

Steering Committee #5

Meeting Summary

Date: November 2, 2023
Time: 2:30 PM to 5:00 PM
Location: Washington County Public Service Building 155 N 1st Ave, Hillsboro, OR 97124
and Zoom webinar

Committee Members Present

Art Pearce, *Portland Bureau of Transportation (PBOT)*
Brendan Finn, Urban Mobility Office Director, *Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)*
Councilor Beach Pace, *City of Hillsboro*
Councilor Juan Carlos González, *Metro*
Jessica Berry for Commissioner Sharon Meieran, *District 1, Multnomah County*
Karmen Chavez-Sam, *Asian Pacific American Network of Oregon (APANO)*

Mariana Valenzuela, Director of Community Partnerships and Advocacy, *Centro Cultural*
Monique Claiborne for Bret Marchant, *Greater Portland Inc. (GPI)*
President Deanna Palm, *Washington County Chamber of Commerce*
Stephen Roberts for Commissioner Pam Treece, *Washington County*
Tom Mills, *Director, Planning and Policy, TriMet*

Committee Members Absent

Bret Marchant, *Greater Portland Inc. (GPI)*
Commissioner Sharon Meieran, *District 1, Multnomah County*

Commissioner Pam Treece, *Washington County*
Mayor Lacey Beaty, *City of Beaverton*

Agency Representatives

Stephanie Millar, *ODOT*
Mandy Putney, *ODOT*

Kate Hawkins, *Metro*
Malu Wilkinson, *Metro*

Staff and Consultants

Mara Krinke, *Parametrix*
Jennifer John, *Parametrix*
Nadine Appenbrink, *Parametrix*

Jeanne Lawson, *JLA Public Involvement*
Brandy Steffen, *JLA Public Involvement*
Valentina Peng, *JLA Public Involvement*

Additional Attendees:

Jean Senechal Biggs, *City of Beaverton*
Eric Hesse, *Portland Bureau of Transportation*

Meeting Summary

This was the fifth meeting of the Westside Multimodal Improvements Study Steering Committee. The purpose of the meeting was to review previous work and meetings, to understand Scenarios 4 and 5, the cost assumptions, and to discuss investment prioritizations as a group. Committee members reviewed the investment options and began grouping and sorting them for inclusion into the plan. Since this was the first meeting to cover the topic, there was no final recommendation at the end of the meeting. Steering Committee members directed the Project Management Group (PMG, staff level technical working group) to develop a proposal for the Committee to consider in developing the Implementation Plan at Meeting #6.

Welcome and Introductions

Committee co-chair Brendan Finn thanked the group for their time and contribution to the process. He stated the study's problem statement and reminded them of the project goal and their roles in the process.

Review and Update

Facilitator Jeanne Lawson welcomed the group and provided an overview of the meeting plan. She emphasized that the group should consider the priority areas (mobility and reliability, safety, social equity, climate action, and economic vitality) in addition to effectiveness in addressing the problem statement when they evaluate the investment options. Following the previous meeting, project staff sorted the investment options into two categories:

- **Projects that move the needle** (address the core challenges laid out in the problem statement).
- **Projects that do not move the needle** (will not address the core challenges).

The facilitator introduced the three buckets the group will be sorting the projects into:

- **Bucket 1** – This addresses the study's problem statement and is worthy of further study.
- **Bucket 2** – This doesn't address the study's problem statement but should be considered through a different process.
- **Bucket 3** – This is not recommended for further study or inclusion in the implementation plan.

She emphasized that the group's goal is to reach consensus, but the projects will not be included in the plan if the responsible jurisdiction is unwilling. As requested at the previous meeting, the project staff will share information on the cost and jurisdiction responsibility for the projects.

Scenarios

Kate Hawkins provided a recap of the discussion from the last meeting. She noted that when reviewing scenarios 1-3, the group shared the consensus that it showed improvements for safety and mode-shift but little impact for mobility or reliability on US 26. She noted the group's request to include cost information as part of the evaluation.

Stephanie Millar provided a high-level review of the scenario groupings. She shared the expected changes by 2045, noting that the base year for comparison is 2045 using the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) projections.

Jennifer John presented performance results for scenario 4 and the tolling scenario. She noted that scenario 4 focuses on major investments which include major, large-scale infrastructure, and that the tolling scenario is unique, as it is only built from the financially constrained-based RTP and does not include the investments from scenarios 1-4. She noted that the team identified congestion points, where high demand fees may be introduced in addition to base toll fees on US26 and OR217.

The group asked some clarifying questions to better understand the data presented. Highlights from the Q&A include:

- The change in travel time on the tolling scenario is a change compared to the baseline evaluation, which is the 2045 RTP.
- Modeling examined the effects of diversion. Most diversion is shown in the tolling scenario, but also occurs in scenarios 1-4 when US26 is at capacity.
- The baseline model run shows expected conditions in 2045 (land use, trip making, etc.). With this assumption, the baseline of delay is 800 hours during PM peak hours.
- Reliability is important for business operations. However, measuring reliability within the regional travel demand model is a challenge.
- The amount of delay remained largely unchanged between the arterials and the freeway system, except in the tolling scenario. The tolling scenario would eliminate delay on US26, but there would be a slight increase in delay on local streets.
- Scenarios were run through Regional Travel Demand modeling as groups of projects; it is not possible to distinguish how individual elements contributed to the aggregated results.
- There is a discussion on transportation funding happening right now in the region, including a special committee on joint transportation in the state legislature. This is a priority to many of the partners in the region.
- New and recent legislation and policies at the regional and state levels encourage employment opportunities.

Activity and Discussion

Ms. Millar provided an overview of the cost assumptions and lead agencies for the investment options. She noted that capital and operating costs were both considered.

The facilitator confirmed that the group is expected to make informed decisions with the information that is provided, acknowledging the limitations without detailed information. She reiterated the meeting goal of identifying items for further discussion and items that everyone can agree on, which would help guide decision making in future meetings.

Sorting Activity

The facilitator provided an overview of instructions for the sticky wall and the sorting exercise. She highlighted that there will be no decision at this meeting. The facilitator reminded the group that "moving the needle" in this study means improving US26 access and reliability, lowering congestion, and increasing mobility. Ms. Hawkins added that the feedback and categorization from this meeting will help the project team create a framework to help guide the discussion on bringing together a recommendation at the next meeting.



After the individual dot exercise, the facilitator confirmed with the committee that they're comfortable with the project management group (PMG) gathering their input and producing a recommendation to help guide their conversation at the next meeting.

The committee felt comfortable with most of the projects in the buckets discussed but noted that some additional information is needed for projects that received varying levels of support. During the next meeting, recommendations based on this feedback will be reviewed by the committee for additional refinement regarding the investments that should be included in the implementation plan. The project team anticipates adding another meeting with this group for a final vote.

Public Comment

The facilitator invited public attendees to ask questions or share comments. There was one public comment.

- Tim Layton, Director of State Government Affairs, Genentech: I appreciate the conversation and have learned a lot. This is a process that has impacted and will impact the operations of Genentech, in terms of production, expansion, and deliveries. If the changes impact Genentech's ability to ship or deliver our products, we'll need to move. When I look at the buckets and scenario 4, while they're expensive, those are projects that increase reliability and move the

needle. I would like the group to identify and figure out how to get it done in order to get to longer-term projects.

Next Steps and Adjourn

The next meeting is on November 30. The facilitator noted that an additional meeting following that would be needed to make a decision. She shared the goals of the next two meetings are to work through discussions, make recommendations, and then reach consensus at the final meeting.

Councilor González and the facilitator thanked the group for their discussion and comments.