

Portland Streetcar Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting

Wednesday, February 1, 2012, 3:30-5:00 p.m., City Hall, Pettygrove Room

Members in Attendance: Owen Ronchelli, chair; David Brandt; Carolyn Brock; Bill Danneman; Michael Dennis; Peter Finley Fry; Arlene Kimura; Gerik Kransky; Susan Pearce; Cora Potter; Zoe Presson; Bob Richardson; Vern Rifer; Richard Ross; Scott Seibert

Others: Jim Simpson, Chris Smith

Staff Attendance: Kay Dennen, Julie Gustafson, Carter MacNichol, Shoshanah Oppenheim,

1. Meeting to Order:

Owen Ronchelli, chair, called the meeting to Order. The minutes from the December 7, 2011 meeting were approved.

2. Public Comment

Chris Smith presented to the committee the issue of a catenary pole on the NE approach to the Broadway Bridge that causes a pinch point of approximately 5 feet on the sidewalk for pedestrians and cyclists. Smith has been working on the issue since August with Streetcar staff. The issue has garnered a lot of discussion recently on BikePortland.org and other online discussions/blogs. With single file traffic the pinch point does not cause much problem, however, when a passing conflict presents itself this pole can present a dangerous situation. Smith has been working with staff to either 1) move the pole or 2) provide some other mitigation to improve cycling somewhere else along the alignment. The public does not yet understand why moving the pole would be so difficult or costly. Smith requested that the CAC discuss this pole at their next meeting and invite the activists to help all better understand the situation. Smith stated that he is hoping for a good outcome from further conversations, both in public understanding as well as a good mitigation project.

Michael Dennis asked if the pole was vetted with activists before being installed. Carter MacNichol responded that the original design had the pole up against the railing and that with the light pole to the east of this pole the current location would cause less conflict. Gerik Kransky added that the BTA had cosigned a letter with Chris Smith requesting the mitigation and seconded the request to discuss this issue at the next CAC meeting. Vern Rifer commented that historically the CAC has not discussed design issues in detail but would appreciate hearing a staff recommendation for mitigation at the next meeting. Owen Ronchelli stated that he would like to give the citizens time to voice their concerns and give them the opportunity to better understand the situation, but that he does not want to see a lengthy discussion about the minute details. Vern Rifer requested that staff and activists work together over the next month and bring back a suggested mitigation for this issue to the committee. Carter MacNichol stated that the construction team evaluated several locations and that this is not the ideal location, but given other circumstances in the environment this is not a dangerous location. It is a single file area for bikes as they come up onto the sidewalks 10 feet to the east via a single file ramp. The location is not ideal, but it works.

Jim Simpson of the Elders in Action Commission presented to the committee the EAC's concern about the possible, more than likely, removal of streetcar from the free rail zone. Elders have a fixed income and have increased medical bills. Many of these people rely solely on public transportation and a fare of \$1 may not seem like a large amount, but it could add up to over \$300 in any given year that these people would need to take out of their fixed income that is not growing. At minimum they would like to see the Streetcar

honor the "Honored Citizen" pass. They recognize the fiscal situation and will continue to review that. They will continue to work with the various City Commissioners and wanted to bring the issue to light here. Owen Ronchelli reminded the committee about the Honored Citizen bus only pass that will be honored on the Streetcar. Susan Pearce asked Mr. Simpson why the issue of equity was not brought up as streetcar moves to the east side of the river. Simpson responded that the fiscal issue is well understood and that the issue of equity needs to be more fully developed before being well received.

3. Line Designations

Owen Ronchelli spoke to the committee about an upcoming March 1 deadline for the line designation to allow for the design of the printed material in coordination with the Opening of the Loop. The current recommendation is to have the Loop as the L line or "Loop" and the existing line would be the A Line as it is the first line that opened. Kay Dannen added that TriMet uses both primary colors and numbers. Bob Richardson added that he would like to see streetcar avoid using letters that correspond with the existing MAX colors. Richardson also asked if there could be a temporary designation for the Loop as it is not a complete loop at this time. He also suggested mirroring the way TriMet has their reader boards (12-to Gresham/via Sandy Blvd). Carolyn Brock stated that Portland is such a creative place, but that letters seem so humdrum. Gerik Kransky seconded that concern that the letters don't sell the place making component of the streetcar. Richard Ross stated that the A line or Green line is essentially the westside streetcar and that the Loop is the Central City Streetcar and that the Central City brand has not been used in many places to date and could be a good way to brand it. Michael Dennis stated that this is a good process to bring the surrounding community into the discussion to help bring in their ownership. Susan Pearce stated that she appreciates Michael and Richard's comments but that she also supports keeping it simple. Richardson added that he agrees with keeping it simple and that if these are the only two lines we could get very creative with naming the lines. But that the System Plan may add 5-10 new lines and that it gets difficult to delineate the lines on maps.

Peter Fry added that this is part of a larger system and that this Loop is different than everything else as all of the other routes are mainly lines rather than loops and that the loop connects lines and that the lines connect places. David Brandt added that this is difficult as you have to deal with the graphic issues with the designations. As there are so few recognizable shapes maybe they should be reserved to designate systems (i.e. Circles designate the different MAX lines on their current signage). Brandt also sees the point in designating the lines based on place but tying in a letter designation with that to make it easier to label the lines on maps and sign posts. There may be some useful clues for us from historical designations. Kay Dannen responded that we have applications where we are space restricted. She also stated that we have the headers on the cars that will have the destinations called out on the cars and we can say via Lloyd District or via 10th Ave. It is very challenging to come up with a simple enough system to provide the information but still find a way to be creative in our designations. She added that there is also a sponsorship program that allows for more naming and placemaking opportunities.

Richardson asked if there are thoughts about naming the existing line. Brandt stated that he would really support the idea of two letters to designate lines such as LP for Loop and WS for west side. Brock asked why the lines need to be designated sequentially. Ross stated that he likes the idea of no more than two words and designate the Loop as the Central City CC line and existing as the West Side or WS. Richardson seconded the support of the historic tie in with the double letter. Kransky asked if this is really the CAC's baby to name. Dannen responded that the PSI Board had passed a resolution this morning supporting the

A and L line, but any recommendation will be taken to the board and they will take that into consideration. Richardson stated: "What if we recommend two letters for the historical tie in. He stated that he is warming to the idea of calling the Loop the Central City line but isn't sure if WS would work as it is close to WES. Michael Dennis stated that the more we discuss the more he supports what is presented on the map of A and L but maybe call it L Loop rather than L Line as it is a loop. Shoshanah Oppenheim added that she really appreciates what Kransky said about placemaking and that if there is consideration of the Central City Loop as the title of the line it would get to the placemaking theme. She also reminded the committee that people will use the reader boards because there will be a shared track. Kransky added that it would be nice to use something that is already here, keying off names that are familiar to people and that they recognize and can identify with. Dannen added that the original name for the streetcar was the Central City Streetcar and that the name was changed before the first line was built because it was obvious early on that the streetcar would extend beyond the Central City. Seibert stated that he supports the use of two letters. Potter seconded the support of using two letters. Richardson stated that on Portland Transport they solicited feedback and if you eliminate all the letters that could be associated with a MAX line and all sound alike letters you are left with 10 letters.

Ronchelli concluded the conversation and will summarize the input and ask for additional input and a straw poll. If the committee can't come up with something different, he suggested they support what is on the map.

4. Fare Policy

The CAC recommendation to PBOT about the fare structure was forwarded on to PBOT shortly followed by the recommendation from the PSI Board. The biggest difference between the two recommendations is that the CAC did not weigh in on the exact costs of the annual pass.

5. Lake Oswego

Vern Rifer presented to the committee that of the three segments of the Lake Oswego extension there has always been issues with consensus on the middle segment. For the longest time Lake Oswego had a 4-3 majority on their council that favored proceeding with the project. That majority has now been reversed. Extending the Streetcar beyond the City of Portland at this time is currently on hold. It appears that the next round of discussions about this project will concentrate on the minimal operating segment to Willamette Park. Those discussions have not been scheduled to date. The Sellwood Bridge construction, which has begun, is configured to support a streetcar across the Sellwood Bridge. Bob Richardson asked if the Environmental Impact Statement defined a Minimal Operating Segment. Rifer responded that it did including cost and some methods of financing. Michael Dennis asked given how the Lake Oswego project was highly competitive in the New Starts process if that money will go to a different region. Rifer and MacNichol stated that the project would become a city project versus a regional project. Cora Potter asked if the project is no longer a regional project, are there other areas of Portland that would have higher benefits from the investment. Rifer stated that the city does not have a process for selecting the next line at this time and that the evaluation and discussion would need to be expanded. Richard Ross added that the shorter segment was not included in the Streetcar System Concept Plan as the Lake Oswego line was considered to be the next line.

6. Loop

Test trains will run February 21-23 on the Loop. Lane closures will occur with flaggers on those days as the streetcars move around the system.

7. Other Business

No other business was discussed.

The next meeting for the Streetcar Citizens Advisory Committee will be Wednesday, March 7, 2012, 3:30pm-5:00pm at City Hall, Pettygrove Room.

Please call Kay Dannen at 503/478-6404 or email at dannen@portlandstreetcar.org if you have any questions regarding this committee.

The CAC meetings are open to the public.