



Southwest Corridor Plan Steering Committee

Monday, September 24, 2012

9 to 11 a.m.

Metro Council Chamber, 600 NE Grand, Portland, OR 97323

Committee Members Present

Barbara Roberts, Co-Chair

Neil McFarlane

Loretta Smith

Lou Ogden

Jason Tell

Gery Schirado

Metro Council

TriMet

Multnomah County

City of Tualatin

Oregon Department of Transportation

City of Durham

Committee Members Excused

Roy Rogers

Jack Hoffman

Sam Adams

Carl Hosticka

Keith Mays

Susan Turley

Craig Dirksen

Denny Doyle

Washington County

City of Lake Oswego

City of Portland

Metro Council

City of Sherwood

City of King City

City of Tigard

City of Beaverton

Alternate Members Present

Andy Duyck

Katja Dillman

Margaret Middleton

Nick Wilson

Donna Jordan

Washington County

City of Portland

City of Beaverton

City of Tigard

City of Lake Oswego

Metro Staff

Elissa Gertler, Malu Wilkinson, Karen Withrow, Robin McArthur, Emma Fredieu, Clifford Higgins,

1.0 Welcome and introductions

Co-chair Barbara Roberts, Metro Councilor, called the meeting to order at 9:07 a.m. She notified committee members that Co-chair Carl Hosticka would not be attending the meeting. Co-chair Roberts then asked the committee members to introduce themselves. After introductions, she explained that the committee would lay the groundwork for the project screening process to occur in October, 2012. She stated that the project screening results would reflect the collective priorities and community visions of the SW Corridor Plan area members. Co-chair Roberts added that the screening process would allow the committee to examine how to spend their resources and how to focus their efforts on the most important projects.

Co-chair Roberts also mentioned recent ballot measures in Clackamas County and King City that would require an election to approve the use of public resources toward light rail projects. She asserted that the efforts to include those measures on local ballots highlighted the importance of the political and planning processes for citizens and the need for inclusion.

2.0 Review fall schedule

Ms. Malu Wilkinson, Metro, directed committee members to the fall steering committee schedule (included in the agenda packet). She reminded committee members of the upcoming change of committee membership after the November 2012 elections. She then informed the committee that a steering committee workshop planned for December 2012 would allow newly elected members and new jurisdictional staff to meet with current steering committee members to ease the transition. Ms. Wilkinson also mentioned upcoming Community Planning Forums in October and December 2012 that will convene community stakeholders to discuss the SW Corridor Plan. She concluded by describing private sector outreach efforts as well as efforts to identify a community partner group for the SW Corridor.

Mr. Jason Tell, ODOT, expressed surprise over the high level of agreement amongst the public regarding the importance of the plan, as noted by the public feedback summary (included in the agenda packet). He believed it would be the committee's responsibility to deliver on the plan's promises, and Co-chair Roberts added that it would also be the responsibility of the committee to keep the approval numbers from the public high.

Ms. Donna Jordan, Lake Oswego, asked where the Community Planning Forums would be held. Ms. Karen Withrow, Metro, responded that the October 9, 2012 forum would be held at the Multnomah Arts Center, and that staff were working to identify a location for December.

3.0 Consideration of the Steering Committee meeting summary from June 11, 2012

Co-chair Roberts asked the committee if they had any comments on the meeting minutes from the June 11, 2012 steering committee meeting.

Mr. Neil McFarlane, TriMet moved to approve the June 11, 2012 minutes. Ms. Jordan seconded Mr. McFarlane's motion. No committee members opposed approving the minutes.

4.0 Transportation plan problem statement

Co-chair Roberts introduced the documents need for the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA): the SW Corridor transportation plan problem statement and the Transit AA purpose and need (both included in the agenda packet). She reminded the committee that these documents were reviewed and edited during the previous steering committee meeting, and she asked if there was any additional feedback that the committee would like to give. Ms. Jordan wondered why the Boones Ferry connection to Terwilliger and I-5 was not included in the main body of the problem statement. She noted that many residents use that connection and argued that it should be included. Ms. Wilkinson responded that the Boones Ferry connection could easily be included in the main body since it was already listed in a bulleted section.

Mr. Nick Wilson, Tigard, addressed the Transit AA purpose and need and asked the phrase "in the corridor" be inserted in two places for better clarity. Co-chair Roberts asked the committee if they had any opposition to inserting "in the corridor." No committee members voiced opposition.

Mr. Tell asked what the phrase "mass transit" meant in the two documents. Mr. McFarlane replied that he considers it to be all encompassing, including buses, rail, trains, etc.

Co-chair Roberts wondered if the committee was ready to take action on the two documents. Ms. Jordan motioned to approve the transportation plan problem statement. Mr. McFarlane seconded. No committee members opposed approving the problem statement, and the motion passed.

Mr. McFarlane moved to approve the Transit AA purpose and need. Ms. Jordan seconded the motion to approve the Transit AA purpose and need. No committee members opposed approving the transit AA purpose and need, and the motion passed.

Ms. Wilkinson noted that the SW Corridor Plan staff were coordinating with the Native American tribes in the region, so the Transit AA may need to be altered if the tribes submit feedback in the future.

5.0 Investment capacity for transit

Co-chair Roberts directed the committee to the transportation investment document (included in the agenda packet). She informed them that there would be presentations by two cities on opportunities for investments in local jurisdictions.

Mr. Alan Lehto, TriMet, presented the transportation investment document. He reviewed Figure 1 with the committee and noted that investments from the federal government to the

region have decreased over time. Mr. Lehto then outlined several difference sources of funding opportunities listed on the documents, such as highway trust funds, transit discretionary funds, state lottery, and local sources. He added that the committee would need to discuss which funding sources are reasonable and possible as they move through the project screening process.

Mr. Tell noted that the cost to build projects has increased as funding opportunities have decreased.

Mr. Wilson asked Mr. Lehto if the costs listed on the document were adjusted for inflation. Mr. Lehto responded that they are not. Mr. Wilson and Mr. Lehto discussed the challenges to adjusting past and projected costs for inflation.

Mr. Tell argued that the message to take away from Mr. Lehto's presentation is that local governments, the region and the state will need to take on more of the cost burden, as federal funding for transportation projects decreases. Co-chair Roberts noted that one the evaluation criteria in the project screening process is cost, and that the information imparted by Mr. Lehto would be useful when deciding to pursue funding for projects or screen them out of the planning process.

Mr. McFarlane commented that the federal government had tightened the eligibility requirements for the kinds of transportation projects that can receive funding. He also noted that Congress had given the New Starts category additional funding, but that general fund expenditures would be restricted. Mr. Lehto agreed that New Starts could be a good future opportunity for funding and added that the highway trust funds would not be restricted similarly to the general fund. He noted that funding for bus rapid transit (BRT) projects with designated right of ways had increased, representing a significant investment from the federal agencies.

Mr. Tell wondered if funding strategies differed between BRT and light rail projects. Mr. Lehto informed him that the federal agencies distinguished between larger and smaller cost projects above and below \$100 million, but did not distinguish between modes of transportation. Mr. Wilson asked if the \$100 million figure was the amount of federal investment or the total cost of the project. Andy Cotugno, Metro, responded the \$100 million represented the federal investment.

Mayor Lou Ogden, City of Tualatin, referred back to Figure 1 in the transit investment document. He noted that Figure 1 estimated federal investment in future projects to be 50% of costs. Mayor Ogden asked if 50% was a guess or a reliable projection for the level of federal investment in future projects. Mr. Lehto replied that the estimate was based on communications from the FTA that agencies should assume federal investment at 50% or less. Mr. McFarlane agreed that 50% would be a sound assumption for the SW Corridor Plan, but that projects much larger than the SW Corridor Plan would need to reevaluate their assumptions and possibly use a smaller estimate. Co-chair Roberts noted that as the steering committee membership changes after the November 2012 elections, there would also be changes at the state and federal levels, so the steering committee should not view the 50% estimate as a guarantee, but as a realistic maximum investment from the federal government.

Mr. McFarlane commented that operating costs of transportation projects create a challenge when pursuing realistic funding as well. Mr. Tell asked Mr. McFarlane if he believed that the operating costs of a project deserve their own analysis. Mr. McFarlane responded that he thought it was too early in the planning process to do an analysis of operating costs but that SW Corridor staff should consider operating costs in order to prevent making unrealistic promises.

Mr. Wilson argued that the economic environment could be different and improved ten or fifteen years into the future, so the committee should take a more positive approach to future funding opportunities. Co-chair Roberts agreed but noted that the planning process should be practical, as well as visionary.

6.0 Land use vision and connections to transit

Co-chair Roberts guided the committee to the document relating to land use development and transit options (included in the agenda packet). Ms. Elissa Gertler, Metro, explained how the land use development and transit options were related to the questions of investments in transit. She explained that the documents outlined how certain transit modes might yield certain types of development. Co-chair Roberts asked the committee to read the chart regarding how certain transit modes meet certain land use goals in detail for clarity.

6.1 City of Tigard's High Capacity Transit (HCT) Land Use Plan

Ms. Judith Gray, City of Tigard, presented Tigard's High Capacity Transit (HCT) Land Use Plan (presentation included in the meeting packet). She explained that the City of Tigard was looking city-wide to identify locations that could support HCT station communities. The City of Tigard considered the kinds of neighborhoods, needed investments, and plans for future growth.

Mr. Tell commented that certain neighborhoods had not expressed the desire for changes or improvements. He asked Ms. Gray if those neighborhoods would be accepting of change or if it might be challenging to implement projects there. Ms. Gray replied that it might be a challenge, but that the purpose of Tigard's plan was to confront that question and identify places most ready for change. She highlighted the importance of finding shared desired outcomes in Tigard, such as increased safety. Mr. Wilson noted that the community within the Tigard triangle had expressed the desire for changes and had identified the triangle as an opportunity for high density building.

Mayor Ogden and Mr. Wilson discussed the top priority areas for the City of Tigard. Mr. Wilson informed him that areas marked 1 and 2 in the powerpoint presentation commanded most of the City of Tigard's focus.

Ms. Jordan wondered if the City of Tigard was pursuing partnerships with the private sector for development in the Tigard triangle. Ms. Gray replied that the upcoming economic development summit and community partners group would be good opportunities for forging those partnerships.

6.2 City of Portland's Barbur Concept Plan

Mr. Jay Sugnet, City of Portland, presented the Barbur Concept Plan (presentation included in the agenda packet). He explained that the City of Portland was working to transform Barbur Boulevard from a thoroughfare to a destination. He outlined a number of scenarios for Barbur Boulevard that Portland has evaluated and presented to members of the public. He noted that the most popular scenario, moderate mixed use, did not currently have support among developers according to the consultants on the project. However, developers noted that investment in HCT could change their motivation to build there.

Mr. Wilson asked if the City of Portland considered linking centers between Hillsdale and Multnomah, and if not, why not. Mr. Sugnet replied that Portland focused on Barbur Boulevard because it has the greatest potential for change in the area. He noted that connections to Hillsdale could be possible, but that Hillsdale had its own plans for development.

Ms. Gertler explained that the committee would need to consider the links between transportation and land use moving forward in order to find the right transit investment for the SW Corridor Plan.

Co-chair Roberts commented that both the City of Tigard and the City of Portland had included an outreach campaign to the public regarding their local plans. She expressed appreciation for allowing the local communities to give feedback as to the kind of development they would like, and which transit investments would work best with that kind of development. She noted that the screening process explanation outlined the benefits of different kinds of modes of transportation and how they would line up with the development need of the local communities.

7.0 Wide range of projects update and screening approach

Ms. Wilkinson directed the committee to three handouts: the project workflow, the summary of the online open house, and a copy of her power point presentation (included in the agenda packet). She presented the steering committee considerations for the next steps in the project workflow. Ms. Wilkinson informed the committee that 500-plus projects will be screened, and she outlined the steps of the screening process. She concluded that the goal of the screening process is to develop a shorter list of projects for the committee to consider.

Mayor Ogden expressed concerns regarding the decision making process of the project screening. He asked who would make the decision to apply the screening criteria to each project. Ms. Wilkinson replied that SW Corridor staff would work together over the next month to come up with a screening recommendation to present to the steering committee in October. She confirmed that the steering committee would make the final decision on the recommendation. Ms. Gertler added that the committee would discuss the major screening recommendations in project packages in October, but most likely would not need to approve each individual project's screening outcome.

7.1 Parks and natural resources examples

Ms. Janet Bebb, Metro, presented examples of the green infrastructure projects, which include parks, trails, stream corridors, storm water, and tree canopy (presentation included in the agenda packet).

7.2 Transit and roadway examples

Mr. Matt Bihn, Metro, presented examples of the roadway and transit projects that would be included in the screening process (presentation included in the agenda packet). He discussed examples such as the I-5 southbound climbing lane, and the Boones Ferry road bridge improvements. He provided a brief list of potential HCT alternatives, and their investment magnitude and property impacts of: light rail from Portland to Sherwood, bus rapid transit from Portland to Sherwood, and bus rapid transit from Portland to Tigard.

Mayor Ogden asked Mr. Bihn if the presented transit alternatives were examples of projects or recommendations to the steering committee. Mr. Bihn replied that the transit alternatives were examples to illustrate the kind of considerations and data used during the screening process. Mayor Ogden wondered when and who would be making decisions regarding the screening of the transit and roadway projects. Mr. Bihn informed him that the Project Team Leader (PTL) group and other staff members were developing recommendations to take to the steering committee on October 22, 2012, and that the steering committee would ultimately decide whether or not to accept the recommendation.

Ogden also asked if staff would analyze the impacts of the 99W lane uses in time for the October 22nd steering committee meeting. Mr. Bihn answered that analysis at that level of detail would wait until after the screening process had narrowed down the list of projects to consider. Once the screening process is concluded, staff can develop a more detailed evaluation of the remaining projects.

Mr. Wilson requested clarification as to why impractical transit alternatives, such as using existing lanes on 99W, remain on the list of potential projects. Mr. Bihn informed him that federal planning processes require all alternatives to be considered.

Co-chair Roberts highlighted the importance of the screening process time buckets: short-term, mid-term, and long-term. She explained that the committee would be able to place projects in the correct buckets in order to focus analysis on the most current and short-term projects.

Ms. Jordan commented that short-term projects, such as adding a lane for BRT, might need to be flexible to consider long term goals. She wondered if the time buckets would be flexible if local plans change. Ms. Gertler responded that corridor refinement plans, such as the SW Corridor often result in amendments to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) which can be amended as local plans change.

Co-chair Roberts addressed concerns that projects designated as long-term would be rejected. She clarified that long-term projects would continue to be included in the future vision of the SW Corridor Plan.

Ms. Katja Dillman, City of Portland, asked analysis of the transit projects could include the value of the projects, in addition to the costs and impacts. Mr. Bihn responded that it would be difficult to calculate the value of the projects, given the variety of factors contributing to value, and that the level of modeling necessary would come after the screening process.

8.0 Project partner updates

Co-chair Roberts invited the committee members to give brief updates on the status of projects in their jurisdictions.

Mayor Ogden described the completion of the citizen involvement effort to identify local interest in transit and land use in Tualatin. He summarized comments and conclusions from the involvement effort, including the importance of local travel, east-west connections, and the need for reliable transit.

Mr. Wilson updated the committee on the City of Tigard charter amendment that will appear on the upcoming ballot in November. The amendment includes changes to allow staff to attend corridor planning meetings at Metro. Mr. Tell asked if the amendment applies to light rail. Mr. Wilson replied that it only applies to light rail construction, and that he believes that Tigard citizens support light rail in general.

Ms. Margaret Middleton, City of Beaverton, explained that Beaverton is concentrating on the Washington Square portion of their local plans.

Mr. Gery Schirado, City of Durham, informed the committee that Durham was coordinating with ODOT regarding improvements to Upper Boones Ferry Road. He described an upcoming apartment and commercial development project in Lower Boones Ferry Road across from Providence and the Claim Jumper restaurant.

Ms. Jordan reported that the City of Lake Oswego approved an urban renewal district and would be exploring ways to use existing TriMet service to improve the use of transit. She mentioned a \$5 million bond on the ballot in November for making improvements to Boones Ferry Road from Madrona to Oakridge/Resso.

Mr. Lehto reported that TriMet had updated fares and completed a service change in September. Next year, TriMet will begin a southwest service enhancement plan to include the transit network to the south of Portland.

Ms. Loretta Smith, Multnomah County, commented Multnomah County would not be able to provide a support letter to Metro regarding funding for health initiatives as the county would be pursuing some of the same funding opportunities.

Mr. Tell noted that ODOT would soon update their statewide transportation improvement program (STIP), and that there would be a solicitation for projects to include in the update. He hoped that the committee would be able to add to the STIP program, starting in November.

Co-chair Roberts reminded the committee that the next meeting is scheduled for October 22, 2012.

9.0 Public Comment

Mr. Tim Esaw, resident of Tigard, disagreed with the observation from Mr. Wilson that Tigard supports light rail. He expressed concerns that the suburban community of Tigard does not need high capacity transit, and does not want to spend the money on transit when it is not needed or wanted. He noted that car use in Tigard is the most practical and well used mode in the community. He stressed that transit did not serve the transportation needs for Tigard.

Mr. Jim Howell disagreed with Mr. Esaw, and expressed hope that the committee would keep visionary options on the table and not screen them out. He believed in a need for a rapid transit alternative to I-5 to the south. He argued that light rail would be the correct mode of transit to travel from Portland to Tualatin. He hoped that the committee would not become wrapped up in discussion regarding project cost.

Mr. Roger Averback, SW Neighborhood Coalition Transportation Committee, hoped that 99W would not be characterized as a relief valve for traffic on I-5. He expressed the importance of improvements and changes on 99W for job creation and neighborhood development.

Co-chair Roberts adjourned the meeting at 11:19 A.M.

Meeting summary respectfully submitted by:

<SIGN HERE FOR FINAL VERSION>

Emma Fredieu

Attachments to the Record:

Item	Type	Document Date	Description	Document Number
1	Agenda	9/24/12	August meeting agenda	092412swcpssc-01
2	Summary	9/24/12	SW Corridor steering committee schedule	092412swcpssc-02
3	Document	6/11/12	June 11, 2012 meeting minutes	092412swcpssc-03
4	Document	9/24/12	Public feedback summary	092412swcpssc-04
5	Document	9/24/12	Transportation plan problem statement	092412swcpssc-05
6	Document	9/24/12	Transit AA purpose and need	092412swcpssc-06
7	Document	9/24/12	Transit investment document	092412swcpssc-07
8	Document	9/24/12	Transit and community benefits	092412swcpssc-08
9	Document	9/24/12	SW Corridor workflow	092412swcpssc-09
10	Powerpoint	9/24/12	City of Tigard powerpoint	092412swcpssc-10
11	Powerpoint	9/24/12	City of Portland powerpoint	092412swcpssc-11
12	Powerpoint	9/24/12	Screening approach powerpoint	092412swcpssc-12
13	Powerpoint	9/24/12	Parks screening powerpoint	092412swcpssc-13
14	Powerpoint	9/24/12	Transit and roadways screening powerpoint	092412swcpssc-14