

# Agenda



**Metro**

600 NE Grand Ave.  
Portland, OR 97232-2736

Meeting: Southwest Corridor Light Rail Community Advisory Committee Meeting  
Date: Monday July 30, 2018  
Time: 6:15 to 8:45 p.m.  
Place: Multnomah Arts Center, Room 30, 7688 SW Capitol Hwy, Portland  
Purpose: Agree upon Locally Preferred Alternative recommendation.  
Outcome(s): Discuss route options to build consensus amongst members.

---

6:15 p.m.	Welcome and introductions	<i>Share</i>	Eryn Kehe, facilitator
6:20 p.m.	June meeting summary approval	<i>Decide</i>	All
6:25 p.m.	Public comment	<i>Listen</i>	All
6:35 p.m.	Project updates	<i>Listen/ Questions</i>	Staff
6:40 p.m.	Group discussion of remaining topics <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– Downtown Tigard choice</li><li>– Design refinements 4, 5, 6 (Tigard)</li><li>– Design refinement 1 (Viaducts)</li><li>– Design refinement 2 (Crossroads)</li><li>– Other</li></ul>	<i>Discuss</i>	Matt Bihn, Metro All
7:30 p.m.	Locally Preferred Alternative recommendation	<i>Decide</i>	All
8:00 p.m.	Discuss CAC presentation at Steering Committee meeting (Aug 13)	<i>Discuss</i>	All
8:15 p.m.	Thank you, members!	<i>Share</i>	All
8:45 p.m.	Close meeting		Eryn Kehe

*This is the last meeting of the CAC. Thank you for your participation in this important process!*

# Meeting Summary



Meeting: Southwest Corridor Community Advisory Committee  
Date/time: Monday, June 25, 2018, 6:15 – 8:45pm  
Place: Multnomah Arts Center, Room 30, 7688 SW Capitol Hwy, Portland

---

## Committee Members Present

Carine Arendes	City of Tigard Town Center Advisory Commission
Roger Averbeck	Oregon Walks
Tim Dickey	At-large
Rachael Duke	Community Partners for Affordable Housing
Jim Gardner	South Portland Neighborhoods
Vasilios Garyfallou	Barbur Boulevard business representative
Serge Killingsworth	Tigard Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee representative
Michael Kisor	Bicycle/Pedestrian Advocate & Southwest Portland resident
Lonnie Martinez	Tigard Transportation Advisory Committee representative
Mark Gorman, Alt	Portland Community College
Debi Mollahan	Tigard Chamber of Commerce
Brian Newman	OHSU
Arnold Panitch	TriMet Committee on Accessible Transit
Elise Shearer	Tigard Transportation Advisory Committee
Ian Strude	Portland State University
Ibrahim Turki	Muslim Educational Trust

## Committee Members Absent

Chad Hastings	CenterCal Properties
Kathleen McMullen	Portland Community College
Linda Moholt	Tualatin Chamber of Commerce
Evelyn Murphy	At Large

## Metro Staff Present

Eryn Kehe, Chris Ford, Matt Bihn, Michaela Skiles, Malu Wilkinson and Lucy Folau

### 1.0 Welcome and introductions

Ms. Eryn Kehe, Metro, called the meeting to order at 6:15 p.m. and welcomed the committee members and public to the meeting.

### 2.0 Approval of Draft Meeting Summary

Ms. Kehe asked for edits and changes to the May 2018 meeting summary. On page three, it was noted that it should read: “it is not enough to avoid displacement of existing housing; it is necessary to regulate what is currently unregulated affordable housing, or it will be lost”. Also on page three, there was a request for clarification of the design modification for South Portland and the viaducts as presented by Mr. Matt Bihn.

With four abstaining votes (Mr. Roger Averbeck, Mr. Arnold Panitch, Mr. Tim Dickey, and Mr. Mark Gorman), members of the committee voted approval with changes noted and the summary passed. Mr. Michael Kisor was not present for the vote.

### **3.0 Public Comment**

Mr. Mike Bell, a resident of the SW Corridor since 1966, noted that light rail will impact the intersection behind Barber World Foods.

Mr. Mark McGirr, president of Atiyeh Brothers, Inc., and co-chair of the Coalition for SW MAX Railroad Option, reiterated the Coalition's support for the C2 Railroad option as the best route, requesting CAC members support the IRP, the DEIS and its findings, in its recommendation to the Steering Committee.

Ms. Katie Dobler, chief operations officer at The Portland Clinic, is also a member of the Coalition for SW MAX Railroad Option. The Portland Clinic, located in Tigard along I-5 and Bonita Road, supports the recommendation to follow the railroad alignment.

Mr. Steve Brown, resident in the Park Hill neighborhood in the Barbur Woods, spoke in support of the proposal for an east side transit design refinement through Barbur Woods, because going to the west side would cause irreparable damage (i.e. to the water table).

Mr. Austin Bague, a resident of Tigard, noted that to make the transit project successful and for more people to be on board with the project, it needs to be less of an impact to residents, made safe and crime-free.

### **4.0 Project Updates**

Mr. Chris Ford, Metro, addressed committee members sharing the DEIS purpose as a disclosure document, identifying potentially significant impacts and ways to mitigate them. Ultimately it is a federal document for federal agencies. He also outlined the overall organization of the DEIS document, including key appendices and findings, tables, and project cost. Mr. Ford then reviewed the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) selection process including an example LPA recommendation.

A committee member encouraged other members to keep in mind these concepts: how many more cars can I-5 handle, how long it can take to get to from Bridgeport to PSU in a car, as well as, the reasons for having light rail. Ms. Kehe reminded everyone of the newly published Summer 2018 Newsletter which highlights some benefits of the SW Corridor project. She mentioned that copies were available at the sign-in table. She also noted the upcoming Open House at Markham Elementary on June 26, which, along with future events in July, provide opportunities to have this conversation with new people.

### **5.0 Group Discussion and**

#### **6.0 Identify areas of agreement for Locally Preferred Alternative recommendation**

Ms. Kehe reminded the group of the tools they would use for sharing their opinions, and how the group would work toward consensus. Tonight, she asked the group to begin sharing their positions on the pieces of the LPA as a way of identifying areas of agreement. A few members expressed concern about committing to decisions too early. Others said it was important to understand members' positions before the last meeting. Ms. Kehe assured the members that tonight's discussions were a "temperature check" and not a vote. She asked the group to give it a try and the group agreed to move forward.

Each topic discussed by the committee is shown below with bullet points to summarize the nature of the discussion.

- Branch/Through (Section C)  
The group showed support for the Through Route although not all members were in full agreement. Discussion topics included:
  - By supporting the through route, it still leaves Ash, Clinton, Naito, Railroad/I-5 and the refinements on the table.

- The Through route alignments C-1 and C-4 have more frequent and direct service to downtown Tigard and Bridgeport plus the totality of people using the SW Corridor.
- Railroad/I-5 (Section C)  
The group was mostly in full agreement or showed consent with reservations for the Railroad alignment option. Two members, however, indicated some major concerns with that choice.
  - Railroad option protects Tigard's employment corridor, less disruptive to businesses, and less expensive. Railroad has lowest capital cost, lowest impact to residential housing, and protects business and employees for Tigard with the least impacts.
  - Railroad is more direct, and the stations are closer to residents who will use mass transit.
  - City of Tigard has gone on record stating park and ride at either location will add to congestion.
  - Public comments at CAC meetings in support of Railroad should be seriously considered.
  - Would like to hear from more people potentially impacted by the Railroad option and understand their position.
  - Desire to protect the Village Inn.
  - Need to work out both the Bridgeport Village park and ride issue (impact to Village Inn) and determine whether or not there will be a park and ride at Bonita.
  - The need for park and ride spaces could become a #3 item for consideration.
  - Moves location of O&M facility to Hunziker, which is a better industrial location and would not require rezoning.
  - Should look at providing shuttle buses for outlying communities: Sherwood, etc.
  - The process of getting people the "last mile" to the stations with cars, buses, shuttles and ride share, etc. should be discussed in the station design phase.

Ms. Kehe noted the committee was in consensus about the Railroad Option, with uncertainty around park and rides, the O&M facility, and the design of the terminus with impact on the Village Inn.

- Barbur/I-5 (Section B)  
Nearly all of the members present supported the choice of B2, either fully or with some reservations. Two members said they would stand aside and let the group proceed with it.
  - B1 best supports the Barbur Concept Plan/multimodal transit corridor, making Barbur a true boulevard, although at a higher capital cost, fixing the Crossroads, and linking sidewalks and bike paths.
  - The group discussed the differences between options B1 and B2.
- Design Refinement 2 (Taylors Ferry)  
The group discussed Design Refinement 2 and many thought that further study was warranted, however, four members felt that more discussion was needed before the group could consider a decision.
  - To support Taylors Ferry modification, need to have bike and pedestrian facility alongside the bridge crossing over I-5. TriMet has heard from residents about having bike and pedestrian connectivity over the freeway.
  - Traffic congestion is a concern in the Crossroads. There is a long queue along Barbur to the I-5 on ramp.
  - What are the property impacts of the different choices in this section?
- Naito/Barbur (Section A)  
Nearly all of the members present supported the choice of Barbur, either fully or with some reservations. One member said they would stand aside and let the group proceed with it.

- Originally, the South Portland Neighborhood supported center running light rail on Naito, but now looks like there would be more impacts to historic resources with a Naito option.
- The Barbur alignment is closer to OHSU.
- The most recent consensus of the South Portland neighborhood is that the Bridgehead problem has to be fixed. If it can be fixed, the neighborhood may support the Barbur choice

#### **FOR DISCUSSION AT THE NEXT MEETING:**

Topics around the viaducts design refinement:

- Has staff determined the useful life of the old Vermont/Newberry viaducts?
- Was consideration given to putting north bound vehicles on the new east side light rail bridge, which would make space with a bike and pedestrian path on the south bound bridge?
- Consideration for bike and pedestrian connectivity to PSU.

Topics around the Ash/Clinton (Section C) alignment choice and design modifications:

- The group, quickly, indicated general support for the Ash alignment choice before discussing the three design modifications in this section.
- Would like to understand how the design modifications change the impacts of original Ash and Beveland businesses/employees and residential areas of naturally occurring affordable housing.
- Actual photos of the modification areas would be helpful.
- Specifically “blown up” pictures of alignments and modification areas.

#### **7.0 CAC participation in upcoming meetings**

Ms. Kehe noted that outreach efforts have included a postcard mailing, newspaper advertisements, social media and upcoming events. She said it would be very helpful if several CAC committee members participated in the recommendation presentation to the Steering Committee. She asked members to speak with her after the meeting if they would like to participate.

#### **8.0 Adjournment**

Mr. Dave Unsworth, TriMet, who will be out of town for the July meeting, expressed his thanks for the dedication of CAC committee members working towards the LPA recommendation, and to Metro staff for managing the vast amount of information contained in the DEIS.

Ms. Kehe adjourned the meeting at 8:50p.m.

The next SW Corridor Steering Committee meeting will be a public hearing on Thursday, July 19, 6:00pm, at Tigard City Hall. The next CAC meeting is scheduled Monday, July 30, 6:15 p.m., Multnomah Arts Center.

Attachments to the Record:

Item	Type	Document Date	Description	Document Number
1	Agenda	06/25/2018	June CAC Meeting agenda	062518SWCCAC-01
2	Summary	05/14/2018	May CAC Meeting summary	062518SWCCAC-02
3	Document	06/25/2018	5.2 Initial Route Proposal; DEIS, Chapter 5, Sec 5.2, pages 5-9 through 5-12	062518SWCCAC-03
4	Document	06/25/2018	Locally Preferred Alternative Worksheet	062518SWCCAC-04
5	Document	06/25/2018	Levels of Consensus	062518SWCCAC-05
6	Document	06/14/2018	SW Corridor Light Rail Project – Summer Newsletter 2018	062518SWCCAC-06
7	Document	06/08/2018	Unite Oregon Call to Action Letter	062518SWCCAC-07

## **Comparison of Impacts: Refinement options and Draft EIS alternatives**

The Draft EIS uses data from a quarterly census of employment and wages produced by the US Bureau of Labor Statistics and local tax lot information to estimate the number of businesses, employees and residential units potentially impacted by the Southwest Corridor light rail project. Numbers of employees are not always accurately assigned to tax lots. Franchises or businesses with multiple retail locations could have all employees assigned to the single tax lot where the headquarters or main office is located. Contract workers or consultants may not be assigned to the tax lot where they physically work. The information is best used to understand the sense of scale between alternatives, and not to define specific job impacts.

Please note that TriMet is required by the Uniform Relocation Act to provide assistance to residents and employers in moving from the property they occupied and finding new suitable locations to live or work.

Below, potential impacts are summarized to compare potential impacts of each of four refinement options included in the Initial Route Proposal to the Draft EIS alternative each would replace, with some explanations or caveats. The numbers of impacted businesses, employees and residential units reflect the portions of the alignment where the design refinements differ from the Draft EIS alternatives (not the entirety of Segment A, B or C). This information is based on assumed full acquisitions using current designs, which will continue to be refined during the Final EIS and beyond.

### **Refinement 2: Taylors Ferry I-5 Overcrossing**

The Taylors Ferry Refinement would impact two more businesses than Alternative B2, 20 compared to 18, and impact about 70 more employees, 180 compared to 110. The major source of the difference is the office building located at the corner of SW Taylors Ferry Road and SW 41<sup>st</sup> Avenue, where the data indicate 160 jobs exist. There are a few reasons to question this date. There are only 80 to 90 parking spaces at this building, and the businesses are likely single-shift, daytime jobs.

Neither the refinement nor Alternative B2 impacts any residential units.

### **Refinement 4, Barbur Undercrossing**

The Barbur Undercrossing refinement would impact four businesses with a reported 70 employees, all along Highway 99W. The Alternative B2/C2 in the equivalent segment would not impact any businesses. The refinement would impact five residential units compared to seven with the Alternative B2/C2.

### **Refinement 5, Elmhurst**

The Elmhurst refinement would not impact any businesses, compared to 14 businesses and 90 employees impacted by Alternative C2 in the equivalent segment. The refinement would impact eight residential units, two more than Alternative C2.

### **Refinement 6, Tigard Transit Center Station East of Hall**

The East of Hall refinement would avoid affordable housing impacts and traffic impacts that Alternative C2 would cause by crossing SW Hall Boulevard twice and traveling on SW Ash Avenue, but would impact more businesses. Based on an alignment running just east of SW Hall Boulevard, the refinement would impact 19 businesses compared to 17 with Alternative C2, but 380 more employees (557 compared to 175). The refinement would impact 4 residential units compared to 78 with Alternative C2. These numbers include the assumed impacts of an operations and maintenance facility east of the station.

## Locally Preferred Alternative

### DRAFT Community Advisory Committee Recommendation

The following is based on preliminary discussion at the SW Corridor Light Rail Community Advisory Committee meeting on June 29, 2018. This information provides a basis for reaching a group consensus at the July 30, 2018. This draft information does not represent a group decision until it is voted upon.

1. From the available options studied in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, does the group recommend?(Pick one in each category) *Preliminary direction set at June 29 CAC meeting*
  - a. ~~Barbur (A1), Naito with Bridgehead(A2-BH) or Naito limited access (A2-LA)~~
  - b. Barbur (B1), I-5 BTC- 60<sup>th</sup> (B2), ~~I-5 26<sup>th</sup>-60<sup>th</sup> (B3), or I-5 Custer-60<sup>th</sup> (B4)~~ (more discussion recommended)
  - c. ~~Ash to I-5 Through (C1), Ash to RR Through (C2), Clinton to I-5 Through (C3), Clinton to RR Through (C4), Ash and I-5 Branched (C5), or Wall and I-5 Branched (C6)?~~
  
2. Does the group support continued exploration of the following design refinements/modifications? Why or why not? *Preliminary direction set at June 29 CAC meeting*
  - i. Viaducts (1)
    1. Need pedestrian and bicycle improvements in this area
    2. Requests:
      - a. What is the expected life span of the existing viaducts?
  - ii. Taylor's Ferry (2)
    1. Build safe routes for bicyclists and pedestrians crossing I-5 at the Crossroads area to access the Barbur Transit Center station.
    2. Study traffic impacts at the Taylor's Ferry/Capitol Hwy intersection
  - iii. 99W undercrossing (4)
  - iv. Elmhurst in Triangle (5)
  - v. Hall station downtown (6)
    1. Requests:
      - a. Would like to understand different impacts to businesses/employees and residential units
      - b. Photos & larger maps of the modification areas
  
3. Are there considerations for these choices that the CAC hopes the Steering Committee will consider? *Preliminary direction set at June 29 CAC meeting*
  - a. Support pursuing the Ross Island Bridgehead project.
  - b. Further study park and ride demands at Bonita and Boones Ferry stations to minimize property impacts while supporting transit rider needs.
  - c. Work with the community and the owners of the Village Inn restaurant to design the future station at Bridgeport Village.