

Homestead Neighborhood Association
General Membership Meeting Minutes

DRAFT

Tuesday, September 5, 2017

OHSU – CDRC 707 SW Gaines, Portland, OR

Meeting called to order at 7:06 sharp. Introductions. Minutes From June 2017 approved, as written. Agenda: approved

Presentation: Transportation Demand Management Project for OHSU (Bret Dodson/Jenny Cadigan)

This TDM project kicked off Feb 2017; it is a 10 yr transportation strategy for OHSU. Final Plan expected Dec 2017. OHSU is trying to align parking and access with growth, using a plan to engage a diverse set of stakeholders. TDM consists of policies, incentives, and infrastructure to reduce single occupancy vehicle trips; also they are trying to make it easier to walk, bike, car share, etc; and to shift trips to off-peak. Why? OHSU wants to increase access & satisfaction (esp for patients), to deal with traffic, to reduce parking-related costs (parking is expensive for OHSU), to improve employee health, and also to increase employee recruitment/retention. The focus of this plan is on Marquam Hill and the So Waterfront, and are particularly trying to include multimodal planning. Since Feb, they have been acquiring stakeholder input, and they are doing that here at our meeting.

Data was presented on the existing mode split: Drive alone 38%, Bus 21%, Bike, 17%, light rail 7%, walk 6%, drop off 4%, carpool 4%. Some prelim focus of the plan will be to increase walking and carpool numbers. By demography: E Portland has very high drive-alone rate (78%). Current population # for Marquam Hill and SoPdx Campus: 2016: 13800 employees, 2200 students, 30100 patients. Projected 2028: 17200 employees, 2500 students, and 48800 patients (assuming ~2% annual gain, based on past performance).

Parking: Currently: pay to park spaces, also with trams and public transit info on screens at pay stations. They also use the "Parker" iphone/android app- it shows where spaces are in real time, so commuters know whether to drive or take transit, and this also helps to reduce drive-around time. Also, now about 400 bikes/d are using the bike valet at the base of the tram.

At this point, a working group session.: the group broke into 3 stations (Parking, Transit, Walking/Biking), spending about 5-10 min each. At each, active discussions of major issues/challenges, using maps and making comments, and to hear what recommendations or improvements could we recommend.

Presentation: OHSU Gateway Project (Tara Mather).

Intro by Michael Harrison- there are 4 concepts/alternatives for the SWCP connector, and as this will almost certainly come up to campus at Campus Drive, OHSU is trying to solicit ideas and concerns re: the design of this entry to OHSU ("Campus Gateway"). Some HmNA desires have been voiced re: the Trimet components (e.g. the nature of the Terwilliger crossing (surface vs sub), where to land at OHSU (7th floor)). As this is a complex undertaking, but OHSU recognizes need for planning and hired some consultants (Mayer-Reed Architecture/Landscape Design, with a transportation subconsultant).

Either way (Barbur vs Naito): there will be a "robust" up the hill connection, as it is well accepted by Trimet that Tram is full. The actual decision on alignment will almost certainly be made based on technical aspects at the 405 crossing, but today we are focusing only on the design elements at the OHSU entrance.

Just to review, the Trimet options:

1A: Elevator/Bridge from Barbur, then Path. An on-grade (surface) Terwilliger crossing. After Terwilliger- theres a switchback, then elevator to OHSU. Ed asks: why switchback if you are already taking an elevator? Michael states that a desire was to have elevator shielded behind trees, and also to have a shorter bridge at the top.

1B: Elevator/Bridge and recessed path: Same as 1A, but sub-grade (undercrossing) of Terwilliger. W of Terwilliger, you'd come up from underground, then switchback a bit, with stairs, then head to elevator/bridge.

1C: Stay underground after sub-crossing, all the way to the elevator. Trimet didnt like this because they wanted to provide surface access to Terwilliger on BOTH sides of street. Also, they felt that staging the building of the tunnel would damage a lot of park/forest. Ed asks- why do they really need this on both sides? Nobody had a good answer as most felt that a path to the road on one side would be adequate, as one could cross at existing crosswalk as many currently do (and the overall crosswalk usage would likely still be way lower than currently).

2. Full tunnel: A horizontal (long) tunnel all the way from Barbur straight into the hill, and then a single elevator all the way up to OHSU.

Again, tonight's meeting to go over the gateway concepts with designers (as this is not a Trimet mtg to choose the options).

Per Tara (OHSU), the project *Intent*: to develop a conceptual design for a distinct visitor entry at OHSU that creates hospitable environment for all. *Goals*: Design a prominent entry that signifies it at the main public entrance to OHSU; to enhance existing landscape so it is consistent with the Terwilliger design guidelines, to improve safety and accessibility, create comfort at all hours, and also ideally involve a design that could be phased rather than need to be built all at once.

Bit of History: 1952: City ordinance 96267 (?) allowed the state of Oregon to build a roadway to OHSU. 1983: Terwilliger Parkway design guidelines: most importantly, invoked the "forest corridor" concept. Terry notes that the plan of creating a grand "campus gateway" is completely opposed to the Terwilliger pkwy design.

The campus gateway design plan is intended to be wrapped up by next year.

Other plans being considered during this process: Terwilliger parkway design, SW corridor plan, OHSU night access plan, OHSU TDM plan, Casey eye institute expansion, OHSU 20-yr facilities master plan.

Ed asked if signage design has already been considered: Carol says no- they are not that far yet. Michael notes that the sign that is currently there (with the OHSU bush) is not the ideal image.

During discovery, Ryan (Mayer-Reed) found that the public ROW curves far West of the existing Terwilliger road, and the park actually touches the Casey eye institute: this has added extra challenges. Only a small wedge of OHSU property exists East of Casey eye- where the OHSU hedge is.

Ryan asks: how to allow OHSU an entrance/identity, but keep the forest? Jackie asks about can they put a landscaped median into campus drive... to make it pretty. Susan notes that the Terwilliger guidelines are clear re: forest, and she mentions some history of some of the efforts that have gone into trying to restore the park there. Susan & Robin agree that it is not appropriate to use park land to advertise OHSU. Terry mentions that it is quite clear that OHSU is up the hill, and that it is currently way too open- we are not looking for a grand entrance concept as much as restoring some healthy forest.

Carol (Mayer-Reed) states that the land could be re-forested, but is very concerned re: the infrastructure required for the Terwilliger crossing/SWCP connector.

Michael asked about whether they had considered transit Mode and Flow; Eric reminded the group of the Marquam Hill Traffic Circulation plan, whose goal was to have all commuter traffic leave Campus Drive and go north (away from the park and neighborhood cut-through streets), but that this seems unrealistic given the current 405 connector. Some discussion of placing a traffic signal at Campus drive- this is not allowed per ordinance, but perhaps its impact could be mitigated if it actually requires fewer switchbacks and other impacts? NA/FoT has long been opposed (and appears to remain so at this moment). Ed questions: does Terwilliger really need to be a destination? If not, it makes installing a SWCP connector much easier with much less demand on the connectors... and probably will serve the needs of this connector.

Carol mentions that this is just the beginning- they will provide some alternative design options and stay in touch. Open to feedback. Tara will send us a copy of the presentation.

Regular Reports:

Board Notes (Jackie): SWNI notes (provided)

Membership outreach (Susan): Picnic was a success. Susan also notes successful "No Ivy" days but very few/no neighborhood folks: she wants more people! So, more work parties coming up: 9/18, 9-12AM; Oct 28 is next one.

OHSU Liaison (Michael): He is our SW In Motion (SWIM) rep and they will be meeting soon. He might also become SoPdxNA's rep. We all agreed that if it became a voting body it would definitely be preferable to have two separate people (votes)

Meeting adjourned at 905pm

Respectfully submitted

Eric Schnell