



## Southwest Corridor Plan Steering Committee

Monday, October 22, 2012

9 to 11 a.m.

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

### Committee Members Present

Barbara Roberts, Co-Chair

Carl Hosticka, Co-Chair

Craig Dirksen

Keith Mays

Neil McFarlane

Loretta Smith

Lou Ogden

Jason Tell

Gery Schirado

Roy Rogers

Suzan Turley

Metro Council

Metro Council

City of Tigard

City of Sherwood

TriMet

Multnomah County

City of Tualatin

Oregon Department of Transportation

City of Durham

Washington County

City of King City

### Committee Members Excused

Jack Hoffman

Sam Adams

Denny Doyle

City of Lake Oswego

City of Portland

City of Beaverton

### Alternate Members Present

Donna Jordan

Joseph Zehnder

City of Lake Oswego

City of Portland

### Metro Staff

Elissa Gertler, Malu Wilkinson, Jamie Snook, Matt Bihn, Anthony Buczek, Karen Withrow, Robin McArthur, Emma Fredieu, Tim Collins, Jenny Cadigan, Marc Week, Nikolai Ursin

## **1.0 Welcome and introductions**

At 9:07 a.m., Co-chair Barbara Roberts, Metro councilor, welcomed the steering committee and audience members. She asked attendees to introduce themselves.

## **2.0 Consideration of the Steering Committee meeting summary from September 24, 2012**

After introductions, Co-chair Roberts directed the committee to the September 24, 2012 Steering Committee meeting summary (included in the agenda packet) and asked if committee members would like to propose any changes. No committee members proposed changes so the committee adopted the meeting summary.

## **3.0 Prioritization process overview**

Co-chair Carl Hosticka, Metro councilor, gave an overview of the desired outcomes and purpose of the meeting. He described the process of narrowing the list of projects included in the SW Corridor Plan and explained that the steering committee would now discuss prioritizing and adopting the screened project lists. He introduced Ms. Malu Wilkinson, Metro, who would review the prioritization process and discuss the next steps of the plan.

Ms. Wilkinson stated that the goal of the SW Corridor Plan was to align the local and regional land use and transportation investments to support the SW Corridor jurisdictions' community visions and aspirations. She reminded the committee of the last meeting's screened transit and roadway project lists, and reviewed that the projects were placed in short-term, mid-term, and long-term time buckets after moving through the project screening process. She informed committee members that they would now prioritize the projects on the list that best support the corridor vision.

Ms. Wilkinson defined the prioritizing process as including projects in the short and midterm time buckets, and then deciding to analyze the projects further. A project placed in the long-term bucket will remain in its original local or regional plan, but would not necessarily be included in further SW Corridor Plan studies. She noted that the next step after the prioritization process is to discuss the collective land use vision for the corridor and the projects that best support that vision.

Ms. Wilkinson then introduced Ms. Jamie Snook, Metro, who outlined the current and upcoming phases of the Alternative Analysis process of the SW Corridor Transportation Plan. Ms. Snook described the new federal funding program for transportation and high capacity transit projects – Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (MAP-21). She explained that the SW Corridor transportation plan would continue along the transit alternative analysis process. Between now and June 2013, the SW Corridor team will narrow the range of options to be considered. Beginning with a wide range of possible projects, SW Corridor staff and the steering committee would develop a narrow range of possible projects until June 30, 2012. At this point SW Corridor staff can narrow options to be considered during the next phase – drafting a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) document, such as an a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) or an Environmental Assessment (EA). This first phase of the NEPA process would begin in July 2013 and last

until 2014 or 2015. A second phase of the NEPA process could be the drafting of a Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) with preliminary engineering analysis, and would begin after the completion of the DEIS. The entire DEIS or EA process will conclude with the identification of a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) for the SW Corridor Plan partners to implement and construct.

Ms. Snook noted that the Federal Transportation Administration (FTA) had provided a grant for funding of the alternatives analysis and NEPA processes in the past, but that, depending on which projects the steering committee prioritizes and which kind of NEPA document is required (DEIS or EA), additional local funding may be necessary. The second phase of the NEPA process, the FEIS document, will also need additional funding and local contributions.

Co-chair Hosticka opened the meeting up to questions from committee members regarding the NEPA process. Ms. Donna Jordan, City of Lake Oswego, mentioned ODOT's plan for developing a high speed rail line through the SW corridor plan area and asked that the SW Corridor Plan and the high speed rail plans be coordinated so that they do not negatively impact each other. Mr. Jason Tell, ODOT, offered to help connecting staff from ODOT to staff on the SW Corridor Plan.

Mayor Lou Ogden, City of Tualatin, wondered what kind of cost would be associated with the Project Development of the MAP-21 process. Ms. Snook responded that it was difficult to identify a cost at this time since the narrow-range project list had not yet been developed, but noted that the DEIS and FEIS from the Portland-Milwaukie light rail project had cost between 12 and 14 million dollars. Mayor Ogden asked for clarification that the costs are generally in the tens of millions of dollar, and not hundreds of millions of dollars. Ms. Snook agreed and added that many factors could impact the cost of the Project Development process.

Mr. Tell asked if there was an estimated funding match from the federal government that the SW Corridor Plan could use to calculate funding needs for the project development phase. Mr. McFarlane said that the investment from the federal government could be up to 50%.

Mr. Zehnder asked if there was an expectation for additional local funding contributions leading up to the end of the project development phase. Mr. McFarlane responded that there has been sharing on similar projects in the past.

Co-chair Roberts returned to Ms. Jordan's comment regarding ODOT's plans for high speed rail in the corridor. She agreed that it is important to keep the broad picture of regional plans in mind and to make sure those plans fit well with local plans in the future.

#### **4.0 Engagement update**

Ms. Karen Withrow, Metro, briefed the committee on the October 9, 2012 community planning forum. She outlined the discussion of the forum, which included the roadways and transit project lists, and noted that they had explored the possibility of reconfiguring some projects in the long-term bucket to move them to the mid-term bucket. Ms. Withrow also mentioned the forum's discussion of shared community investments in the SW Corridor and

that attendees agreed that a balance of projects from the transit, roadways, natural resources, and active transportation lists is key. Attendees believed in the importance of catalyzing development in the corridor, and prioritization and implementing short term projects.

Ms. Withrow updated the committee on the SW Corridor online tool that will enable members of the public to combine projects to create shared investment strategies. The tool will allow the public to see the kind of impacts and effects their choices will have on the SW Corridor Plan.

Co-chair Hosticka suggested that the steering committee participate in the online tool. Ms. Withrow agreed and offered to send the committee information as soon as Metro staff complete the design and post the online tool.

Ms. Withrow also informed the committee of the November 14 SW Corridor economic summit and the December 3 community forum.

Mr. Tell addressed the October 9, 2012 community planning forum and asked Ms. Withrow to clarify the term “balance” when referring to the list of SW Corridor projects. He wondered whether the community planning forum attendees discussed a balance of projects within each category (transit, road, natural resources, active transportation) or across the categories. Ms. Withrow explained that the attendees noted the importance of balance between categories. Mr. Tell hoped that the community would address balancing projects within each category as the steering committee will also need to discuss how to do that in the future.

## **5.0 Transit terminology 101**

Mr. Alan Lehto, TriMet, described definitions of different modes of transit. He directed the committee to a transit modes fact sheet (included in the agenda packet) that explained configurations of bus rapid transit (BRT) and light rail service.

Mr. Roy Rogers, Washington County, wondered how BRT or light rail configurations planned now might address future growth and changes in demographics. Mr. Lehto responded that planning processes may project 30 to 40 years in the future, but that the tools used may only address needs 10 to 20 years in the future. He noted the importance of analyzing the entire transit system when planning for future growth.

Co-chair Hosticka asked if transit models exist for a hybrid system that could travel directly from Portland to Tigard, and branch out from Tigard throughout the SW Corridor plan area. Mr. Lehto agreed that a hybrid model would be an interesting option for the SW Corridor. Mayor Dirksen, City of Tigard, wondered if bus service from Portland to Tigard could have dedicated right-of-way, but share right-of-way with road traffic when travelling between cities within the corridor.

Mr. Rogers argued that plans made now will need to be flexible and visionary enough to adapt to demographic changes in the next few decades.

Co-chair Roberts compared a hybrid plan to an airport hub system in which many lines could converge into a central location and travel back out inside the corridor.

Mayor Dirksen responded to Mr. Rogers and reminded the committee that the SW Corridor Plan is also a land use plan. He commented that lifestyle changes in the future may involve living more locally. He also recommended using Eugene's transit system as an example.

Mr. McFarlane argued that while communities will need to develop and expand upon their local transportation and land use plans to accommodate future needs, there will also continue to be need for travel to major employment hubs.

Mayor Gery Schirado, City of Durham, expressed concern for planning for isolated enclaves of livability within the corridor and advocated for a shared vision and regional activity. Ms. Jordan added that frequency and convenience of transit were important to encourage regional and local travel. She commented that citizens use transit more frequently when they feel confident they can travel easily. Ms Jordan also noted that ease of transit is important for encouraging active and independent lifestyles among senior citizens.

Ms. Suzan Turley, City of King City, considered the challenge of transporting residents from outlying communities to transit hubs and argued that current community busing programs are not regular enough to satisfy that need.

Co-chair Hosticka wondered if it would be possible to route buses from Portland, through a hub, and then around the corridor without requiring transfers between bus lines.

## **6.0 Transit project prioritization**

Co-chair Hosticka introduced Matt Bihn, Metro, to discuss the results of the transit project prioritization process. Mr. Bihn directed the committee to the list of screened transit projects (included in the agenda packet) and outlined each project in the mid-term, long-term, out, and to-be-determined category. He also noted that TriMet would soon begin a local service enhancement plan that would address many transit needs in Sherwood and downtown Tualatin. Mr. Bihn explained that project #8, improvements to the WES, would need to be studied in a corridor plan of its own, so it would no longer be included in the SW Corridor study.

Co-chair Hosticka open the meeting up to discussion by the committee as to which projects to study further. He asked Mr. Bihn to clarify where in Tualatin the projects reference. Mr. Bihn responded that the projects addressing Tualatin referred to the town center.

Mr. Rogers expressed concern as to how to fund the projects proposed on the transit projects list. He noted TriMet's limited budgets and the limited budgets of the SW Corridor jurisdictions. He appreciated TriMet as a planning partner but wondered how a major transit project in the corridor would be funded. Mr. McFarlane responded that TriMet was eager to address transit needs in the SW Corridor and was already planning for the service enhancements in 2013. He added that opportunities to pursue funding for the SW Corridor Plan should be explored. Mr. Rogers reiterated his concerns regarding proposing a plan for the SW Corridor that cannot be funded.

Co-chair Hosticka noted that project #3, Local bus service enhancement, may be a mid-term project for the SW Corridor but that it may occur in the shorter term based on TriMet's plans.

Mayor Keith Mays, City of Sherwood, commented that he is unsure how Sherwood residents would use enhanced transit service since the level of service in Sherwood is currently very limited. He expressed support from Sherwood for the SW Corridor Plan and stated that Sherwood citizens would support frequent and more consistent BRT connectivity within the corridor rather than a light rail line. He argued that the committee would need to choose between extended light rail and WES improvements and requested more information as to why the WES improvement project (#8) would be removed from the SW Corridor Plan.

Mayor Ogden felt unprepared to make a recommendation on the transit project list and requested additional analysis on the projects before making a decision. He argued that the transit portion of the plan should be flexible enough to address both current and future needs in the corridor, and considered the possibility that BRT projects might be transitioned to light rail over time. He believed that small improvements should be made as soon as possible but did not feel informed enough to make a recommendation.

Co-chair Hosticka responded to Mayor Ogden, explaining that the committee would be considering which transit projects to study further, not which transit projects to construct. He clarified that some projects may be eliminated from the plan altogether, without further analysis, and that is what the committee would discuss and vote upon today.

Ms. Jordan expressed supported for project #1 (BRT operating between Portland and Tigard, and possibly Tualatin with other potential connections) and #3 (Local bus service enhancement) to fulfill Lake Oswego's need for a BRT connection on Kruse Way. She also commented that ODOT's future high speed rail line might be used for regional connections, and may move the WES line to a new alignment. She argued for including the high speed rail plans in further SW Corridor analysis.

Co-chair Roberts asked Ms. Jordan if she agreed that WES improvement plans (#8) should be studied separately from the SW Corridor Plan. Ms. Jordan could not be sure but reiterated that changes to the WES or the addition of high speed rail lines would be important for the SW Corridor Plan to consider.

Mayor Dirksen agreed that WES improvements (#8) should be considered as a separate corridor study outside of the SW Corridor, but argued that the WES line should continue to be included in the SW Corridor study in some capacity so that its impacts on the corridor can be analyzed.

## **6.1 MOTION TO PURSUE FURTHER STUDY**

Mr. Zehnder proposed the committee recommend further study on the projects #1 (BRT operating generally between Portland and Tigard and possibly Tualatin with other potential connections), #2 (Extension of BRT on-street between Sherwood and Tigard or Tualatin), and #3 (Local bus service enhancement). He proposed that projects #4 (Light rail to Tigard), and #5 (Light rail to Tualatin) be included in the study of projects #1 through #3. He argued that BRT with dedicated right-of-way was new for the region and that its impacts

and benefits may be similar to light rail. He believed that further study including the light rail projects to Tigard and Tualatin alongside the BRT projects could enable a transition from BRT to light rail in the future, and could highlight the alternatives' difference and similarities.

Mayor Schirado requested more information regarding the strategy of the SW Corridor Plan. He considered the transit projects list to be tactics supporting a strategy. Additionally he addressed recent ballot measures throughout the region that limit the ability of jurisdictions to participate in planning light rail projects. He wondered how the impacts of the ballot measures will be incorporated into the SW Corridor Plan.

Co-chair Hosticka responded to Mayor Schirado, clarifying that the decision before the committee is to identify which transit alternatives to study further. He noted that the committee's decision could include strategic considerations. He argued that further study would consider strategic goals and the land use plan of the project.

Co-chair Hosticka then put Mr. Zehnder's motion to study projects #1 through #5 up for discussion. He amended the motion to state that project #3 (Local bus service enhancement) should be considered in the short term given TriMet's plans.

Mayor Ogden seconded the motion. However, he continued to express discomfort recommending or eliminating projects without any level of study. He also requested that an analysis of the impacts and effects of the WES line be considered in some capacity. Co-chair Hosticka noted that the committee would be briefed on and discuss how the WES and high speed rail project should be included in the plan at the next committee meeting.

Mayor Mays expressed reluctance for removing project #7 (Extension of transit-exclusive right-of-way BRT to Sherwood) from continued study. He commented that parts of an enhanced BRT system could include dedicated right-of-way for buses to Sherwood. Co-Chair Hosticka remarked that a high level of analysis could be done for #7, and asked Metro staff to comment on this idea. Ms. Snook noted that the assumption of BRT enhancements is that the buses will run to Sherwood. Mr. Bihn explained that any of the proposed BRT projects could include dedicated right-of-ways along parts of a line.

Ms. Jordan commented on the general cost differences between BRT and light rail transit systems and concluded that a hybrid system between the two should be considered by the committee. Co-chair Hosticka added that many of the proposed transit projects are hybrids of BRT and light rail.

Mr. Rogers, Ms. Turley, and Mr. Bihn discussed adding King City to the project list descriptions and titles. Mr. Bihn noted that the jurisdictions currently mentioned in the transit project list were the end points of the projects. Mr. Rogers advocated for adding the cities in the middle of the project routes since those cities' needs would need to be accounted for. Mayor Dirksen requested more specificity as to where the project alignments would be routed.

Ms. Wilkinson responded to both Mr. Rogers and Mayor Dirksen. She explained that the transit project list contained general representations of projects, and that more detail would come as projects are chosen for further study.

Ms. Turley wondered if the committee's recommendation would be binding and expressed hesitation toward prioritizing projects. Co-chair Hosticka clarified that the committee would decide to study projects further, and would not be committing to construction at this time.

Ms. Jordan supported the vision of two subregions of the corridor – a direct route from Portland to the Tigard/Tualatin region, and then transit lines to Sherwood and around the corridor. Co-chair Hosticka contrasted light rail alternatives to the hub and spoke of the possibilities of a BRT system in the corridor.

Co-chair Hosticka ended discussion on Mr. Zehnder's motion and described the motion on the table: Pursue further study for projects #1 through #5, discussing #3 in the short-term as part of TriMet's planned service enhancements. Additionally, begin a high level of analysis for project #7 as part of #2. He asked if there were any objections to the motion. No committee members expressed objections so the motion passed unanimously.

**Recommended for further study:**

- #1: BRT operating generally between Portland and Tigard and possibly Tualatin with other potential connections.
- #2: Extension of BRT operating on-street generally between Sherwood and Tigard or Tualatin
- #3: Local bus service enhancement
- #4: Light rail transit to Tigard
- #5: Light rail transit to Tualatin
- #7: Extension of transit-exclusive right-of-way BRT to Sherwood (study as a subset of #2)

**Not recommended for further study:**

- #6: Extension of light rail to Sherwood
- #8: WES improvements
- #9: I-5 options to convert a lane or to add a lane for HOV/HOT/BRT
- #10: Streetcar to Sherwood

**7.0 Roadway project prioritization**

Ms. Talia Jacobson, ODOT, and Mr. Anthony Buczek, Metro, presented the roadway project list (included in the agenda packet) and explained that the committee would discuss the list further at the November 26, 2012 meeting.

Mayor Mays suggested providing the roadway screening memo as well as a key for the color coding on the project list.

Mayor Ogden asked Ms. Jacobson and Mr. Buczek if the steering committee would be considering each individual project or if jurisdictional staff would work through the list prior to the meeting. Co-chair Hosticka responded that staff would highlight important topics for discussion and points of contention for the steering committee and that the committee would not be expected to make a recommendation on each project on the list.



Ms. Jacobson gave an overview of the roadway screening process and reminded the committee that projects in the long-term category would remain on their original source lists but would not be studied further in the SW Corridor Plan.

## **8.0 Public comment**

Co-chair Hosticka opened the meeting up to comment from audience members and members of the public.

Mr. Michael Denton, a business owner in Tigard suggested using microphones at meetings and adding the titles of the steering committee presenters to the agenda for easier identification. He also urged the committee to consider the fiscal impact on business located on 99W should they decide to add BRT or light rail. Co-chair Hosticka informed him that fiscal impacts would be one of the criteria used to evaluate each project.

Mr. Jim Howell, Association of Oregon Rail and Transit Advocates, noted that BRT had been proposed in the region since the 1970s. He advocated for light rail service in the SW Corridor and explained that deciding on frequency of BRT service within the corridor would be a challenge. He added that transit service in the SW Corridor uses a disproportionate amount of TriMet's budget and that a grid system in the plan area would make it more effective.

Mr. Roger Averbeck, SW Neighborhood Transportation Committee, expressed appreciation for placing local bus service in the mid-term category on the transit project list.

## **9.0 Project partner updates**

Co-chair Hosticka remarked that time was left for urgent project partner updates. Mr. Zehnder noted that a community forum to review the City of Portland's Barbur Boulevard Plan was planned for November 12, 2012. The City of Portland planned to seek approval of the plan in January and February, 2013.

Co-chair Hosticka adjourned the meeting at 11:05 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	10/22/12	October meeting agenda	102212swcpssc-01
2	Summary	9/24/12	September 24, 2012 meeting minutes	102212swcpssc-02
3	Document	10/22/12	BRT booklet	102212swcpssc-03
4	Document	10/22/12	Transit modes factsheet	102212swcpssc-04
5	Document	10/22/12	Transit project list	102212swcpssc-05
6	Document	10/22/12	Roadways project list	102212swcpssc-06
7	Document	10/22/12	Roadways 3 projects	102212swcpssc-07