

## Southwest Corridor Plan – Portland Working Group (PWG) Meeting #2 Summary

January 6, 2014 - 6:00-8:00 p.m.  
Multnomah Arts Center, Room 30

**Meeting Materials:** Draft Southwest Corridor Plan Purpose and Need  
Draft Southwest Corridor Plan Steering Committee January 13, 2014 Agenda  
Southwest Corridor Plan - Portland Working Group Charter  
Project development overview flow chart

### **Introductions and housekeeping items**

**Joan Frederiksen with the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability (BPS)** opened the meeting at 6:05pm, welcomed attendees and led off the introductions. Attendees introduced themselves and stated their respective interests.

Joan asked for any comments or questions on the Portland Working Group (PWG) Charter or the meeting summary from December 2, 2013. No questions or comments. The summary and charter will be finalized and posted online.

Joan also reminded participants of the opportunity to share concerns and ideas about bus service in southwest Portland at the upcoming TriMet Southwest Service Enhancement Plan Workshop planned for January 23, 2014, from 6:30 to 8:30 pm in the Multnomah Arts Center Auditorium.

### **Southwest Corridor Plan - Refinement Phase Overview, Draft Purpose and Need and Draft 1/13/14 Steering Committee Agenda**

**Malu Wilkinson with Metro** presented information on the Southwest Corridor Plan refinement phase including an overview of the calendar of events for refinement phase. Malu highlighted that this phase is refining roadway, parks and habitat areas in addition to the high capacity transit. At the end of this phase a decision is expected from the Steering Committee as to whether we should continue to study High Capacity Transit (HCT) and if yes, what it should look like. She also noted that we can't afford to study all the current options so a narrowed list of options is needed. Part of this work is being done in partnership with TriMet who is helping with the alignment design options and related analysis.

Metro is currently working towards a March 2014 opportunity to get community guidance on the alignment design options, taking that feedback to the Steering Committee in April to continue the narrowing discussion. Based on the March and April work and community forum feedback, a joint staff (Metro and jurisdiction and agency partners) recommendation is planned for the May Steering Committee. Metro aims to have a decision on this in July and then move into the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) scoping and process.

A number of questions were asked by participants related to the Implementation and Development Southwest (ID SW) group, including its purpose, level of influence and coordination opportunities with the PWG. Malu responded that the purpose of ID SW is to engage other voices – such as

institutions and larger business owners in the corridor – and begin to build a foundation for the kind of public-private partnerships that will be needed to bring the Southwest Corridor Plan to fruition. She noted that it is a type of group that has not been convened before. It is an opportunity to build support for the land use visions in the corridor.

Malu also noted that ID SW is a subcommittee of the Steering Committee. ID SW meetings are open to the public and meeting summaries will be prepared and available. ID SW discussion concepts will be presented to the Steering Committee. The value of ID SW feedback is not any greater than that of the PWG or other community forum feedback, rather it is feedback from a different set of stakeholders, and there is no conflict in reaching out to different groups.

Meeting summaries from future ID SW meetings were requested for PWG meetings.

Malu then covered the upcoming January 13, 2014 Steering Committee agenda. That meeting will include an update on TriMet's SW Service Enhancement Plan, an update on multimodal project narrowing approach, action on creation of ID SW and the Purpose and Need statement. Malu notes that all the options and projects that are being considered and analyzed will be evaluated through the Purpose and Need statements. Phase 1 of this plan had a Purpose and Need but since then we've narrowed the area of transit service. This is reflected in the current Purpose and Need draft along with an expanded set of goals related to economic development, housing options and accessibility from this housing to transit. The current draft Purpose and Need was shared at the November 6, 2014 forum and an online survey was also available for input. If there is a regional decision to move forward there will be a DEIS scoping phase in the summer and the Purpose and Need statement will be reviewed again and updated.

Participants also had the following questions and comments:

- Not knowing much about mass transit planning seems to be one handicap for the community. Can we have a primer on transit planning? Malu responded that there are similar sentiments among some project partners. A station location planning 101 is being planned for staff. A similar type of training might be of interest for this group as well.
- The Newberry bridge work seems to be in conflict with SW Corridor Plan and that we might spend the money twice. Malu responded that there are problems with the bridges right now related to safety. Dealing with these problems gets at concerns for cars today. The SWC is a long term planning effort and we don't know if we're going to do work on those bridges. It is not uncommon to have to make choices about spending dollars on doing immediate safety fixes and considering longer term investments on those same roads/stretches. We don't know yet if we will have these HCT improvements in 15 years, and we have safety issues now.
- Are any of the Central City planning issues being considered in this process? Denver Igarta of PBOT responded that we have regular check-ins with the central city planners in BPS and PBOT. I-405 is a boundary – but both the SWC and CentralCity2035 planning efforts don't want to leave it as barrier.
- Are there any efforts to reduce the noise? Malu responded that if we go into a DEIS, noise is one of the issues that will be looked at. Kirstin Pennington with ODOT is also available to discuss this further after the meeting.

**Denver Igarra with the Portland Bureau of Transportation (PBOT)** presented information on the Southwest Corridor Plan recommended roadway and active transportation projects. He noted that Anthony Buczek with Metro would also briefly present information on how the transportation projects were being narrowed as part of the HCT analysis work.

Denver then reiterated the purpose of the PWGs work on the 34 Portland projects was to help develop a process by which to gauge the level of community support for the Portland projects. A public event in April 2014 is expected to provide an opportunity for community members to relay these priorities. This will not only feed into the SWC work but also inform next steps on projects from the City's perspective.

After the April public event some next steps might include coordination with other agencies, look how we might match projects with funding opportunities and refine descriptions and costs to update things like the Transportation System Plan (TSP).

Denver noted that tonight the list of projects would be discussed to see if there are any that might be broken up/segmented or phased. A priority can then be given to a part or the whole project. It might be more feasible to identify funds for smaller segments of projects. Denver noted that the plan is looking at HCT ten plus years out. We'd like to look at which ones we might be able to start implementing before the transit build timeline.

Next meeting there will be a focus on what information we can share with the public at the spring event that will help them understand or decide on priorities, whether criteria, considerations, costs, etc.

Before going into the specific projects Denver gave an overview of how a project develops and gets to construction. Typical phases of project development:

- Planning: scope the concept, very high level cost estimate; general level of support from community
- Design: most of the engineering happens, scope is refined, funding sources can then be investigated
- Construction: final engineering, contracts, build

Each of the projects on the SWC list is at different a place in this spectrum of project development. This means that there are varying levels of detail developed for each project. Some will require more project development, public outreach, or design work, etc. Some projects can be phased by where they are in the project development spectrum, others might also be divided into segments or partial improvements. PBOT would like to get to the point with the projects where we can at least start looking for funding sources/opportunities to keep moving them forward.

Projects that are smaller in scale cost are less critical to phase, while those in the medium to higher range are most useful to phase. Some might not be able to be phased – for example Markham school overpass.

Participants also had the following questions and comments:

- A participant noted that there are no current funding options for these projects at this time. All capitol projects need to be funded by grants and this is a very competitive and challenging process. The Barbur demo project was noted as an example.
- A lot of these projects are from single mode plan lists (for example the Bike plan). Are we going to get into that now? Denver responded refining the descriptions could be part of the conversation forwarding that input into the TSP update as well.
- These are all from TSP right? Denver responded that they are primarily from adopted plans, but some still need to be adopted.
- Are sidewalks always necessary? In some cases it is overkill. Denver responded that a good example of this might be SW Troy on the project list. Bike plan had sharrows on this road. But if you were to make it a ped/bike project the cost would be much higher.
- How long will these improvements last? We had a bus lane once but taken out? Denver responded that the SWC plan reaffirmed the importance of these projects, not just to HCT but to the places in this area; the transit and land use vision.
- When will we take the alternatives and boil it down to get input from community? In particular, the Red Electric which is under two projects, # 9005 and 9007: when will we join those so that community can support it. Denver responded that part of point tonight is to get feedback particularly on mid-level cost projects. Five projects are highlighted this evening as examples of ones that might lend themselves well to phasing and looking for feedback on that.
- The listed projects are missing context – i.e. the need for a specific project. Denver responded that at the next meeting one focus will be discussing what information will be useful for community to consider when giving input.
- Discussion of why some projects partly funded are still on list and request to add column that denotes which projects are already funded. These projects should not compete with the others. Denver noted that the reason these are still on there is because they not complete. Further he stated there could be a way of annotating what parts of projects have been funded in a notes column for example.
- What do the asterisks mean? Denver responded that these are big projects that already have a series of next steps - like further traffic analysis - tied to them.
- These are major decisions. Denver concurred and added that it's not outside of the realm of possibility that new projects will be discovered and those could also be identified to start with through these conversations. We're going to focus on adopted projects, but understating that there may critical deficiencies identified moving forward.
- What happened to the on-ramp at SW 26<sup>th</sup>? Anthony from Metro responded that this was not critical to HCT. This does not exclude it from happening in the future it is just not part of this HCT project
- What does land use vision (LUV) on this list mean? Denver explained that LUV noted projects support the land use and not the HCT. For the purpose of the PWG's work there will be no distinction between the two.

Denver then moved to call out five example projects that might be good candidates to explore for phasing or segments.

#2999 - Pedestrian connection to OHSU, from Barbur to Terwilliger at Gibbs.

#6022 - I-405 bicycle/pedestrian crossing improvements.

#6034 - Taylors Ferry Road between Capitol Highway and City limits. Improvements from Capitol Hwy to SW 48th may be the most critical.

#5009 – Capitol Highway from Multnomah to Taylors Ferry. - Participants raised the issue of the large stormwater management cost associated with it and relayed relevant history. Should stormwater be showing up on more of these project descriptions? Denver responded that it would be good to get input on and annotate which ones there are known stormwater concerns/challenges with.

#9005 - Red Electric Trail: Fanno Creek Trail to Willamette Park – Denver noted that in this case more detailed design cost estimates would be needed. There are 5 segments and 3 options on easternmost segment. There is funding to do the Hillsdale segment with that project getting underway this summer. A participant asked where the western boundary of SWC and Red Electric was. Denver responded that for projects there was no specific boundary used since it was more about whether a project supported access to HCT or was along the alignment.

Further clarification was requested by the participant who asked whether the western part of Red Electric wasn't outside of this corridor plan area. It was also noted that Hoot Owl corner improvements did not make the final list in part because it was too far from potential alignments. Denver responded that maybe the corridor plan boundary is a way to segment this [#9005] project.

Next Anthony Buczek with Metro spent a few minutes outlining the steps from now to June for narrowing the projects in the Metro process. He distinguished that there were alignment supportive projects and station supportive projects, and that there were different approaches on how to narrow each of these project lists. As far as projects along any alignment such as sidewalks, etc., these will be an automatic part of any HCT project.

Multimodal projects critically supportive of HCT - if there is HCT - are the improvements that we need to safely access the stations. The station area planning process will also identify which are the key projects for accessing the stations. It's also critical to make sure they work with the regional active transportation plan and fill gaps in bike and ped facilities.

He noted as well that these are concept level designs and do not have complete engineering work done. The goal is to prioritize which projects need to be part of the transit design going forward.

Participant questions or comments included:

- Will there be a framework with criteria of how we discuss the pros and cons of these projects? The Red Electric was mentioned. I'd say if you encourage bike to transit then western section 2-3 mile segment of red electric makes a lot of sense.
- Reinforces need for a "considerations" column in the project list to be able to include things like: safety, longer distance bike access, close access pedestrian access. I would really want to know which ones are heavy in the safety category.
- What did Mayor Hales mean by saying he wanted to be paving streets in Portland? Have not seen anything in SW. Also for perspective, how long did it [Sunset] take from the time it was conceived to being built for perspective? Denver responded that SW Sunset is a good example of how projects can be segmented and built as funding is available. It was 2009 funds provided for Sunset and other sidewalks built this year.
- A Transportation funding work group is being convened by Mayor Hales and Commissioner Novick.

- What's been the effort to reach out to schools to understand their needs for bike and walking to schools: Denver responded there is a safe routes to school program and some schools have plans for projects to complete, noted Bridlemile and Capitol Hill examples. Provide a link to safe routes to school is something to think about when considering the project list.
- How do we get plugged in to HCT analysis, this PWG seems to be veering toward the projects? Joan acknowledged the intent of the PWG was to discuss both but that the timeline had shifted for the HCT work. Malu with Metro added that the HCT analysis work is not done yet. TriMet is working on this and the March time frame is more realistic. She added that the PWG is a great place to be involved and information can be sent to the group as things develop.
- Would like to take these projects and tie them to the bigger goals – safety, getting people active, etc. Let's not lose sight of the bigger goals. Denver responded that this is the idea with this plan: projects support HCT or land use visions which are tied to the larger goals.
- Is high speed internet being considered? Makes sense to lay fiber at same time.
- Will lanes be taken away? Anthony responded that critical traffic areas will likely not see a reduction of lanes at those locations.
- Concern and frustration was noted regarding jake brakes on I-5 and Barbur. Participant was directed to ODOT staff for additional discussion.

### Meeting Wrap-up and Next Steps

Joan with BPS wrapped up and adjourned the meeting at 8:00 pm.

### PWG Participants January 6, 2014

Name (alternate)	Organization or Interest	
Roger Averbeck	SWNI	
Don Baack	SW Trails	
Sandy Morgan	South Burlingame	
Bill Chapman	Markham	
Bill Dant	West Portland Park	
Jim Diamond	Collins View NA	
Kay Durtschi	Corridor/Multnomah	
Marianne Fitzgerald	SWNI/Ashcreek	
Gerald Fox		
Jim Gardner	South Portland NA	
Steve Green	Barbur	
Maripat Hensel	Arnold Creek NA	
Joan and Tim Hamilton	SW Trails	
Al Iverson	Hayhurst	
Milt Jones	SWNI/Homestead	
Peter Johnson	Far SW NA	
Michael Kisor		
Gerry and Connie Lenzen	SW Barbur / PCC	
Marcia Leslie	Far SW NA	
Keith Liden		

Mike and Vicki McNamara	Barbur	
Cynthia Moore		
Scott McLain	Markham NA	
Arnold Panitch	Hillsdale NA	
Leslie Pohl-Kusbau	Hillsdale NA	
Ken Reamey	Homestead NA	
Scott Richman	South Burlingame NA	
Wes Risher	Hillsdale NA	
Kris Schade	Barbur	
Rick Seifert	Hillsdale News	
Anton Vetterlein	Homestead/Friends of Terwilliger	
Erik Vidstrand	SW Portland Post	
George Vranas	Far Southwest	
Lisa Ward		
Jan Weston	Marshall Park	

**Staff in attendance**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Representing</b>	
Denver Igarta	Portland Bureau of Transportation	Denver.igarta@portlandoregon.gov
Joan Frederiksen	Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability	Joan.frederiksen@portlandoregon.gov
Malu Wilkinson	Metro	Malu.wilkinson@portlandoregon.gov
Anthony Buczek	Metro	Anthony.buczek@oregonmetro.gov
Brian Harper	Metro	Brian.harper@oregonmetro.gov
Juan Carlos Ocaña-Chiu	Metro	juan.carlos.ocana-chiu@oregonmetro.gov
Kirsten Pennington	Oregon Department of Transportation	Kirsten.pennington@odot.state.or.us
Judith Gray	City of Tigard	