

Meeting: Southwest Corridor Steering Committee  
 Date/time: Monday, July 10, 2017  
 Place: Metro Regional Center – Council Chamber, 600 NE Grand Ave., Portland

---

### **Committee Members Present**

Craig Dirksen, Co-chair	Metro Council
Bob Stacey, Co-chair	Metro Council
John Cook	City of Tigard
Neil McFarlane	TriMet
Lou Ogden	City of Tualatin
Roy Rogers	Washington County
Dan Saltzman	City of Portland
Gery Schirado	City of Durham
Rian Windsheimer	ODOT

### **Metro Staff Present**

Chris Ford, Matt Bihn, Michaela Skiles, Eryn Kehe, Anthony Buczek, Elissa Gertler, Malu Wilkinson, Yuliya Lee, Lucy Folau.

### **1.0 Welcome and introductions**

Co-chair Bob Stacey called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. and welcomed the committee members and public to the meeting. The committee members proceeded to introduce themselves and noted their jurisdictional affiliation.

Co-chair Bob Stacey gave a brief summary of the meeting's agenda items and noted that today's meeting action item would be to approve appointment of a new member to the Southwest Corridor Community Advisory Committee.

### **2.0 Consideration of the Steering Committee meeting summary from May 8, 2017.**

Co-chair Bob Stacey asked the committee for approval of the meeting summary from May 8, 2017. With all in favor, the meeting summary was accepted unanimously.

### **3.0 Public Comment**

Mr. William Terrill, Beveland Street business owner and also representing other small business owners on Beveland Street, stated that he is proponent of the mass transit in general, but voiced opposition to having a light rail operating on Beveland Street due to its negative impact on local small businesses. He stated that many of the current small business owners were required by the City of Tigard in the past to put their own money into the development of the Beveland Street, and it would be devastating for them to walk away from such a personal and financial investment.

Mr. Terrill agreed that some sacrifices must be made in order to advance the project. He proposed an alternate route which would use 70<sup>th</sup> Street to Elmhurst Street, then turn West to cross highway 217, and having only one station on Elmhurst Street in Tigard Triangle. The detailed proposal was submitted at the Southwest Corridor Community Advisory Committee on June 5, 2017 and included as part of that meeting record.

Mr. James Shook, Beveland Road property owner, expressed opposition to having a light rail operating on Beveland Street. He pointed out that the uniqueness and serenity of the location on Beveland Street would be displaced by the light rail operations. Mr. Shook stated that not just small businesses, but also families would be negatively impacted by the light rail operations and urged the committee to consider proposal for only one station in Tigard Triangle on Elmhurst Street.

Ms. Liz Tester, Beveland Street business owner, expressed concern that Southwest Corridor light rail project is going to negatively impact her clients if the light rail is chosen to operate on Beveland Street. She stated that her other business locations are not able to service as many clients as location on Beveland Street and pointed out that reduced parking and noise from the light rail operations would be devastating to her business.

#### **4.0 Southwest Corridor Plan updates**

Mr. Chris Ford, Metro, gave a brief overview of the meeting agenda. He reminded the committee that in today's meeting they will hear several briefings from the project partners and staff on the Portland Community College (PCC) – Sylvania campus connection options, along the railroad vs. I-5 in Tigard route options, Downtown Tigard through and branched route options, and on Barbur vs. I-5 route options. Mr. Ford also noted that the City of Portland and the City of Tigard have received Equitable Housing grants from Metro and they will work towards looking for potential equitable housing opportunities related to the Southwest Corridor project. Mr. Ford added that Metro received an Equitable Transit Oriented Development grant last year from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and the committee will be updated on it in September. In conclusion, Mr. Ford stated that in today's meeting the committee members will hear updates on public involvement and on the upcoming Light Rail Transit design work and Sustainable City Year Program.

Ms. Leah Robbins, TriMet, gave a brief update on the LRT design work and Sustainable City Year Program. She stated that their project development teams are currently in the middle of the procurement process. Two contracts are being awarded (transit design and urban design), and hopefully those two entities will be formed into one consultant team. Ms. Robbins explained that the role of the consultant team would be to analyze preliminary proposed alignments and alternatives and use data from the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) to come up with strategies to avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts of the project before moving on to the project development phase.

#### **5.0 Public involvement updates**

Ms. Eryn Kehe, Metro, reminded the committee that the Southwest Corridor Community Advisory Committee's liaison will give updates from the June meeting in today's meeting. She also gave a brief update of recent community involvement efforts which included:

- Southwest Corridor Plan newsletter mailing
- Barbur Boulevard businesses outreach
- Attending several meetings - Southwest Neighborhoods, Inc. (SWNI) Transportation Committee, Far Southwest Neighborhood Association, Portland Planning land use, Westside Economic Alliance, Downtown Tigard Business Alliance, Beveland Street businesses meeting
- Meeting one-on-one with several property owners
- Tabling at Tigard Balloon Festival and Muslim Cultural Festival
- Presenting at St. Anthony's Church – outreach to Vietnamese and Spanish speaking parishioners

#### **6.0 Consideration of appointing a new member to the Southwest Corridor Community Advisory Committee**

**MOTION:** Co-chair Craig Dirksen moved to approve Vasilios Garyfallou, Barbur Boulevard business representative, as a new member to the Southwest Corridor Community Advisory Committee.

**ACTION:** Without any comments, the motion passed unanimously.

## 7.0 PCC connection and Railroad vs. I-5 (Tigard) briefings

Mr. Matt Bihn, Metro, gave a presentation on Portland Community College (PCC)-Sylvania shuttle connection options. He elaborated on the two current options which included:

- 53<sup>rd</sup> Avenue automated shuttle
- Barbur TC – Baylor shuttle

Mr. Bihn explained considerations for both of the connection options which included neighborhood impacts, travel time, transfer convenience, capital and operating costs (pending information). In terms of neighborhood impacts, the two options included:

### 53<sup>rd</sup> Avenue automated shuttle

- On-demand electric vehicles, so frequency would vary throughout the day
- Would be located on 53<sup>rd</sup> Avenue (currently low-traffic street)

### Barbur TC – Baylor shuttle

- Projected to add 18 buses per hour (peak) and 8 buses per hour (off-peak) to Capitol, Lesser, and Haines (which have existing bus routes)

Mr. Bihn summarized travel time and transfer convenience considerations which included:

### 53<sup>rd</sup> Avenue automated shuttle

- Barbur TC to PCC – 4 minutes
- Baylor to PCC – 5 minutes

### Barbur TC – Baylor shuttle

- Barbur TC to PCC – 4-7 minutes
- Baylor to PCC – 5-7 minutes

Mr. Bihn stated that additional pending information would include capital costs, operating costs, and any other findings from the DEIS.

The committee members raised questions about the type of riders who would be using 53<sup>rd</sup> Avenue and Baylor shuttles, how many stops would be there on campus, and requested more details on the bus service that would support PCC connection options.

Mr. Bihn continued his presentation by giving an overview of the Railroad and I-5 route options. Two proposed route options included:

### Railroad Option

- Crosses 72<sup>nd</sup> and Upper Boones
- Elevated at Bonita

### I-5 Option

- Crosses 72<sup>nd</sup> at grade
- Under Bonita and Upper Boones at grade

Mr. Bihn gave an overview of considerations for both of the options which included station locations, park & rides, travel time, property impacts, ridership, traffic analysis and potential DEIS findings (pending information). He summarized how each of the route options compared to each other in each consideration:

### Station locations

#### Railroad Option

- Bonita – Elevated station with stairs/elevator
- Upper Boones Ferry – At-grade

**I-5 Option**

- Bonita – At-grade (slightly below Bonita)
- Upper Boones Ferry – At-grade (slightly below Upper Boones)

**Travel time**

The Railroad alignment would be 30 seconds faster than the I-5 alignment.

**Projected Ridership (2035)**

- **Railroad** is faster, but an I-5 station would attract more riders at Bonita due to proximity to Kruse Way
- **I-5** would have 1% more line riders and 2% more new transit trips

**Park and Rides**

- **Railroad Option** – 100 spaces at Bonita, 50 spaces at Upper Boones Ferry
- **I-5 Option** – 150 spaces at Bonita, 600 spaces at Upper Boones Ferry

**Property impacts**

- **I-5 alignment** - 13 more acres of full or partial property acquisitions (30% higher)
- **Railroad alignment** - assumes a 25-foot buffer between LRT and freight rail tracks; if a 50-foot buffer is required the impacts would increase significantly

**Traffic impacts (at Upper Boones Ferry Road)**

- **Railroad** – At-grade crossing
- **I-5** – runs below grade passing under road, park and ride access

Mr. Bihn concluded his presentation with a reminder that additional traffic information and findings from DEIS are still pending and will be presented to the committee later on.

The committee members deliberated and asked to clarify information on reaching low income populations around the station locations, commented on not adding more constraints on the current service while working on lane considerations for the I-5 alignment option thus allowing future plans for development, and noted how the ability to build higher structures due to transit options can bring potential development opportunities for the largest landholder in Tigard. In addition, comments were made to highlight the differences for operational facilities for two of the alignment options.

Mr. Michael Kisor, Southwest Corridor Community Advisory Committee (SW CAC) liaison, also resident of Southwest Portland and bicycle and pedestrian advocate, presented on the SW CAC discussion on the PCC shuttle connection options.

Mr. Kisor stated that overall, committee members had more to say about the 53<sup>rd</sup> Avenue shuttle option, both positive and negative. The Barbur TC/Baylor Shuttle was seen as being more flexible and providing more connection options by connecting at two light rail stations. On the other side, strengths of the 53<sup>rd</sup> Avenue Shuttle included better reliability, a smaller carbon footprint, lower operating costs and interest in exploring a new technology. The committee shared several concerns about the 53<sup>rd</sup> Avenue shuttle including safety, for riders, neighbors, cyclists, pedestrians, pets and children on the street. There was also concern about neighborhood impacts, vehicle storage, wait times/frequency and potential congestion at the SW 53<sup>rd</sup> station. Concerns about the Barbur TC/Baylor shuttle included increased congestion on local arterials, a higher carbon footprint and less reliability.

**8.0 Downtown Tigard briefing**

Mr. Matt Bihn, Metro, presented to the committee the route choices for the Through and Branched route options in Downtown Tigard. Mr. Bihn stated that the Through Route choices included operating on either Clinton Street or Ash Street. He proceeded by comparing those two choices in the following categories:

**Travel time and ridership**

- Clinton: 1 minute 20 seconds faster
- Ash: 2% more line riders and new system trips

**Walkshed – Tigard Triangle**

- Clinton: 1 stop – smaller walkshed area
- Ash: 2 stops – larger walkshed area

**Property impacts, redevelopment potential, support of local plans**

- Clinton: 11% more acres of acquisitions, support Tigard HCT Land Use Plan
- Ash: more relocations, more residential impacts, two stations in Triangle – better support for Triangle Strategic Plan, support Tigard HCT Land Use Plan

**Traffic impacts**

- Clinton: less interaction with traffic in Triangle, but proximity of Hall intersection to 99W is a concern

**Pending information**

- Capital costs, traffic analysis, impacts to wetlands, displacements of residents and businesses, effects on communities

Mr. Bihn continued with an overview of the Branched Route choices which included operating on either Ash Street or Wall Street. He summarized the two choices by comparing them in the following categories:

**Travel time and ridership**

- Ash: 1 minute 48 seconds faster, 1% more line riders and 2% new system trips

**Property impacts, redevelopment potential, support of local plans**

- Wall: 15% more acres of acquisitions, supports Triangle Strategic Plan and Tigard HCT Land Use Plan
- Ash: more relocations, more residential impacts, support Triangle Strategic Plan and Tigard HCT Land Use Plan

**Traffic impacts**

- Ash: more at-grade street crossings

**Pending information:**

- Capital costs, traffic analysis, impacts to wetlands, displacements of residents and businesses, effects on communities

The committee members deliberated and asked for additional details about why Wall Street is selected for the branched route option and why proposing two stations in the Tigard Triangle. Mr. Bihn responded that the Wall Street option will have a fewer impacts on the Downtown Tigard and potential for future light rail extension. He added that the City of Tigard expressed interest in having two stations in Tigard Triangle for development that would benefit the entire area. The committee members commented on the need for two stations in Tigard Triangle, urged staff to look for alternate routes in place of Beveland Street, and emphasized the importance of connecting to other modes of transportation while looking for alternate route options.

**9.0 Barbur vs. I-5 briefing**

Mr. Matt Bihn, Metro, presented to the committee the route choices for the Barbur or Adjacent to I-5 route options. Mr. Bihn explained there are two choices leaving south Portland: center-running on Barbur Boulevard or adjacent to I-5. Once the alignment switches off Barbur to run adjacent

along to I-5, then it will stay along I-5. There will be no moving back and forth between the two alignments.

### **Roadway Character – Today**

- Gaps in sidewalks and bike lanes; spacing of protected pedestrian crossings insufficient for a pedestrian corridor; and in places, auto, bike, pedestrian lane widths not to ODOT or City of Portland guidelines

### **With adjacent to I-5 alignment:**

- Auto lanes largely unchanged, bike and sidewalk gaps filled but maybe not to guidelines, some pedestrian crossings added for stations; no corridor-length storm water treatment, street trees, lighting, fewer traffic and property impacts; and FTA funding eligibility uncertain for improvements to Barbur

### **With center-running alignment:**

- Complete rebuild of Barbur w/new auto, bike, pedestrian facilities designed to meet guidelines; new storm water, street trees, lighting, new pedestrian crossings, signalized intersections, wider profile requires more acquisitions

### **Auto operations**

#### **With adjacent to I-5 alignment:**

- Auto lanes, intersections, signals largely unchanged; gated crossing for LRT transition from Barbur, and at SW Spring Garden; some local circulation impacts (Multnomah near I-5, Spring Garden)

#### **With center-running alignment:**

- Preserves 2 through-lanes in each direction; removes center-turn lane where it exists; U-turns required to access businesses on opposite side; longer walk phases due to wider street; potential new signals and new pedestrian crossing

### **LRT operations – reliability**

#### **With adjacent to I-5 alignment:**

- LRT in exclusive ROW; not affected by signals, except at Spring Garden

#### **With center-running alignment:**

- Traffic signals to give LRT priority, but some delays for longer pedestrian crossings phases and longer left-turn/U-turn phases possible

### **LRT operations – travel time**

- Custer to 26<sup>th</sup>: adjacent to I-5 faster than center-running
- 26<sup>th</sup> to 60<sup>th</sup>: center-running faster than adjacent to I-5
- Zero to 80 seconds delay between Terwilliger and 60<sup>th</sup> due to signals on center-running

### **Pedestrian and biking environment**

#### **With adjacent to I-5 alignment:**

- Bike lane/sidewalk gaps filled, but still narrow in places; stations further away from most people; for most users, station access requires crossing all lanes

#### **With center-running alignment:**

- Corridor-length wide sidewalks and bike lanes; more protected pedestrian crossings; center platforms require crossing of 2 lanes for all users

Mr. Bihn explained that the wider width of crossing additional lanes for pedestrian environment (in addition to four lanes, plus platform, plus meridian), the signals will take longer with impacts traffic and signal operations.

**Quality of stations****With adjacent to I-5 alignment:**

- Stations further from most users, less visible, more isolated; less accessible to emergency responders; and visual impacts – structures and lighting

**With center-running alignment:**

- Stations closer to most users; more visible, less isolated; more accessible to emergency responders; possibly perceived as safer

**Redevelopment/Barbur Concept Plan****Barbur Concept Plan:**

- Calls for Barbur transition from highway to a “civic corridor”; key finding: HCT is critical to the vision; identifies focus areas that correspond to stations; proximity to envisioned redevelopment areas, better accessibility to more users, better visibility make center-running station platforms more likely to encourage redevelopment

The committee had questions and comments regarding the presentation, beginning with the impact on accessibility to the stations, for vehicle park-and-rides and buses. Mr. Bihn responded there would not be any real differences in design for either option; the model is not refined enough to show any differences. Another comment was about the center-running option, that businesses are concerned about safety aspect, taking away left turn into businesses. The vehicle impact of U-turns makes a longer path for people to cross, it also takes longer to make a U-turn, which means cars are waiting in line longer to make the U-turn. The tradeoff is safety vs accessibility of getting the cars through while waiting for pedestrians to cross to the platforms.

Committee members discussed the suggestion of having another physical tour, especially for Beveland Street, Ash and Wall, and the station at Bonita. A committee member expressed a concern regarding the viability of the dollars going forward to continue this project, and would like to have an update for potential revenue, providing information for how financially healthy the project is for at least another year. There will be challenges; the committee will need to come back for a much more thorough conversation. The project is currently funded to get to the DEIS. Staff will be evaluating the legislative transportation package; hopefully for the September meeting, more information will be provided. The idea of doing a route tour is very timely, especially now after receiving updates and analysis of the different alignments. It would be very helpful to have more in-depth diagrams/maps showing locations of stations, etc. for the tour. The chair observed perhaps a corridor tour could be provided before or in conjunction with the upcoming September committee meeting.

**10.0 Adjourn**

There being no further business, Co-chair Craig Dirksen adjourned the meeting at 11:09 a.m.

**Attachments to the Record:**

Item	Type	Document Date	Description	Document Number
1	Agenda	07/10/17	Meeting agenda	071017SWCSC-01
2	Summary	05/08/17	05/08/17 meeting summary	071017SWCSC-02
3	Document	06/01/17	Decision Briefing Book – PCC-Sylvania Shuttle	071017SWCSC-03
4	Document	05/18/17	Decision Briefing Book – Along the Railroad or I-5 in Tigard?	071017SWCSC-04

5	Document	06/05/17	CAC meeting June 5, 2017 – Key Considerations	071017SWCSC-05
6	Document	06/30/17	Decision Briefing Book – Downtown Tigard: Through Route	071017SWCSC-06
7	Document	06/30/17	Decision Briefing Book – Downtown Tigard: Branched Route	071017SWCSC-07
8	Document	06/30/17	Decision Briefing Book – On Barbur or Along I-5?	071017SWCSC-08
9	Email	07/10/17	Testimony from Michael Kisor (Loop hybrid proposal)	071017SWCSC-09