



Southwest Corridor Plan Steering Committee
Monday, December 8, 2014
9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.
Tigard Public Works Auditorium

Committee Members Present

Craig Dirksen, Co-chair
Bob Stacey, Co-chair
Marc Woodard
Steve Novick
Lou Ogden
Denny Doyle
Krisanna Clark
Gery Schirado
Al Reu
Roy Rogers
Neil McFarlane
Rian Windsheimer

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

Metro Staff

Malu Wilkinson, Elissa Gertler, Noelle Dobson, Matt Bihn, Michaela Skiles, Brian Harper, Alan Gunn, Camille Freestone, Noah Siegel, Mei Yong

1.0 Welcome and introductions

Co-chair Stacey called the meeting to order at 9:01 a.m. and welcomed the committee members and audience to the meeting. He asked that the committee members introduce themselves, and then gave an outline of the upcoming agenda. He emphasized the meeting's focus on the Shared Investment Strategy.

2.0 Consideration of the Steering Committee meeting summary from June 9, 2014

Co-chair Stacey asked for a motion to approve the meeting summary from the June 9, 2014 Southwest Corridor Plan Steering Committee meeting if there were no edits. Commissioner Steve Novick moved to accept the summary without revisions, and Mr. Neil McFarlane seconded the motion. The meeting summary was accepted unanimously.

3.0 Public Comment

Ms. Marianne Fitzgerald expressed disappointment in the speed of the planning process. She felt that there was a lack of productivity over the summer and fall, and worried that with the multi-layered planning process, no real progress towards construction would be made.

Mr. Roger Averbeck, representing SW Neighborhoods Inc (SWNI), expressed concern about the lack of project engagement with SWNI. He noted that they had not been included in any of the stakeholder conversations over the summer and fall, and they would like to be incorporated in future engagement as an important stakeholder in the area.

Mr. Kevin Watkins noted the amount of growth that has taken place in Tigard but explained that until recently infrastructure had kept pace. He suggested that the committee continue pursuing an integrated, reliable transportation system for the growing area. He further explained that the area will need better transit and other transportation infrastructure as it continues to grow. Additionally, he pointed out two fallacies which he believed helped pass Measure 34: light rail would come down Pacific Highway and no public involvement would be done.

Mr. Doug Allen, representing AORTA, requested that the committee reconsider the AORTA proposed option, which he believed needed to be included as an alternative. He cited three reasons that staff have given regarding why the proposal has not been included: there would be no acceptable staging area for a south waterfront tunnel portal, the cost of tunneling would be too high, and the travel time via south waterfront would be excessive. Mr. Allen refuted each of these reasons and asked that the AORTA alternative be considered and studied. (See written comments attached to the record.)

Mr. Mike Stevenson, owner of B&B Print Source, discussed the increasing costs of doing business in the corridor. He explained that previously his company had operated with two delivery trucks. Recently a third truck needed to be added to make deliveries more efficient due to the increasing traffic congestion. He felt favorably towards light rail, but also suggested roadway improvements. He emphasized the ways that traffic negatively affects businesses in the area.

Ms. Sue Christenson gave six points in support of the system: all development is due to innovation, it is important to start now, economics, housing, connectivity, and health and livability. (See written comments attached to the record.)

Mr. Steve Schopp explained that he has followed the project for some time. He expressed concern about the vagueness of the process since the DEIS was postponed. He noted that the design process has been long and the public has been involved, but the process has been continually changed and the DEIS has been pushed back multiple times. Mr. Schopp expressed the belief that the public did not support the planning expenditure, and that there was a lack of trust between the project and the public. He also raised concern over a large capital expenditure with the lack of funding for basic road maintenance. He asked for information about the amount spent on the project and the amount that will be spent. He also asked for a clear and specific description of the process.

Mr. Ralph Hughes questioned the stability of a tunnel if a seismic event were to take place. He suggested that the vote in Tigard not be considered too large an obstacle due to the small turnout of voters and the slim margin of success. He asked that the voters be shown the facts and allowed to make their own decisions.

Ms. Elise Shearer approached her comments from a social justice perspective. She pointed out the need for better transit in Tigard, especially for those that rely on transit as their main mode of transportation. She noted that there are three major employment centers in Tigard that need better connections, and there are other areas for potential growth in the city. She also discussed the need for TOD around employment centers. She noted the average cost of owning a car and the need to make transportation more affordable.

Mr. Tim Esau explained that he was not totally opposed to light rail and mass transit. He did, however, note that he did not believe light rail was the right answer for the corridor currently. He expressed concern about the changing schedule and asked about the project's overall effectiveness. He also expressed concern about the availability of funding for the project. He asked that instead of light rail, increased local bus service and improved roads be considered as solutions. (See written comments attached to the record.)

Mr. Marland Henderson noted that Tigard is a young city in comparison to many others in the region. He explained that this lack of history sometimes denotes a lack of processes. Mr. Henderson discussed Measure 34 and explained that the vote was lost by only a few percentage points, and he felt that the measure had been unclear and difficult for the voters to understand. He asked that in future votes the explanation on the ballot be made very clear, so voters know what they will receive for their money. (See written comments attached to the record.)

Ms. Debi Mollahan pointed out her own commuting experience as a template for commuting in the region. She noted the high percentage of Tigard residents that commute out of the city for employment, and the high number of employees who commute into Tigard from elsewhere. She discussed the need for reliable business delivery and commuting options in the corridor. She asked that the committee continue exploring innovative solutions that integrate many modes into an effective system. (See written comments attached to the record.)

Mr. Tom Murphy explained that one of Tigard residents' top concerns is traffic congestion, and noted that high capacity transit is a component of alleviating congestion. He also explained how high capacity transit could weave Tigard into the regional fabric, and complements its goal of walkability. He asked that Measure 34 not be considered the final word, and staff give the citizens a well-reasoned, visionary, comprehensive, and transparent plan.

Ms. Dianne Cassidy, a citizen of Lake Oswego, noted the impacts this project could have on Lake Oswego and refuted the previous comment that asserted that transit is beneficial for social justice. She asserted that automobiles are, in fact, more beneficial to social justice. Ms. Cassidy also asserted that transit oriented development does not work, as many people do not live and work in the same area and frequently change jobs. She also expressed concern about the last mile of trips, where the bus and train cannot take riders into their neighborhoods or directly to their places of business.

Mr. David Jorling approached his comments from a global warming perspective. He asked that the committee and audience read "This change everything," and consider light rail as a part of the solution to global warming.

4.0 Southwest Corridor: solving our transportation challenges

Mr. Matt Bihn reviewed the impetus for this project and the selection of this corridor as a priority. He consolidated the reasoning behind its selection into four main areas.

- High travel demand through and across the corridor paired with population and employment growth
- Lack of transportation choices
- Safety issues
- Congestion and reliability problems

He gave an overview of each of these areas, with special attention on the data that allows for modeling of travel times and reliability in the corridor. He then outlined the integrated strategies pulled from the Shared Investment Strategy that offer solutions to some of the problems in the corridor.

- Roadway projects
- Bike and pedestrian projects
- Local bus service improvements
- High capacity transit options
- Park projects

Co-chair Dirksen called for questions from the committee.

Commissioner Roy Rogers inquired about the Powell-Division project and asked if the two corridor projects will compete at the federal level for funding. Mr. Bihn and Co-chair Stacey explained that it is unlikely that the two projects will be competing for the same type of federal funding, and also somewhat unlikely that they will run on the same timeline. Commissioner Rogers also asked about the total cost of exploring the preferred solutions. He asked that the committee be transparent with potential costs of projects and planning.

He explained that he has been asked, if light rail is not selected, to build more roads, but many people do not understand that there is no money for roads.

5.0 Approach to develop a Preferred Package of Solutions

Mr. Alan Lehto, TriMet, explained the reasoning behind changing the order of the project process. He noted that when a project enters into a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) it essentially requires that the design be frozen in its current state, and it leaves little room for refinement and responsiveness. Thus, it is more viable to further refine in a way that is responsive to everyone's needs before entering the federal process.

He also explained how high capacity transit could allow TriMet to redeploy local buses to other places in the corridor and increase local connections.

Mr. McFarlane noted his belief that this new process will allow the project to be more flexible and made more sense in the current situation. Mr. Lehto added that many projects have been done in this process order throughout the country, but none have been done here.

Per Commissioner Roger inquiries, Mr. McFarlane explained that the region has precedents for supporting more than one transit project at a time, and Co-chair Stacey noted that this project was prioritized higher than other corridor projects through a process that focused on areas with the highest potential demand and ridership.

Commissioner Rogers also inquired about the possibility of this project evolving into a stand alone project on Barbur Blvd that could eventually connect to Tigard and Tualatin. Mr. McFarlane noted that this was possible, but the committee could shape the process and evolution of the project.

6.0 Activating the Shared Investment Strategy

A. Proposed Recommendation Timeline

Ms. Malu Wilkinson gave an overview of the timeline handed out. She noted that the refinement process will help resources to be used most efficiently and will narrow the scope of work prior to entering the federal process. She explained the project's goal of addressing transit and transportation needs today while shaping development and transportation in the future. By 2016 staff plans to have a preferred package ready for steering committee consideration.

Ms. Wilkinson then outlined the questions given to the staff by the Steering Committee last June and explained that staff plans to bring back the answers as the geographically relevant questions come up during place-focused discussions. She also explained that the project will engage in significant public engagement over the next 18 months. She then went over the areas covered during each time period of the next year and a half and laid out the overall needs for the final preferred package. She also noted there needs to be discussion about how local projects that are not part of the high capacity transit, but are complementary to the corridor's connections, will be funded.

Commissioner Novick inquired about the level of flexibility built into the schedule for the next 18 months and the committee's ability to make decisions as certain technical information becomes available. Ms. Wilkinson and Co-chair Dirksen pointed out that conversations can start prior to the committee being prepared to make a decision.

Mayor Denny Doyle asked about staff's confidence in the project's ability to achieve the timeline. Ms. Wilkinson responded that staff feels confident in the work, but wants the time to engage with the public and have community conversations.

B. Place-focused development strategy

At this point, this agenda item was deferred to the next meeting due to time constraints.

7.0 Proposed engagement to support decisions

Ms. Noelle Dobson introduced herself to the committee and reviewed the work she has done since joining the team in August 2014. She then gave an overview of the outreach approach and tools.

The integrated approach will:

- Focus on outcomes and integrated solutions
- Highlight places
- Aim to capture hearts and minds
- Leverage partner expertise and outreach experience
- Two way communication

The tools include:

- Series of local dialogues
- Storytelling
- Map-based online comment tool
- Online resource/social media
- Creative youth engagement

8.0 Direction on SWCP approach

Co-chair Stacey explained that the last direction given to staff was to enter the DEIS, and that direction must be formally changed.

Mayor Doyle moved to direct project staff to change the sequence of Southwest Corridor Plan milestones to develop a locally-driven preferred package of transportation solutions by spring 2016. Councilor Marc Woodard seconded the motion.

Commissioner Rogers inquired about increased costs due to the delay of the DEIS. Ms. Wilkinson explained that because DEIS level work will aim to be done during this phase or else delayed until the DEIS is started, the cost should be the same.

Mayor Schirado expressed concern that Multnomah County was no longer a stakeholder in the process, and was no longer represented on the committee. Co-chair Stacey explained that Multnomah County ceded much of their transportation program and responsibility to Portland and now focuses most of their transportation efforts on maintaining their bridges.

The motion then passed unanimously.

9.0 Adjourn

Co-chair Dirksen noted that the next meeting would be on February 9, 2015 and adjourned the meeting at 11:00 a.m.

Meeting summary respectfully submitted by:

<SIGN HERE FOR FINAL VERSION>

Camille Freestone

DRAFT

Attachments to the Record:

Item	Type	Document Date	Description	Document Number
1	Agenda	12/08/14	December meeting agenda	120814swcpssc-01
2	Summary	06/09/14	06/09/14 meeting summary	120814swcpssc-02
3	Memo	12/08/14	SW Corridor Plan DEIS timing	120814swcpssc-03
4	Calendar	11/26/14	Meeting topic/Engagement calendar	120814swcpssc-04
5	Document	Nov. 2014	Winter 2014 project update	120814swcpssc-05
6	Map	12/01/14	HCT Options for Further Study map	120814swcpssc-06
7	Comment	12/08/14	Public comment: Doug Allen	120814swcpssc-07
8	Comment	12/08/14	Public comment: Marland Henderson	120814swcpssc-08
9	Comment	12/08/14	Public comment: Debi Mollahan	120814swcpssc-09
10	Comment	12/08/14	Public comment: Tim Esau	120814swcpssc-10
11	Comment	12/08/14	Public comment: Sue Christenson	120814swcpssc-11
12	Comment	12/08/14	Public comment: Laura Sciortino	120814swcpssc-12
13	Comment	12/08/14	Public comment: Pam Chandler	120814swcpssc-13
14	PPT	12/08/14	SW Corridor Challenges and Opportunities	120814swcpssc-14
15	PPT	12/08/14	Proposed recommendation timeline	120814swcpssc-15
16	PPT	12/08/14	SWCP Outreach	120814swcpssc-16

DRAFT