

## **SW Corridor Light Rail Project Community Advisory Committee (CAC)**

**Thursday, July 18, 2019, 5:30-7:30 p.m.  
Tigard Public Works Auditorium  
8777 SW Burnham St., Tigard**

### **Meeting Summary**

#### **Present**

Rachael Duke – Community Partners for Affordable Housing (CPAH)  
Calista Fitzgerald – Designer Former Tigard Planning Commission Chair  
Ethan Frelly – Tigard Chamber of Commerce, business owner  
Bill Garyfallou – Property/business owner  
Angela Handran – Tualatin renter Transit commuter to PSU  
Bob Ludlum – Washington County resident, Veteran’s advocate  
Melissa Moncada – Engineer, West Portland Park Neighborhood  
Ramtin Rahmani – Tigard resident, bicycle commuter to OHSU  
Elise Shearer – Tigard Transportation Advisory Committee, St. Anthony Parish  
Eric Sporre – PacTrust  
Lindsey Wise – Tigard Transportation Committee, transit commuter to PSU  
Rebecca Ocken – Portland Community College (PCC) Sylvania Campus

#### **Not present:**

Chris Carpenter – Oregon & Southern Idaho District Council of Laborers  
Julia Michel – Portland State University (PSU)  
Michael Harrison – Oregon Health & Sciences University (OHSU)  
Chad Hastings – CenterCal Properties Bridgeport Village  
Debra Dunn – Synergy Resources Group Business Consultant

#### **Welcome; introductions; notes/agenda review**

**Brandy Steffen, Facilitator**

Brandy welcomed the group to kick off the meeting. She provided an overview of the agenda and an opportunity for committee members and TriMet staff to introduce themselves. TriMet staff included Jennifer Koozer and Leah Robbins.

#### **Public comment**

- Cynthia – Representing Bridgeport LLC that own the property where Bed, Bath & Beyond, DSW Shoes, bridal store are located. We are concerned about where the Bridgeport Village station is going to land. In April, there were six choices. From what I understand two options have been removed from further consideration. Right now, the one that was vetted during the Draft Environmental Impact Statement uses public right of way and the surface lot on the south side of Lower Boones Ferry Road. It would put the parking structure there and impact part of my client’s property. It is important as you are looking at cost, because you aren’t just looking at the cost of the structures you are

going to put in. You are looking at the cost to the community, which is one of the standards that I've brought to your attention before—greatest public good, least private injury. Our client has over 120 employees there. Costs include businesses when you are looking at relocations.

## Station Access and Park & Rides—survey results

Josh Mahar, Community Affairs Representative

- Presentation and discussion

Josh reoriented the committee to topics covered during the last meeting's discussion about station access and Park & Ride locations, including how TriMet is casting a wide net to consider the future of connected transportation options. He then reviewed the park & ride scenarios and the results of a recent public survey about Park & Ride access and design.

The online survey netted 569 responses. Overall, people liked the idea of dispersed Park & Rides (Scenario A). Survey analysis showed that people who bike and walk to access transit preferred options that limited funding spent on parking. By and large, this sentiment was felt most strongly by respondents who indicated that they live in urban Portland, as opposed to residents reporting to live outside of the main city center, including the majority of folks who live in the SW Corridor area.

Josh then discussed next steps for station access and design. He noted that the project will define its scope in October 2019 and that will include an approach to Park & Ride locations. Station access and design will also be a topic in the Conceptual Design Report when it is released in early 2020. Josh reminded the committee that the project team is early in the design process and that TriMet will continue to do outreach to solicit feedback on this topic as designs are refined.

### Questions, Responses and Comments:

- **Rachel**—How much weight will this survey play in your decision about Park & Ride design? 569 responses is a rather low number. Are you also taking into account polling data?
  - The survey is just one data point in a larger picture. It is part of our community engagement around Park & Rides. Our goal is to design a cost-effective project, so we will weigh many factors. In terms of polling, I think you are referring to work that Metro is doing. That is separate from this project.
- **Bob**—One of the earlier studies said that 14% of rides are generated from the Park & Rides. Today, this presentation says 5%. Why are these numbers different?
  - Good question. The 14% figure relates to the number of MAX trips generated from riders who use Park & Rides. Only 5% of total TriMet riders use Park & Rides. This lower number includes all of our bus trips.
- **Calista**—I'm concerned that the dataset is rather limited. The survey was only available in English and Spanish. What about other language groups? Metro has a list of groups they are working with.
  - We're always looking to improve the reach of our outreach efforts. Even though we translated the survey into Spanish, we didn't get a high number of responses in Spanish.

- **Ramtin**—We've discussed in the past that it is really important to design a project that is competitive for Federal funding. In an ideal world, parking would be great. I think it is important to prioritize bus access.
- **Lindsey**—If we build several large parking structures, are we trading off bus access?
  - The bus connections are also part of our assumptions. It is not a direct trade off. The real trade off may be the space for parking vs. other mobility uses (e.g. scooters, etc.).
- **Ramtin**—When you cost out the MAX line, does that include the operational cost of adding bus service?
  - No. The project cost estimates are for capital construction.
- **Rachael**—Are there any studies about the number of parking spaces and its impact on transit ridership? What is the relationship between the number of parking spaces and riders?
  - The parking itself is not the primary driver for ridership numbers. We'll work to get you info on the tipping point of ridership coming from parking spots for the success of the line.
  - In our modeling for FTA purposes, one Park & Ride spaces adds 2.1 transit trips per week day.
- **Elise**—Getting back to Bob's earlier question, does the 14% take into account the WES line?
  - Yes.
- **Bill**—In defense to your survey, I think you broke down the groups that are relevant. If folks are concerned about the survey size, perhaps people could go out and help generate more responses. As a property owner with parking lots onsite, I've run into challenges with people who have parked in my lots for several days. I think it is smart that you are engaging residents because they will be affected by spill over.
- **Calista**—This project will be built in 10 years. I don't think that we are engaging young people. I'm worried that we don't have any representatives from Generation Z in this project.
- **Ethan**—I agree. We should try to engage younger folks in the project.
  - I'd like to flag that this data set did not include age. Our team is interested in engaging younger folks, especially as it relates to connected transportation.
- **Angela**—I'd like to see an increase in the survey numbers. Can your team get on the bus and take the survey out to transit riders in-person?
  - Thank you for the feedback.
- **Bob**—In TriMet's most recent report, it said that the agency is developing a Transit Oriented Development policy. I think that is interesting.
- **Rachael**—Are you considering other ways to increase ridership besides parking, such as using these funds to subsidize rider costs or housing? How does the timeline for station design fit into overall project decision making?
  - The project does include station access projects which provide improvements for people accessing transit by walking or biking. The actual station access and what parking and bike/walk facilities might look like will be in the CDR. There will be a large public process in early 2020.
- **Ramtin**—Did you take into account if you'll need to widen roads due to increased traffic from Park & Rides?
  - Yes, we will take into account all capital construction impacts related to the project.

## Conceptual Design Report—intro and framework

Fiona Cundy, Urban Design Project Manager

- Principles and goals

Fiona began her presentation by explaining what a Conceptual Design Report (CDR) is. She noted that a group of public agency representatives began work on this project about a month ago. Additionally, the TriMet Community Affairs team is working to develop a list of folks to have stakeholder interviews with, in addition to the CDR committee, to make sure that the project hears from a broad spectrum of interests. The CAC will also review the CDR.

She then reviewed the project timeline and provided an in-depth look at the planned CDR table of contents. Fiona noted that work on the immediate horizon will focus on the first four chapters of the planned CDR.

### Questions, Responses and Comments:

- **Ramtin**—Can you bring to us a striping map? I'm interested in seeing what the planned car and bike lanes will look like.
  - The report in December will be at 20% design, so a lot of work will still need to happen. We won't have that level of detail at that stage in project development.

She then reviewed the key terminology that will be used in the CDR. She noted that presently, the CDR committee has developed the project Vision and Principles and that they are working with partners to draft project goals. The identified core principles for this project include Mobility, Equitable Communities, Environment, and Resilience.

### Questions, Responses and Comments:

- **Bill**—May I suggest another one: commerce. It is tied into all of these. I know that you can make the argument that it's implied in some of these items, but I think it is buried. Case in point, businesses on Barbur Blvd. would prefer to see all modes of transportation than 2-3 hours of parking every day. I would like to see it in there.

Fiona then went through each core principle in greater detail. In terms of Mobility, goals center around designing a project that is competitive for Federal funds, attracts riders, is adaptable to future modes of transportation, and supports completion of the region's multimodal network. She noted that her team is working within other existing plans and working to bring the project purpose to the forefront.

Equitable Communities goals center around maintaining/strengthening existing cultural/community assets, and promoting equitable access to community resources. This is a key consideration for long term community health.

Environment goals center on protecting and improving the environment along the project corridor. She noted that Southwest Portland is known for its leafy character and salmon spawning streams, so that is something the project is taking into account. Additionally, she noted that that storm water in this region is not currently being treated. With this project, TriMet will be working with partners such as NOAA to address water treatment.

Finally, Resilience goals ties into how we protect our structures and community assets, including economic development.

**Questions, Responses and Comments:**

- **Ramtin**—It seems like potential future modes are being put ahead of general safety of people walking and biking.
- **Bill**—Have you included law enforcement in these conversations about the size and design of Park & Rides?
  - One of our general design principles is called *Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design*, often referred to as CPTED. We design for safety. Our transit safety division is part of these conversations.
- **Elise**—Goal 4 seems to tie more into commerce and Goal 2 seems to tie into affordable housing.
- **Rachael**—Why does Goal 4 say “inspire” instead of “promote” or some other more actionable word regarding “inspire equitable economic development?”
- **Ramtin**—I agree. The descriptions should use active words and include something about bike/walk/transit access.
- **Lindsey**—I don’t see disaster resilience on this list.
- **Ethan**—We should add something about commerce here.

She then reviewed the scale and context of the project study area. This includes project segments and land use districts. The land use districts are defined by their topography and environmental considerations. Each of these areas will have a section in the CDR.

She also touched on definitions of station area vs. station core area, corridors and focus areas. All of these details are preparing the committee for future conversations.

**Questions, Responses and Comments:**

- **Bill**—Will the Woods area have its own section in the report? The two viaducts seem like they are robust in content.
- **Lindsey**—What about technological resilience. For example, the Steel Bridge is a bottle neck and has technological challenges. I think this should be on the list.

TriMet asked the committee to submit questions or comments on the CDR framework by Friday, July 26. Libby Winters will send the committee materials to review.

## **Project cost update**

Leah Robbins, Project Director

- Presentation and discussion

Leah began by reminding the committee of her previous presentations about cost and how TriMet has been working to address the cost gap for the Minimum Operable Segment (MOS).

She then noted that the updated cost estimate includes a larger gap than previous estimates. The current cost gap is \$462 million. This is based on the project scope target of \$2.375 billion which takes into account likely/potential revenue streams, compared with the new estimate for the project’s current design which comes in at \$2.84 billion.

**Questions, Responses and Comments:**

- **Bill**— Will there ever be a time when we make a list of priorities and cut the lower level priorities?
  - When we adopted the Locally Preferred Alternative, it included costs that we didn't anticipate. To stay competitive for Federal funding, we need to think of solutions other than just cutting the distance of the route. We need to reach the southern end of the project area to meet ridership goals.
- **Ramtin**—I've heard that it is taking longer for the FTA to approve projects, so how does that impact financing costs?
  - The impact isn't related to timing of approval, as much as designing a fundable project.

Key considerations impacting cost include escalation and contingency funds. There are required levels of contingency that must be included in each phase of the project, based on the level of design and risk. To apply to enter into design next year, we need to include a 25% contingency fund. Major changes since the 2018 estimate include increasing cost escalation and updating the scope of the project for the Locally Preferred Alternative. A lot of this is related to storm water treatment, utility relocation, and property impacts.

**Questions, Responses and Comments:**

- **Elise**— Does the risk assessment take into account another potential recession?
  - The market analysis does note that a downturn could happen during project development or construction. If one occurred, there may be some cost decreases. The real risk is if we underestimate cost escalation.
- **Eric**—Does the gap include the cost savings you showed us last month?
  - Yes, it does. Even with \$100 m in savings, we still have a \$462 million cost gap.
- **Rachael**—Are the cost increases for storm water and utility related to federal requirements?
  - No, they are due to local regulations. They result from the project's plan to rebuild Barbur Blvd.

Leah continued by stating that potential solutions are either to increase funding or reduce scope. To secure the targeted \$1.25 billion from the Federal Transit Authority (FTA), TriMet will need to show a local match. The largest portion of planned funding will come from Metro, which would be generated from a bond measure, followed by funds from the state and local jurisdictions. Together, this gives us our scope target of \$2.375. It is unlikely that we would be able to find additional matching funds beyond what we've identified here.

Leah then presented information about recently funded FTA projects. In past few years, FTA is typically funding projects at less than 50% total project cost, meaning that projects with a more than 50% local match are more competitive, and at most \$1.25 billion per project. The most competitive projects score medium-high on their design rating scale and have a lower percentage of federal contribution.

**Questions, Responses and Comments:**

- **Bob**—Where will the \$150m in financing costs come from?
  - That is still being determined. We will look into how we will pay for the financing costs from the Federal grant.



In terms of rating our project, we believe that it will score well on Mobility Improvement, Environmental Benefits, Congestion Relief and Economic Development. We cannot score higher on Land Use due to project constraints. The last item that we are scored on is Cost Effectiveness. We can score higher on this if local partners are able to provide significant additional funding.

To be competitive, we need to reduce the scope of the project. Of note, the project is more competitive the further south it gets as it serves more riders.

We are exploring scope reductions over \$100 million, such as narrowing Barbur Blvd, building adjacent to Barbur Blvd, or avoiding the viaduct structures. If we narrow the project footprint, we reduce property impacts and impervious footprint that has to be taken into account for storm water improvements. There is also the possibility to work with local partners, such as ODOT and the City of Portland to address Barbur through a jurisdictional transfer of \$65 million.

Our team will be working over the summer and will present you with feasible options in September. If you have ideas, we'd love your feedback.

#### Questions, Responses and Comments:

- **Melissa**—Narrowing Barbur could cause some congestion issues.
  - We are currently considering alternatives that were on the side of Babur, but not on Barbur. These were identified in the DEIS. They too have structural costs and property impacts. If Barbur were not rebuilt through this project, it would impact the Barbur Concept Plan. There are a lot of factors to take into consideration.
- **Ramtin**—Take a look at Glisan east of I-205, they just reduced to three lanes from five. This could be a good model for Barbur Blvd.
- **Bob**—What about how Bechtel partnered on the Red Line? What about doing a land swap with a company like Nike or Intel?
  - Bechtel had property to donate for that project. I'm not sure that we're in the same position on this project, but it is certainly an idea.
- **Elise**—In terms of the local match, what about asking partners to fund part of the project themselves?
  - I think you are referring to the related access projects. Those are not included in the base cost for this project.
- **Ethan**—Do you have any partnerships with cities to say that they'll build near transit lines to increase transit ridership? Or doing MAX to Tigard and then using bus service to Bridgeport?
  - We are talking to Tigard about development. In terms of route length and cost, we would need to decrease scope even if the MAX length were to terminate in Tigard.
- **Bill**—If we replaced part of the segment with buses, that could work with the Barbur Concept Plan. If you decreased the number of stops would that help?
  - In and of itself, reducing stations may not affect the algorithm. We need to look into that.
- **Melissa**—If you were to avoid the viaducts, how much would you save? When would ODOT update those?
  - \$150 million in savings. From my understanding, this would affect if the City of Portland would take Barbur over from ODOT without the viaduct being replaced.

- **Angela**—If you stopped before Bridgeport Village, would you lose money from Washington County?
  - Yes, that is my understanding.
- **Elise**—What about using WES to connect to Bridgeport and having the MAX stop in downtown Tigard?
  - We would need to look into if that fell within the project scope.

**Next CAC meeting**

Thursday, September 5, 5:30-7:30 p.m.

Tigard Public Works Auditorium, 8777 SW Burnham St., Tigard