



Southwest Corridor Plan Steering Committee

Monday, November 26, 2012

9:30 to 11:30 a.m.

Tualatin Police Department Training Room, 8650 SW Tualatin Rd, Tualatin, OR

Committee Members Present

Barbara Roberts, Co-Chair

Craig Dirksen

Keith Mays

Neil McFarlane

Lou Ogden

Denny Doyle

Gery Schirado

Roy Rogers

Suzan Turley

Metro Council

City of Tigard

City of Sherwood

TriMet

City of Tualatin

City of Beaverton

City of Durham

Washington County

City of King City

Committee Members Excused

Jack Hoffman

Sam Adams

Carl Hosticka

Loretta Smith

Jason Tell

City of Lake Oswego

City of Portland

Metro Council

Multnomah county

Oregon Department of Transportation

Alternate Members Present

Donna Jordan

Rian Windsheimer

City of Lake Oswego

ODOT

Metro Staff

Elissa Gertler, Malu Wilkinson, Jamie Snook, Matt Bihn, Anthony Buczek, Clifford Higgins, Robin McArthur, Leila Aman, Emma Fredieu, Tim Collins

1.0 Welcome and introductions

Co-chair Barbara Roberts, Metro councilor, called the meeting to order at 9:34 a.m. She noted that this would be the last meeting with the current membership of the committee, and that new members would officially join in January 2013. Co-chair Roberts explained that project staff would work to ensure a smooth transition as new members joined. She also reminded the committee of the upcoming December 12, 2012 workshop, which will include new and old committee members and will be in a different format from the usual meetings.

Co-chair Roberts then asked committee and audience members to introduce themselves.

2.0 Consideration of the Steering Committee meeting summary from October 22, 2012

After introductions, Co-chair Roberts directed the committee to the October 22, 2012 steering committee meeting summary (included in the meeting packet). She asked if any members had any corrections or edits that they would like to submit. Hearing no corrections, Ms. Donna Jordan, City of Lake Oswego, moved to accept the meeting summary. Ms. Suzan Turley, City of King City, seconded the motion. No committee member opposed, so the motion passed.

3.0 Corridor land use vision

Co-chair Roberts then addressed the SW Corridor land use vision. She explained that the vision would serve as a guide for the committee to target investments in the corridor. Using the East Metro Connections Plan as a model project, Co-chair Roberts emphasized the importance of collaboration when creating the vision for the SW corridor and planning for on-the-ground changes. She introduced Ms. Leila Aman, Metro, who presented the land use vision for the SW Corridor (presentation included in the meeting packet).

Ms. Aman discussed the land use vision of the corridor in the context of land use themes, and described how the vision would guide planned transit connections and shared investment in the plan area. She gave an overview of the local plans that were incorporated into the overall corridor vision, and the Envision Today software staff used to model the land use vision.

After identifying the development types currently existing in the corridor and those expected to grow in the future, Ms. Aman explained that places ripe for change had opportunities for higher density and amenity land use. She also identified corridor-wide trends that could be seen after spatially combining jurisdictions' local plans on project maps. For example, the cities of Portland, Tigard and Tualatin showed a transition to mixed-use land use along 99W. She highlighted existing and projected employment, retail, and education centers in the corridor as well.

In order to apply the land use vision to the corridor, Ms. Aman explained that staff used the existing and expected conditions data to identify potential transit station connections in the corridor. Using the station connections and place types identified within the corridor, staff and committee members will work to build shared investment packages.

At the conclusion of Ms. Aman's presentation Co-chair Roberts asked if committee members had any questions or comments. Ms. Malu Wilkinson, Metro, noted staff had incorporated the cities of Durham and King City into the land use vision work by using the current comprehensive plans for those jurisdictions.

4.0 Approach for building shared investment strategies

Co-chair Roberts directed the committee to the shared investment strategy document (included in the meeting packet). Ms. Jamie Snook, Metro, presented the approach to building shared investments in the SW Corridor (presentation included in the meeting packet). She reiterated that the land use vision would be the framework for developing the shared investments and gave an overview of the screening process and methodology for bundling projects together into investment packages. She explained that from the land use vision, staff will consider transit alternatives and identify potential station areas. Projects previously identified by staff that support station areas can be bundled into the shared investment packages. Finally, staff will identify corridor-wide networks (such as wildlife and stream network, bike networks, etc.) and bundle projects supporting those networks as well. Ms. Snook concluded her presentation by highlighting the next steps to identify potential shared investments.

Co-chair Roberts requested committee action on the approach for building shared investment strategies, and asked the committee to discuss approving the approach and methodology.

Mr. Roy Rogers, Washington County, asked for clarification of the term "shared investment strategy." He wondered if it implied actual investments of funds and if jurisdictions would be able to agree to contributing money to the investment packages. Ms. Snook responded that the committee would need to explore funding options, depending on if the projects were local, state, or region-wide.

Mr. Rogers noted that the term "partnerships" implied that all parties contribute some resource or some level of investment, and asked if that would be case. Ms. Elissa Gertler, Metro, replied that the SW Corridor plan links the project partners with a transit component and the land use vision. She further explained that the transit component will link the other pieces of the land use vision together and is the organizing investment around which other projects are developed. Mr. Rogers asked if jurisdictions would need to invest resources to support stations if a transit line is implemented. Ms. Gertler responded that the partner jurisdictions would be bringing resources to implementation stages.

Co-chair Roberts added that project partners have already invested funding and staff in the planning and public involvement processes of the project, so they are already sharing investment in the SW Corridor plan. Ms. Wilkinson emphasized that investment can include policy changes to support the land use vision and project packages.

Mayor Lou Ogden, City of Tualatin, highlighted the importance of incorporating local plans into the SW Corridor Plan. He noted that local jurisdictions could pursue funding for those local projects independently from the SW Corridor Plan and wondered if there would be a difference between the local projects that jurisdictions believed would support the overall vision of the SW Corridor. He expressed concern that those differences might prevent a

sharing of investments and argued that any differences in the vision should be discussed from the beginning stages of the planning process.

Mr. Rogers added that there might be differences between SW Corridor prioritized projects and Washington County's Major Streets Transportation Improvement Program (MSTIP). Mayor Ogden replied the projects on the MSTIP lists may already be included on the SW Corridor project lists, so there would not be a last minute conflict between the two plans.

Mayor Keith Mays, City of Sherwood, agreed with Mayor Ogden and also emphasized that the transit alternatives should continue to include local busing service and Bus Rapid Transit (BRT).

Mayor Craig Dirksen, City of Tigard, described the shared investment strategy as a way to assemble resources from all of the partners to achieve the goals and vision of the SW Corridor plan. He noted that the SW Corridor plan assembled the partners' local visions together, identifying those projects which had already been flagged at the local level for needed investment. He explained the SW Corridor plan will help partners identify how projects around the plan area can work best with their own plans, and with the region-wide vision. He applauded the collaborative planning process enabled by the SW Corridor plan.

Ms. Jordan asked about the potential transit alignments in the land use vision dot map presented by Ms. Aman. She noted that since Lake Oswego has very little transit services connecting them to the rest of the corridor, she was most interested to see how transit options would develop.

Mayor Denny Doyle, City of Beaverton, stated that his staff was excited by the opportunity to work collaboratively with the rest of the corridor, while respecting each partner's goals. He believed that working together was the best way to survive the current funding environment.

Mr. Neil McFarlane, TriMet, endorsed the shared investment strategy approach. He noted the high capacity transit (HCT) component of the plan was necessary for catalyzing the land use vision throughout the corridor. He cited the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail (PMLR) project as an example of investments occurring around an HCT project.

Co-chair Roberts stated that attendees of a recent professional conference in Portland had commented on the quality of the transit options and places throughout the region. She hoped that the SW Corridor plan would add to that quality. She asked for an indication that the committee accepted the shared investment strategy approach. Committee members responded by thumbs up voting the shared investment strategy approach, with no thumbs down votes.

5.0 Shape SW – online interactive tool

Co-chair Roberts introduced Mr. Clifford Higgins, Metro, who presented the Shape SW online tool to the committee. Mr. Higgins directed the committee to the Shape SW information card (included in the meeting packet) that staff would be circulating throughout the corridor. He noted that local committee and public planning forums had filled the role for the SW Corridor Plan that a citizen's advisory committee often plays. He explained that the Shape SW tool was an online questionnaire that would allow citizens to

identify their preferred balance between investments in transit, active transportation, roadway improvements, and natural resources.

Mr. Higgins then walked the committee through each step of the Shape SW online tool at www.swcorridorplan.org and noted that the tool will be active until December 31, 2012. He asked the committee if they had any questions or comments on the tool.

Mayor Mays commented that the term “prosperity” was difficult to quantify, and expressed concern that participants may be frustrated its vagueness. He also argued that the Level 1 improvements that citizens can choose were too small to be included the SW Corridor Plan and were more appropriate for local plans (filling pot holes, for example).

Mr. Higgins responded that the improvement levels had been developed in discussions with partners and ODOT. Ms. Jordan noted that some jurisdictions have different road maintenance needs that might be appropriate to include in the SW Corridor plan. She asked about the data behind the Shape SW tool’s assertion that investment in parks would stimulate economic development. She encouraged staff to make sure there was not a bias toward Metro’s or the City of Portland’s planning built into the results of the tool. Mr. Higgins responded that the tool included an explanation of the trade-offs between accuracy and simplicity within the Shape SW program.

Mr. McFarlane noted that the Shape SW tool fits into a continuum of public involvement for the SW Corridor plan. He argued that the tool was simple enough to provide a basis for conversation and involvement, and that other outreach efforts would build upon the results of the tool. He also highlighted the importance of reaching those without computers, and in populations with less access or resources. Mr. Higgins explained that staff had distributed a paper version of the questionnaire to local service organizations to reach outlying populations. He noted that most of the respondents so far had a secondary degree, which was not representative of the plan area. He encouraged as a wide a distribution as possible for information on the tool.

6.0 Report on 11/14 economic summit

Mr. Ben Bryant, City of Tualatin, presented the outcome of the SW Corridor economic summit on November 14, 2012. He explained that business leaders from the plan area were invited to learn about the SW Corridor plan and contribute feedback. Participants expressed the importance of customer mobility, freight mobility, and the educational and retail destinations in the corridor. They highlighted the need for natural areas to draw employers and acknowledged short term and long term safety concerns in the corridor. Mr. Bryant also explained that participants were interested drawing the creative class of employers and employees to the SW Corridor. He noted that the participants appreciated the SW Corridor plan’s willingness to listen and accept feedback on the plan’s projects and processes.

Mayor Ogden believed that the conversation at the summit was extremely productive and reiterated that the participants wanted to know that their input mattered and would be included in the decision making process.

7.0 Project partner updates

Co-chair Roberts asked committee members if they wanted to present any updates on local projects or developments.

Mr. McFarlane noted that the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) application work identified 99W as a key area for pedestrian and transit improvements. Additionally, the service enhancement plans on the west side, beginning after January 1, 2013, would be a precursor to further SW Corridor work. He also reported on milestones of the PMLR project.

Mr. Rian Windsheimer, ODOT, noted that STIP application were due, and that this was the time for the region to think about shared priorities and identify opportunities for collaboratively pursuing funding.

Co-chair Roberts explained that the December 12, 2012 steering committee workshop would be an opportunity to begin the committee transition process.

8.0 Public comment

Co-chair Roberts opened the floor to comments from members of the public. Ms. Carol Bellows, a resident in unincorporated Washington County, expressed hope that public involvement outreach include local high schools. She informed the committee that the debate policy team subject was transportation and would be discussed by high school students around the corridor.

Mr. Michael Denton, business owner in Tigard, was pleasantly surprised by the economic summit. He appreciated the questions asked during the summit but was disappointed by the lack of business owners in attendance at the steering committee meeting. He thought the summit was a success and looked forward to seeing how the discussion from the summit would be incorporated into the plan. He noted that business owners do not necessarily believe that the SW Corridor plan needs to be based off of transit alternatives, and cited negative effects that HCT plans can have on local businesses. He hoped that there would be continual engagement with the local business owners throughout the planning process.

Ms. Elise Sheer, citizen in Tigard and a member of the downtown urban renewal commission, asked Mr. Denton to join her commission. She expressed hope that growth in the corridor would be continued with HCT development. She noted how greater connectivity, in addition to WES improvements, could support the employment areas in the region.

Mr. Roger Averbeck expressed difficulty reading the land use vision presentation but found it very interesting. He looked forward to seeing how land use would change as a result of transportation investments. He believed that land use changes might need to happen first in order to see the transportation improvements occur.

Mr. Tim Esaw, Tigard resident, believed that the that the options on the Shape SW tool were too limited and saw more value in focusing on roadway improvements rather than on bike and pedestrian facilities. He explained that most single-family neighborhoods and residents in the corridor preferred cars. He did not see the value of the online tool as a realistic way of illustrating investments corridor. Mr. Esaw advocated for focusing the SW Corridor plan around a beltway connector to I-205, rather than a transit alternative.

Ms. Marianne Fitzgerald, SW Neighborhoods, encouraged the use of the Shape SW tool, but wondered how it would inform the decisions being made on the investment strategies. She looked forward to Barbur Boulevard improvements and greater transit connectivity.

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	11/26/12	November meeting agenda	112612swcpssc-01
2	Summary	10/22/12	October 22, 2012 meeting summary	112612swcpssc-02
3	Document	11/26/12	Building the shared investment strategy	112612swcpssc-03
4	3x5 card	11/26/12	Shape SW card	112612swcpssc-04
5	Document	11/14/12	November 14, 2012 economic summit	112612swcpssc-05
6	Presentation	11/26/12	Land use vision presentation	112612swcpssc-06
7	Presentation	11/26/12	Shared investment presentation	112612swcpssc-07