



## Southwest Corridor Plan Steering Committee

Monday, January 14, 2013

9:30 to 11:30 a.m.

Metro Council Chamber, 600 NE Grand Ave, Portland, OR 97232

### Committee Members Present

Craig Dirksen, Co-chair

Bob Stacey, Co-chair

Bill Middleton

Neil McFarlane

Loretta Smith

Lou Ogden

Jason Tell

Gery Schirado

Roy Rogers

Denny Doyle

Donna Jordan

Metro Council

Metro Council

City of Sherwood

Trimet

Multnomah County

City of Tualatin

Oregon Department of Transportation

City of Durham

Washington County

City of Beaverton

City of Lake Oswego

### Committee Members Excused

John Cook

Charlie Hales

Suzan Turley

City of Tigard

City of Portland

City of King City

### Alternate Members Present

Joseph Zehnder

Marland Henderson

City of Portland

City of Tigard

### Metro Staff

Elissa Gertler, Malu Wilkinson, Catherine Ciarlo, Karen Withrow, Matt Bihn, Anthony Buczek, Clifford Higgins, Robin McArthur, Leila Aman, Emma Fredieu, Tim Collins, Erin O'Reilly

## **1.0 Welcome and introductions**

Co-chair Craig Dirksen, Metro Councilor, welcomed steering committee and audience members, and asked the committee members to introduce themselves. After introductions, Co-chair Dirksen expressed excitement for the next six months of the SW Corridor Plan and looked forward to working together with the communities of the SW Corridor. He noted that the steering committee would take action on five different shared investment strategy alternatives on February 11<sup>th</sup>, and that staff would work to review those alternatives with the public. Co-chair Dirksen then asked for project updates from each jurisdiction.

Ms. Donna Jordan, City of Lake Oswego, informed the committee that the citizens of Lake Oswego passed a \$5 million bond measure for Boones Ferry Road improvements.

Mr. Joe Zehnder, City of Portland, explained that Portland's Barbur Boulevard concept plan would be submitted the Planning and Sustainability Commission for review in February.

Mr. Neil McFarlane, TriMet, reported that TriMet, partnering with many of the SW Corridor communities, submitted Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) applications to ODOT for improvements along Barbur Boulevard and 99W. He expressed his enthusiasm for working together to implement practical improvements to the corridor.

Mr. Roy Rogers, Washington County, also reported on Washington County's participation in the STIP applications, and explained that Washington County would be partnering with King City to improve sidewalk connectivity.

Mayor Denny Doyle, City of Beaverton, informed the committee that he would be giving an update on the SW Corridor Plan to the Beaverton City Council in February.

Ms. Julia Hajduk, City of Sherwood, described updates to the Sherwood town center plan. She explained that planners had evaluated three alternatives and that there would be an open house on January 17 to discuss the alternatives with the public.

Mayor Lou Ogden, City of Tualatin, reported on the agreement for an alignment for a connection between 124<sup>th</sup> and Boones Ferry Road. He noted that the agreement was an historic accomplishment between the jurisdictions involved.

Mr. Marland Henderson, City of Tigard, explained that plans for River Terrace were moving forward and that the City of Tigard had applied for a grant to study the Tigard triangle.

Mr. Jason Tell, ODOT, explained that ODOT would narrow the STIP applications between now and March, and would have a set of recommendations to the State of Oregon regarding who to award STIP funds to by the end of the summer. Mr. Tell also discussed the value of low cost investments in the corridor and encouraged the committee to look for opportunities for implementable projects, such as bus shelter or sidewalk improvements. He added that ODOT was looking for partners to work with to fund these low cost projects.

## **2.0 Consideration of the Steering Committee meeting summary from November 26, 2012**

Co-chair Dirksen asked the committee to consider the meeting summary from November 26, 2012. Ms. Jordan motioned to approve the meeting summary. Mr. Rogers seconded Ms. Jordan's motion. With no members opposed, the committee voted to approve the November 26, 2012 meeting summary.

### **3.0 Major milestones/next six months and beyond**

Co-chair Dirksen highlighted the accomplishments of the committee thus far and the decisions to be made moving forward. He noted the agreed upon plan charter and the shared vision for the corridor the committee had established. Co-chair Dirksen praised the strategy of assembling local plans together for an overall vision of the corridor, rather than starting from scratch to generate a list of necessary projects. He argued that this strategy allowed communities to feel ownership over the SW Corridor plan and explained that the steering committee would use the shared vision to choose the shared investment strategies in the near future.

Mr. Rogers wondered if the SW Corridor Plan would integrate other studies in Washington County, such as a corridor study in Hillsboro, and if other considerations were necessary to include before June 2013. He expressed concern over the choice between integrating plans from throughout Washington County or continuing to use the current defined plan area.

Co-chair Dirksen agreed that the committee should be aware of the studies throughout Washington County, and noted that the committee included community members from throughout the county for that reason. He argued, however, that a plan area and focus is necessary for the SW Corridor Plan to succeed.

Ms. Jordan questioned how corridor studies in the region would be prioritized for funding. She wondered if plans would be funded one at a time, or if funding would be distributed. Mr. Rogers agreed with Ms. Jordan but was unsure as to how plans would be prioritized.

Mayor Doyle advocated for continuing with the current plan area for the SW Corridor.

Mr. Tell believed that the limited capacity for funding in the region meant that the committee should be aspirational about its plans but should also be careful to develop projects that can be implemented. Co-chair Bob Stacey, Metro Councilor, agreed with Mr. Tell and argued that the SW Corridor Plan should include small, medium, and aspirational-sized projects.

### **4.0 Shape SW results**

Ms. Karen Withrow, Metro, presented an overview of the Shape SW tool results (presentation included in the meeting packet). She briefed the committee on the number of participants of the online survey tool, and how the participants identified the key places in the SW Corridor. She also outlined how participants ranked the importance of certain factors in the survey (safety, quality of life, access, equity, etc.).

Mr. Rogers asked how the survey defined the relationship of the participants to the corridor. Withrow responded that she could send out a more detailed breakdown of the survey responses to answer his question.

Mr. Tell noted that two-thirds of the respondents lived in Portland. He wondered if their responses were similar to the one-third of respondents who did not live in Portland. Ms. Withrow responded that she would send out more detailed information regarding responses by location.

## **5.0 Transit options**

Mr. Alan Lehto, TriMet, presented five high capacity transit (HCT) alignment alternatives (included in the meeting packet) to the committee and emphasized that the alignments should be considered early drafts and are not final. He added that the components of the alignments could be mixed and matched and noted that the committee would not be locked into any alignments or decisions on the alignments at this time. Mr. Lehto also explained that TriMet would work to determine how the background transit network would relate to the five HCT alternatives. He asked the committee for an assurance that SW Corridor staff should continue to develop the alternatives.

Mr. Lehto introduced Mr. James McGrath, CH2MHill, who provided an overview of each of the five alignment alternatives and opened up his presentation to questions from the committee.

Referencing the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) to Sherwood alignment, Ms. Jordan asked if staff would be looking to developing a connection between Kruse Way and the BRT route. Mr. Lehto responded that the hub-and-spoke model could provide for a connection or there might be a local transit alternative to and from Lake Oswego. He noted that TriMet would review the background transit network to identify needs such as a connection to Lake Oswego.

Mayor Ogden wondered about the level of analysis staff used to develop the five alignments, and how viable the alternatives would be for implementation. Mr. McGrath responded that the next step in developing the alignments is to determine details such as available right-of-way, grade, freight needs, etc., that would influence implementation. Mr. Lehto clarified that jurisdictional staff had worked through high-level considerations to determine the current routes of the alignments.

Regarding the BRT to Tualatin alignment, Mayor Ogden asked why the route differed from the BRT to Sherwood alignment. Mr. McGrath explained that staff wanted to illustrate as many options as possible for the alignments, and that the routes could be mixed and matched.

Referencing the BRT hub and spoke alignment, Co-chair Stacey requested more detail as to how the system would operate. Mr. Lehto responded that each of the branches of the system would share a certain number of the total buses running on the system per hour, based on demand and ridership. He explained that each bus line would travel from down the main spine of the system and out along one of the branches. Mr. Lehto also explained that the branches could be local service bus lines connecting at the hub transit center in Tigard. He added that a grid transit network is most efficient for cross-corridor travel.

Mayor Ogden asked if the hub and spoke system might include connections between communities that are not attached to the hub. Mr. McGrath replied that the committee could

mix and match the five alignment alternatives to form a hub and spoke system that includes additional BRT or local connections.

Ms. Jordan commented that the hub and spoke alignment would allow residents of Portland to travel to employment areas in the SW Corridor.

Regarding the light rail transit (LRT) to Tigard alignment, Mayor Ogden requested clarification if the committee had preserved an LRT to Tualatin alignment for further study when screening the potential transit projects. Ms. Wilkinson responded that the committee had not eliminated LRT to Tualatin as a transit option in the corridor, and noted that orange lines on the alignment maps included an LRT route to Tualatin.

Co-chair Stacey asked if staff would study ridership on the orange lines when analyzing the alignment options further. Mr. Lehto explained that the red lines on the maps would go through a full regional demand model for analysis, but the orange lines would be studied in a more qualitative manner. Ms. Wilkinson added that staff will provide further analysis on whichever option best reflects the shared vision of the corridor, as chosen by the steering committee in June 2013.

Mr. Zehnder wondered if Mr. Lehto expected to see a difference in ridership between BRT and LRT alignments. Mr. Lehto answered that staff had not completed that level of analysis yet, but that nationally LRT systems have higher ridership rates than BRT systems.

Ms. Jordan noted that planning a transit connection to Portland Community College (PCC) is challenging and wondered if PCC and the SW Corridor Plan could explore a shuttle service option to the nearest possible connection. Mr. Lehto replied that TriMet will be studying the background transit network in the corridor and considering shuttle options as analysis continues. He added that there are no plans for specific station locations at this time.

Ms. Jordan commented that she was most interest in seeing a connection to Kruse Way in Lake Oswego. Co-chair Dirksen reminded the committee that the presented alignment options included the ability to mix and match between the alternatives, which might allow for a connection to Kruse Way.

Co-chair Stacey asked Mr. Lehto for more information as to when TriMet would be studying the background transit network in the corridor. Mr. Lehto explained that TriMet would begin the SW service enhancement plan in early 2013 and would work with stakeholders, local jurisdictions, and the public to establish the needs and vision for the local bus network. He noted that the existing conditions analysis provided by the SW Corridor Plan would assist with TriMet's work.

Co-chair Stacey wondered how the SW Corridor Plan would incorporate TriMet's planned improvements into its work. Co-chair Dirksen explained that currently the SW Corridor Plan was identifying the requirements needed to build a transit system that reflects the shared vision of the corridor. He argued that the first step after identifying the needs would be making improvements to the local bus service, which is where TriMet's service enhancement could be incorporated into the SW Corridor Plan. Mr. McFarlane added that the SW Corridor Plan and TriMet's service enhancement plan would inform each other moving forward.

Mr. Rogers asked Mr. McFarlane if TriMet has determined a how potential alignment alternatives balance ridership, cost, and number of connections at this time. Mr. McFarlane replied that TriMet had set no expectations yet as to how ridership and connections compare to level of investment in each alignment.

Ms. Jordan advocated for planning a connection between the Tigard triangle and Washington Square. Co-chair Dirksen agreed and added that local connections between the Tigard triangle and Washington Square, and Washington Square and the WES are important to the region. He noted that the work done by the SW Corridor Plan could affect a north-south corridor study.

Co-chair Dirksen asked if the committee agreed that the five transit alignments presented by Mr. Lehto and Mr. McGrath reflect the vision of the corridor, and if staff should continue to develop the alignments moving forward. No committee members objected.

## **6.0 Building shared investment strategies**

Ms. Elissa Gertler, Metro, explained that, in February, the committee would take action on a set of shared investment strategies currently being developed by SW Corridor staff. She reminded the committee that the lists of projects should support the corridor vision, and should be implemented in short, mid, and long-term phases. She argued that identifying those projects that support the vision of the corridor will allow communities to develop desired places, access to transit, and mobility across the corridor. She noted that the East Metro Connections Plan (EMCP) was the first of this kind of corridor project.

Ms. Gertler continued to explain that building shared investment strategies will allow the committee to find the right sequence of projects to achieve the corridor vision. She cited TriMet's service enhancement plan as an example of proper sequencing to support the vision. She informed the committee that they would make a final decision on the chosen investments in June 2013, which would conclude Phase I of the SW Corridor Plan. After the committee takes action on the shared investment strategies, it will begin to explore funding options for the chosen projects.

Ms. Jordan wondered who would participate in the funding process. She asked if all would share in funding each project, or if investment would be calculated based on who benefits or is impacted the most. Co-chair Dirksen responded that sharing of investment would be determined on a project-by-project basis. Ms. Gertler added that the chosen investment package should support the corridor-wide vision, so all project partners should benefit in some way from the projects chosen. She noted that the benefits to partners might be at different levels, but all partners should agree that they want those projects to be built.

Co-chair Dirksen explained that if the committee agrees on the projects and the priority of the projects, they will know how to use funding as it becomes available.

Mr. Tell argued that the committee could generate a list of all the desired improvements and projects in the corridor, or the committee could think strategically about prioritizing specific projects and supporting those projects when funding becomes available. He advocated for developing a strategy where the political will of the SW Corridor Plan partners can be used to pursue funding and build agreed upon projects.

Ms. Gertler agreed that a strategic approach will allow the corridor to implement projects in a prioritized manner and allow for short term improvements as funding is available.

Mayor Ogden responded to Mr. Tell and argued that the SW Corridor Plan should work toward an improved transit corridor and a large-scale improvement for the partners to agree to. He believed that the SW Corridor Plan needed to be a regional priority supported by the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT). Mayor Ogden concluded that support for the SW Corridor Plan needed to come from regional authorities, and not just local communities, for the plan to achieve its vision.

Mr. McFarlane replied that regional investment arrives when local jurisdictions advocate for projects they believe are important. He believed the region has been successful at finding funding for light rail and transit options because local jurisdictions support those solutions.

Ms. Jordan noted that funding processes move slowly, so the committee will need to explore now how to find investment for projects to implement in 2015.

Mr. Rogers explained that funding sources in Washington County were limited, and the committee would need to decide on the priorities for the SW Corridor Plan to determine how and when to pursue investment.

Ms. Gertler informed the committee that implementing a large project will require a large effort. She argued that the effort would have the best chance when SW Corridor Plan partners together strategically.

## **7.0 Public Comment**

Co-chair Dirksen opened up the meeting to comments from members of the public.

Mr. Don McHarnesi, resident of Lake Oswego, commented that he would like to see Kruse Way connected to Washington Square, and the Beaverton transit center.

Ms. Marianne Fitzgerald, SW Neighborhoods Inc., was glad to see upcoming action by the steering committee and encouraged the committee to involve the public before make any major decisions.

Mr. Jeremy Grotbo asked the committee to consider the perceptions of younger residents when developing the vision of the SW Corridor.

## **8.0 Next meetings and adjourn**

Co-chair Dirksen thanked the committee and audience members for their participation and reminded them that staff would be developing shared investment strategies for the committee to consider in February.

Ms. Wilkinson clarified that staff would bring five strategies for the committee to consider, and would ask the committee to chose one of the five strategies in June after additional analysis.

Co-chair Dirksen adjourned the committee at 11:30 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	1/14/13	January meeting agenda	011413swcpssc-01
2	Summary	11/26/12	11/26/12 meeting minutes	011413swcpssc-02
3	Document	1/3/13	Engagement calendar	011413swcpssc-03
4	Summary	12/12/12	12/12/12 workshop summary	011413swcpssc-04
5	Memo	1/7/13	Transit alternatives memo	011413swcpssc-05
6	Maps	1/14/13	Transit alternatives maps	011413swcpssc-06
7	Workflow	1/14/13	SW Corridor workflow	011413swcpssc-07