

Meeting #2 Summary

Wednesday, March 13, 2018, 4:00 – 6:00pm
Vey Conference Center, OHSU Campus

Committee Members in Attendance

Fred Miller (Chair), Doug Kelsey, Skai Dancey, Todd Lofgren, Zari Santner, Councilor Bob Stacey, Jamey Duhamel, Anton Vetterlien, Chet Orloff, Don Stastny

Absent: None

Presenters: Carol Mayer-Reed & Shannon Simms (ZGF-VIA-Mayer/Reed Joint Venture)

Public Comment

Four people from the audience made comments:

1. A representative from the SWIRL transportation committee spoke in support of better transit between SW neighborhoods and OHSU. She encouraged realignment of N/S bus service to better serve destinations.
2. A local architect spoke. He worked on numerous projects around OHSU and was on the Design Commission during the process for the aerial tram. He talked about a previous proposal he had developed for a 2,000 car parking garage at the site of the current synagogue building. It would include a visitor center for Marquam Hill. He called the site a “solar plexus” and said that there would be high private interest in building this as a partnership with OHSU.
3. A member of the Friends of Terwilliger group spoke about the importance of the environmental regulations of the site. He encouraged information on that to be presented as soon as possible as it might limit the options.
4. A representative from the Homestead Neighborhood Association, and a member of the Working Group, spoke about his concern with building a “landmark.” He said that there could still be an “iconic experience” without the connection being a landmark.

Goals and Criteria Discussion

The Chair presented the refined goals and criteria for the project based suggested changes from committee members at the first meeting ([see refined goals and criteria document](#)). At that first meeting, several committee members suggested that the connector be “cool, iconic, and something to be proud of.” A draft captured these thoughts with the term “landmark.” That received lots of attention at the Working Group; there was a feeling that a very visible monument would be inconsistent with the park. The Chair asked that “landmark” be removed, and the revised goals and criteria used the term “signature connection” instead. One committee member voiced concern about the addition of the “Experience” goal, while another voiced strong support. The committee ultimately accepted the new goals and criteria. It was recognized that these goals and criteria represent things to consider when selecting an option; they would not be assigned numbers and weighted in making a recommendation.

Connector Types

Prior to the consultant presentation, the Chair expressed hope that the committee could come as close as possible to making a recommendation at the third meeting. The Chair suggested that the fourth meeting should be used to evaluate and incorporate additional public input from the April 10 public open house and make any suggestions that could improve the functioning of the recommended connector. Issues that may be addressed could include:

- How would the connector relate to the 2 existing footpaths? Should they be improved?
- How might bus or shuttle service complement the connector?
- If the synagogue building is retained, are there opportunities for someone to pursue uses at the building, such as a day care, a cafe, or bike racks?
- Should there be parking created in the vicinity?

The consultants presented information on 9 connector types and 3 options for crossing Terwilliger ([see full presentation](#)). They reminded the team that they should think of all of the options as pieces as the final connector will likely include a combination. The key questions and comments from the committee during the presentation are summarized below.

Pathways

- Too much grade for this to be primary connector but likely part of any option

Bridge + Elevators

- Was studied as part of DEIS.
- Where would elevator shaft be located, near hill or close to Barbur?
 - o Will be part of next refinements in design. Noted that visibility of the structure is something of concern, it will need to be careful of existing view corridors, particularly of Mt. St. Helens, as well as 4(f) environmental requirements on park land.
- How would elevator capacity compare to Darlene Hooley elevator at Gibbs over I-5?
 - o Would likely be more than one elevator car, and would have much higher capacity, similar to Zoo MAX station.
- Support for this option as it is most likely to be free for the user and very user-friendly.
- Support for good weather protection on this option.

Funicular/Inclined Elevators

- May not necessarily have less of a visible impact than bridge/elevator. Seems like it would be a "scar."
 - o Other suggestion that it would be less visible.
- Questions as to whether this would qualify for FTA funding as they have not necessarily funded such investments in the past.
- Should consider how other types of mechanical connections have been built into Olmstead parks.

Tunnel + Elevator

- Needs to be safe and lit
- Will need redundancy with a stair option
- Could the tunnel be paired with future construction of the OHSU hospital expansion?
 - o Not sure, but if it could add cost and complications, would not be desirable
- Could be some issues tunneling under working hospital facilities

Escalator + Moving Walkway

- Flexible , reversible, but need to be weather protected for effective operations
- Accessibility and maintenance challenges (constantly moving)
- Limited discussion by committee

Tram and Gondola

- Generally an outsized solution for this connection, not many existing trams/gondolas on this scale
- Limited discussion by committee.

Shuttle Bus

- Route between Gibbs Station and Marquam hill would be long and circuitous under existing traffic conditions
- Could be opportunities for a shuttle bus circulator through the OHSU campus, primarily west of Terwilliger
- Need to explore how Number 8 bus is incorporated into this process.

Terwilliger Crossing

- Strong support from Working Group for at-grade crossing and undercrossing, not standalone overcrossing.
- At-grade can be safe and accessible if done right. Example of Division street where more pedestrian crossings have slowed traffic and made the street more “permeable” for people
- Question as to whether the current design of Terwilliger, with sharp turn right at Campus Drive intersection, allows for a safe at-grade crossing.
- An at-grade crossing minimizes the impact.
- Important to note that existing plans try and limit traffic on Terwilliger. OHSU encourages employees to use Sam Jackson Park Road for campus access, and tries to get patients only to use Terwilliger, and primarily only northbound.
- Undercrossing is more challenging for bus connections and is hard with ADA ramps which generally mean significant path switchbacks.

Connector Type Narrowing Discussion

The Working Group had previously reviewed these options and evaluated them. The consultants presented a document summarizing feedback from the Working Group and their preferences for the different connectors ([see summary document](#)).

The GRC agreed to drop consideration as the primary connector types of:

1. Elevated pathway
2. Gondola
3. Escalator/moving pathway
4. Shuttle bus

The GRC wanted further consideration and more information for:

1. Elevator/bridge option - the most popular option of the Working Group.
2. Funicular/inclined elevator
3. Tunnel/elevator
4. Aerial tram - at least interested in getting cost data.

Terwilliger Crossing

The GRC agreed to drop consideration of:

1. Standalone overcrossing

The GRC wanted further consideration and more information for:

2. At-grade crossing – the most popular option and strongly preferred by Parks.
3. Undercrossing

General discussion

- Economic impact to user will be a critical consideration
- The termini are going to be very important

Next Steps

In evaluating the remaining options, the Chair requested that we hear of any significant risks or "deal killers" before making our final decision. The chair directed staff to look into the following questions for the next meeting:

- Are there options less likely to be funded by FTA?
- Are there approaches that are unacceptable to Parks?
- Is the tunnel option acceptable to OHSU given their research and patient care responsibilities?
- Are there environmental or regulatory considerations that preclude any of the options?
- Is there existing utility infrastructure (water lines, storm sewers, electricity, gas) that would complicate any option?

The committee agreed that among the criteria, two of the most important data points for comparing the options are:

- Overall capital and operating costs
- Capacity of the option to handle anticipated ridership and future growth, including taking into account queuing time

