

June 4, 2007
Meeting of the Riverfront Board
Minutes

Members Present: Seagler, Wall, Green, Stacey, Martin, St.Clair, Klein
Guests: Councilors Stone and Collette and 30-40 visitors
Bridget Wieghart, Metro and Sean Batty, Tri Met

Minutes:

Martin motioned to approve the minutes from the May 8 meeting. Stacey seconded and motion passed 4-0-2 (two abstaining and St Clair not present when vote taken.)

South Corridor Phase II Alignment Discussion

Herrigel began by summarizing the meetings held in the City to date on the South Corridor Phase II. She noted that during and between the Open House and the three segment meetings, City staff and Council have received requests from members of the Waldorf School, Historic Milwaukie NDA, Lake Rd NDA and other schools in the downtown area that the project team consider an additional alignment in the SDEIS, which would go along McLoughlin and/or Main Street. The three alignments currently approved for evaluation in the SDEIS travel along the Tillamook rail line through the downtown area. As a result of these requests, the Mayor has asked for four groups to weigh in on whether this fourth alignment should be taken into the SDEIS. These groups include the Riverfront Board, the Planning Commission, the Downtown Businesses, and the North Industrial Businesses. She said that tonight's discussion was to focus on whether that fourth alignment should be included in the SDEIS so that the Board could deliver a recommendation to the Mayor on this question.

Green acknowledged that there was a large audience and asked the Board how they wanted the audience to participate at the meeting. Klein suggested that the Board hear the presentation, have some discussion, ask questions and then hear from the guests afterward. Green said he concurred with this approach and suggested that questions or comments from the audience, specific to the presentation, be taken after the Board had had a chance to ask questions. All Board members agreed to this approach.

Bridget Weighart, Project Manager from Metro, went over the history of the South Corridor project, noting that the Portland to Milwaukie line is Phase II and the I-205 line, currently under construction, is Phase I. She briefly described the three alignments already in the SDEIS, namely the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA), the LPA with a tail running to Park Ave and the Working Group alignment with a tail to Park. She then introduced Sean Batty from Tri Met who would describe the potential Mcloughlin/Main alignment in more detail.

Batty went over a table of contents for a booklet Metro and Tri Met are developing on the Main/McLoughlin alignment. He said he would follow this format roughly for his presentation. He began by showing the Board concept plans of the LPA along the

Tillamook line. He then showed three concepts for possible and feasible alignments involving McLoughlin and Main: 1) McLoughlin (West side running), 2) McLoughlin (Center running) and 3) McLoughlin /Main Couplet. Following are some of the features described for each:

1) McLoughlin (West side running)

- Double tracks
- Bridge and abutment at 224 reconstructed
- 5 buildings displaced
- Signalized crossing on McLoughlin for track to cross McLoughlin from east side
- 29-40 feet of space removed from Riverfront Park (from back of sidewalk)
- Right turn pocket required for entering park
- 275 space Park and Ride at cash Spot
- Stations would be straddle entrance to Park
- 29 foot track only
- 40 foot station and turn lane

For tail to Park:

- Reconstruct rail road bridge south of Kellogg
 - Reconstruct bridge over Kellogg at 99E
- (noted that Tillamook alignment would not affect railroad bridge or Island Station intersections since rail touches down south of this area)

2) McLoughlin (Center running)

- From 224 to Harrison – same affect as West running
- Bridge and abutment at 224 reconstructed
- 5 buildings displaced
- Signalized crossing on McLoughlin for track to cross McLoughlin to center median
- Track would run along center median of McLoughlin
- Left turn lane onto 17th taken up by station at Monroe
- Reconstruct Kellogg Creek bridge at 99E
- Continue center run to Park
- Reconstruct rail road bridge south of Kellogg

Green noted that he'd participated in the CAC for the McLoughlin project and the left turn lane pocket length had been a very important issue to ODOT during that process. He said he was skeptical that ODOT would be of a different mind for this project. Batty acknowledged that they had not met with ODOT on any of these concept plans and he agreed that ODOT might have some issues with mitigation for this design. He noted that if this center running option was not feasible within ODOT's standards, then the side running options would need to be pursued.

Klein asked which option Batty thought affected traffic on Harrison the most. Batty said he thought the center running option did.

3)McLoughlin/Main Couplet

- Single track runs down McLoughlin on west side
- Turn left on Washington (southside)
- Turn left on Main St (east side)
- Terminus track would be in south part of Riverfront on McLoughlin
- 275 car Park and Ride at Cash Spot
- Access to P+R from Main only
- Grade steep on Washington
- Looked at a center and east side run on Main St
- All angled parking would be removed on Main
- 4 new stop lights would replace signed intersections
- Area between 12 and 21 feet of Riverfront to be displaced
- Double and single tracking actually uses similar amount of space since turning and other road elements must be accommodated
- 35 parking spaces would be lost on Main

Stacey asked to look at the overhead of the LPA. Batty noted that the Tillamook alignment had 100 feet of right of way available and three gated street crossings (at Harrison, Monroe and Washington)

Seagler asked if all alternatives have to stop at Lake Rd and then later be extended to Park. Weighart said that the SDEIS would look at either Lake or Park as a terminus but whichever was selected would be built all at once, they wouldn't be phased.

St. Clair asked why they were even looking at alternatives to the Tillamook alignments. Batty noted that community members had requested that Tri Met look at alignments on Main/McLoughlin.

St. Clair asked if an eastside option on McLoughlin was feasible. Batty responded that an eastside run would cause each turn from McLoughlin into downtown to cross two tracks. He said this was hard to reconcile with required mitigation. He said even with safety protections people tend to jump gates or lights to turn right. He also noted that with an east side run business accesses off of McLoughlin would have to be consolidated or closed.

Green noted that in addition to the amount of space taken up in the Park by each of these options, he had concerns about either single or double tracks along McLoughlin and Main causing additional barriers between downtown and the Riverfront. He noted that one of the Board's main goals was to connect the Park to downtown Milwaukie.

Seagler noted that when you compared the Tillamook alignment to the options presented tonight, the Main/McLoughlin options didn't seem worth it.

Wall said he felt that our resource (the Riverfront) continued to dwindle.

Green noted that we already lost some square footage from the Park with the McLoughlin enhancements.

Stacey said he felt they'd fought too long and hard for what we have to balance of parking and green space.

Klein asked if the train could run in the street and what about changing streets to one-way? Batty answered that the tracks can run in the street but that they are on tracks so they don't share lanes with cars. He also noted that making streets one-way is possible but the Milwaukie downtown movements would be complicated.

St Clair said he thought the Main/McLoughlin couplet would be okay but we really are tight on space right now.

Klein asked if there was a way to move the terminus track on the couplet option. Batty said that there might be a way to move it to Main St but they'd need more ROW on Main.

Klein noted that any extra wall near Johnson Creek would not be attractive and he noted that there is an outlet there for water from the creek at the Waldorf School.

St Clair suggested they could move the McLoughlin station in the couplet option toward the sewer plant site and that would save some Park space.

Green asked if Sean had looked at a Main/21st couplet. Batty said he had but that the ROW to the north on Main got very thin so the connection to the north was difficult.

Klein asked about using a single tracked system (trains running north and south on the same track). Batty said Tri Met has built this type of track but has always gone back and rebuilt double tracks later to reduce bottlenecks and run time delays.

Seagler asked if this single track idea would prevent extending to Oregon City. Batty noted that it wouldn't prevent it but they would ultimately have to come back and rebuild as a double track if they extended to Oregon City.

St Clair asked about the timeline for light rail. Weighart clarified that the SDEIS would be done in July 2008. Preliminary engineering and final design would then take place and construction would begin in 2011 at the earliest. The line would open in 2014-15.

Klein noted the requirements of the Oregon Marine Board to pay back funds for projects modified or removed and wondered if the light rail project would pay these funds back for the City if the Riverfront was modified. Batty said that this would be evaluated in the SDEIS if this alignment went forward.

Green said that many of the Riverfront Board members have spent the better part of a decade working on this Park and they were protective of every square foot of space. He

said one of their goals was to reconnect the downtown to the Riverfront and they wanted to increase that connection rather than decrease it.

Green then asked if there were people in the audience that had questions.

Jerry Foy of Westwood Construction and St. John the Baptist Church

- Your missing an opportunity if you don't think light rail would be an attraction
- If I was a business person in Milwaukie I wouldn't like the Tillamook alternative since it's too far away from downtown
- Seems like access issues to the Riverfront are just as bad when the light rail is on Main/McLoughlin as they are now
- Maybe you could use the sewer plant site as a turn around or storage area
- Noted that they had gathered 290 signatures opposing the Tillamook alignment without even trying last Sunday

Mark Gamba, a Gallery owner at the McLoughlin Building(and Waldorf parent?)

- Why not have both stations on Main with Couplet option? (Batty said this could be done but they'd still need a terminus site for dead trains)
- Why not extend south, it makes sense to. (Weighart said all options would be evaluated with a southern "tail" and without one.)

Dan Hoight, a Waldorf parent and TriMet employee from 12 years

- What elements do you look at in the SDEIS? (Batty went over the matrix of issues looked at for each option presented and briefly described what the SDEIS would cover. Weighart then clarified that tonight's presentation was a "quick blush" concept plan and that there was a great deal more evaluation that would have to be done)

Ed Zumwalt

- Batty says no to one track but we were looking at one track before the Waldorf School was purchased (Weighart said that she has been unable to find any evidence of this in the records of the past light rail processes in Milwaukie)

Brandon Eiswerth, Farmers Market Manager

- Noted that there is still discussion of moving the Framers Market to the Riverfront
- Light rail would bring folks from all over to the Riverfront for the Market
- They'd come from Sellwood and south Portland
- People could come to concerts at the Riverfront by light rail too

Carol Damm, Waldorf School Board

- Handed out a position statement on Public Transportation Systems in Downtown Milwaukie
- Asked why not make Main and 21st both one-way
(Batty said they did look at one-way traffic pattern but would need to do broader review if this option moved to SDEIS. He said they present more problems than they solve at first look)
 - Asked why not single track on McLoughlin?
(Batty noted that single track running down center of McLoughlin would take less width but there would still be all the other issues for turning etc he'd

described. He noted that a single track is not really half of a double track due to the infrastructure required for tracks)

Ed Pareki, owner of a potentially impacted building

- Noted that at this point we don't know what impacts there are on the Tillamook line either
- All we are asking is that the pros and cons of other options be included

Scott Churchill, citizen of the City and member of Historic Milwaukie NDA

- Noted he was not speaking as a Planning Commissioner
- Asked that we not jump to tactical solutions
- Noted that the request to consider the Main/McLoughlin alternative was only made 15 working days ago
- We ask that you please include this alternative in the SDEIS
- Highway 26 to Beaverton(congestion was mitigated...???)
- There is inconsistency with how much space we need. Ranges from 30 feet to 100 feet
- Seems that you are building a foundation for tactical solutions

(Batty noted that 34 feet is for track and 80 feet includes curb sidewalk etc.)

Weighart noted that the discussion of the Tillamook alignment uses 100 feet of ROW as what's available – not what will be used. In no case, she said are we shoving 70-80 feet into the neighborhoods)

Green closed the meeting to public comment and said he'd like the Board to spend time, now, discussing the question.

Wall asked what the timeline was for the SDEIS as it related to the Riverfront design.

Herrigel noted that she understood that the SDEIS would be completed in July of 2008. She said that the Riverfront design is underway now and would be complete in late summer or fall of 2008. She noted that if the Main/McLoughlin alignment went forward, the Riverfront design and permitting would have to be put on hold while the SDEIS went forward.

St Clair made a motion to add the McLoughlin/Main alignment to the SDEIS as long as it allowed the Riverfront design the Board had worked on to be achieved.

St Clair said he felt it would bring good things to the City and he would use it. He added that the light rail line should not be "in lieu of" our design for our park. He said he did not want to sacrifice what they'd worked on. He said if they could come up with an alternative that minimized the impact on the Park he thought we should consider it. If there was no way to do that, then he'd drop the idea.

Seagler stated that he thought our recommendation had to be about what we have seen tonight. (Batty said that there were certainly other options but that he couldn't speak to other design parameters)

St Clair said that the only way he could support any other option was if it didn't impact the park.

Green noted that St Clair is suggesting an option which the Board can't address tonight since the SDEIS is not done. Another option is to support only options that have no impact on the Park. He said he felt strongly that if we impact the Park at all that would be unacceptable. He said he was uncomfortable with additional lines separating Downtown from the Riverfront – that to him is as important an issue as how much space would be taken away from the park.

St Clair said he thinks it will bring people to the park rather than keeping them away.

Stacey said he felt that it would make McLoughlin even worse than it is now.

St Clair said that it could facilitate getting people to the River and wouldn't necessarily be a negative impact.

Seagler noted that there isn't really time to develop an alternative to what we've seen tonight. He said the best alternative shown would have taken more than 10 feet from the park.

Green asked if there was a second to St Clair's motion. Motion failed due to lack of second.

Wall said that based on the information from tonight's meeting he would **motion that the Riverfront Board recommend against including a McLoughlin/Main alignment in the South Corridor SDEIS based on the potential impact on the Riverfront park.**

Stacey seconded the motion. Motion passed 6-1 (St Clair voted no)

Carol Damm asked whether this meant any alternative or just those that impacted the Riverfront Park.

Green said that based on the alternatives they'd seen tonight the Board recommended against inclusion of any alignment in the SDEIS that ran on McLoughlin or Main Street.

Scott Churchill said they should not jump to tactical solutions.

Herrigel asked Weighart when the report on these options would be done. Weighart said she would get it to Herrigel to get to the Board within a few days.

The Board reinforced that they hoped that Council would get the message that this alternative has major impacts on our process and our Riverfront Park project.

Oregon Solutions Update

Green and Herrigel summarized the June 1 Oregon Solutions meeting. Green noted that there had been about 20 agencies and groups represented. He noted that the permitting folks are interested in working with us on the treatments near the Creek mouths and along the water. Herrigel said she'd accomplished her goals of bringing the Partners up to speed on the progress made over the past two years and in letting them know we'd be coming to them with permits soon. She said she felt confident that they would know who we were and what our project was now.

Motion to adjourn passed 6-0.