neighborhood Coalition (SUEL); Portland Clean Air

Cory Price, Gresham Business Owner

Chabre Vickers, Portland Community College Southeast (PCC)

Carol Fenstermacher, Centennial School District

Carlos Moreno, Hispanic Chamber of Commerce

Kem Marks, East Portland Action Plan (EPAP)

John Bildsoe (alternate) – Gresham Coalition of Neighborhoods

Welcome

Heidi Guenin, CAC Chair, welcomes the committee and started with announcements. She announced that Chabre Vickers has accepted the second seat on the Policy and Budget Committee. Rick Bartko agreed to be an alternate chair for the CAC when Heidi is traveling.

Comments from the Public

Doug Allen

Mr. Allen read a statement to the CAC members. His statement can be found at the back of this document.

Committee Questions

Heidi Guenin requested that someone from TriMet talk to the committee about coordinating a time when committee members may ride the Vine.

Paul Pappas had concerns about the conversations taking place on the Google Group application. He wanted to know how the information generated through the discussions was going to be made available to the public. Heidi let Paul know that at the end of the week she takes all of the questions posted on the forum and sends them to TriMet. At that point, the questions are in the public record and TriMet can respond. She also suggested that questions could be posted online along with the CAC meeting summary notes.

Coral Egnew, Senior Community Affairs Coordinator, responded to the comment about the CAC Vine Tour and let the members know that there was a tentative date of Thursday May 11, 2017. Once the date was confirmed with C-TRAN, the members would be emailed an invitation.

Paul asked if it was possible to get any public input from C-TRAN riders about their experiences with the new Vine BRT system. Jennifer Koozer, Community Affairs Manager, said that it should be possible and that she would work with C-TRAN to invite some community members to the tour.

Coral also clarified that is the committee was comfortable with sharing their Google Group questions with the public, TriMet can release the questions and answers online along with the online CAC material.

Heidi said that they will try and schedule a date to meet with C-TRAN after the ride to discuss what everyone took away from it.

Presentation on the Outer Division Safety Action Plan

Elizabeth Mahon, Project Manager with the City of Portland Bureau of Transportation, presented about the bureaus collective lists of projects on outer Division Street. She explained that this is the first comprehensive Vision Zero plan that the Bureau is undertaking. Vision Zero is the city's commitment to eliminate all traffic deaths and serious injuries by 2025. Elizabeth stated that Division Street was picked as the first plan because in the last 10 years, 13 people have been killed and 117 people have been seriously injured. Division Street has been on the High Crash Corridor list for years.

The goal of the Outer Division Safety Plan is to make the road safer for all users by infilling sidewalk, adding separated bike lanes, median islands, rapid flashing beacons and infilling street lighting. She stated that PBOT also recently installed fixed speed cameras and speed reader boards.

John Bildsoe had concerns with the accuracy of the speed cameras and drivers only slowing down for the range of the camera and then zooming away after they pass. He wanted to know how PBOT would be taking that behavior into account. Elizabeth stated the speed cameras were only one tool in lowering speeds. Vision Zero follows the three E's to reduce speeding on Division. Engineering, like median islands and curb extensions for pedestrians, will make the road seem narrower causing driver to slow down. The second E is enforcement, which includes the speed cameras, and third is education for drivers, pedestrians and cyclists. John also asked at what speed the cameras would be activated. Elizabeth said that your picture was taken and citation issued when you were traveling over the speed limit.

Kem Marks asked why the speed limit to activate the camera was set so high since at 40 mph the chance to have an accident is 80% higher than 30 mph. Follow-up: the programming of the specific cameras on Division coincides with Oregon Class C moving violation and will currently issue ticket to drivers traveling over the posted speed. Programming for fixed speed cameras varies around the city. Some buffer is typically allowed to account for tire pressure influence on speed and inaccuracies in speedometers, however programming is more stringent in other areas such as within school zones. Please note that programming is subject to change and drivers are liable and can be cited anytime they are traveling over the posted speed limit.

Cory Price asked what the city's proposal for illegal jaywalking along Division Street. Rick Bartko answered that this issue is best addressed by education outreach and encouraging the use of reflective gear for pedestrians. Rick also mentioned that there is a cultural aspect to the behavior. Immigrants living in Portland may not understand the rules of the road and how fast cars are traveling. He said that the City of Portland spent \$300,000 to educate the immigrant community on how to be safe and read signs in Division Midway. Elizabeth explained that there was a sheet in the committee's packet that explained the education campaign that was allocated by council in December of last year. Elizabeth also let the committee know that the median islands will assist in channeling where pedestrians decide to cross. Currently every corner is a legal crosswalk. When PBOT puts in the median islands some of those will no longer be crosswalks. However, there will be a crossing approximately every 530 feet for pedestrians.

Kem Marks stated his concerns about how Vision Zero will educate drivers on the road. Elizabeth mentioned that PBOT has organized street teams to go out into the community to educate people on all aspects of the road.

Sydney Mead asked about the lighting being proposed. She wanted to know if there was any chance of expanding light all along Division. Elizabeth responded that Vision Zero is focusing on the High Crash Corridor network, which only included Division east of 82nd Avenue. However, there are plans to eventually expand lighting infill projects city-wide.

Cory Price asked if the medians will be storm water facilities to deter people from crossing. Elizabeth stated that the medians will not be storm water facilities, but will include groundcover and green vegetation, including some trees.

John Bildsoe asked where the funding for these improvements was coming from. Elizabeth stated that the projects were primarily funded through federal grants, the gas tax, and Transportation System Development Charges. Most of the projects are 89% federally funded and some of the grants were awarded in 2011, but funding was not received until the 2012 – 2015 cycle.

Elizabeth ended her presentation by stating that the next steps were to launch public outreach along the corridor in May. PBOT would also be hosting a joint open house with TriMet on June 29. The project has a goal to have all improvements constructed by 2018 before Division Transit Project breaks ground.

[Presentation on Division Transit Project Design Considerations](#)

James McGrath, CH2M Design Team Lead for the Division Transit Project, presented on the design considerations his team was using to decide preliminary station footprints for the project and the feasibility to support the LPA decision. The goal for CH2M is to create a realistic project that the CAC can step through in detail in the summer. James walked the CAC members through the alignment and how different areas would require different kinds of stations to fit into the community context. While the project will have levels of continuity, stations will be design to fit into their environment. James went into some of the assumptions that the design team was operating under like 60-foot buses, level boarding, all door boarding, bikes on the bus, etc.

Kari Schlosshauer asked James to clarify his comment about the three doors versus the second door. James stated that currently the design assumption was that mobility devices and carts would enter the bus through Door 2 and bikes would be entering the bus at Door 3.

Cory Price wanted to know if the CAC would be going out to the corridor to look at station locations on the street, versus drawings or digital photos. He wanted to know if the CAC would be asked to force ranking stations from most difficult stop to place to easier stations to place. James stated that there are going to be stations where drawing and models will not help answer difficult issues. Those may be ones worth going out and making a field trip to the area. However, with 80 platforms, there will not be enough time to visit all location.

Cory suggested that since the CAC represented the different alignment segments, members could break up into sub-committees.

John Carr wanted to get some clarification on the raised platforms compared to what exists today. He asked about the difference in cost and what the time savings would be by not having the bus kneel. James responded that the project will get a greater time benefit if it can achieve all door boarding, with almost no cost associated for it. Achieving level boarding takes time off the clock, which is how this project will be most successful. The team is unsure the actual costs, but they are working on it.

John asked a follow-up question regarding varying platform heights. He wanted to know if there is a possibility that platforms will be at different heights and be different or flexible. James said that the project will try as hard as possible to keep the system consistent, but there is flexibility if its needed.

Chabre Vickers asked James what his top two priorities for the project were. James said that his number one priority number was to find the most accurate and sensible platform placement that balances station needs and

current ridership. His second priority is balancing transit performance. His third priority is avoiding significant property impacts because that is where the project spends money for no real benefit.

John Bildsoe stated that James pointed out many instances of rocks and hard places, but he wanted to know if there were any costs associated to the options yet. James responded that cost estimation work is currently underway. The team is trying to get to a realistic project by this summer. Once there is realistic design that can fit into the project funding, the team will come back to the CAC for feedback. Coral Egnew also added that in May the CAC will get more into the details as far as design goes, and then in June TriMet will have the preliminary design that members can begin vetting with their communities.

Sydney Mead expressed her concerns about the furniture and amenities package with the platforms in Inner Division and how that may all work in such a tight space. James responded that the project has a goal to make all platforms the same for the operator, but the backdrops and contextual form can be changed station by station according to the environment.

Kem Marks listed his expectations as a member of the CAC. He said that he expects that the numbers of stations will not change. He hopes that 81 stations do not change to 75. James said that we may have to move stations depending on design considerations. Kem also expects that not only buses have communication with signaling, but pedestrians and cyclists as well. His last expectation is that when the CAC is asked to help make decisions, that they are given hard and fast dollar numbers with the things they are valuing.

Rick Bartko asked about what considerations were taken regarding a road diet, or median running buses.

James said that not implementing a road diet on Division was something that the jurisdictions had agreed on, but that does not mean that it cannot change. While the area around Interstate 205 is well above the volumes that allow and enable road diets to occur, the rest of outer Division has vehicle traffic below the volumes that would benefit from a road diet. James mentioned that what he likes about the scheme that the team arrived at (right running bus service) is that it allows for improvements in the future that make the right lane a transit-only lane, creating a de-facto road diet. It allows the project to be future proof if things change. Building median running lanes today would be a level of transformation and cost that is out of range for this project.

Cory Price wanted to know how the bus would operate west of 80th in regards to bottlenecks from delivery trucks or semi trucks. He asked what the potential back up would be for those 80 blocks until Tilikum Crossing. James stated that there is no design that could get the project out of these potentialities. The project design is working to make the buses more nimble, with fewer stops, shorter dwell times and achieving transit signal priority. But it will not solve all the problems, and the team will continue working on making service better.

Michael Harrison asked about bicycle accommodation west of 60th Avenue. James states that it is not a current design assumption that the project has to accommodate a delineated bike facility on Division west of 60th.

Heidi asked the CAC to approve the meeting notes from the March meeting. The committee suggested small changes and approved the notes for public record.

[Written Comments submitted to the committee](#)

Bree West

Thank you for allowing public attendance. There were a lot of acronyms that were unfamiliar to me “LPA” “BMP” etc. It would be helpful to have people spell them out or provide a list of commonly used acronyms.

I am curious what role the City of Gresham plays in this project. I heard a lot about Portland “to the City Limit” what about beyond the Portland City Limit? Will there be additional opportunities for community participation?

I really appreciate the thoughtful facilitation by the chair. Ensuring all members had a chance to speak was refreshing.

Claudia Robertson

You really need a sound system. It would be impossible for a person with any hearing loss to follow anything said by committee members

Jake

I have concerns around platform access. The decision indicated that some platforms would be ADA accessible from 1 side but each platform has 2 access points. I hope the committee can maximize platform access for all users – that is have 2 ada accessible points for as many as possible, if not all platforms. Forgive me if I misunderstood the presentation.