

 **Metro** | *Meeting Summary*

Southwest Corridor Plan Steering Committee  
Monday, June 10, 2013  
9:30 to 11:30 a.m.  
Tigard Library

Committee Members Present

Craig Dirksen, Co-chair  
Bob Stacey, Co-chair  
John Cook  
Denny Doyle  
Charlie Hales  
Bill Middleton  
Lou Ogden  
Gery Schirado  
Jason Tell  
Suzan Turley  
Roy Rogers

Metro Council  
Metro Council  
City of Tigard  
City of Beaverton  
City of Portland  
City of Sherwood  
City of Tualatin  
City of Durham  
ODOT  
City of King City  
Washington County

Committee Members Excused

Neil McFarlane  
Loretta Smith  
Skip O'Neill

TriMet  
Multnomah County  
City of Lake Oswego

Alternate Members Present

Alan Lehto

TriMet

Metro Staff

Robin McArthur, Malu Wilkinson, Catherine Ciarlo, Matt Bihn, Anthony Buczek, Crista Gardner, Michael Walter, Clifford Higgins, Leila Aman, Emma Fredieu, Tim Collins, Nick Christianson, Beth Cohen, Dana Lucero

## **1.0 Welcome and introductions**

Co-chair Bob Stacey, Metro Councilor, welcomed the committee and audience members and asked them to introduce themselves. He thanked the attendees for their participation and reminded the committee that there would be time allotted for public comment at the end of the meeting.

Co-chair Stacey explained that the SW Corridor Plan was nearing the end of the project narrowing process and that the committee would make a decision at the end of July about which high capacity transit (HCT) projects to continue to study in the next phase of the project. Co-chair Stacey informed the committee that they would spend this meeting learning about and discussing the staff recommendations for the HCT alternatives and other transportation investments in the corridor.

He asked the committee to supply brief project updates from their communities. Ms. Suzan Turley, City of King City, noted that the King City City Council would have a joint meeting with the planning commission next week.

Mayor Bill Middleton, City of Sherwood, explained that Metro Councilor Craig Dirksen attended the Sherwood City Council meeting for a briefing on the SW Corridor Plan. He added that the City of Sherwood continued to work on completing the town center plan update.

Mayor John Cook, City of Tigard, described upcoming SW Corridor briefings to the public and various Tigard committees.

Mayor Lou Ogden, City of Tualatin, explained that the Tualatin Planning Commission and the transportation task force would be discussing the SW Corridor Plan over the next few months. He noted that public outreach for the plan is a high priority.

Mr. Alan Lehto, TriMet, informed the committee that TriMet would be implementing service improvements to bus lines 12 and 94 in September 2013.

Co-chair Craig Dirksen, Metro Councilor, described Metro's periodic review process of transportation and active transportation plans.

## **2.0 Consideration of the Steering Committee meeting summary from May 13, 2013**

Co-chair Stacey asked the committee to consider the meeting summary from the May 13, 2013 SW Corridor steering committee meeting. He asked if anyone had any revisions or objections to the summary. Mayor Denny Doyle, City of Beaverton, moved to accept the meeting summary. Mayor Cook seconded the motion. All committee members voted to accept the summary.

## **3.0 Decision framework**

Co-chair Dirksen described the decision framework for the SW Corridor Plan and explained that the refinement phase would narrow the focus of the plan and provide a more detailed analysis of the projects recommended for further study. He noted that the decision framework calendar includes TriMet's SW Service Enhancement Plan, HCT project destination choices, HCT mode choices, and policy directions on bus rapid transit (BRT) right-of-way.

#### **4.0 Public engagement update**

Co-chair Dirksen outlined upcoming opportunities for public engagement. Mr. Juan Carlos Ocana-Chiu, Metro, walked the committee through the feedback and results of the past economic summit, community planning forum, and online surveys (summary included in the meeting packet). Ms. Turley asked Mr. Ocana-Chiu if public safety officials had been included in the public involvement process. Mr. Ocana-Chiu informed her that members of Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue had attended public involvement events.

#### **5.0 Draft recommendation**

Ms. Malu Wilkinson, Metro, thanked the project staff and committee members for their time spent developing the draft recommendation. She expressed her excitement for the development of the draft as the culmination of the past two years of work on the SW Corridor Plan. Ms. Wilkinson outlined a few of the documents in the meeting packet and described the work that staff would undertake over the next six weeks to complete a final recommendation for the committee to consider.

Ms. Wilkinson reminded the committee that the recommendation was designed to support the vision and goals of the project partners as a corridor. She emphasized that the recommendation was a draft of what the committee would consider and take action on in July. She introduced Mr. Matt Bihn, Mr. Anthony Buczek, and Ms. Leila Aman, Metro, to present portions of the draft recommendation.

##### *5.1 Transit recommendation*

Mr. Bihn presented the transit alternatives portion of the draft recommendation (included in the meeting packet). He outlined the decision points to consider for HCT projects in the corridor. He reminded the committee of projects that had previously been considered but ultimately removed from the project list, including WES upgrades, streetcar options, and alternatives on I-5 and 99W.

Mr. Bihn explained that staff recommended directing TriMet to implement the SW Service Enhancement Plan, which would improve local bus service to connect key corridor locations, increase access to transit, and make capital improvements to the transit system in the corridor. Mr. Lehto added that TriMet agreed with this recommendation and expected to begin work on the SW Service Enhancement Plan in the coming year.

Mr. Bihn informed the committee that staff recommended advancing both light rail and BRT to the Refinement phase of the SW Corridor Plan. Staff also recommended that only BRT projects with between 50% and 100% of dedicated right-of-way be studying further.

Finally, staff recommended further study of an HCT project to Tualatin via Tigard, with improved local bus service connection the HCT project to Sherwood.

Mr. Bihn also updated the committee on capital cost estimates for LRT and BRT routes to Tigard and Tualatin. He noted that the refinement stage would allow for better estimates for HCT capital costs.

Mayor Cook asked if the capital costs for HCT to Tualatin included the \$500 million cost estimate of projects that would support an HCT alignment, or if the capital cost estimate was for the transit line portion only. Mr. Bihn replied that the capital cost estimate did not include the cost of the supporting projects. Mr. Lehto clarified that a similar project, the Portland-Milwaukie light rail, included some roadway projects necessary for completing the light rail line. Mr. Bihn agreed that the cost estimates include more than the building of the rail line.

Mr. Jason Tell, ODOT, noted that the federal government has been decreasing the amount of funding it will offer as a match to local funding sources. He wondered what level of federal funding match could be expected for the SW Corridor Plan. Mr. Bihn responded that a 50% federal match was a reasonable working assumption.

#### *5.2 Roadway and active transportation recommendation*

Mr. Buczek outlined the staff recommendations for roadway and active transportation projects. He provided a brief background for how the project list was compiled and narrowed and described the models and measures used to analyze the various projects. Staff recommended a narrowed list of projects, including those that are highly supportive of an HCT alternative and those that are highly supportive of the land use vision in the corridor. Mr. Buczek did not take the committee through each project but directed them to the project lists in the draft recommendation document.

Commissioner Roy Rogers, Washington County, asked Mr. Buczek how the refinement phase would continue to narrow the roadway projects and if staff had developed any parameters to further analyze the project list. Mr. Buczek replied that a committee would be formed to work on evaluating projects but that a further narrowing process had not yet been developed.

Mayor Ogden remarked that since the projects had come from local project partner plans, those that supported HCT and land use visions should be prioritized first and other projects would be considered locally, apart from the SW Corridor Plan. Commissioner Rogers responded that the steering committee should determine how to develop a queue for the projects and how project partners should work to complete SW Corridor Plan projects in addition to their own local projects.

Co-chair Dirksen agreed that projects not included in the SW Corridor Plan would continue to be included in local plans. He noted that the decision as to how to queue SW Corridor Plan projects would be made in a later phase of the work. He advocated for a flexible project list able to respond to unforeseen opportunities and challenges.

Commissioner Rogers discussed the challenge of coordinating the variety of needs and priorities across the corridor. Mr. Buczek agreed that the project partners have different priorities, and reiterated that the SW Corridor Plan projects would support HCT and the land use visions. He added that the SW Corridor list would inform local lists and the regional transportation plan.

Co-chair Stacey replied to Commissioner Rogers that the refinement period and Draft Environmental Impact Study would address decisions on how to queue projects and best prioritize SW Corridor Plan and local plan priorities. Commissioner Rogers felt that the steering committee should provide guidance to staff as to how to prioritize the final project list. Co-chair Dirksen reminded Commissioner Rogers that, at the staff level, project partners have been working to coordinate their goals and priorities, and that this work is reflected in the current recommendation.

Ms. Robin McArthur, Metro, added that the draft recommendation answers the question of how best to combine projects to build project partners' communities. Projects outside of that recommendation will still be in local plans and may be funded separately from the SW Corridor Plan effort.

Mayor Ogden stated that funding is the essential question of the plan. He described the difficulty that could arise when communities have to work toward completing both the SW Corridor Plan projects and their own local projects. He emphasized the importance of knowing how to best strategically advance both categories of projects.

### *5.3 Parks and natural resources recommendation*

Ms. Aman presented the parks and natural resources project recommendation. She outlined the models used to evaluate and narrow the projects list and noted that the combination of projects would work to support the HCT and land use vision in the corridor.

Ms. Wilkinson added that the SW Corridor green team would be working to further narrow the list of the month of June.

### *5.4 Regulatory framework and catalytic investment recommendation*

Ms. Aman also presented financial measures and investments that would be necessary to support an HCT project and the corridor land use vision. She explained the gap between the current market and the land use vision of the SW Corridor communities, and catalytic investment in the public realm can provide proof of concepts for financial institutions and private investors, and jump start development.

Ms. Aman described how New Starts and Small Starts program guidance from the Federal Transit Administration looks for communities working to improve land use plans, transit supportive projects, and affordable housing considerations. She explained that zoning codes, parking requirements, and landscaping are part of the regulatory framework that can support the land use vision. Financial incentives such as direct and indirect investments could also be used to leverage the regulatory framework to support the land use vision. She provided a few project examples, such as the Portland Armory, Tigard Triangle, and

Tualatin, to be used as case studies to evaluate the regulatory framework and financial environment.

### *5.5 Draft recommendation discussion*

Co-chair Dirksen asked committee members for their reactions to the draft recommendation and what other information they might need to feel comfortable moving forward.

Mayor Ogden asked for a copy of the presentation slides. He was curious about the ridership and HCT use statistics in the corridor. Mayor Ogden did not want to lose sight of the fact that the SW Service Enhancement Plan was important to support an HCT project and would be a first level of improvement in the corridor. He believed that local transit investments could be used to advance larger HCT improvements in the future.

Commissioner Rogers wondered about developing connections to other parts of Washington County. Mr. Bihn replied that local transit improvements would include connections to other parts of Washington County. Mr. Lehto added that the SW Service Enhancement Plan would take into account a number of stakeholders' preferences throughout Washington County. TriMet's expectation in the long term is to have a significant increase in service throughout the corridor and the southwest region. Commissioner Rogers wondered if this included investments such as roadway improvements. Mr. Buczek responded that the roadway investments had been narrowed to directly support either HCT and land use in the SW Corridor, which may or may not include connections elsewhere.

Co-chair Stacey reminded Commissioner Rogers that the WES corridor and I-217 corridor might be separate study areas. Commissioner Rogers felt that it was difficult to recommend projects that only benefitted one district in the county.

Mr. Tell believed that clarification on how to prioritize projects for implementation would be important for members of the public. He noted that the project lists did not have corresponding revenue sources at this time, so either project partners would need to raise more funding or restructure the project lists to match current funding sources. He added that HCT was vital to the SW Corridor discussion. He emphasized that HCT offers a way to meet the land use goals and improve mobility in the corridor. According to Mr. Tell, solutions other than HCT would be on a much smaller scale. He advocated for focusing on prioritizing the HCT project, given the large effort necessary for pursuing funding and developing public will.

Co-chair Dirksen noted that the refinement of the plan and the time to assemble funding would be a decade long effort.

Mayor Charlie Hales, City of Portland, commented that the HCT project would need to advance the land use plans of the communities in the corridor to be competitive and effective on a regional level when pursuing funding. Commissioner Rogers noted that Washington County would likely be asked for a substantial investment so he needed to be sure he would be able to gather the agreement of the Washington County commissioners.

Mayor Gery Schirado, City of Durham, expressed concerns that another large regional project could compete with the SW Corridor Plan for funding opportunities in the future. Mayor Hales responded that other local projects might compete for state funding, but that the SW Corridor would be competing with projects around the nation for federal funding. He suggested using the commitment to the project from the steering committee, as well as public outreach, increase the chance of receiving state funding. Mr. Tell agreed with Mayor Hales that commitment from committee members was necessary for implementing an HCT project.

Commissioner Rogers asked for clarification of the difference between HCT and BRT. Co-chair Dirksen explained local bus service, BRT, and light rail with regard to ridership and reliance on traffic conditions.

Mayor Ogden expressed excitement for the SW Corridor Plan and emphasized the importance of connecting the region. He wanted the committee to be aware that the SW Corridor Plan would not be a solution for all of the transportation challenges to the corridor. He wondered if the SW Corridor Plan might provide relief to congestion on I-5. Co-chair Dirksen noted that information regarding relief to I-5 would be a part of the refinement period.

## **6.0 Public Comment**

Co-chair Stacey opened the meeting to public comment. He reminded the members of the public of a two-minute limit on comments.

Ms. Kathy Newcomb, corridor resident, believed that the committee should focus on bringing BRT to the corridor.

Mr. John Gibbon, discussed the use of rail around the country and believed that a combination of light rail and BRT could work in Portland.

Ms. Maripat Hensel, SW Portland resident, wondered if the planning process accounts for the changing technologies of personal vehicles. She wondered if there might be federal grants available to study the issue further.

R.A. Fontes, Lake Oswego resident, commented that autonomous vehicles should be brought into the discussion and would save transit operators a large amount in operational costs.

## **7.0 Next meetings and adjourn**

Co-chair Stacey adjourned the meeting at 11:50 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	6/10/13	October meeting agenda	061013swcpssc-01
2	Summary	5/13/13	5/13/13 meeting minutes	061013swcpssc-02
3	Document	6/10/13	Public involvement summary	061013swcpssc-03
4	Document	6/10/13	Transit evaluation	061013swcpssc-04
5	Document	6/10.13	Roadway evaluation	061013swcpssc-05
6	Document	6/10/13	Active transportation evaluation	061013swcpssc-06
7	Document	6/10/13	Draft recommendation	061013swcpssc-07
8	Presentation	6/10/13	Recommendation presentation	061013swcpssc-08