



## MEETING AGENDA (MEETING #4)

**DATE:** January 23, 2023  
**TIME:** 5:00 p.m. – 6:30 p.m.  
**MEETING LINK:** <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83900666431>  
Join via phone (audio only): 346-248-7799; Webinar ID: 839 0066 6431

### Meeting Purpose

- Welcome new members
- Project background/context/schedule
- Metro High-Capacity Transit Study
- Right of Way (ROW) update
- Review and discuss alignment evaluation
- Public Comment
- Share next steps

TIME	SUBJECT	QUESTIONS/OBJECTIVES
5:00	Welcome and Introductions	Welcome new members/alternates
5:10	Agenda review	Any questions on agenda?
5:15	Project background/context/schedule	Review
5:20	Metro High-Capacity Transit Study	Information/discussion
5:25	Right of Way (ROW) update	Information/discussion
5:35	Summary of alignment evaluation	Any questions or comments about trail alignment assumptions/discussion
6:20	Public comment	Up to 3 minutes allowed for public comment
6:25	Next steps	Overview of EOSC schedule
6:30	Adjourn	

## Meeting Materials

- CCRT EOSC Meeting #3 Summary
- What we've learned – alignment evaluation summary
- Evaluation assumptions

### EOSC Representatives

	Agency/ Jurisdiction	Position	Designated Member
<b>Voting Members:</b>	Forest Grove	Mayor or Council Member	Councilor Michael Marshall Alternate – TBD
	Cornelius	Mayor or Council Member	Mayor Jef Dalin Alternate – Luis Hernandez
	Hillsboro	Mayor or Council Member	Councilor Beach Pace Alternate – TBD
	Washington County	County Commissioner	Commissioner Jerry Willey Alternate – Chair Kathryn Harrington
<b>Ex Officio Members:</b>	TriMet	General Manager or designee	Executive Director of Public Affairs JC Vannatta Alternate – Tom Markgraf
	Metro	Metro Councilor District 4	Councilor Juan Carlos Gonzalez Alternate – Jon Blasher
	ODOT Region 1	Region Manager	Rian Windsheimer Alternate - Chris Ford
	State Representative	District 29 Representative	Representative Susan McClain

# WHAT WE LEARNED

## Tier 1: Prioritize Trail Implementation

- Cost
- Feasibility
- Trail user safety and comfort
- Environmental and cultural impacts
- Schedule implications
- Right-of-way impacts
- Utility impacts

**Which alignment best prioritizes trail implementation by segment?**  
 The analysis identified the relative impact scores by alignment. Major constraints within each segment are identified in the summary below.

Relative impact score and constraints comparison by segment:

	SEGMENT 1			SEGMENT 2			SEGMENT 3			SEGMENT 4			SEGMENT 5			SEGMENT 6		
NORTH	north		91	north		37	north		28	north		87	north		89	north		18
CENTER	center		0	center		0	center		0	center		0	center		63	center		0
SOUTH	south		116	south		41	south		27	south		95	south		91	south		11

### CONSTRAINT SUMMARY

Primary issues within each alignment



Council Creek is a major constraint for the **North** and **South** alignments. It would require structural elements that would increase costs, require additional permits, have scheduling implications, and increase environmental impacts.

**North** alignment has extensive culvert conflicts and power pole relocation affecting project cost, schedule implications, and permitting needs.

**South** alignment has extensive ROW encroachment issues, culvert constraints and requires tree removal. These issues affect project cost, schedule and may create public relations issues, including perceived safety issues to adjoining properties

**North** alignment has power pole relocation needs, and some culvert and tree conflicts affecting cost, permitting needs and schedule implications.

**South** alignment has tree conflicts, culvert and ROW encroachment issues. These constraints create environmental impacts, potential public relations issues and perceived safety issues to adjoining properties

Jobs ditch is a major constraint for the **North** and **South** alignments that would require new structure increasing total project cost and causing scheduling implications.

**North** alignment is also impacted by culvert and power pole conflicts.

**South** alignment is also impacted by culvert conflicts and ROW encroachment issues.

Dairy Creek is a major constraint for the **North** and **South** alignments, requiring extensive grading, and a new structure increasing total project cost, permitting needs, and causing scheduling implications. **Center** alignment would also require structural improvements.

**North** alignment is also impacted by power pole conflicts.

**South** alignment is also impacted by ROW encroachment issues and tree removal which could cause perceived safety/privacy issues to adjoining properties.

**North** alignment has power pole conflicts and ROW constraints including parallel access roads.

**South** alignment is also impacted by ROW encroachment issues and tree removal which could cause perceived safety/privacy issues to adjoining properties.

<b>CONSTRAINTS RELATIVE COSTS</b>		
<b>Culvert conflicts</b>	A	\$\$
<b>Wetlands / Waterways</b>	B	\$\$
<b>Tree Removal / Conflict</b>	C	\$
<b>Power Pole Conflicts</b>	D	\$
<b>Right-of-way Encroachment</b>	E	\$
<b>Structure</b>	F	\$\$\$\$
<b>Major grading / Retaining wall</b>	G	\$\$\$\$

## CONSTRAINTS COST COMPARISON

Cost implications include: monetary, environmental, schedule impacts, permitting costs, and political / public relations.

<i>Constraints --&gt;</i>	<b>Culvert conflicts (A)</b>	<b>Wetlands / Waterways (B)</b>	<b>Tree Removal / Conflict (C)</b>	<b>Power Pole Conflicts (D)</b>	<b>Right-of-way Encroachment (E)</b>	<b>Structure (F)</b>	<b>Major grading / Retaining wall required (G)</b>	<b>Rail removal (H)</b>
<i>relative costs: comparing Constraints</i>	\$\$	\$\$	\$	\$	\$	\$\$\$\$	\$\$\$\$	\$-\$\$\$ (depends on salvage option)
<i>cost (monetary)</i>	new crossing or extension of existing crossing	may include both protection and/or mitigation	removal, potential replanting as good will for adjacent property owners	relocation - no cost to client	may include relocation of property as good will to adjacent property owners	new structure (trestle or bridge)	earthwork, new retaining wall	owned by PNWR cost to client will largely depend on if they want to abandon or reuse materials?
<i>environmental</i>	potential wetland impacts	water quality / stormwater management	depends on species and health, heritage vs invasive	-	-	-	-	potential contamination
<i>scheduling</i>	potential implications	potential implications	potential implications	potential implications	potential implications	potential implications	-	potential implications
<i>permitting</i>	potential implications	potential implications	potential implications	potential implications	-	potential implications	-	potential contamination/ disposal requirements
<i>political / public relations</i>	-	-	potential implications	-	potential implications	-	-	-
<i>Range (min. to max.) of quantifiable impacts within each segment along corridor</i>	0-12	0-330 ft	0-72 trees	0-33 poles	0 - 954 ft	none, existing bridge, new bridge required	0 - 2,633 ft	0 ft - entire length of trail
<i>Notes/considerations</i>		ditch vs creek <b>Addresses</b> stormwater mgmt and permitting	approximation based on aerial imagery	consider # of poles and % of section	consider LF and % of section			center alignment is heavily affected by this Constraints

**CONSTRAINTS COST IMPACT MULTIPLIER**

Considers # of instances (minimum / maximum range) of each constraint

Culvert conflicts	cost impact multiplier	Wetlands / Waterways	cost impact multiplier	Tree Removal / Conflict	cost impact multiplier	Power Pole Conflicts	cost impact multiplier	Right-of-way Encroachment	cost impact multiplier	Structure	cost impact multiplier	Major grading / Retaining wall required	cost impact multiplier	Rail removal	cost impact multiplier
1-4	1	90' Council creek	2	1-25	1	16 poles, 63%	1	1-350 ft	1	new structure needed 90' Council creek	1	1733 ft	2	scenario 1: Assumes PNWR will salvage railroad materials	1
5-8	2	240' Council creek	3	26-50	2	8-9 entire length	2	351-750 ft	2	new structure needed - 240' Council creek	3	2633 ft	3	scenario 2: Assumes PNWR will take railroad materials only at recent crossing improvements (5 intersections ~5,000 LF)	2
9-12	3	330' Jobs ditch	3	49-75	3	21-33 entire length	3	750+ ft	3	new structure needed - 330' Jobs ditch	3			scenario 3: Assumes PNWR abandons the railroad materials and project incurs cost of removal	3
								setback	1	upgrade existing 383' trestle & 18' bridge @ 'tunnel'	3				
										new bridge at dairy creek	3				

**CONSTRAINTS AND TIER ONE PRIORITIES RELATIONSHIP**

Considers how each constraint impacts the project cost, feasibility, safety / comfort, environmental / cultural impacts and schedule implications (Tier 1 criteria).

		Cost		Feasibility			Safety/ Comfort	Environmental/ Cultural Impacts	Schedule implications
		Project cost	Demolition/ Site prep	ROW/ easement considerations	Permitting/ coordination requirements	Political/ public relations	User and property owner experience	Adjacent to wetlands/ waterways and / or tree removal	Impacts to construction schedule
		A-G	A, G	E	A, B, C, D, F	C, E	C, D, E	A, B, C	A, B, C, D, E, F
<b>A</b>	<b>Culvert conflicts</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>	-	<b>X</b>	-	-	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>Wetlands/ waterways</b>	<b>X</b>	-	-	<b>X</b>	-	-	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>C</b>	<b>Tree removal/ conflict</b>	<b>X</b>	-	-	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>D</b>	<b>Power pole relocation/ conflict</b>	<b>X</b>	-	-	<b>X</b>	-	<b>X</b>	-	<b>X</b>
<b>E</b>	<b>ROW/ encroachment</b>	<b>X</b>	-	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>	-	<b>X</b>
<b>F</b>	<b>Structure (trestle/bridge)</b>	<b>X</b>	-	-	<b>X</b>	-	-	-	<b>X</b>
<b>G</b>	<b>Major grading/ retaining wall</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-



**COUNCIL CREEK REGIONAL TRAIL  
ELECTED OFFICIALS STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #3  
MEETING SUMMARY**

**November 21, 2022, 5:00 PM-6:30 PM  
Zoom Virtual Meeting**

**Voting Members**

Commissioner Jerry Willey, Washington County,  
(Committee Chair)  
Mayor Jef Dalin, City of Cornelius  
Councilor Timothy Rippe, City of Forest Grove  
Councilor Kyle Allen, City of Hillsboro

**Ex Officio Representatives**

JC Vannatta, TriMet  
  
Councilor Juan Carlos González, Metro  
Chris Ford, ODOT Alternate

**Attendees**

Victor (interpreter)  
Julie Sosnovske, Washington County  
Megan McKibben, Washington County  
Stephen Roberts, Washington County  
Erin Wardell, Washington County

Dyami Valentine, Washington County  
Emily Brown, Washington County  
Adrian Esteban, Alta Planning + Design  
Lake McTighe, Metro  
Nick Baker

**Welcome and Introductions**

Committee Chair Jerry Willey, Washington County Commissioner for District 4 (trail location), opened the meeting welcoming members, representatives, and the public. All participants/attendees are returning, so no introductions are needed.

**Agenda Review**

We will be talking about the vision and goals tonight, reviewing minor modifications. Then we'll move into a slide presentation and get another update on the possibilities open to us with this trail. Our only official business tonight is approval of the revised vision and goals, but it's a full agenda. Commissioner Willey also notes that he will need to depart at 5:45 p.m., at which time Mayor Dalin will take over for him in the role of the Chair.

**Project Background and Context**

Julie Sosnovske, Senior Transportation Planner, described the current CCRT project as being part of a broader network. The project is currently in the planning, preliminary engineering and design phase. We have a compressed timeline as we are working toward a decision in order to be prepared for final design and engineering (estimated start in 2024) in time to reach the construction phase (estimated start in 2026).

4 major phases: building the foundation, defining alternatives, select preferred alternative, design and engineering. Currently, we're moving into the defining alternatives phase.

Community engagement update: the second Stakeholder's Advisory Committee (SAC) meeting is scheduled on December 6. We are preparing for an online open house and survey that will be available in January

**Department of Land Use & Transportation  
Long Range Planning**

155 N First Avenue, Suite 350, MS 14, Hillsboro, OR 97124-3072  
phone: 503-846-3519 • fax: 503-846-4412  
[www.washingtoncountyor.gov/lut](http://www.washingtoncountyor.gov/lut)



(tentative), and possibly an in-person open house at the Cornelius Library. The third Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting will be held on November 18.

### **Elected Official Steering Committee Charter (EOSC)**

Julie requested updates regarding membership and post-election changes. Are there going to be new members? Have continuing members identified their alternates? It is important to do so in order to ensure that each jurisdiction is represented.

Chair Willey – Commissioner Allen is the only current member whose term is coming to an end. Councilor Allen responded that Hillsboro’s transportation committee will be meeting tomorrow, and there will be discussion of who will replace him on this committee. He thinks he will have a name tomorrow and will email Julie.

Councilor Rippe noted that he will remain on Forest Grove’s city council for two additional years but may not be selected to continue as their representative for this committee. The council will make that decision in January.

Chair Willey requests that each member follow up with Julie to advise her of their alternate.

### **Approve Vision and Goals**

Julie – there are minor changes to our vision statement and goals. Everyone has the track changes version in this meeting’s packet. Julie gave a quick overview of the changes.

Chair Willey: does anyone have comments? Has everyone had a chance to review these changes?

Councilor Gonzalez – are we still on committee charter slide? JS – no, this is a new discussion topic.

Councilor Gonzalez wanted to make sure that his technology is working; he was concerned that his Zoom feed had frozen. Providing comments on the revised project vision and goals, he thinks changes shown in the packet reflect the spirit of [last meeting’s] conversation. He also appreciated the spelling out of goals – good work.

No opposition; vision and goals are approved.

### **Draft Trail Design Objectives**

What’s a Regional Trail? Reminder that a regional trail is generally a 12-16 ft paved trail that may include elements such as bridge or boardwalk, enhanced ped xing where we meet arterials and collectors, high volume traffic streets.

Julie provided an overview of our decision making framework. We’ve already gone over the vision (why we’re doing this project); the goals (that’s what we’ve just approved). Now we’re moving into the next stage – the objectives (how can we meet the goals). The next phase, which you’ll see later on, will focus on design criteria and performance metrics. We won’t be going over that today. Today, we are going to present some draft objectives for your review and comment for each of the goals.

Goal 1: Ensure Equitable Trail Access

Discussion: no comments

Goal 2: Create a Safe and Enjoyable User Experience

Councilor Rippe – lighting isn’t mentioned here. In terms of safety, there needs to be some criteria of lighting in particular spots. JS – This is a good question. She will defer to Adrian - maybe this is something to consider during the design objectives when we get to that, or is it something we should be including here?

Adrian – agrees with Julie, that this is something that would be part of the design objectives. We could mention it as part of the goal, but typically that is more on the design side.

Julie – returning to the slide showing objectives, those identify *what* we’re trying to achieve. Lighting would be more *how* we aim to achieve it.

JC Vannatta – wants to make note on our goal to accommodate emergency access: some of those older trestles may need to be rehabbed. That could cost the project a lot of money. We [at TriMet] know that through experience trying to keep Willamette Shoreline open as an active railway, and we’ve had to rebuild a lot of those trestles. Reinforcing trestles is not cheap. You’ll have to have those trestles reinforced to accommodate fire trucks and other vehicles.

Julie – yes, this is something I’ve thought about too. We may need to address it in our wording. The way we’ve talked about it, a trestle may not necessarily support emergency vehicles, but possibly access is available beside it. If it’s decided that emergency vehicles must be able to cross, we will have to account for that in our design. Adrian, do you have a comment on this?

Adrian – as part of the project, we understand that not only are the trestles old and may not accommodate emergency vehicles, but they’ll have to be upgraded if we decide that the best alignment is to maintain access on those trestles. That is part of the project and we understand that there’ll be a high cost for improving those. They would be able to accommodate maintenance vehicles. There is access from both sides of the trestle. We don’t anticipate emergency vehicles having to cross the trestle unless someone is injured on the trestle itself.

Com. Willey – how many trestles are we talking about?

Adrian – we have one trestle that’s approximately 400 ft long

Mayor Dalin – restrooms? Where do they fit in? That’s something that we ended up adding in after the fact on the Banks-Vernonia [rail trail].

Julie – a good question, but again may be a design element and outside the scope of the project we are doing. We’re scoping a preliminary design for a basic trail. We don’t have funding for things like that yet.

Adrian – part of this goal calls for identifying locations where gathering spaces in shade could be located. This project would just be identifying those locations. Those gathering places, when they are developed, could include restrooms and other amenities.

Mayor Dalin – On the Banks-Vernonia trail, that was one of the things that was a miss. They had to come back in and add restrooms after the fact. It’s better for us to understand that they’re going to be needed, so where would they be? Where could we do something? If there’s a park along the way – like the park in Cornelius, then could Cornelius add a restroom in the park – that would be a partnership between the trail and the park. Responding to Councilor Rippe’s point, maybe we’re not lighting the entire trail but maybe we should think about lighting crossings. Restrooms, emergency vehicles, and lighting where it’s tactical – these are all things we have to think about.

Com. Willey – I think it’s easy for us to navigate back and forth to what we’re trying to accomplish tonight, kind of a big scope perspective of what we want this to look like – then, later on when we start talking about design, we can do that. We certainly don’t want to leave anything out like restrooms and lighting, but [those elements] will come more into play with the design of the trail itself. Trying to stay high level at this point.

Goal 3: Increase Mobility and Access

Discussion: no comments

Goal 4: Protect Cultural Resources and Goal 5: Protect and Enhance Environmental Resources

Councilor Allen – goal is set up to “preserve and protect” existing trees. Will there also be beautification along that corridor in the form of planting trees?

Julie – we will definitely have landscaping. [I think that’s something we’ll look at in a later step.] What we’re looking at here is how we’ll align the trail within the corridor.

Mayor Dalin – At Stubb Stewart, we cut all the trees to plant trees. The trees look great now – they’ve matured – but there were already trees there, so why did we cut the trees that were already there? It would seem silly to go in and disturb if we don’t have to.

Com. Willey – thinks this will be part of the design features that we’ll be doing when we can physically see the trail, walk the line – and where we locate the trail will have a lot to do with the preservation of trees.

Mayor Dalin – on the west end, there’s a north / south split... pretty similar in size. Which is spur and which is main line? They both dead end.

Julie – Adrian will be showing slides/graphics later on that should clarify.

Adrian – I think you may be referring to Hawthorne. At Hawthorne, there’s a split, a Y, and the alignment goes in the southern direction towards Douglas Street. You’ll see when we go through the corridor a little later where that lies.

Mayor Dalin – that northern spur is kind of dead. There are a lot of spurs along the way we’ll have to talk about.

Councilor Rippe – what did master plan indicate? I think the original master plan indicated the southern part terminates about a block from Pacific University, whereas the northern one is almost all along the industrial area and wouldn’t be that attractive as a trail. We should go back to master plan. In my opinion, the southern spur will be more favorable to bringing people into the downtown Forest Grove area.

Mayor Dalin – I look at this as an opportunity. If the spur is now defunct, maybe that would make some great trail parking.

Julie – that’s something we can consider.

JC Vannatta – going back to the safety goal. The other piece I wanted to add: developing partnerships to ensure the safety of the trail [would be important]. I say that because Springwater Corridor in Portland has issues (crime, houselessness issues). Making sure that we develop partnerships with community groups, law enforcement, community services that we can rely on to help [is important]. That’s another note as we develop this trail into being the best it can possibly be.

Julie – excellent idea. It might fit more into the implementation and management of the trail. I think here we’re talking more about design objectives, but that’s an excellent point.

Mayor Dalin – yes, it has an existing homeless problem in areas surveyed already.

**Trail Alignments Development**

Julie – reviewing where we are in the project because we’re all having similar thoughts and ideas, jumping ahead of where we are in the trail design process. This was a little bit confusing to me and the consultants helped me organize it in my head. I hope these slides help you organize it as well.

Right now we’re making trail alignment decisions, and we’re hoping have a decision by early next year, February 2023. This is a high level evaluation and risk assessment. What we’re trying to identify is the alignment that is feasible that we can construct, and best meets the project goals that we’ve been talking

about through this process. Once we've identified that alignment, we will develop it in further detail. We'll talk about that in the next slide.

We've outlined this process, and I think we introduced it to you last time. We've broken the trail alignment into six segments – you'll see that in Adrian's presentation. Within each of those six segments, we want to decide whether the trail should go into the north, center or south of the ROW. What makes the most sense for each segment, and also for the trail as a whole through the corridor?

We've identified some alignment criteria that you'll see in a few slides, but our first priority is for trail implementation. What makes the most sense for the trail? What makes the trail the best? We've also got this Tier 2 alignment criteria that we've identified: what makes the most sense to optimize trail/transit combination? If there is high capacity transit somewhere down the line, where do we have opportunities to facilitate that?

These are the decisions that we're making, and that we need to make soon.

We also have these trail design decisions that we'll be talking about later next year in the spring and summer of 2023. I won't go into a lot of detail, but these are some of the things that we'll be talking about. Where would trailheads go? What does the cross-section look like? Where does the trail access streets or pedestrian ways along the trail? What are potential user amenities? We'll be making those decisions a little bit later. Also to be determined later: the trail width, how we're avoiding sensitive areas, looking in more detail at pedestrian crossing treatments. Then we'll be applying prioritization criteria so we can determine where to allocate our construction budget. We only have so many dollars – what is the best trail we can build with those dollars?

That's a preview of where we're going. Bringing us back to where we are now, we're looking at the trail alignment. That is where we want to put the trail within the corridor. Again, Tier 1 is prioritizing trail implementation. The criteria to consider by segment are cost, feasibility (could be based on a number of factors), trail user safety and comfort, environmental impacts, schedule implications, ROW impacts, and utility impacts. These are the first things we're going to consider, with the goal of getting to construction in 2026.

The next tier would be to optimize trail and transit feasibility. Criteria that we could use could be avoiding overlap between where trail and transit would go or minimizing future trail relocation if we decide that's what we want to do. Does anyone have questions on these?

No questions/comments.

Adrian will be presenting next. He will go through the corridor fairly quickly, identifying conflicts. Many of the conflicts we've seen. We'll look at challenges that we might have if we push the trail to the north or south, and also what it looks like if we put the trail in the middle. Feel free to ask him any questions.

Councilor González – will there be a more substantive discussion after the presentation?

Julie – yes, we're hoping to move through it pretty quickly and leave time for you to talk. We definitely want to make sure that you have the opportunity to share your thoughts.

Adrian's presentation:

Last mtg, we looked through the corridor and identified some of the constraints. There is a link to these slides in the agenda so people can go in and take a closer look. We won't be looking at the same level of detail tonight, but we're going to see three alternatives – north, center, and south alignments. Power poles, trees, existing culverts, grading conflicts (grading conflicts occur mostly near the trestle), encroachment areas, building setbacks, and wetland areas will be shown.

JC Vannatta – power pole conflict – do we know easement agreements? Is it really a conflict? A lot of easements state that poles must be moved at utility company's expense. Adrian – not confirmed. Our assumption is that they're there by permit and would have to relocate. It's likely that we'd need to give the option to relocate power poles elsewhere in the corridor which would affect future transit.

Adrian – corridor has been divided into six segments of approximately 1 mile each. Attention has been given to dividing them in ways that group particular types of conflicts into a single segment. They've been broken out at good division lines as well as by issue types. 1st segment at Douglas – lots of tree impacts, both north and south of the railroad, which is typical of segment 1. East, crossing Hawthorne – power lines. You'll see trees to the south and power poles to the north throughout this segment. Note Council Creek is on the north. It comes in via culvert and follows the southern alignment to the west. Shifting the alignment from center to south here would require a structure directly over Council Creek which would be a major impact. Usage encroachments follow – no structures, but people are using ROW for parking.

Segment 2 after Hwy. 47: trees to south, encroachment (buildings are right up against the property line on the north). There's impact on both sides – some buildings are inside the property lines. As we move east, we see similar issues – powerlines north but fewer trees on south, buildings with setback issues.

After crossing 4th Ave, we continue to see trees on the south and other issues similar to what we've seen before including power poles and encroachments. Culverts near intersection.

Mayor Dalin – these aren't just regular power poles, right? Some are high tension, high voltage transmission?

Adrian – yes, higher transmission. We see more residential as we approach Segment 3; more high density areas. Trees on south; power poles on north. 29th Ave. divides Segments 3 and 4. In Segment 4: more density, more encroachment including structures.

Com. Willey - those property owners that have structures and obstructions in the ROW (ROW) that isn't theirs – will it be their financial responsibility to move those?

Adrian – yes. Julie had looked at whether they would be allowed to remain there and determined that they would have to move out of the railroad easement.

Julie - yes, per statute – if someone calls them on the encroachment, it is their responsibility to move or remove the structure. Railroad has that authority, county has that authority, and state has that authority. That doesn't mean it will be easy to do, but the entity that owns the ROW should be able to initiate the process that would require them to move.

Mayor Dalin – thought there were manufactured homes in easement west of 19th?

Adrian & Julie – mostly fences, minor structures, and access roads there.

Com. Willey – what's our communication plan going to be to put everyone on notice of encroachment issues?

Julie – we're not there yet. Not sure we have to – if we build right in the middle. We would need instruction to do that.

Mayor Dalin – we're going to have to make sure we're correct about that. East of 29th there may be some question about where the property and the easement actually are located.

Adrian – Not just east of 29th. Shows a home placed about 5 ft from ROW.

Councilor Gonzalez – how does this happen? Gradually over time?

Mayor Dalin – maybe surveying error? Reputable builder put those homes in. Make sure we know 100% where line is. This is right around the corner from me – I know this area. We need to make sure we're in the right and know exactly where the line lies.

Adrian – this presentation uses surveys that were part of the record, but yes, confirming will be important.

Com. Willey – if we choose rail line itself, would we incur significantly fewer issues and less expense at this point? Then, if later, we want to change, could we do that and deal with encroachments at that time?

Julie – correct. That's a choice we could make.

Com. Willey – but we're not making that decision tonight?

Julie – correct.

Com. Willey – I appreciate everyone's attention to this. Also, this is not unlike the Salmonberry Trail, where there are encroachments all up and down [the trail] that we're going to have to deal with. Leaving the meeting now. Mayor Dalin will take over chair duties for the remainder of this meeting.

Councilor Allen – piggybacking, it seems like most of the structures in ROW are coming from south. If we chose to build center or north, would we then lose the opportunity to have those structures be moved later on if railroad is no longer owner of ROW?

Julie – We don't yet know who will own the ROW, but whatever entity owns the ROW should have that authority.

Adrian – in Segment 4, looking east of 29th – about 330 ft of wetlands north and south of existing corridor. May require structure to mitigate. Jobs' Ditch has an existing culvert (wetland on both sides). The trestle is further east. Segment 5 – 341st – we start approaching trestle. Power poles on north; trees to south. Less densely populated, but we have encroachments to the south. Mobile home in ROW. Dirt road with access. Another temporary structure almost in the ROW. And maybe a metal roofed shed with a corner in ROW. Approaching Dairy Creek, we have a short bridge (existing structure). A new structure will be required if we choose north or south alignment. There are sensitive areas to the south and a lot of trees. The trestle over Dairy Creek is very old and will require upgrades if we use it. Even if we upgrade, there may be limits to lifespan. We'll have to decide: would it make more sense to move alignment north or south and build a new structure that could potentially leave room for transit? Or upgrade existing trestle, possibly providing for high capacity transit in the future? Also, grading will be needed in this area. Still in Segment 5, approaching Hillsboro: there are trees and power lines, grading will likely be needed as well. We are approaching commercial buildings here.

Julie – in grading areas, would that mean we need to acquire additional ROW?

Adrian – It's possible that additional structures would be needed. Continuing on from Segment 5 that ends at Main Street, we're looking at Segment 6. We're looking at gravel access in ROW, minor encroachments on south side. Another gravel access connects to ROW on the north side. That is an overview of our corridor. Are there any questions?

Julie – Adrian, is the segment by segment analysis of the conflicts available? Adrian – yes, will share that next.

Councilor Rippe – how much of an impediment are utility poles? Could the trail go around them?

Adrian – it would require that we move the alignment toward centerline, but the trail could go around power poles. That could have implications for grading and/or structures. Possibly we would need to move trail later on to make way for transit.

Councilor Rippe – are we looking at having separate trails - one for pedestrians, one for motorized devices?  
Julie – probably not given the funding available.

Councilor Rippe – crisscrossing – trying to envision – how would that actually be achieved?

Councilor Allen – how wide is each colored line on the graphic?

Adrian – approximately 20 feet wide for each alignment (60 ft ROW; 3 potential alignments). Segment evaluation – we have summarized information (what the major conflicts are) from these graphics into a table. Our next step is to assess impacts: which alignment is more costly/difficult? We will start looking at how to show the different impacts and provide information to help decision makers.

Mayor Dalin – would the main work with using center alignment be just pulling the rails and ties?

Adrian – yes. Decisions would come up at Dairy Creek, though, as we look at how to handle the structure.

Mayor Dalin – noting that the city of Forest Grove just paved over the rails (or ODOT?). Not sure if it was ODOT or Forest Grove, but rails are now buried at 47.

Councilor Rippe – Forest Grove did that, with permission of the railroad.

Adrian – questions? Discussion?

Councilor Allen – noting preference to use as much of this ROW for the public good as possible. Maybe using north alignment now and saving the south for high capacity transit?

Mayor Dalin – we say high capacity transit, but what does that mean? How does high capacity transit look? If you'd asked Mayor Truax and I 20 years ago, we thought that would mean extension of MAX from Hillsboro. Now maybe it's a bus.

Councilor Allen – I don't know what it will look like, but I do think that long-term all of this ROW should be for public good, for transportation of some kind. That also gives places with encroachments more time (decades, potentially) to address that.

Councilor González – I've really enjoyed the presentation today, and Adrian, I admire and respect your attention to detail and that of the team in putting together this map. From a Metro perspective: we support a trail alignment that is cost effective and delivers the best trail experience for folks into the future. These comments are based on outreach and the amount of funding dedicated to developing this trail – we want consideration of transit to be included, but it shouldn't preempt design decisions for the trail. Also, during this decision-making period we need to understand potential changes in future ownership. Whatever public entity does have future ownership, it's important to have in writing a binding plan for a regional trail in perpetuity. In terms of alignments: wants to prioritize getting a trail in now. Seconding Councilor Allen – we need to do as much as we can now. Need to think about how/when to communicate to owners that are encroaching on the easement about preparation. We need to be empathetic with homeowners, but use forward-looking, thoughtful communication. If we can build in a mechanism to build in touchpoints for the process...

JC Vannatta – do we know next steps for formal decommissioning / abandonment of rail line?

Julie – we have “intent to abandon” – Counselor Rippe has said they're still reassessing value. We're still waiting for the railroad to go ahead with the necessary steps for abandonment.

Mayor Dalin – hasn't there also been a change in ownership?

Julie – yes, that as well as questions about valuation.

Councilor Rippe – confirming what Julie said. That's the latest he's heard from a member of the U.S. House Transportation Committee. They've been in contact with Genessee in Wyoming (the new owner of Portland and Western) but haven't received a response. He is disappointed with kicking transit issue down the road. With the bilateral infrastructure law that just passed, there's lots of funding. All sorts of energy and momentum around improving infrastructure. To say we'll look at transit 10 or 15 years down the road – we're missing an opportunity. Cornelius & Forest Grove are in a transit desert. We've only got one line, and the congestion is only going to get worse on TV Hwy. We talk about high capacity transit, but I don't think we even need to approach it that way. We could look at something that's more scalable, that's clean energy, that's smart. We've been talking about transit for years. Now we're settling on just a trail. It's disappointing. There are opportunities that we'll miss if we say we're going to look at it in 15 years. We're probably not going to have the funding opportunities again that are available now. Just got back from national league of cities conference in KC – a lot of people would be very interested in this project. It's just a matter of political will and vision to move forward.

Commissioner Allen – if his comments came off that he doesn't think we're ready for high capacity transit, he would like to correct that. He is definitely all for transit; if his comments came off as kicking down, that wasn't his intention. He may be unaware of infrastructure dollars referenced but, as he said before, he thinks the whole corridor should be utilized in support of public good.

Julie – we do need to open it up for public comment if we have anyone.

#### **Public Comment**

No members of the public were present or submitted comment.

#### **Next Steps**

Julie – a comment on the last discussion: the ongoing Metro high capacity transit study and TV Hwy Hope grant have been mentioned before, both of which are looking at this corridor for transit/high capacity transit, but we won't have information back for a few months. We will need to decide how to proceed with the preliminary design [before that information is available].

Mayor Dalin – we have to be mindful of the opportunity to get the trail built without precluding what's next. It's not this or that, it's this and that. How do we utilize the money we do have to get the trail done? Right now, we need to get this grade separated path to get from city to city (once in a lifetime).

Julie – TAC had similar comments. Looking at next steps: in January, we'll have an online open house with survey and possible in-person event. The next EOSC meeting is scheduled for January 23, 2023. Our February meeting is going to be more challenging to schedule, so it's important to provide alternates so that all can have representation. We will need to select a preferred alternative alignment so that we can proceed with preliminary design.

#### **Adjourn**

6:27 pm