

Community Task Force (CTF)

MEETING NOTES

November 17, 2008
5:30 to 8:30 p.m.
SMILE Station

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Meeting Objectives

- Respond to CTF requests for information.
- Update CTF on public involvement activities.
- Discuss alternative alignments and elements.

Key Points

- CTF members unanimously rejected the “no-build” option.
- Members’ concerns and comments may lead to a “hybrid” option to be discussed at the next meeting.
- Alternative D and hybrids received the most support from the CTF.

Action Items Completed

- Responded to CTF requests for information.
- Began focus on eventual CTF recommendation for its preferred alternative.

Action Items

- Provide information on possible hybrids.
- Receive report from freight working group.
- Report on feasibility of S-curved or cantilevered bike/ped facility on lower bridge deck.
- Study whether Alternative E can be built with a separate bike/ped bridge.

Community Task Force (CTF)

MEETING NOTES

Attendees

CTF Members: Barbara Barber, Jason Barbour, Gary Barth, Tom Brown, Marie Dodds, John Fyre, Ken Love, Laura Jackson, Richard Marantz, Tina Nunez, Lidwien Rahman, Scott Thayer, Robert Wilhelm and Brian Wilson.

Staff: Multnomah County: Ian Cannon, Michael Eaton and Mike Pullen; CH2M Hill: Marcy Schwartz; Cogan Owens Cogan: Elaine Cogan and Ellie Fiore; Alta Planning + Design: Mia Birk; Portland Office of Transportation: Mauricio LeCleric; David Parisi; Metro: Tim Collins.

Guests: Megan and Steve Adkins, Margaret Foster, Arlene Kavlok, Jim Larpenteur, John Lattig, Steve Law, Metro Councilor Richard Liberty, Ed Murphy, Richard Poulton, Diana Richardson, Lynn Rogers and Tom Walsh.

Welcome and Introductions

Elaine Cogan opened the meeting by reviewing the agenda.

Elaine reminded members of the public that due to federal regulations during this period, only written comments are being accepted at this time. All comments received will be appended to this meeting summary.

This is the last CTF meeting at SMILE station. CTF member John Fyre and the other hosts from the neighborhood were thanked for providing this space.

Note: In the following summary, comments from the CTF are in italics; comments from staff and others are in regular type.

Public Comments

The following members of the public spoke and submitted written comments that are attached to this summary: Jim Larpenteur; John Lattig; and Tom Walsh.

Public Involvement Update

Mike Pullen reported that the public comment period on the DEIS began November 7th and will conclude on December 22nd. . The County held four community briefings to explain the DEIS content with a total attendance of about 70 people. They received 10 written comments to date. So far, there have been 420 responses to the online survey.

A briefing for the SMILE neighborhood was well attended. Ian Cannon updated the Metro Council. The bike/ped working group will report later at this meeting and the freight working group will meet tomorrow. County staff also met with the Macadam Bay Home Owners Association, a floating home community whose access could be affected. There will be a public hearing at OMSI December 10th.

Gary Barth: Were there other working groups?

A bridge type working group met earlier in the process and reported to the CTF, the freight group is meeting tomorrow and a bridge structure working group consists of technical staff.

Bicycle / Pedestrian Working Group Update

Richard Marantz reported that the bike/ped working group met last week to review the DEIS findings. They focused their comments on Alternatives A and D.

Alternative A -- The group has strong concerns but general support for this Alternative, favoring the separate bike/ped bridge. Main points of concern:

- Do not neglect the bike/ped bridge during the next steps of bridge planning
- Impacts to the park and riverfront
- Important for community to support the bike/ped bridge
- Create a long-term maintenance plan for the bike/ped bridge
- Security and isolation under bridgeheads
- The added cost of the bike/ped bridge

Alternative D – The group believes this alternative is most optimal for bike users and pedestrians. Main points:

- Non-separated facilities accommodate different users
- Would prefer D with the current SE 6th Avenue treatment.
- Do not favor a temporary bridge or service interruptions
- Small amount of out-of-direction bike travel is acceptable
- D has the fewest problems

Alternative B

- The roundabout won't function well for bikes and pedestrians
- A 10-foot bike lane is inadequate compared to 12 feet in the other cross-sections
- The shoulders end in a manner that is undesirable for bikes and pedestrians

Brian Wilson: Do you have the same concerns for Alternative A?

Richard: No, because the separate bike/ped bridge takes these users out of the roundabout.

Alternative C

- The working group is strongly opposed to the bike/ped path underneath the roadway.
- We have concerns about safety and maintenance and have not heard any success stories about this type of design.

Tina Nunez: Is there information on S-curved or cantilevered bike/ped paths?

Staff will research this and report back next meeting.

Richard continues

- With the trumpet interchange, the bike/ped working group thinks there would be loss of vehicle access to the River View cemetery. If the cemetery chooses to close this roadway to bicycles, this would eliminate a commuter route for Lewis and Clark students and other east-west commuters.

Alternative E:

- We do not like the full signal treatment on the east side.
- Do not favor the unbalanced/different bike/ped widths on the north and south sides of the cross-section.

Gary: How do we incorporate feedback from the working groups?

Every CTF member has a constituency. Working groups were based on requests from individual constituencies.

Gary: We should ensure that all groups are represented, especially considering the financial considerations.

Tina: It is worth pointing out that all the alternatives support transit.

Lidwein Rahman: The bike/ped bridge and “scaled-back” main bridge in Alternative A resulted because rehabilitation was supposed to be cheaper.

Response to CTF Requests

David Parisi and Steve Katko responded to CTF questions from the previous meeting.

Proposed transit stops have been added to the drawings. In Alternatives A and C, no stops are on the bridge because of the west-side intersection design. Transit stops would be north of the bridge near Taylor’s Ferry Road.

Traffic demand estimates are based on 2005 and 2035 peak hour counts. There are four bottlenecks along Tacoma Street and the bridge—at the west end, on the bridge and at SE 13th and SE 17th. Currently, this facility is approaching or at its functional capacity. By 2035, demand will increase 15-20%, with heaviest traffic westbound in the morning peak hours and eastbound in the evening.

All the build alternatives will increase westside capacity, leaving the other three bottleneck points as they are. Just west of SE 6th Avenue, as there is one lane in each

direction on SE 6th, traffic will continue to be held up at SE 13th and SE 17th. If no lanes are added to Tacoma, traffic will continue to be held up at these points during morning westbound traffic. Past 6th Avenue, traffic will ease about halfway across the bridge. The reverse is true for the evening peak hour travel.

Roundabouts with meters are unusual. The purpose of this is to prevent gridlock in the roundabout, which in turn blocks westbound and northbound traffic.

There are two options for the intersection treatment at SE 6th Avenue. The first is to leave the intersection as it is, possibly adding a bike/pedestrian activated signal. The second option is to have a full signal for vehicles. The intersection will fail at SE 6th if there is a full signal permitting left turns. Intersections at SE 13th and SE 17th would continue to function.

Mauricio LeClerc, PDOT staff, added that the City will continue to look at other options for this intersection.

Barbara Barber: It is likely that Spokane Street will become a limited bike boulevard. Are there advantages to having a full signal at SE 6th?

There would be more north-south travel time and more ability to take a left turn off the bridge, but there are concerns regarding bike/ped safety. The signal can be managed differently to create different outcomes.

Tom Brown: Is it an effective traffic management strategy to put stop signs at SE 6th and allow pedestrians to cross safely, while having vehicles travel through in groups?

With a surface crossing, additional capacity would be needed.

Richard: Is there any information on the impact of a full signal on noise from vehicles stopping and starting?

The eastside loop option in Alternative C connects to Grand underneath the bridge in place of a left turn. This may increase neighborhood traffic but it also increases accessibility.

Tina: Is it possible to put diverters on Spokane Street?

Traffic calming options can be explored. There is a traffic calming plan for Spokane underway as part of another project. There will be a public open house on this subject in December.

Next, CTF members commented on the five build and the no-build alternative by attaching post-it notes to sheets of paper for each alternative on one of three columns – “positive”, “negative” and “other”.

Elaine read a sample of the comments. The compilation of group comments is attached.

The CTF then divided into three groups to discuss the following: bridge elements to drop from further consideration, elements to retain, requests for additional information and further comments if any. The results from their discussion are shown in the following table.

Group 1:
Tom Brown
John Fyre
Ken Love
Richard Marantz
Scott Thayer

Group 2:
Barbara Barber
Jason Barbour
Gary Barth
Tina Nunez
Lidwien Rahman

Group 3:
Marie Dodds
Laura Jackson
Robert Wilhelm
Brian Wilson

	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
Elements to drop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trumpet • Roundabout with bike/peds • Eastside full signal • Four-lane cross-sections • Rehab options • Detour bridge • Bridge closure • Lower deck for bike/peds • Unbalanced b/p roadway (E) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trumpet • No-build • Roundabout (all) • Rehab options • Eastside full signal • Lower deck for bike/peds directly under vehicle right-of-way 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trumpet • Roundabout (all) • Eastside full signal • Lower deck for bikes/peds • Eastside loop • “Extreme” phasing
Elements to keep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Westside signal • Eastside bike/ped treatment • Cross-section D • Eastside loop (with traffic calming) • Separate bike/ped bridge • C roadway (3 lanes) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Westside signal • Eastside bike/ped treatment • Cross-section D • Alignment D • Eastside loop with traffic calming 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Westside signal • Cross-section D • Four-lane cross-section on bridge, striped for two lanes
Additional Information Requests	Info on hybrid: Alignment D or E with cross-section A and separate bike/ped bridge	How does cross-section D accommodate transit/streetcar?	Only detailed info on any hybrid option

Other Comments	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would like to see an additional Clackamas County bridge • Explore tolling on all bridges • If PAG keeps elements CTF wants to drop, please explain. • No long term closure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eliminate no build. • If long term closure, must have detour bridge • Accelerate timing to be shovel ready ASAP
----------------	------	--	---

Staff agreed to provide further information on the hybrids proposed by Group 1 and whether the alignment on Alternative E could be constructed with the separate bike/ped bridge.

Metro Councilor Robert Liberty, who attended the meeting, told the CTF that the Sellwood Bridge is one of many projects being considered for funding at a time when funding is scarce. He added that projects adopted in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) must have a realistic and reasonable finance plan.

Next Steps

The next CTF meeting will be January 5th at OMSI. If members cannot agree on a preferred alternative at that time, an additional meeting on January 19th will be held.

The public comment period and online survey close December 22nd. This information, as well as recommendations from senior staff will be presented to the CTF on January 5th.

**Sellwood CTF Meeting
November 17, 2008
Comments from members**

No Build Option		
Plus	Minus	Other
	<p>Not an acceptable alternative/doesn't solve the problem (5)</p> <p>Could result in a larger bridge later (1)</p> <p>Structure can't support mass transit. (1)</p> <p>Inadequate for bikes/pedestrians (1)</p> <p>Safety concerns (1)</p>	<p>With no added capacity to overall system, scarce resources could be used more effectively elsewhere (1)</p>

Alternative "A"		
Plus	Minus	Other
<p>Separate bike/pedestrian bridge (3)</p> <p>Loss of fewer condos (1)</p> <p>Similar footprint to existing bridge (1)</p> <p>Adds a regional bike/pedestrian trail connection (1)</p> <p>Improved safety (1)</p>	<p>Don't like roundabout (3)</p> <p>Rehab doesn't seem cost effective (3)</p> <p>Bike/pedestrian bridge may not get funded/too expensive (3)</p> <p>Don't further bike/ped vs. vehicle funding argument (2)</p> <p>Impact on park of separate bike/pedestrian bridge (1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - structure/footprint - transients under bridge <p>Separate bridge (1)</p> <p>Closure time (1)</p> <p>Too expensive (1)</p> <p>Tough sell to public to build two structures so close together (1)</p> <p>The whole plan (1)</p> <p>Potential irretrievable commitment of community and regional park resources (1)</p> <p>Construction feasibility bike/pedestrian bridge (1)</p>	<p>Why doesn't bike/pedestrian bridge touch down at Spokane Street?</p> <p>What would it cost to combine bike/pedestrian bridge with new bridge with same cross-section as vehicular bridge under alternative 'A'?</p> <p>Why is the river not considered a recreational resource? It is in public ownership.</p>

Alternative “B”		
Plus	Minus	Other
Loss of fewer condos (1) Detour bridge (limited closure time) (1) No signal at 6 th (1)	Don't like roundabout (7) Not cost effective (4) Inadequate bike/ped infrastructure (2) Excessive bike/pedestrian vis-à-vis lane width (1) Temp bridge cost (2)	Why is the river not considered a recreational resource? It is in public ownership.

Alternative “C”		
Plus	Minus	Other
Loss of fewer condos (1) Lane configuration on bridge (1) Cheapest. (1) Similar footprint to existing bridge (1) Limited displacement (1) Potential to s-curve bike/pedestrian bridge (1) West end underpass ok (1) No signal (1) With separate bike/ pedestrian bridge (1) Direct trail connections east and west (1)	Don't like bike/pedestrian bridge under vehicular bridge – safety, maintenance and user comfort (6) Don't like the trumpet (5) Access to cemetery limited (3) Staff Jennings should not be sacrificed (2) East side connector underpass to Grand/cut through (2) Don't like east end loop (2) Closes the bridge (1) Not enough benefits (1)	Why is the river not considered a recreational resource? It is in public ownership. Why so much park resources dedicated? Please explain. Add diverters to direct traffic to Tacoma.

Alternative “D”		
Plus	Minus	Other
<p>No bridge closure (7)</p> <p>Provides better mobility, connectivity and capacity (3)</p> <p>Best overall option (3)</p> <p>Preferred bike/ped treatment (3)</p> <p>Signalized west interchange (3)</p> <p>Meets purpose: need, cost effective (vs. rehab or option “E”), displaces fewest commercial units (1)</p>	<p>Too many west-end lanes (2)</p> <p>No east full signal (4)</p> <p>Parallel construction limited to delta and deck arch (1)</p> <p>Condo displacements (1)</p> <p>West end should be a signal (1).</p> <p>Impacts to Tacoma (1)</p>	<p>Need more info on in-water work and impact to popular recreational fishing spot.</p> <p>Some are concerned this is a “select” preferred alternative that’s been pre-selected.</p> <p>Why is the river not considered a recreational resource? It is in public ownership.</p> <p>I think we should have a 3rd lane for transit, future streetcar, etc.</p>

Alternative "E"		
Plus	Minus	Other
<p>Signalized interchanges (3)</p> <p>Provides most capacity (3)</p> <p>No bridge closure (2)</p> <p>With northwest end treatment (1)</p> <p>Bridge designed with transit lanes (1)</p> <p>Bridge width (1)</p> <p>Good construction schedule with minimal impact on existing bridge (1)</p>	<p>Number of lanes negatively impacts Tacoma as main street (3)</p> <p>Impacts the park and church (3)</p> <p>Most business and residential impacts (2)</p> <p>Light at 6th (2)</p> <p>Full signal may cause cut-through traffic (2)</p> <p>Out of direction travel for cyclists and pedestrians in community (1)</p> <p>Concern that transit lanes could be turned into general traffic lanes (1)</p> <p>Length of transit lanes may be of no real benefit to transit (1)</p> <p>Bikes/pedestrians need to get to north side of bridge because no loop ramp to south side (1)</p> <p>Bad alignment (1)</p> <p>Impact on Staff Jennings, traffic flows, historic feeling, aesthetics (1)</p>	<p>Why is the river not considered a recreational resource? It is in public ownership.</p>