

# Agenda



**Metro**

600 NE Grand Ave.  
Portland, OR 97232-2736

Meeting: Southwest Corridor Plan Steering Committee  
Date: Monday, November 13, 2017  
Time: 9 to 11 a.m.  
Place: Council Chambers, Metro Regional Center, 600 NE Grand Ave., Portland  
Purpose: Receive updates on Southwest Corridor Plan schedule, SW Equitable Development Strategy, public involvement, and Community Advisory Committee meetings.  
Review visualizations of LRT project.

---

9 a.m. Welcome, introductions and partner updates Co-Chair Stacey

## **ACTION ITEM**

9:15 a.m. Consideration of the Steering Committee meeting summary From September 11, 2017 ACTION REQUESTED Co-Chair Stacey

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

9:20 a.m. Public Comment Co-Chair Stacey  
*Opportunity for citizens to provide short testimony and/or submit written comments to inform the Steering Committee decisions.*

## **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

9:35 a.m. Southwest Corridor schedule update Chris Ford, Metro & Dave Unsworth, TriMet  
*Latest information on the schedule for environmental review and selection of a preferred alternative, as well as the longer term schedule for design and funding.*  
***Discussion: Questions on changes to the project schedule?***

9:50 a.m. Equitable Development Strategy update Brian Harper, Metro  
*Report on recent and upcoming activities of the Southwest Equitable Development Strategy (SWEDS).*  
***Discussion: Questions on the process or expected outcomes of the SWEDS program?***

10:05 a.m. Public involvement updates Eryn Kehe, Metro  
Community Advisory liaison  
*Overview of recent and upcoming engagement activities, including the interactive map tool. Report back by liaison on October and November Community Advisory Committee (CAC) meetings. Request for one change to CAC membership.*  
***Discussion: Questions on recent and upcoming public involvement efforts?***

**ACTION ITEM**

10:25 a.m.      Consideration of appointing a new member to the      Co-Chair Dirksen  
SW Corridor Community Advisory Committee  
**ACTION REQUESTED** *Steering committee action to add a member to the CAC.*

**DISCUSSION ITEMS**

10:30 a.m.      Visualizations of station areas      Leah Robbins, TriMet  
*Review of illustrative concepts of potential station areas and other alignments.*  
***Discussion: Questions on what the light rail alignment might look like?***

11:00 a.m.      Adjourn

**Materials for 11/13/2017 meeting:**

- 9/11/2017 meeting summary

Meeting: Southwest Corridor Steering Committee  
 Date/time: Monday, September 11, 2017  
 Place: Metro Regional Center – Council Chamber, 600 NE Grand Avenue, Portland

---

### **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
Steve Witter	TriMet
Lou Ogden	City of Tualatin
Roy Rogers	Washington County
Dan Saltzman	City of Portland
Kelly Brooks	ODOT

### **Metro Staff Present**

Chris Ford, Matt Bihn, Eryn Kehe, Anthony Buczek, Malu Wilkinson, Lucy Folau, Chevy Pham.

### **1.0 Welcome and introductions**

Co-chair Craig Dirksen called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m. and welcomed the committee members and public to the meeting. Mr. Dirksen paid homage to the catastrophic events of the terrorist attack of 9/11. He then proceeded to outline the agenda for today's meeting: updates on the light rail project's environmental review, also the design and public involvement efforts, as well as some initial briefings on upcoming decisions with more information to come. Because there are no action items on today's agenda, the public comment period will be moved to the end of the agenda.

### **2.0 Consideration of the Steering Committee meeting summary from July 10, 2017.**

Co-chair Craig Dirksen asked the committee for approval of the meeting summary from July 10, 2017. With all in favor, the meeting summary was accepted unanimously. Committee members Clark, Gibson and Schirado were absent.

### **3.0 Southwest Corridor Plan updates**

Co-Chair Bob Stacey introduced Mr. Chris Ford, Metro, who provided an overview of the steps in the process along with Dave Unsworth, TriMet, providing an overview of the New Steps Rating process.

- Draft Environmental Impact Survey (DEIS): federally required environmental impact review, targeted for the end of 2017/beginning 2018.
- Southwest Transit Partners (SWTP): responsible for the design and costs, have hired consultants to improve on the design, helping to identify impact items for "avoid, minimize or mitigate" feasible options, through June 2018
- Land Use Final Order (LUFO): state legal issue process with more updates to come.
- Sustainable City Year Program (SCYP): TriMet agreement with University of Oregon; U of O teams with different jurisdiction cities for a year's worth of design, analysis and problem-solving; youthful, energetic students (architects, landscape architects, economists, policy) lead by faculty, who review issues, bring ideas and concepts: Marquam Hill connector, wetlands and storm water, affordable housing, redevelopment, etc. Also, PSU will have 12 capstone students focus on sustainable projects.
- SW Equitable Development Strategy (SWEDS): Metro has received a \$895,000 grant from FTA for equitable transit-oriented development, hired a consultant team, corridor-wide planning effort to ensure future development serves a wide range of people who live in the corridor, in terms of housing, economic, job opportunities. This is in parallel with equitable housing market and joint effort with Cities of Tigard and Portland, part of overall regional efforts.

**Upcoming Events:**

- October 2: CAC meeting
- October 9: SWC Steering Committee meeting (briefing book updates, SWEDS)
- November 6: instead of a CAC and/or a Steering Committee meeting, have a single, joint committee workshop, discuss values and opportunities.
- December 4: CAC meeting
- December 11: Steering Committee meeting.

**4.0 Initial Route Proposal (IRP)**

- MAP-21 transportation bill (2012) called for streamlining of environmental review
- New FTA standard operating procedure: "...the NEPA **preferred alternative** should be identified in the DEIS in order to give the public and Federal, State and local agencies, and tribal governments an opportunity to comment on the preferred alternative prior to FEIS/ROD publication."

## Preferred Alternative process

1. Project partner staff will identify an IRP: submit to FTA for acceptance
2. IRP included in Draft EIS: public and agency comment on IRP
3. Staff and CAC recommend a Preferred Alternative: based on public comment, analysis and key considerations; and, can be same as IRP, variation of IRP, or a new alignment.
4. Steering Committee recommend a Preferred Alternative (PA)
5. Affected agencies adopt/endorse the PA: Portland, Tigard, Tualatin, Washington County, Multnomah County, ODOT, TriMet. Metro will then adopt into Regional Transportation Plan Update.
6. FTA ultimately selects the PA: FTA will select our locally preferred alternative if we have regional consensus.

Co-chair Dirksen noted his concern that public perception might be the IRP would be the (final) route/alignment, without going through the public process, without accepting public comment first. He reiterated that the IRP is a FTA requirement as part of their process, and following that, the committee will continue to go through the process and do further analysis, take public comment, and take all of that into consideration before the final preferred route is made. After the release of the IRP, there will still be adjustment, refinement, and changes made based on further analysis.

**5.0 New Start Rating**

Mr. Dave Unsworth, TriMet, started his presentation with an explanation of the New Starts program. It is the largest discretionary fund of money from the federal Department of Transportation (USDOT) and is very competitive with large cities participating like Los Angeles, New York, etc.

**FTA New Starts Funding Information**

- Highly competitive program
- Successful projects are typically awarded up to 50% of total cost (80% for west side, 72% for yellow line, and 50% for orange line)
- Local funding commitment required; likely to include 2018 regional bond measure
- Complex rating system
- Need "medium-high" cost-effectiveness rating to qualify

**Variables in project budget**

- Capital Cost (cost-effectiveness rating); want to make sure the Initial Route Proposal (IRP) is affordable and will do well in the cost-effectiveness rating

- Operating cost: \$18m annual contribution by TriMet to operate the buses and light rail connection
- Projected ridership: light rail and bus daily riders are annualized for each year
- Local funding contribution

Committee members raised questions regarding absorbed costs including overhead. Mr. Unsworth explained these costs include the individuals who are directly involved with the running of and maintenance of the trains and buses, but does not include capital costs. Annual operating costs for a boarding rider is lower for a light rail than a bus rider with many more people on light rail than buses. Another committee member asked to define a “rider.” Mr. Unsworth noted that a “trip” is when someone boards and gets off; this is considered one trip and the return trip would be a second trip. A transfer to another line is an additional trip. No credit is received for pedestrians who walk up or biking to transit. Committee members commented on the need to attract ridership, and some said money needs to be spent on the ancillary components: bike and pedestrian improvements, access to stations, and additional bus routes to get people to light rail, and the payback is getting a boarding that counts towards the ratio.

### **6.0 Public involvement updates**

Ms. Eryn Kehe, Metro, introduced Mr. Roger Averbeck, Southwest Corridor Community Advisory Committee liaison, who would provide updates from the CAC meetings in July through September. She also gave a brief update of recent community involvement efforts which included:

- Tigard street fair and Latino festival
- Tualatin Crayfish festival
- Hillsdale farmer’s market
- Multnomah Days
- Tigard farmer’s market
- Tabling at St. Anthony’s Church – outreach to Vietnamese and Spanish speaking parishioners

Individual meetings with property owners also have occurred, involving Metro staff, TriMet staff and a member of corresponding city staff. Meetings with property owners are by request; they can contact Ms. Kehe. There will have been more than 20 meetings between April and the end of September. The project Facebook account has been reactivated to share information along with Twitter. Community Advisory Committee members are very committed, with great participation. Public participation has also been good with speakers during public comment. The committee has been learning about the various alignment alternatives, and discuss considerations they think are most important for each alternative.

Mr. Roger Averbeck, CAC liaison provided a summary for I-5 vs. Barbur and alternative for downtown Tigard. Top three considerations for I-5 vs. Barbur are: 1) pedestrian and bike safety, 2) demographics of future riders and who benefits from each of the alignment options, and 3) business vitality and livability in the community. Questions included the U-turns and limited left turns would affect people driving, walking or biking. And questions about which option best supports low income populations, the businesses and future development and livability in the corridor. Also some interest in how each option could leverage other transportation and development investments. More information is needed in the areas of ridership and costs. There was not agreement on which alignment choice is best, but related to more spending is needed and more information is needed as how each alignment supports or impacts to the Barbur Concept plan of 2013 as well as how Barbur will function as a civic corridor.

Regarding the Downtown Tigard options, considerations raised most often were:

- Minimizing impacts to existing businesses and residents,
- Traffic impacts near downtown, specifically the area near Hall, 99W and I-5,

- Desire for two stations in the Tigard Triangle,
- Consistency with the local plan,
- Connections to downtown Tigard and to other transit
- Impact to the wetlands,
- Travel time
- How the options serve vulnerable populations in existing city of Tigard retail.

There was not full agreement of how these alignments best achieve these outcomes, because the committee does not have all of the information needed. Co-chair Stacey was very complimentary of the great detail and careful consideration of the committee members.

Mr. Chris Ford, Metro, explained that the various briefing books and slide shows, considered “Version 1”, are essentially incomplete due to missing information that will be provided when the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is completed, such as property and traffic pacts. The next version of briefing books will begin to fill in the blanks.

### **7.0 Briefings on Naito vs. Barbur, Ross Island Bridgehead and Marquam Hill Connection**

Mr. Anthony Buczek, Metro, started his presentation with a summary of the Ross Island Bridgehead. The Naito option requires roadway reconfiguration at Ross Island Bridgehead. There are two options being studied.

#### **Barbur/Naito Route Choices:**

1. Barbur or Naito?
2. Naito option: requires roadway reconfiguration at Ross Island Bridgehead (two roadway options being studied)

#### **Naito Alignment**

- Requires modifications of roadway to add LRT
  1. Bridgehead A2-BH
  2. Limited Access A2-LA

#### **Existing Conditions: Local Access and Land Use**

- Neighborhood is split by Naito Parkway, I-5 and ramps
- Auto crossings of Naito only at Grover (underpass)
- Pedestrian/bike crossings at Grover (narrow sketchy tunnel) and Hooker Street pedestrian bridge (not ADA)
- Limited/obsolete pedestrian/bike facilities
- Confusing tangle of arterial traffic routes, including local streets
- Low levels of private investment

#### **Goals of South Portland Circulation Study (1978, 2001)**

- Reunite the Lair Hill community by reconnecting the east-west street grid across Naito Parkway
- Provide a sense of community by turning former rights-of-way currently used as bridge ramps and travel lanes into developable land for private investment in housing and commercial uses.
- Take non-local, regional traffic out of the heart of Lair Hill neighborhood by providing improved connections between the Ross Island Bridge, I-405, I-5 and Downtown.
- Respect the historic character of the Lair Hill neighborhood by encouraging development that is in keeping with the urban design motif of the neighborhood.
- Increase opportunities for multi-modal travel, including access to the Willamette River.

#### **Related ODOT Goals**

- Preserve and enhance highway to highway connections (US 26, Powell, Sunset Highway, Naito, I-405, I-5, and OR-43) for regional traffic movement through South Portland.
- Maintain and/or improve safety and operations.
- Avoid precluding future potential improvements to this area, including along I-405 and US-26.

**Naito/Bridgehead (A2-BH)**

- Adds median-running LRT on Naito
- Redirects SB traffic from Naito to Kelly
- Converts Naito to surface boulevard with signalized crossings at five locations
- Eliminates use of neighborhood streets as ramps
- Converts Naito interchanges to intersections
- Adds bike/pedestrian facilities
- Reclaims 2.8 acres of redevelopment

**Naito/Limited Access (A2-LA)**

- Adds median-running LRT on Naito
- Largely maintains existing highway configuration
- Adds signal at Naito and Gibbs to allow crossings
- Removes Grover Street underpass
- Reconstructs and enlarges ramps
- Adds bike facilities

Mr. Averbeck presented the CAC considerations regarding the Naito vs. Barbur and the Ross Island Bridgehead, with the focus on the Bridgehead and the potential positive impacts on the South Portland neighborhood. The CAC wanted to understand who would have property impacts, both residents and businesses, with each choice, and learn more about who might benefit from each alternative. Another concern was, what would be the cost of the Bridgehead project, and what would be the impact of implementation vs. amenities and opportunities for the rest of the Corridor project.

Steering committee member comments included the observation that the Ross Island Bridgehead project, specifically alignment A2-BH, should be seen as an attempt to fix a significant mistake of 30 years ago, and now is the time to fix this, if we can. Is the Bridgehead only for the Naito alignment and not for Barbur? Mr. Buczek noted the Naito alignment necessitates the Bridgehead configuration; cannot add light rail to Naito without some consideration. By building light rail on Barbur, the Bridgehead would probably not be a component of the transit project. Is this a long-term plan with ODOT? Mr. Buczek explained the Bridgehead is a project of the City of Portland, but is currently not funded. If incorporated into the SW Corridor project, what would it do to the New Starts rating and total amount of money available? Mr. Buczek explained if it becomes part of the transit project, potentially reduce the project's rating and increase the project's overall costs. Another comment was: Portland traffic analysis is complex and important, the Bridgehead is a critical location and want to make sure that whatever goes in does not make it worse.

Mr. Matt Bihn, Metro, began with his first briefing on Barbur vs. Naito Alignments. He elaborated on the two current options which included:

**Barbur or Naito?****Both:**

- Marquam Hill connector
- Hooley pedestrian bridge access
- Shared transitway

**Naito only:**

- Lincoln Station

**Travel Time**

- Barbur alignment is faster by one minute 10 seconds, largely due to Lincoln Station with Naito alignment.

**Reliability/complexity**

- Existing Orange line track crossover requires one vehicle at a time.
- Both SW Corridor alternatives introduce additional LRT vehicles through crossover

**Naito**

- Merge with Orange line four blocks away from crossover

**Barbur**

- Merge with Orange line close to crossover

**Line ridership**

- Barbur: 41,600
- Naito: 40,900

**New transit system trips**

- Barbur: 17,800
- Naito: 16,300

**Station activity – Lincoln (Naito)**

- 700 daily walk-ons and offs (2035)
- 1,800 daily transfer to/from Orange line (2035) (at Lincoln station)
- Better connection for Orange line transfers (platform to platform)
- Worse connection for Yellow line transfers (walk a block to connect at Jackson)
- Orange/Yellow line: +1,150 riders with Naito vs. Barbur

**Station activity – Gibbs**

- Barbur: 7,800 walk-ons and offs (closer to Marquam Hill; accessible via stairs & ADA ramps, as well as elevators and sky bridge to VA)
- Naito: 6,600 walk-ons and offs (closer to South Waterfront; theoretically includes new growth of facilities at South Waterfront)

Information still to come includes: property impacts (such as tree removal at Lair Hill Park vs. the right-of-way at Dunaway Park), capital costs, traffic analysis, redevelopment potential, relationship to Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Limited Access.

Committee members raised questions regarding travel time table showing 1:10 difference, does this take in to consider the crossover delays of either alignment? Mr. Bihn explained it should, based on the alignment, how long it takes to stop at a station. Another question concerned the additional Lincoln Station stop, what is the average time that a train is considered to be at that stop. Mr. Bihn noted the plans use a standard of 30 seconds, and includes slowing down coming in and speeding up leaving the station.

Mr. Averbeck provided the CAC considerations regarding Naito vs. Barbur: support and interest in the simplicity in easy transfer to the Orange line/Lincoln station, also interest in bike and pedestrian connectivity in the same area, potential for neighborhood improvements, concern for access for Marquam Hill employees, notable difference between two stations on Gibbs are two blocks apart, account for ADA accessibility. A comment was made that Barbur is already well-served by buses, and Naito is not. Also, that one minute time difference taken by the extra station is not that significant in someone's commute.

Steering committee comments indicated it is clear further cost benefit analysis is needed for consideration of these alignments. Reconfiguration of Naito to include Ross Island Bridgehead is going to add significantly to project costs without providing direct benefit to light rail riders. If the Naito alignment is used, would the existing Naito overcrossing of I-405 be utilized? Mr. Bihn stated it would be a new structure. Which of these alignments provide better connection to the new Division BRT? Teresa Boyle, City of Portland, explained that transit is slated to come from South Waterfront, up Lincoln to 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue and it would have a bus stop adjacent to Lincoln light rail station.



Mr. Matt Binh, Metro, continued with his second briefing by introducing the four options for Marquam Hill Connections, how they work and are physically different.

### **Marquam Hill Connector**

- Connection to jobs and services on Marquam Hill, with either Barbur or Naito alignment
- 10,000 daily trips projected on 2035
- About six minutes walking time
- Four connection options

### **Marquam Hill**

- Congested auto connections; limited parking
- Heavy transit usage: lines 8, 61, 64, 65, 66 68, C190, and tram
- Connection target: Kohler Pavilion

### **Kohler Pavilion**

#### **9<sup>th</sup> floor, access to:**

- Tram terminal
- OHSU Hospital
- Hatfield Research Center
- VA (skybridge)
- Doernbecher (skybridge)
- Sam Jackson Park Road

#### **7<sup>th</sup> floor:**

- Large, open entry area
- Multiple access/exit points

**Option 1A: Elevator/Bridge and Path, 3<sup>rd</sup> floor access (Upper Campus Drive across the street from Kohler)** ends under the tram and cannot reach the 7<sup>th</sup> floor elevators.

**1B: Elevator/Bridge and Recessed Path, 7<sup>th</sup> floor access** underpass that goes underneath Terwilliger with ADA ramps and recessed path, with two sets of elevators.

**1C: Elevator/Bridge and Tunnel, 7<sup>th</sup> floor access** path from near Barbur, elevator and underpass at Terwilliger, then stays at that level until it reaches the second elevator to the 7<sup>th</sup> floor. Distance is approximately 700 feet.

**2: Full Tunnel, 7<sup>th</sup> floor access** under Terwilliger without access to Terwilliger; most expensive plan, and will have the most construction impacts (trees, etc.) above ground with roads up to excavation site. Bicycle and pedestrian access tunnel.

The committee members raised questions about a rough estimate of the number of feet from Barbur to the elevator that goes up to Kohler. Mr. Binh noted the entire distance is approximately 700 feet. Mr. Chris Ford stated that FTA is mainly interested in the rail alignment and train routes. The Marquam Hill connector is a complex decision, and like the PCC connection, is separate from the Initial Route Proposal. More time is available to determine best transit connections and local support for these projects. Another question related to ADA compliant improvements for people walking from Naito or Barbur. Mr. Binh explained that whether from Naito or Barbur, there would be improvements to the stairways and installing ramps.

Mr. Averbeck provided the CAC considerations regarding the Marquam Hill connector: concerns raised were costs, security, connectivity and access. Seems to be a preference of getting to the 7<sup>th</sup> floor matching OHSU's preference, focusing on choices 1.B and 1.C, rather than 1.A. Safety and security in any tunnel situation was highly discussed. Lighting or cameras may or may not resolve those concerns and may have to post staff at the tunnel entrance, and who will pay for staff, be responsible for maintenance of the tunnel. Another topic was bike use, accessing the tunnels and elevators, and elevators large

enough to accommodate bikes. Also redundancy is needed with multiple elevators in case one is down for maintenance. Regardless of Barbur or Naito alignment, accommodation is needed to get people safely across Barbur.

### **8.0 Public Comment**

Mr. Gerald Fox, a current Corridor resident and user of OHSU, stated he is a proponent of a direct tunnel station with a complex elevator system from Barbur or Naito. Transit users access the hospitals include an unusually large proportion of elderly and impaired; the current proposal is wildly inappropriate to serve the requirements of hospital access. All the options present an obstacle course of inclined walkways and elevators, requiring physical stamina, and expose users to rain, winter cold and summer heat. Mr. Fox proposed four considerations: 1) The light rail line needs to serve the hospitals directly, like the (red) Airport line does. 2) A moving walkway or inclined elevator (or combination) should be provided, or a second tram. 3) The connector must be protected from weather, preferably enclosed and air conditioned. 4) Dropping the tunnel station prematurely should be revisited for comparison with the other options.

Mark McGirr, president of Atiyeh Brothers Carpet, located on Bonita Road between Sequoia Parkway and I-5. The business has been at this location since 2001. Any of the four of the six I-5 light rail alignment choices, in the areas of Tigard south to Bridgeport Village, specifically C1, C3, C5, and C6, are chosen, several businesses including Atiyeh Brothers, would be severely impacted. The two railroad alignment choices (C2 and C4) would not have the same impact on these businesses, including Paul Shatz Furniture, The Portland Clinic, The Home Depot, Courtyard by Marriott and others. Over 1,000 jobs would be affected along with customers and patients, and related revenue for the City of Tigard.

Mr. Anton Vetterlein, representing the Friends of Terwilliger, is addressing the Marquam Hill connector. The connector proposals are largely located in Terwilliger Parkway, a large historic city park designed by the Olmstead Brothers over 100 years ago, and it needs to be preserved and protected, which is the mission of the Friends of Terwilliger. The most efficient connector directly as possible to OHSU would be the tunnel proposal. The connection proposals to Terwilliger would have significant impacts to the Parkway by either tree removal or hard infrastructure (ramps, bridges, stairs, trenches, retaining walls). Option 2, the tunnel option, seems to have the least impact on the Parkway, although some work could be done to minimize tree removal. The Terwilliger Parkway Corridor Plan was adopted by the City of Portland in 1983, and Goal A is to “preserve and enhance the scenic character and natural beauty of Terwilliger Parkway and Boulevard”. That should be one of the considerations, that they do no harm to the Parkway, and needs to be studied much more closely to minimize that impact altogether.

Mr. Robert Davidson, Minuteman Press (Tigard), is generally representing businesses on Beveland Street, and would like to remind the committee that they are concerned about the outcome of this process. The Beveland Street alignment, less than a quarter mile, virtually impacts or destroys 10 to 15 buildings of small businesses and building owners, most are owner occupied, many have space leased to additional tenants, representing 20-25 businesses and approximately 100 employees. A readily available alternative route, less than two blocks away, with minimal impacts on existing structures, as is mostly current vacant property, a route that would not remove Beveland businesses. “Avoid and minimize” would fail if the proposed route is followed; “mitigate” would buy us out and disrupt our existing businesses and livelihoods.

Mr. Ben Drasin, a resident of Lair Hill, represents his neighbors who are concerned regarding the Barbur vs. Naito and the optional Bridgehead reconfiguration, as it relates to walk-up ridership from South Waterfront would be affected because the current pedestrian crossings on Naito are so poor. Secondly, OHSU is served by a large piece of public infrastructure, and building another large public-

funded infrastructure to support a single employer, seems like a heavy lift, and would like to know if they are going to cover any of the costs, in regards to safety and maintenance.

A committee member asked to clarify an earlier question regarding the 700 to 800 feet distance from Barbur to the elevator (as in Option 2 with the full tunnel), and for options 1.C or 1.B, what is the walking distance when using all the ramping, it does look like it doubles the distance. Mr. Bihn explained with the tunnel option, it is relatively flat with one elevator, while 1.C. is flat with two elevators. The ramps are used only to get to and from Terwilliger. 1.A. tries to stay on the surface, and does include ramps and stairs. Mr. Dave Unsworth, TriMet, was asked to explain again how ridership is determined for cost per rider for federal funding. Mr. Unsworth responded with as an example, someone going from Tigard to Gresham, would be one trip, and returning from Gresham to Tigard would be a second trip. There will be trade-offs for capital costs; make sure it is cost-effective using the ridership and estimates of capital costs.

### 9.0 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	09/11/17	SWC SC September Meeting Agenda	091117SWCSC-01
2	Summary	07/10/17	SWC SC July Meeting Summary	091117SWCSC-02
3	Document	09/01/17	July 2016 through July 2017 Public Engagement Summary	091117SWCSC-03
4	Document	09/01/17	Appendix A: Collection of SWC Stories & Metro Newsfeeds June through August 2017	091117SWCSC-04
5	Document	07/31/17	Appendix B: Southwest Corridor Earned Media Coverage June 7, 2016 - July 31, 2017	091117SWCSC-05
6	Document	08/29/17	FTA New Starts Rating	091117SWCSC-06
7	Document	07/31/17	Decision Briefing Book - Naito vs. Barbur	091117SWCSC-07
8	Document	07/31/17	Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration Option Overview	091117SWCSC-08
9	Document	08/30/17	Decision Briefing Book - Marquam Hill Connections	091117SWCSC-09
10	Document	09/01/17	Public Input July through August 2017	091117SWCSC-10
11	Testimony	09/11/17	Testimony - Gerald Fox, LRT Connections to Marquam Hill	091117SWCSC-11
12	Document	09/01/17	Public Input July through August 2017	091117SWCSC-12