

 **Metro** | *Meeting Summary*

Southwest Corridor Plan Steering Committee

Monday, April 22, 2013

9:30 to 11:30 a.m.

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

Committee Members Present

Bob Stacey, Co-chair	Metro Council
John Cook	City of Tigard
Denny Doyle	City of Beaverton
Neil McFarlane	TriMet
Bill Middleton	City of Sherwood
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

Co-chair Craig Dirksen	Metro Council
Charlie Hales	City of Portland
Skip O'Neill	City of Lake Oswego
Lou Ogden	City of Tualatin

Alternate Members Present

Monique Beikman	City of Tualatin
Amanda Fritz	City of Portland

Metro Staff

Robin McArthur, Elissa Gertler, Malu Wilkinson, Catherine Ciarlo, Matt Bihn, Crista Gardner, Clifford Higgins, Leila Aman, Emma Fredieu, Tim Collins, Joyce Felton, Heather Kent, Janet Bebb, John Williams, Andy Cotugno, Alexa Ross, Ramona Perrault

1.0 Welcome and introductions

Co-chair Bob Stacey, Metro Councilor, called the meeting to order at 9:31 a.m. He explained that the SW Corridor Plan was at the final stages of Phase I, and that the committee would be adopting an agreement to refine transit alignments and projects to support the land use vision in July 2013. He asked the committee members to introduce themselves and provide a brief update on their communities.

Ms. Suzan Turley, City of King City, noted that King City was finalizing its comprehensive plan. Ms. Amanda Fritz, City of Portland, informed the committee that the Portland City Council would consider the SW Barbur Blvd Plan for adoption on Wednesday, April 24, 2013.

Mayor Denny Doyle, City of Beaverton, described his recent trip to Atlanta and the work that the City of Atlanta has done to develop a street car corridor around the city limits. Mayor John Cook, City of Tigard, announced a SW Corridor community forum at Tigard City Hall on Tuesday, April 30, 2013. Mayor Gery Schirado, City of Durham, updated the committee on the status of his city's Bridgeport apartments. He reported that construction is on schedule, and that the buildings will represent a 20% population increase in Durham.

Mr. Neil McFarlane, TriMet, reported on TriMet's recent public meeting regarding service changes on SW Barbur Blvd and 99W. Mr. Jason Tell, ODOT, updated the committee on the status of the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) grant allocation process. He explained that the process would be completed in the fall and that the STIP region 1 committee was currently reviewing applications representing 150% of available funding.

Co-chair Stacey expressed appreciation for the work the City of Atlanta had completed for its streetcar connector around downtown Atlanta, and how the city has leveraged trails and parks projects to complete the connector. He noted that their strategy for redevelopment is similar to SW Corridor Plan efforts.

2.0 Consideration of the Steering Committee meeting summary from February 11, 2013

Co-chair Stacey directed the committee to the February 11, 2013 meeting summary (included in the meeting packet) and asked if there were any proposed edits or changes. Hearing none, Mayor Doyle motioned to accept the summary. Committee members did not object and the summary was adopted.

3.0 Implementing the Corridor Land Use Vision

Co-chair Stacey outlined the purpose of the SW Corridor land use vision as a means of encouraging community building and economic development. He introduced Ms. Leila Aman, Metro, and Mr. Alan Lehto, TriMet, to present additional information regarding the land use vision.

Ms. Aman began a presentation regarding implementation of the SW Corridor land use vision (included in the meeting packet). She explained that the SW Corridor Plan is organized around the land use vision, and uses the vision to determine the most appropriate transit alignment and transportation projects. Ms. Aman described some of the policies and partnerships necessary to implement the land use vision. She reminded the committee that the land use vision was developed using current concept plans from project partners and project partner feedback. Beginning with land use, project partners and staff identified key places in the corridor, developed potential transit alignments for the key places, and compiled project bundles to support the transit alignments.

Ms. Aman outlined the regulatory framework, public realm investments, and public subsidies needed to fill the gap between the land use vision and the current market. She provided several examples from the region and around the country to illustrate how successful use of these investments can bring the land use vision into reality.

Mr. Lehto addressed the criteria used by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) to evaluate high capacity transit (HCT) projects and determine the level of federal funding provided to local jurisdictions to implement the projects. He added that land use and economic development are important metrics that the FTA uses to evaluate transit plans for funding.

Co-chair Stacey asked if the committee had any questions or comments on Ms. Aman and Mr. Lehto's presentations. Mr. Roy Rogers, Washington County, asked Mr. Lehto how the SW Corridor Plan's transit alignment options compare to the recent Portland-Milwaukie light rail (PMLR) project in terms of complexity, costs, and ridership. Mr. Lehto responded that he would have more details for that comparison in the coming months, and could likely speak to that at the next steering committee meeting.

Ms. Elissa Gertler, Metro noted that one difference between the SW Corridor and the PMLR is that the SW Corridor would be the first project under new Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP21) regulations. Mr. Lehto noted that the FTA, under MAP21, placed greater emphasis on economic development efforts and land use. Co-chair Stacey wondered if previous projects on the westside of the region that focused on livability would help current projects such as the SW Corridor Plan pursue funding. Mr. Lehto believed that the focus on livability, economic development, and land use would make the region competitive for federal funding.

4.0 Parks and natural resources priorities

Ms. Heather Kent, Metro, presented the process for narrowing and implementing parks and natural resources projects in the SW Corridor. She described a focus on place-building, quality of life issues, and using the regulatory framework to support green projects. Ms. Kent provided examples of public feedback regarding green projects and explained how project partners identified existing conditions and needs in the corridor. She described the project narrowing process and noted that staff would prioritize projects that best support the land use vision and transit alignments. Over the next few months, staff will narrow the project list and explore implementation strategies.

Mr. Rogers wondered if the SW Corridor Plan required parks and natural resources projects to be evenly distributed throughout the corridor, or if they would be implemented in jurisdictions on an individual basis. He also wondered how the SW Corridor Plan would measure success in implementing green projects – corridor-wide or from community to community.

Ms. Malu Wilkinson, Metro, responded that the SW Corridor Plan provides a consistent way of valuing green projects, but does not require a consistent application of green projects if they are impractical or inappropriate for a certain jurisdiction. She added that members of the public throughout the corridor provided positive comments for parks and natural resources. Ms. Gertler noted that a shared appreciation of parks and natural resources attracts development and residents to the SW Corridor and is a means of branding for the region.

Ms. Fritz responded to Mr. Rogers that the City of Portland has found it necessary to begin planning with green projects first to ensure a less complicated implementation process than if green projects are planned as an afterthought. Mr. Rogers answered that it may be challenging to determine how to apply the green projects vision practically and appropriately for each community in the SW Corridor. Fritz agreed, but added that the purpose of Metro and committees such as the SW Corridor steering committee is to share benefits and expectations for community development, even if they are a different scale in each jurisdiction.

Ms. Kent described the next steps for narrowing and prioritizing the list of green projects, and developing strategies for implementation. She added that the green projects would be presented for feedback during community outreach events in May.

5.0 Moving towards a shared investment strategy

Co-chair Stacey introduced Ms. Wilkinson, who would describe the process for moving towards a shared investment strategy. Ms. Wilkinson directed the committee to the shared investment strategy document (included in the meeting packet). She explained how the committee would complete Phase I of the SW Corridor Plan at the end of July 2013. She presented the SW Corridor work plan and noted that the project was currently at steps 10 and 11.

Ms. Wilkinson informed the committee that project partners had worked since January 2013 to develop five transit alignment options, and to narrow down the lists of roadway, active transportation, and natural resources projects. In July 2013, project partners would develop a shared investment strategy, and the committee would adopt an agreement to refine chosen transit alignments before entering a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process.

Ms. Wilkinson outlined the next four steps that project staff would work through for the June 10, 2013 steering committee discussion: 1. Develop a draft narrowed list of projects; 2. Review and adjust project lists; 3. Consider funding opportunities and needs; 4. Develop a draft project list, transit alignment proposal, and investment strategy.

Co-chair Stacey opened the discussion up to questions from the committee. Mr. Tell believed that the HCT project was the critical piece of the SW Corridor Plan and encouraged project partners to prepare for the political and capital investments required to compete for federal funding on a national level.

Mr. Rogers agreed with Mr. Tell and wondered if bus rapid transit (BRT) would require a different approach to pursuing funding. Mr. McFarlane noted that the FTA is mode-neutral as to the evaluation criteria for federal funding. He believed that project partners would need to focus around developing key station areas to support an HCT project in order to fulfill the FTA's criteria.

6.0 Transit evaluation framework

Co-chair Stacey introduced Mr. Matt Bihn, Metro, to brief the committee on the preliminary transit evaluation results, which would be discussed in greater detail at the May 13, 2013 meeting.

Mr. Bihn briefly described the five transit alternatives and listed the evaluation considerations project staff would use on each alternative. He outlined the tradeoffs between adding a lane and converting lane to roadways to accommodate an HCT project, as well as the tradeoffs between using exclusive transit lanes, business and transit only lanes, and mixed traffic lanes.

Mr. Rogers asked if the tradeoffs applied to infrequent transit runs, such as a single bus running every few hours. Mr. Bihn responded that the model uses the year 2035 as the model year, land use projections for the corridor in 2035, and a run every 7.5 minutes.

Ms. Wilkinson noted the difference between the decisions that would need to be made in July 2013 and the decisions that would be made after July, during the refinement process.

Mr. McFarlane noted that there was demand for transit expansion in the region, despite TriMet's current funding challenges.

7.0 Public Comment

Co-chair Stacey opened the meeting to public comment. He invited members of the public from SW Haines St. to address the committee.

Mr. George Vranas, resident of SW Portland on SW Haines St., read speaking points in opposition to routing a BRT or HCT project through SW Haines St. (included in the meeting packet). He supporting the SW Corridor Plan overall, and encouraged the committee to approve an HCT alignment closer to Barbur Blvd. Mr. Vranas believed that the SW Corridor Plan could bring renewed development to Crossroads and Tigard Triangle neighborhoods but urged the committee to keep the transit alignment off of SW Haines St.

Mr. Peter Johnson, resident of SW Portland on SW Haines St., read additional speaking points in opposition to routing an HCT project through SW Haines St. (included in the meeting packet). Mr. Johnson spoke of the high quality of life on SW Haines St. and believed that adding a transit line would widen the road, eliminate the dead end, and remove 100-

year old Douglas fir trees. He also asserted that the period of uncertainty before the transit project is finalized will lower property values in the neighborhood. Mr. Johnson urged the committee to keep any transit alignment on Barbur Blvd.

Ms. Ariane Holzhauer, resident of SW Portland, read final speaking points in opposition to routing an HCT project through SW Haines St. (included in the meeting packet). Ms Holzhauer expressed appreciation for the natural areas in her neighborhood, as well as the access to the urban amenities in the SW Portland region. She elaborated on her concerns for the environmental impacts of placing a transit route on SW Haines St. She highlighted Lester Park, indigenous wildlife, walkable corridors, and the large trees lining the neighborhood streets as characteristics she would like the neighborhood to retain. She also expressed concerns for increasing traffic and speeds on SW Haines St., which she believed could increase road kill in the area. She stated that she supported the SW Corridor Plan in general.

Ms. Marianne Fitzgerald, SW Neighborhoods Inc., appreciated the SW Corridor Plan's approach of looking at transit as a means of economic and community development, and the multi-modal approach to transportation planning. She hoped that the committee would look at the root causes of congestion and develop alternative means of transportation. Ms. Fitzgerald encouraged the committee to look passed simply widening roads.

Mr. John Gibbon, Chair of the Land Use committee for SW Neighborhoods Inc., noted that transit use had increased on Barbur Blvd. He described riding full buses to and from Barbur Blvd. and the Portland city center. Mr. Gibbon added that he did have trouble finding transit service to NE Portland from Barbur Blvd. He commented on the SW Haines Street concerns, and suggested focusing on the NE corner of the Tigard Triangle. Mr. Gibbon believed that transit alignments should be kept on Barbur Blvd. He also highlighted significant storm water issues in the SW Corridor.

8.0 Next meetings and adjourn

Co-chair Stacey adjourned the meeting at 11:29 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	04/22/13	Meeting agenda	042213swcpsc01
2	Summary	02/11/13	02/11/13 meeting minutes	042213swcpsc02
3	Memo	04/21/13	Prioritizing and funding green projects	042213swcpsc03
4	Diagram	04/18/13	Moving towards a shared investment strategy	042213swcpsc04
5	Calendar	04/18/13	Steering committee calendar	042213swcpsc05
6	Report	04/22/13	Economic development executive summary	042213swcpsc06
7	Petition	04/21/13	Residents opposed to BRT routes on Haines Street	042213swcpsc07
8	Presentation	04/22/13	Implementing the land use vision	042213swcpsc08
9	Presentation	04/22/13	Natural resources and green projects	042213swcpsc09
10	Presentation	4/22/13	Preliminary evaluation results	042213swcpsc10
11	Letter	04/22/13	Speaking notes regarding SW Haines St.	042213swcpsc11