



Southwest Corridor Plan Steering Committee

Monday, June 11, 2012

9 to 11 a.m.

Metro Regional Center, 600 NE Grand Ave, Portland, OR

Committee Members Present

Carl Hosticka, Co-Chair

Craig Dirksen

Denny Doyle

Keith Mays

Neil McFarlane

Gery Schirado

Loretta Smith

Jason Tell

Suzan Turley

Metro Council

City of Tigard

Beaverton

City of Sherwood

TriMet

City of Durham

Multnomah County

Oregon Department of Transportation

City of King City

Committee Members Excused

Roy Rogers

Lou Ogden

Sam Adams

Barbara Roberts

Jack Hoffman

Washington County

City of Tualatin

City of Portland

Metro Council

City of Lake Oswego

Alternate Members Present

Monique Beikman

Catherine Ciarlo

Donna Jordan

City of Tualatin

City of Portland

City of Lake Oswego

Metro Staff

Robin McArthur, Malu Wilkinson, Karen Withrow, Jamie Snook, Emma Fredieu

1. Welcome and introductions

Co-Chair Carl Hosticka, Metro Councilor, called the meeting to order and requested that steering committee and audience members introduce themselves. After introductions, Co-Chair Hosticka welcomed everyone and mentioned the allocated time for public comment at the end of the meeting.

2. Project partner updates

Co-Chair Hosticka solicited community updates from the project partners and specifically asked them to provide updates on any petitions circulating the jurisdictions [included in the meeting

packet]. Ms. Suzan Turley, City of King City, informed the committee that the petition in King City had included enough valid signatures, and that proposed measure would be included on the next election ballot. Mayor Craig Dirksen, City of Tigard, noted that petitioners in Tigard have until June 22, 2012 to collect signatures. Mr. Jason Tell, ODOT, asked what the petitions were for. Co-Chair Hosticka explained that several petitions were circulating proposing that any planned light rail projects be approved by voters. He noted that the language of the petitions did not clearly define what phase of a light rail project would need to be put to a vote. Ms. Donna Jordan, City of Lake Oswego, wondered what effect the proposed measures would have on the maintenance and operation of the Willamette Shoreline rail line.

Mr. Neil McFarlane, TriMet, mentioned the recent celebration commemorating the full-funding of the Portland to Milwaukie Light Rail project. Mr. Tell asked for clarification as to whether the petitions and their proposed measures applied only to rail project. Co-Chair Hosticka responded that it was unclear whether they would apply to all High Capacity Transit (HCT) projects.

Mayor Dirksen reported that Tigard had recently completed its High Capacity Land Use plan. Ms. Turley informed the committee that King City and ODOT were in the process of applying for a grant to build sidewalks on 99W.

3. Consideration of the Steering Committee meeting summary from May 14, 2012

Co-Chair Hosticka sought comments on the previous steering committee summary. Hearing none, Mr. Tell moved to adopt the May 14, 2012 steering committee summary. Ms. Monique Beikman seconded the motion. The committee passed the motion with no objections and adopted the summary.

4. Project Development Kickoff

Co-Chair Hosticka informed the committee that the federal government requires the steering committee to submit certain documents in order to complete grant processes. Ms. Robin McArthur, Metro, explained that a large portion of the meeting would focus on the transportation element of the goals and vision of the SW Corridor Plan (SWCP). She acknowledged that the committee would need to discuss technical details in order to submit the proper documents and fulfill federal requirements.

Ms. Malu Wilkinson, Metro, directed the committee to the SWCP workplan approach and schedule [included in the meeting packet]. She explained that the committee would work on step 3 of the workplan – identifying needs and challenges. Ms. Wilkinson noted that many of the cities and communities were working through step 4 at an individual and local level as they establish their own land use and transportation plans. She then gave an overview of steps 5 through 8 and explained that potential projects should be screened and ready for committee review by Fall 2012.

Ms. Beikman requested clarification as to what the committee would be asked to consider at the next scheduled steering committee meeting in October, 2012. Ms. Wilkinson responded that the committee would have the full list of potential projects to screen at the next meeting.

Mayor Dirksen expressed concern regarding the time gap between today's meeting and the meeting scheduled in October. He recommended scheduling an additional meeting during August to prepare the committee to screen projects in October.

Co-Chair Hosticka wondered if other committee members agreed with Mayor Dirksen's recommendation. Ms. Jordan wanted to make sure that the committee would have work to do at an additional meeting and asked Ms. Wilkinson how she planned to distribute screening information between now and October.

Ms. Wilkinson responded that jurisdictional staff would continue to meet in the interim between steering committee meetings. She commented that the steering committee could meet again during the summer if they felt there is a need, but that staff would continue to work together during that time.

Ms. McArthur inquired as to when the range of potential projects would be solidified. Ms. Wilkinson estimated that the range of projects would be developed by early August. Mayor Dirksen suggested that an additional steering committee meeting be scheduled in early August. The committee agreed with his suggestion.

4.1 Transit Alternatives Analysis "purpose and need"

Ms. Jamie Snook, Metro, presented the Transit Alternatives "purpose and need" [presentation included in the meeting packet]. She described the importance of the "purpose and need" document for the federal grant process, and explained the SWCP's coordination with the Federal Transportation Administration. Ms. Snook defined High Capacity Transit (HCT) for meeting attendees and detailed how HCT can be incorporated into the corridor. Ms. Snook then requested the committee consider approving the working draft of the "purpose and need" and approve the continuing efforts of staff to refine it.

Mayor Dirksen offered several suggestions for edits to the document. He recommended adding language to address congestion and growth, which he identified as major purposes of the SWCP. He also suggested adding language linking the SCWP with the regional 2040 plan and with projected future population capacity needs. He believed this language would resonate with other partners and citizens in the region. Finally, he noted that the term "unreliable" was used throughout the document, and commented that the meaning of "unreliable" is unclear. He proposed using a term with a more concrete definition.

Co-Chair Hosticka responded that congestion might fall under the section on capacity. He agreed with Mayor Dirksen that the document should address the underlying regional plans.

Mr. McFarlane suggested the mobility, rather than congestion, may be a better measurement of the benefits of transit in the corridor, since transit-focused studies do not typically address congestion directly. He also noted that "reliability" refers to the consistency of a transit system

Ms. Catherine Ciarlo, City of Portland, asked that the third bullet point under "Needs" be bolded. Co-Chair Hosticka clarified that one of the goals of the SWCP was safe and reliable transit, and that congestion threatened that goal.

Ms. Jordan asked that Lake Oswego and King City be added to the list of jurisdictions at the beginning of the document. She described the length of the corridor and the variety of communities impacted by the plan. Mayor Dirksen suggested adding language such as “other jurisdictions” to the list. Mayor Gery Schirado, City of Durham, noted that Durham would be impacted by the SWCP, so it should also be included in the list of jurisdictions. He supported Mayor Dirksen’s suggestion of adding an additional steering committee meeting to keep the City of Durham apprised of the SWCP.

Mr. McFarlane recommended using “transit improvements” versus more specifically referencing HCT, in order to satisfy FTA preferences. He added that much of the interest in the corridor stems from local transit improvements and that TriMet was looking forward to working with local jurisdictions to improve transit service in their communities.

Ms. Snook thanked the committee for their input and assured the members that she would be working with staff to incorporate their comments.

Co-Chair Hosticka asked if there would be opportunity to review the draft document again at an August steering committee meeting, and Ms. Jordan wondered if staff wanted an action on the draft at today’s meeting. Ms. Wilkinson responded that there would be an opportunity to review the documents in August. Ms. Turley expressed discomfort taking action on the document before reviewing the incorporating comments. Ms. Snook clarified that staff sought approval for continued work on the document, and would be presenting any changes to the committee for approval in the future.

The committee voted using the “thumbs-up” method to approve the plan to continue to work on the draft “purpose and need.” There were no thumbs-down votes.

4.2 Transportation plan “problem statement”

Ms. Talia Jacobson, ODOT, presented the working draft of the SW Corridor Transportation Plan “problem statement” [included in the meeting packet]. She explained that the purpose of the document was to identify high-level needs of the plan, and to create a basis for screening projects to include in the SWCP. Ms. Wilkinson reminded the committee that the “problem statement” was part of the SW Corridor Transportation Plan and would address all types of transportation modes.

Ms. Jacobson informed the committee that the “problem statement” fulfilled Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) requirements. She described the major challenges in the corridor, the constraints to finding solutions, and opportunities to improve the corridor’s transportation system. She asked the committee to consider approving the continued refinement of the working draft of the “problem statement.”

Mayor Dirksen was pleased by the evolution of the document. He reiterated that language addressing “congestion” should be added and that the term “reliability” is problematic.

Mayor Schirado asked if the “problem statement” addressed constraints to applying certain funds to street improvements. He explained that Durham is unable to use street funds to

improve the main street in Durham because the funds have to be used to improve street capacity and cannot be used to improve physical infrastructure. Mr. Tell suggested the committee develop additional examples of financial constraints to clarify project expectation to the public. He expressed doubts about public understanding of the limited funding environment.

Mayor Dirksen agreed and emphasized that the language of all SWCP documents should resonate with members of the public to increase their understanding of the SWCP. Ms. Ciarlo mentioned that the Barbur plan would be financially constrained and was concerned that community members understand the feasibility of the plan. Ms. Jacobson agreed and noted that language in the document paragraph regarding balancing could be adjusted to take feasibility into account.

Ms. Jordan appreciated the emphasis of phasing based on funding availability in the “problem statement.” She mentioned the collaboration between jurisdictions in Clackamas County to identify needs in the region and balance those against available funding. Mr. Tell highlighted the importance of planning based on both current funding feasibility and future funding opportunities.

Co-Chair Hosticka advocated for continued regional funding discussions. He also noted that the opportunities section of the document could be better structured. Mr. Tell suggested sub-headings for that section, included “all modes” and “land use.”

Mr. Dirksen highlighted the importance of balancing the use of all modes.

The committee voted using the “thumbs-up” method to approve the plan to continue to work on the draft SW Corridor Transportation Plan “problem statement.” There were no thumbs-down votes.

4.3 Screening approach

Ms. Snook presented the SWCP screening approach [included in the meeting packet]. She emphasized that the screening approach would build upon previous work in the region to identify projects in the corridor.

Mayor Keith Mays, City of Sherwood, argued against eliminating projects if they do not pass the screening criteria, in case they are feasible or necessary at a later time. Mayor Dirksen agreed and suggested using a 15-year time frame for considering the funding needs and feasibility of the projects.

Mr. Tell warned against adding too many projects to the SWCP, and advocated for building a list of projects that the committee is confident can be implemented.

Ms. Beikman suggested including projects that fall within the vision of the SWCP, including those that cannot be currently funded. She preferred studying all projects in the vision of the SWCP so that, when funding becomes available, the corridor will be ready to implement them.

Ms. Jordan recommended framing the screening as a strategy and not as a discussion of what projects are and are not affordable.

Mr. McFarlane suggested recognizing how short-term investments can align with long-term needs. Mayor Denny Doyle, City of Beaverton, did not believe that affordability would often be used as a screening consideration and was comfortable with including it in the screening approach.

Co-Chair Hosticka wondered who would be making decisions as to whether the corridor can afford a project. He considered that policy makers and local jurisdictions might have to make those decisions with information from consultants and staff.

Mayor Dirksen appreciated the discussion of the screening process. He cautioned against limiting the vision to only those projects that are currently affordable. Mr. Tell agreed and appreciated the strategic approach to the process, rather than creating an all-encompassing list of projects.

Ms. Jordan reiterated the importance of increasing public understanding of the limited funding climate as the screening process unfolds.

Ms. Beikman restated her preference that projects included in the SWCP vision be studied regardless of whether they can currently be implemented or afforded. Mr. Tell responded that the timeline for which projects may be immediately studied is unclear, and it may be more feasible to decide which projects to prioritize at later meetings.

Co-Chair Hosticka explained that adding a project to the SWCP list has a different meaning for planners than it does for elected officials. Ms. McArthur suggested allowing staff to work through the screening process and report back to the committee in August for consideration.

Ms. Ciarlo requested staff rephrase the screening criteria “Can we afford it, and when?” and “Are the impacts reasonable?” Ms. Jordan suggested adding a screening criterion for whether or not a project helps or hurts the long term vision of the SWCP.

5. Implementation partners and public engagement

Ms. Karen Withrow, Metro, directed the committee to the SW Corridor Implementation Partners strategy [included in the meeting packet]. She gave a brief overview of the purpose of engaging implementation partners and the general public. Ms. Withrow described how the SW Corridor Plan would involve various partners and what knowledge each of those those partners might bring to the planning process.

Ms. Turley asked how the SWCP would identify potential project members. Ms. Withrow explained that jurisdictional staff would work together to develop and refine a list of potential members. She added that potential members may emerge as a part of the planning process. Ms. Withrow asked committee members to notify staff if they wished to suggest any potential members. Mayor Schirado suggested including public safety groups, such as safety committees and police and fire services in the SW Corridor communities.

Mayor Dirksen requested additional time to inform the community of upcoming open houses in the corridor jurisdictions. Ms. Withrow described the outreach efforts throughout the corridor and online, and explained that staff could work to adjust open house time lines if necessary.

6. Public comment

Mr. Bud Roberts, Hillsdale resident and former Beaverton traffic engineer, asked the committee to consider pursuing private investment for the SWCP and described the value of public-private partnerships for regional planning.

Ms. Marianne Fitzgerald, President of Southwest Neighborhoods, Inc., suggested adding on and off ramps that connect to residential streets to the Transportation Plan “problem statement.” She highlighted the congestion and safety affects that ramps have on neighborhoods in the corridor.

Mr. Roger Averbeck, Chair of Southwest Neighborhood Transportation Committee, supported the implementation partners plan. He noted that the public was identified as an audience in the draft “purpose and need” and “problem statement” and suggestion identifying the audience as a stakeholder instead. He expressed concern for the shortened timeline for screening projects, and advocated for allowing time for public involvement.

Ms. Withrow responded to Mr. Averbeck that the SWCP would reach out to the community this summer for input on the screening approach.

Mr. Jim Howell, Association of Oregon Rail and Transit Advocates, appreciated the SWCP and hoped that rapid transit would be an outcome of the planning process. He noted a lack of a southern I-5 corridor for rapid transit. Mr. Howell also asked the committee to consider incorporating a connection to the east side of Portland. He suggested expanding the study area east across the Willamette River.

Adjourn

Co-chair Hosticka adjourned the meeting at 11:10 a.m.

Meeting summary respectfully submitted by:

Emma Fredieu

Attachments to the Record:

Item	Topic	Document Date	Description	Document Number
1	Agenda	6/11/12	June meeting agenda	061112swcpSC-01
2	Summary	5/14/12	Meeting summary, May 14, 2012	061112swcpSC-02
3	Document	6/11/12	SW Corridor Approach and Schedule	061112swcpSC-03
4	Document	6/11/12	Transportation Problem Statement	061112swcpSC-04
5	Document	6/11/12	Transit AA Purpose and Need	061112swcpSC-05
6	Document	6/11/12	Implementation Partners	061112swcpSC-06
7	Document	6/11/12	Screening approach	061112swcpSC-07
8	Powerpoint	6/11/12	Presentations throughout the meeting	061112swcpSC-08
9	Petitions	6/11/12	Collection of petitions circulating in the corridor	061112swcpSC-09