



Southwest Corridor Plan Steering Committee
Monday, February 11, 2013
9:30 to 11:30 a.m.
Beaverton Library, Room A, 12375 SW 5th St., Beaverton, Oregon

Committee Members Present

Craig Dirksen, Co-chair	Metro Council
Bob Stacey, Co-chair	Metro Council
John Cook	City of Tigard
Denny Doyle	City of Beaverton
Amanda Fritz	City of Portland
Bill Middleton	City of Sherwood
Skip O'Neill	City of Lake Oswego
Lou Ogden	City of Tualatin
Roy Rogers	Washington County
Gery Schirado	City of Durham
Loretta Smith	Multnomah County
Jason Tell	ODOT
Suzan Turley	City of King City

Committee Members Excused

Neil McFarlane	TriMet
----------------	--------

Alternate Members Present

Alan Lehto	TriMet
------------	--------

Metro Staff Present:

Robin McArthur, Elissa Gertler, Malu Wilkinson, Catherine Ciarlo, Matt Bihn, Crista Gardner, Clifford Higgins, Leila Aman, Emma Fredieu, Tim Collins

1.0 Welcome and introductions

Co-chair Craig Dirksen, Metro Councilor, called the meeting to order at 9:38 a.m. He asked steering committee members and audience members to introduce themselves. After introductions Co-chair Dirksen invited committee members to give project updates for their communities.

Mr. Jason Tell, ODOT, informed the committee that he would need to leave the meeting at 10:30 a.m.

Mayor John Cook, City of Tigard, explained that Tigard staff would be working on a scope of work for a recent Transportation and Growth Management (TGM) grant awarded to the City of Tigard for projects in the Tigard triangle. He also noted that Tigard was applying for a Construction Excise Tax (CET) grant from Metro to continue work on the River Terrace project.

Mayor Bill Middleton, City of Sherwood, updated the committee on work for the Sherwood Town Center Plan and explained that the Sherwood Town Center Plan's steering committee would be discussing project alternatives.

Mr. Skip O'Neill, City of Lake Oswego, mentioned the \$5 million bond measure approved by voters for improvements to Boones Ferry Road.

Ms. Amanda Fritz, City of Portland, informed the committee that the Planning and Sustainability Commission would review the Barbur Concept Plan in February.

2.0 Consideration of the Steering Committee meeting summary from January 14, 2013

Co-Chair Dirksen asked committee members if they had an opportunity to review the meeting summary from January 14, 2013. Mr. Tell motioned for the committee to adopt the meeting summary. Ms. Loretta Smith, Multnomah County, seconded Mr. Tell's motion. The committee then approved the minutes with no members in opposition.

3.0 Decision review: February and June

Co-chair Dirksen described staff work on the SW Corridor shared investment strategies and project bundles. He emphasized that staff intend the bundles to be representative of possible project combinations and that the bundle components can be mixed and matched. He explained that the bundles would allow the committee to narrow and refine their chosen projects into one investment strategy. He informed the committee that they would need to take action to consider approving further analysis on the five project bundles. In June 2013, the committee would consider approval of one final bundle to take into Phase II of the SW Corridor Plan. Co-chair Dirksen then introduced Ms. Malu Wilkinson, Metro, and Ms. Leila Aman, Metro, to present the five project bundles.

Ms. Wilkinson believed that the five project bundles were a significant achievement for the project partners. She highlighted the incorporation of the corridor land use vision, local

plans, and regional priorities reflected in the five bundles. Ms. Wilkinson noted that the project refinement process had sharpened the focus and decreased the estimated cost of the SW Corridor Plan. She informed the committee that active transportation projects make up a quarter of the total projects in the SW Corridor Plan and include critical sidewalk investments. She also noted that project staff would develop more detailed cost estimates for the transit alternatives for the committee to consider. She explained that the parks and natural resources projects will be added to the project bundles once the committee approves further analysis. Ms. Wilkinson described how public involvement components of the SW Corridor Plan informed the project bundle development process. She explained how the ShapeSW online tool channeled public feedback regarding community priorities to the SW Corridor Plan.

Ms. Fritz wondered when the public would be able to review the five project bundles. Ms. Wilkinson responded that the committee and interested parties received information on the five bundles last week. She noted that the public would be given the opportunity to examine the five bundles and add in any missing pieces in upcoming community involvement events. Co-chair Dirksen added that citizens will have opportunities to examine the bundles and provide feedback once the steering committee approves further analysis.

Ms. Fritz requested a version of the project lists in a larger font. Ms. Wilkinson agreed that staff could create a list in larger font. Co-chair Bob Stacey, Metro Councilor, noted that the project lists were difficult to read in small font but looked forward to Ms. Aman's presentation of the bundles. Co-chair Dirksen reiterated that staff had developed the project bundles by incorporating local jurisdictional plans and public feedback.

5.0 Shared investment strategies

Ms. Aman presented the five project bundles (presentation included in the meeting packet). She outlined the process for developing the five bundles and gave an overview of the land use vision, the identification of key places in the corridor, and the five transit alternatives.

Ms. Aman then described each of the five bundles and walked the committee members through the project map book (included in the agenda packet). She explained the methodology for developing the bundles, including the technical and collaborative approach with the project partners. She described how staff narrowed and refined the project lists.

Ms. Fritz wondered if large projects could be broken down into their base components so that the committee or staff could focus on less costly elements in the short term, such as sidewalk improvements. Ms. Aman responded that it would be possible to pull out pieces of large projects and noted that it would be helpful if Ms. Fritz had specific components in mind. Ms. Fritz cited sidewalks on Barbur Boulevard as an important component of a larger Barbur transit improvement project that could be isolated and implemented in the short term.

Mr. Roy Rogers, Washington County, asked if project staff had determined how to prioritize projects in the SW Corridor Plan. Ms. Aman responded that staff had discussed prioritization but detailing the prioritization process would be part of the next steps of the plan. Mr. Rogers explained that the Washington County planning and budgeting process was a shorter-term process than the SW Corridor Plan and wondered if there was a way to

coordinate the two schedules. Ms. Wilkinson noted that the next step of the SW Corridor Plan would include developing a funding strategy and agreeing to a project prioritization method.

Ms. Suzan Turley, City of King City, noted a clerical error in the description of the final project in Section 9 of the project map book (project ID 9999). She asked that the project title include 131st Ave, Fischer Road, and Beef Bend Rd.

Mr. Rogers described recent and projected population growth in Bull Mountain and Cooper Mountain in Washington County and expressed concern that these growing areas were not included in the SW Corridor Plan area. He requested that project staff consider adding these areas to the plan area since they are adjacent to many of the projects in the bundles and their growth would affect the SW Corridor Plan. Co-chair Dirksen responded that the committee had agreed early in the planning process that those areas would fall under the Highway 217 study. He argued that the SW Corridor Plan should consider the impacts of the Highway 217 study, but that the plan area was necessary in order to focus the scope of the SW Corridor Plan study. Co-chair Stacey agreed that the SW Corridor Plan area was an artificial boundary but argued that there would need to be a boundary for the scope of the study. However, he believed that the impacts from connecting areas should be monitored by the SW Corridor Plan. Mr. Rogers argued that the SW Corridor Plan should include the quickly growing adjacent areas. Co-chair Stacey asked to hear back from project staff on this issue.

Ms. Wilkinson added that the final shared investment strategy would need to be able to respond to demographic changes in the corridor. She then outlined the next steps of the plan: project prioritization, funding strategy, and incorporating the parks and natural resources projects into the bundles. She asked the committee to consider approving further work by project staff to evaluate the five project bundles and begin further analysis in to high capacity transit (HCT) alternatives.

Co-chair Dirksen summarized Ms. Aman's presentation and asked for discussion from the committee on approving further analysis into the project bundles and HCT alternatives.

Mr. Tell described an effort parallel to the technical analysis of the five project bundles: developing a funding strategy. He encouraged the committee to begin the discussion on how to raise revenue for the chosen SW Corridor projects as soon as possible. Finally, Mr. Tell stated his support for approving further analysis of the five project bundles and HCT alternatives.

Ms. Fritz agreed with Mr. Tell regarding the importance of raising revenue and argued that public support would be key to pursuing funding locally. She wondered how public input would be gathered to encourage a buy-in from the SW Corridor communities. She also requested additional information as to how staff narrowed and refined the project lists over time. Co-chair Dirksen noted that the next agenda item outlined upcoming public involvement efforts. He added that the projects on the plan lists came directly from local project lists and the project partners' local transportation plans. He believed that consensus from the committee on the list of projects to prioritize would be key to competitively pursuing funding.

Mr. Tell encouraged the committee to consider the importance of incremental improvements in the corridor, beginning with small projects that the region can afford.

Mayor Lou Ogden, City of Tualatin, referred to the hub and spoke transit alignment option. He expressed concerns about the lack of a spoke connection between Tualatin and Sherwood. He wondered if that connection could be added. Mayor Bill Middleton agreed that the connection was important. Ms. Wilkinson replied that the five transit options served to show a variety of information and configurations. She noted that the components of the alignments could be mixed and matched.

Mayor Ogden also expressed concerns regarding a lack of local service connections in the Tualatin-Sherwood area. He referred to the map book and noted that the enhanced transit plans were missing and wondered if they could be included. Mr. Alan Lehto, TriMet, responded that the local transit service routes were missing from the maps, but that TriMet would be working on the SW Service Enhancement plans later in 2013 that would complement the SW Corridor Plan. Mayor Ogden believed that the current local plans should be included in the map book for the committee's information.

Co-chair Stacey agreed with Mayor Ogden that local transit enhancements were needed in the SW Corridor. He also agreed that the missing local transit links could be included on the map books or somewhere within SW Corridor materials. Mr. Lehto responded that staff considered showing the local connections in the background on the project maps, and that those connections were included as assumptions as the projects were developed.

Ms. Fritz wondered if the committee had considered how to ensure that local transit would complement any BRT plans for the SW Corridor Plan. Mr. Lehto noted that TriMet had made commitments on a regional level to the frequent service bus network and hoped to be able to expand those commitments.

Mr. Matt Bihn, Metro, noted that the local service plans and adjustments were not yet mapped but were included in the model when developing the transit options. He informed the committee that the local service plans could be mapped in the next few weeks when further analysis on the bundles is made. Co-chair Stacey noted that the committee and project staff should continue to consider local transit needs and operations in the corridor.

Co-chair Dirksen explained that the committee and the public would have opportunities to add or remove projects from the bundles between now and June. He asked if the committee was ready to consider approving further analysis of the project bundles and the HCT alternatives.

Mayor Denny Doyle, City of Beaverton, motioned for the committee to approve further analysis of the project bundles and the HCT alternatives, provided that staff will correct clerical errors and consider Mr. Roger's concern regarding the plan area boundaries.

Mayor Ogden seconded Mayor Doyle's motion.

Ms. Fritz requested an amendment to the motion. She asked that projects in the Portland labeled "bicycle" be labeled "bicycle and pedestrian" in the project lists. Ms. Wilkinson

responded that project staff would need to examine the bicycle projects individually to make sure they include a pedestrian component before relabeling the projects. Ms. Crista Gardner, Metro, explained that Metro and City of Portland staff could collaborate to confirm that the projects are appropriately labeled.

Ms. Fritz expressed concern for approving further analysis without additional details regarding public involvement efforts. Co-chair Stacey asked Co-chair Dirksen if the committee could defer voting on Mayor Doyle's motion until after the next agenda item. Co-chair Dirksen asked if there was opposition from the committee to deferring the vote on the motion. Hearing none, he deferred the vote until after the agenda item regarding public involvement.

4.0 April engagement overview

Ms. Wilkinson directed the committee to the public engagement calendar (included in the meeting packet). She explained that staff would hold SW Corridor public engagement events and would also provide presentations to existing groups and meetings around the corridor. She informed the committee of the two community planning forums scheduled for April and May and of the economic summit scheduled for April 30, 2013. Ms. Wilkinson also described an upcoming opportunity for online participation through the Opt-in tool.

Ms. Fritz wondered if staff would post the project lists for SW Neighborhood's transportation committee and members of the public to review before the steering committee takes action on the lists. Ms. Wilkinson replied that once the steering committee approved further analysis of the project bundles, staff would hold public involvement events, evaluate the bundles, and provide a refined set of project bundles to the committee in May.

Ms. Fritz wondered why the committee would not have an opportunity to make changes to the bundles in April. Co-chair Dirksen explained that April's meeting would focus on other aspects of the SW Corridor Plan apart from the transportation plan and that the committee would consider the refined project bundles in May.

Ms. Wilkinson described the Fall 2012 public involvement efforts and the ShapeSW tool that had assisted in narrowing the long list of projects. Using public input and the narrowed list of projects, staff developed the project bundles. She noted that after committee approval for further analysis on the project bundles, staff will present the bundles to the public for review. Ms. Wilkinson asked Ms. Fritz if she believed a step was missing from the public involvement piece of the SW Corridor Plan. She added that the public would have opportunities to add any missing projects to the bundles between now and June 2013, when the committee will consider approving one bundle.

Ms. Elissa Gertler, Metro, noted that the steering committee would discuss the public feedback on the bundles in May and determine if the bundles are accurate and complete so that they can vote on a refined project bundle in June.

Ms. Fritz suggested that the City of Portland hold public engagement events during the next few months in order to ensure that the community supports the direction of the SW

Corridor Plan. Co-chair Stacey and Co-chair Dirksen encouraged Portland and the other project partners to begin their own public engagement processes.

Co-chair Dirksen asked the committee to take vote on Mayor Doyle's motion to approve further staff analysis on the five bundles, HCT alternatives, Mr. Roger's request to examine the plan area, staff confirmation of the Portland bike projects' classifications, and exploring the mapping of the local transit network in the corridor.

The motion passed with no opposition.

6.0 Public Comment

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

Ms. Kathy Newcomb, a resident of Tualatin, informed the committee that Tualatin employs 21,000 people, only ten percent of which live in Tualatin. She emphasized that the main transportation challenge in Tualatin was moving the ninety percent of employees who do not live in Tualatin to and from businesses. She expressed concerns over the heavy traffic on Tualatin-Sherwood Road, and the lack of transit options on the west side of the city. Ms. Newcomb encouraged the committee to consider adding a park-and-ride facility on 99W, and a local bus line routed from the park-and-ride, down Tualatin-Sherwood Road during peak traffic hours. Ms. Newcomb believed that a bus-rapid transit (BRT) line was not needed, and that the focus of the committee should be improving local bus service on 99W.

Mr. John Gibbon, the land use chair for SW Neighborhoods Inc., explained that the City of Portland's participation in the SW Corridor Plan was critical to the success of the project. He noted that the terrain and infrastructure needs of the West Hills would be challenging to overcome and believed that the committee should work to reduce the length of commutes when using transit. He believed the SW Corridor Plan was moving in the right direction and the make-up of the steering committee encouraged him.

Ms. Marianne Fitzgerald, President of SW Neighborhoods Inc., expressed excitement to examine the five project bundles. She asked the committee and staff to provide information as to how the bundles were developed. Ms. Fitzgerald also asked to see the bundles in a different format. She agreed with Mr. Tell that the committee needed to develop a funding strategy and that public engagement would be key to that strategy.

Mr. Dick Schouten, Washington County Commissioner, suggested increased bicycle parking facilities around Fanno Creek Trail to connect the trail with the transit network. He expressed concern that the Columbia River Crossing (CRC) and other regional projects might distract from the SW Corridor Plan. Co-chair Stacey hoped that civic engagement efforts would help create broad community support for the SW Corridor Plan.

Mr. Damien Miller, addressed the possibility of short-term, implementable projects, and the limited funding environment. He encouraged the committee to coordinate project #5006 (Barbur lane diet) with ODOT's plans to rehabilitate Barbur bridges. Co-chair Dirksen noted that ODOT had suggested adding project #5006 to the SW Corridor list and hoped that SW Corridor staff would work closely with ODOT on that project. Ms. Fritz emphasized the importance of working together on project #5006 and the Barbur bridges project.

Mr. Carl Larson, Bicycle Transportation Alliance, encouraged the committee to consider a road diet on Barbur Boulevard and explained that removing a lane from Barbur Boulevard would improve bicycle and pedestrian access to SW Portland and the corridor. He requested a study on removing a lane from Babur Boulevard, either from ODOT, the SW Corridor Plan, or the Portland Bureau of Transportation. Ms. Fritz reiterated the importance of coordinating a lane diet project and the Barbur bridge rehabilitation project.

Co-chair Dirksen adjourned the meeting at 11:34 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	2/11/13	February meeting agenda	021113swcpssc-01
2	Summary	1/14/13	1/14/13 meeting minutes	021113swcpssc-02
3	Calendar	2/5/13	Engagement Opportunities schedule	021113swcpssc-03
4	Memo	2/5/13	Bundles process memo	021113swcpssc-04
5	Memo	1/30/13	Bundles technical memo	021113swcpssc-05
6	Maps	2/11/13	Transportation Project map book	021113swcpssc-06
7	Maps	2/11/13	5 transit alternatives maps	021113swcpssc-07
8	Presentation	2/11/13	5 bundles power point	021113swcpssc-08