1. **Meeting to Order:**
   Ronchelli called the meeting to Order. The minutes from the November 5, 2014 meeting were approved.

2. **Public Comment**
   Pearce asked on behalf of John Sporseen if there were plans to open the completed Loop across the Tilikum Crossing prior to the September 12, 2015 opening date as he had heard rumors. Bower responded that testing will occur but that revenue service will begin on September 12, 2015.

3. **Branding Project**
   Brian Kerr and Kristen Howe of Spoke presented the results of the survey to the CAC as well as the next steps for the branding project.

   Richardson asked the branding team and the CAC to consider three questions. 1) How can we work the concept of there being “more in the pipeline” into the communication strategy and ongoing outreach without seeming like we are pushing one line; 2) if the messaging could include how to address the preconceived notions that streetcar is slower than walking as often empirical data doesn’t work as an argument; and 3) in regards to differentiating Portland Streetcar from TriMet he asked the committee how far is too far as too much of a distinction might cause further fare confusion for the average rider. Gustafson responded that the fare question will become less of an issue as eFare is launched as the fare branding will be the same across all three participating agencies. Brock added to Richardson’s concerns about the differentiation as a huge aspect of the Streetcar is the links it provides within the transit system.

   Anderson added that the new housing developments in the Central City seem to be including Streetcar in the marketing of their projects and that should be considered. Also, there is a “Je ne sais quoi” about rail and particularly Streetcar that we need to try and tap into. Anderson then suggested a comedic “Charlie Chaplin” style video showing someone trying to walk faster than the streetcar and failing. He also suggested we be mindful of the negative perception of the tracks in the cycling community and that some of the messaging should be around how to work together and also suggested being mindful of that with any further lines.

   Brandt asked if the branding project will include a marketing plan for the years to come. Kerr responded that the raw materials are part of this project but not the marketing plan. Brandt then suggested that PSI create a multi-year strategy for how to use those raw materials. Bower responded that he is brainstorming and working on this plan. McGarrigle added that she heard a recent statistic about Portland having the second worst traffic issue in the country. She suggested that this could be an opportunity for us to promote Streetcar as an alternative. Ruder complemented Spoke on the great job they have done to date and hoped that they don’t plan on solving all of the issues brought up at the meeting but keep it focused on the issues in their presentation.
Richardson added that he would like to see the other road users included in the messaging as was done in the safety video “When I Ride” as we are all negotiating the road together. He added that some people are afraid of “Pearl District East” due to the perception of Streetcar and expressed a hope that we don’t inadvertently portray that image through the branding. Ronchelli added that the perception is changing as the Streetcar is now on the east side and in different areas such as the Central Eastside which does not and will not be a Pearl East due to the character of the district.

Potter added that to those in East Portland the Central Eastside is not that different than the downtown area as far as travel times and relative character. She added that the issue in East Portland is more the need to focus development as the development is occurring but in a less focused, targeted plan. She also encouraged the CAC to not think of future development of the Streetcar in a trickle out way as there is real potential for urban centers that a targeted development plan, including Streetcar, could foster and create. Ronchelli asked what the perception of Streetcar is in those areas. Potter responded that it is about 50/50 as there are some who want to see the targeted development and others who want to protect their space. She feels that a winning strategy for Streetcar would be to talk about how Streetcar can focus the development and help protect the residential housing not on the commercial corridor. Kimura added that there are examples of residential areas with a streetcar in places like San Francisco. Pearce added that zoning is key to protecting the residential blocks.

Ronchelli thanked Spoke for their work to date and for taking the time to update the CAC.

4. Committee Reports
   a. System Expansion Committee
      Bower reviewed the history of the System Expansion Committee which is made up of members of the CAC and members of the Portland Streetcar, Inc. Board of Directors. The committee has been working with staff from the City and TriMet to sift through various data points starting with the Streetcar System Concept Plan. The goal is to recommend to the City which projects should be included in the update of the Transit System Plan. Projects listed in the plan are eligible to be funded. Projects not in the plan are not dead but rather not envisioned for the next five years. A letter was distributed to the CAC with the recommendations from the committee. Bower emphasized that this letter is not meant to replicate the public process but is rather a recommendation from the PSI Board and the CAC as to which lines were most likely to move forward at this time.

      The two main things that came up during the conversation were: 1) Any expansion of streetcar should be tied intentionally to a focused economic development and/or housing strategy; and 2) that the expansion grow out from the existing streetcar network so as to leverage prior investments such as the maintenance facility. The recommendation is broken into three categories: 1) Projects read to advance today; 2) projects that are a good fit for streetcar yet require some near-future analysis; and 3) those projects that appear to be logical extensions of the system but need to be evaluated against other transit modes during near-future planning efforts.

      The extension along SW Macadam to the Sellwood Bridge was recommended in the first category. With the work that has already occurred as well as data provided by the Bureau of Planning & Sustainability, Macadam remains a good project with the existing public support, connection to the existing alignment and potential for development. It was recommended that this extension remain in the TSP.
The second category recommendation is some sort of connection to the work that is occurring in Northwest Portland north of Northrup into an area that is developing without transit connections. Rifler added that one of the considerations is that the development is already occurring but at a lower rate than could happen with transit connections and that part of the plan could include commitments from the developers to build at a higher density if the City commits to adding the transit component.

The third category recommendation includes alignments that could make a good streetcar project but needs further evaluation and should be considered in the context of other plans and projects for further transit enhancement. This category includes an extension north on Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd and a connection via either NE Sandy or NE Broadway to Hollywood.

Ronchelli added that the TSP process is quite involved and includes a lot of screen elements such as equity, health, etc. The committee took those into consideration when diving into the alignments called out in the System Concept Plan but also looked at these alignments with the mindset that to develop a new Streetcar line a Local Improvement District is typically formed and the recommended alignments should have the ability to form and support an LID. Ronchelli wanted to make sure the CAC was aware of the methodology used by the System Expansion Committee.

Potter commented that the original key statements that the streetcar development be connected to the existing system and tied to economic development will end up excluding any possibility of developing a streetcar line east of 60th in the foreseeable future. There are opportunities to have a far more catalytic and transformational impact through streetcar development in east Portland such as on 82nd Avenue. Bower responded that there was a lot of discussion about East Portland at the subcommittee but that Ronchelli’s last point is an important one as the City is not willing to put City funds into a streetcar project right now which means there needs to be some sort of mechanism to fund expansion. If the City brings everything together to focus on 82nd Bower would be the first to raise his hand and state that Streetcar should be considered as part of the conversation. Bower added that the TSP is updated every four years and that as conversations change around the City which alignments are included will also change. Potter responded that the letter should reflect that this rather than just stating that the expansion be tied to economic development as the development is already occurring.

Anderson added that the first time he had heard of the TSP was when they had come up with some potential trail plans in the Swan Island area and, upon approaching the City, were told they needed to get the plans into the TSP. Adding the plans ended up being a consent agenda item at City Council and not added during the regular update process. The key is not getting the alignment in the TSP but rather building the support of the property owners along the proposed route. Bower added that the TSP has limited funding tied to it and that the priority for most of the City, including East Portland, are sidewalks and road improvements rather than the addition of a streetcar line. Potter returned to her original point that tying the two sentences together about geographically limiting any possible expansion can lead to the assumption that economic development will only occur in that geographic area.

Richardson stated that he also takes exception to the idea that the extensions need to be connected to the current system as, if the next extension were to be a full corridor on 82nd or 122nd, there would be enough additional vehicles that a new facility would be required. Also, as long as the new line is connected to the Light Rail system cars could be brought back to the
maintenance facility in the off hours for major work with routine and minor work performed at
the new facility. Kimura echoed the suggestions of Potter and Richardson. She added that she
sits on the TSP group and that no streetcar projects are currently listed. She would like to see a
sentence added to the letter stating that some consideration will be given in the near-term to
projects that tied in to the existing mass transit system rather than Streetcar system to allow for
those projects that are not in the Central City. Bower suggested the possibility of dropping the
paragraph that states the lines should be connected to the existing system.

Rifer made a motion that the CAC approve the letter. Anderson seconded the motion. Pearce
stated that she appreciates the comments and believes the letter should say something about
the connection to any tracks and not just Streetcar. Bower responded that he could add
another page to the letter to spell out the methodology and the fact that there are multiple
corridors in the System Concept Plan. Anderson added that maybe the letter should say that
there are a number of corridors to be considered but that the ones put forward in this
recommendation are the ones more likely to occur in the coming 3-6 years. Ronchelli put forth
an amendment to the motion to strike the paragraph that states any possible extension should
be tied to an existing Streetcar line. Richardson suggested adding a sentence about the
constrained funding environment and then adding a list and a map from the System Concept
Plan of all of the corridors so people receiving this document would understand there is a lot out
there and not just the three bulleted items. Potter suggested adding 82nd to item 3 as they are
studies. Rifer adopted the amendment. Anderson again seconded the motion. The CAC voted
and approved the motion.

b. Operations Committee Formation
Gustafson reported that the Operations Committee will have its first meeting soon and that
Bower will be in touch with those who volunteered to be on this committee.

5. 2015 Meeting Schedule
Ronchelli tabled this discussion until the January meeting due to time.

6. Grand Opening of Orange Line and Completed Loop
Ann Becklund of TriMet presented the plans for the coming 9 months leading up to and including
the Grand Opening of both the Orange Line MAX and the Completed Central Loop across the Tilikum
Crossing. Events will include a lecture series, Transit on Tap events, the Bridge Pedal which will go
across the Tilikum Crossing, preview rides and the big Grand Opening Celebration on September 12,
2015. Becklund and her team are already working with Bower and Gustafson on the planning and
organization of the various events. Becklund added that testing of the aesthetic lighting will occur
December 3-7 on the Tilikum Crossing.

7. Staff Updates
Gustafson reported that Car 026, the final streetcar from United Streetcar, was delivered on
November 21. The vehicle was delivered on time and will enter testing soon.

8. Other Business
No other business was discussed.

The next meeting for the Streetcar Citizens Advisory Committee will be Wednesday, January 7, 2015,
3:30pm-5:00pm at City Hall, Pettygrove Room. Please call Julie Gustafson at (503) 222-4200 or
email at julie.gustafson@portlandstreetcar.org if you have any questions regarding this committee.
The CAC meetings are open to the public.