



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

**Thursday, September 5, 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)  
Debra Dunn – Synergy Resources Group Business Consultant  
Calista Fitzgerald – Designer Former Tigard Planning Commission Chair  
Ethan Frelly – Tigard Chamber of Commerce, business owner  
Angela Handran – Tualatin renter Transit commuter to PSU  
Michael Harrison – Oregon Health & Sciences University (OHSU)  
Julia Michel – Portland State University (PSU)  
Rebecca Ocken – Portland Community College (PCC) Sylvania Campus  
Elise Shearer – Tigard Transportation Advisory Committee, St. Anthony Parish  
Eric Sporre – PacTrust  
Lindsey Wise – Tigard Transportation Committee, transit commuter to PSU

#### **Not Present**

Chris Carpenter – Oregon & Southern Idaho District Council of Laborers  
Bill Garyfallou – Property/business owner  
Chad Hastings – CenterCal Properties Bridgeport Village  
Bob Ludlum – Washington County resident, Veteran's advocate  
Melissa Moncada – Engineer, West Portland Park Neighborhood  
Ramtin Rahmani – Tigard resident, bicycle commuter to OHSU

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

**Brandy Steffen, Facilitator**

Brandy asked the committee to hold questions until the discussion period and public comments to the end of the meeting. TriMet staff included Kelly Betteridge (SW Corridor Program Manager), Scott Robertson (SW Corridor Design Manager) and Libby Winter and Josh Mahar (Community Affairs Representatives).

#### **Tour of website updates**

**Libby Winter, Community Affairs Representative**

Libby introduced the group to recent updates made to the project website ([trimet.org/swcorridor](http://trimet.org/swcorridor)), including Get Involved tab with information about community meetings and events staff are attending. If there are any meetings CAC members would like TriMet to share or attend, please let her know.

**Rachael** Suggested adding a link to Metros T2020 funding measure website.

## Cost and funding update: scenarios for October Steering Committee project definition

Kelly Betteridge, SW Corridor Program Manager

Kelly provided a high-level view of scenarios and tradeoffs in funding and scope to fill the gap in project cost. She noted that the project team is looking for a sense of what the group likes and doesn't like about the scenarios.

A funding gap is very common in early project development of large infrastructure. TriMet's job is to identify ways to fill the gap. By meeting with project partners and finding technical fixes, TriMet has identified scope cuts that will reduce the gap by \$60-70M, but the project still needs to fill the larger gap of about \$400M. There are three possible ways to achieve this:

1. Creatively find a way to add \$400M in funding.
2. Mix and match approach – additional funding and cut scope.
3. Cut scope.

Kelly presented four project scenarios and noted that not all scenarios meet the project goal of connecting to Bridgeport/Tualatin, but they are intended to be concepts for the purpose of conversation. She reminded the group that as the project team learns more about technical inputs, the dollar amounts will change.

**Scenario 1A** – This concept terminates at Bridgeport and provides the highest ridership, largest impact in reducing miles travels and is the most competitive for federal funding. It includes removing an estimated \$200M in scope by using the Barbur Refinements. It would require an additional \$200M in funding to get to Bridgeport.

There are two strategies as part of the Barbur Refinements:

1. A single auto lane reduction on Barbur in both directions, where it is technically feasible. The City of Portland would need to be willing to accept changes, as there is an assumption that when the project is complete, ODOT will transfer ownership of Barbur to the City Portland. A narrower Barbur would be less impactful to businesses and property owners, but more impactful on traffic.
2. A portion of light rail alignment would track along I-5 not in Barbur's right-of-way, and a portion of Barbur with one auto lane removed. This option assumes there would be an allowance for continuous bike lanes and sidewalks on Barbur.

A traffic analysis is underway and preliminary information will be available at the next CAC meeting.

**Scenario 1B** – This option solves the \$400M gap by cutting scope. It assumes Barbur Refinements and terminates at Bonita/Upper Boones Ferry instead of Bridgeport.

**Scenario 2A** – This option presumes an additional \$200M in funding and cuts \$200M in scope. It does not assume Barbur Refinements and terminates at Bonita/Upper Boones Ferry instead of Bridgeport. This would use the current design and maintain two auto lanes in both directions on Barbur.

**Scenario 2B** – This option cuts \$400M in scope. The option assumes Barbur Refinements are not technically feasible, and the project would terminate near Hall Station. This option provides the lowest ridership and is the least competitive for federal funding.

**Kelly** invited the group to provide feedback and to think about the four scenarios in terms of two possible outcomes: If TriMet receives additional funding or if they do not. The project team believes that the project needs additional funding *plus* scope cuts to achieve the project goal of terminating at Bridgeport.



At the next CAC meeting, TriMet will present additional technical information and gather feedback to share with the Steering Committee; the group does not need to reach consensus.

**Eric** asked if the funding isn't figured out, are there choices or one pick?

**Kelly** confirmed that the environmental document (Final Environmental Impact Statement, or FEIS) will identify a full length project and a minimum operational segment (MOS). The Steering Committee will make a recommendation for one of the scenarios in October. Regardless of the recommendation, the environmental report will cover the full alignment to Bridgeport. If Scenario 1A is selected, the MOS is 1B, for example. We will be clearing a full Bridgeport project through the environmental process.

## Committee discussion

**Brandy** introduced the values framework for the group discussion. She also informed the group that the hope is they will reach out to their communities with the information presented at this meeting. TriMet is available to present at meetings or provide the group with information needed for this to be a successful process.

Overall, the group was in agreement that the route needs to extend to Bridgeport. The group also did not favor reducing Barbur to one auto lane in each direction; particularly related to mobility, resiliency and political support. Below are the detailed comments from members.

**Rachael** asked for more detail about the \$60M of miscellaneous scope refinements already made. Are there any smaller items that could add up to larger savings?

**Kelly** replied that the focus of today's discussion is items that have the potential to remove \$100M or more from the scope or "big bucket" items. It's not easy to get to the \$100M range without something substantial. To clarify, the items that got us down into the \$400M range are changes to right-of-way acquisition, crossovers and assumptions around storm water.

**Calista** asked about the expiration timeframe on the record of decision (ROD).

**Kelly** replied that the ROD, which comes out of the Final Environmental Impact Statement, is good for 10 years.

**Calista** asked about the estimated cost of the phased options.

**Kelly** replied that the general level of investment is \$200M and \$400M.

**Calista** asked about the Park & Ride assumptions when redistributing Bridgeport.

**Kelly** replied that for the time being, we are carrying that cost for the Bridgeport structure into cost estimates for each of the options.

**Lindsey** noted that Scenario 2B ending in Tigard includes a note, "with LPA design." There is an alternative concept Afloat by City of Tigard. City of Tigard has proposed that if it ends in Tigard, the alignment changes to end in downtown Tigard.

**Kelly** affirmed that Scenario 2B does not include the Tigard assumption.

**Lindsey** asked why would moving off Barbur to I-5 would cost less.



**Kelly** replied that the right-of-way needed would be substantially less, so the actual impact and all the scope that go with that would be less.

**Lindsey** asked for clarification about which sections are being considered for one auto lane in each direction?

**Scott Robertson** replied that based on a traffic study from a year ago, we're looking at two segments on Barbur that are currently under capacity and likely will still be under capacity in 2035. The two sections are between Barbur Transit Center and 30th Ave and between 30th Ave and 13th Ave. Another section is between Capital Highway and Brier Place – this would include the very expensive viaduct structure. By narrowing, we would save cost.

**Michael** asked for clarification about narrowing versus avoiding Barbur.

**Scott** explained that the “Hybird” option would avoid Barbur by running adjacent to I-5 near Fred Meyer, have a station near at Barbur at 19th Ave., go back out to parallel I-5 and come back in to Barbur at 30th Ave.

**Kelly** clarified the Hybrid option includes both narrowing and moving off of Barbur, and the Narrow option is only looking at removing lanes.

**Lindsey** asked how these changes fit in with the West Portland Town Center plan.

**Scott** replied that the location of Barbur Transit Center is the same in both options and that's what the West Portland Town Center plan is being built around. There could be some impact if travel lanes are reduced, which we are discussing with the Bureau of Development Services (BDS).

**Elise** asked if the Barbur Refinements would increase congestion by taking out a lane when that's the outlet to deal with I-5 and I-205 congestion?

**Kelly** replied that will be able to quantify this question with technical info (traffic study) available at the next CAC meeting.

**Elise** noted that Scenario 2A is a \$200M cost difference to do phasing if you stop at Bonita. It's going to cost another \$200M to build it out to Bridgeport?

**Kelly** confirmed that the current cost is approximately \$200M.

**Elise** asked what are other items that are higher cost? I personally went to a Steering Committee meeting (as an individual) and think that they should consider phasing the Marquam Hill Connector and just put a bus stop at the base of the hill. The current cost estimate is \$45M with no understanding of what is underground.

**Kelly** noted that the ridership that is gained from the connection to Marquam Hill is essential to being competitive for federal funds. It's not just the station, it's the connection to get folks to that destination. Currently, the cost estimate has a placeholder for \$20M.

**Brandy** asked Elise to clarify if her top value is to get to Bridgeport.

**Elise** responded that the value has always been to get to Bridgeport. When OSHU's tram was built, it was a huge political football that had three cost overruns, but we haven't gotten into cost



estimates for Marquam Hill Connector. I'm making the statement again that we need to look at that \$45M impact. (TriMet Note: There is only \$20M currently budgeted for the Marquam Hill Connector. There are two options still under consideration: a Bridge + Elevator and a Funicular. Early cost estimates for the funicular option were around \$45M. Most detailed cost estimates of both options are currently in process.)

**Eric** asked if moving from Barbur and back in the Hybrid option would slow down light rail?

**Scott** replied that travel time is also being studied along with traffic; information will be available at the next meeting.

**Eric** asked if you were to go to downtown Tigard, is there a way to get a bus shuttle or some sort of connectivity to cover the population south of there?

**Kelly** replied that it can be examined, but without dedicated right-of-way, it could make for a limited ridership. If there is a transfer, people are less likely to take a service.

**Eric** about additional parking for the options that terminate at Bonita or Upper Boones Ferry.

**Kelly** replied that we don't know yet. We have some assumptions that were part of the environmental document, but depending on where we end up, we'll want to make some refinements regarding ridership and access.

**Deborah** reminded the committee that she is also on the task force for the regional funding measure, so I'm here with two perspectives. One, selling this project. We have two audiences: the feds – we need them to buy-in for funding – and we have to appeal to a broader audience. Thinking about stopping before Bridgeport and eliminating Tualatin concerns me. For the benefit of the project, we need Tualatin and Washington County. How we are going to sell it and get funding? Secondly, I was the chair of the freight committee and worked with the City of Portland. With respect to reducing lanes on Barbur, I'm concerned about emergency routes during earthquakes or large natural disasters - to build Barbur with fewer lanes doesn't help our resiliency. I would support not cutting lanes on Barbur, especially if there is an alternative of going around. And lastly, every jurisdiction has the opportunity to gain some development through this process – and that's fair, but I don't know that we have to completely fund ODOT's viaduct. How can we ask them for more? The viaduct needs to be repaired or replaced. It's not on their priority list so it's not going to show up in any transportation plan for funding. If there is an opportunity to get that repaired before it transfers to the City of Portland, I would like to see them invest further.

**Michael** noted that the group all raised good questions about potential impacts to traffic with Barbur refinements. But what happens with other modes? Is it easier to provide bike and pedestrian infrastructure if light rail is off Barbur? Or is it harder because the project isn't happening in one place and there is a less funding?

**Scott** reiterated the key phrase are “Is it technically feasible?” and “will ODOT and Portland approve it?” We've had conversations with both jurisdictions, and we've committed to building out bike lanes and sidewalks on any area of Barbur we don't touch. The goal is to have full bike and sidewalk connections from the Barbur Transit Center to downtown Portland.

**Scott** confirmed that the current design includes raised protected bike lanes. There is some question if those could be included for the full length of Barbur with light rail off Barbur; protected bike lanes might not be possible with that option.



**Rebecca** –asked how have these discussions been held in the past. What were the funding gaps in the past? How likely is phasing and public support?

**Kelly** replied that the funding question is different every time: so many variables and different groups requesting funding. We're poised to go for a large regional funding measure, and that changes things, as well. It is important for us to talk about what would happen if we don't receive the funding, while planning that we do get it. At the federal level, the Orange Line project was forced to make substantial cuts to scope while they were getting ready to go to construction. We focus on being nimble and have great relationship with our federal partners. But the MOS is included in an environmental document in case the project funding falls short.

**Angela** confirmed that the goal of project is getting to Bridgeport and as a Tualatin resident, my goal or value is the same: the three other scenarios are not options. We've been told that Washington County will pull partial or all funding if this doesn't get to Bridgeport – where are we at with that?

**Kelly** confirmed that is part of the conversation among project partners, and an assumption that we will need to factor in as we further develop the cost estimates for each of these scenarios.

**Angela** said she was under the impression this wouldn't qualify for federal funding if the project didn't go to Bridgeport because the ridership wouldn't be cost-effective. Why are the other scenarios now cost-effective when before they were not?

**Kelly** explained that each of the four scenarios fall in the range of what is considered cost-effective. Hall is barely there, but it appears to pencil out.

**Ethan** expressed support for Bridgeport. I don't think a single lane on Barbur will be sufficient and not a good value. Why is an extra \$200M not feasible when the state is doing so well? Why not ask for the full amount?

**Lindsey** made a personal and regional statement about reducing Barbur to single lanes. I lived on Interstate after the Yellow Line went in. It revitalized the area and made it safer and more inviting for pedestrians and residents. Regionally, when Tigard voted to allow light rail, the opposition was all about how we're going to take Barbur away. The opposition will say the same thing if we ask for regional funding and support will drop.

**Rachael** affirmed we need to go to Bridgeport. I can't imagine reducing capacity when the region is growing. Maybe in 15 years all these parking lots will need to be converted to affordable housing because no one drives. I would assume there are pieces in the \$40-50M range that can be looked at. With all due respect to OSHU and their needs, I feel like that's a problem we can solve by spending less money. My statement is "This should be done in a way that is equitable, not just one set of folks who benefit." And what will get the votes is a different statement.

**Kelly** confirmed that staff will bring the CAC data about traffic, person through-put which is the number of people you can carry in light rail and cars, so that's a way to have the conversation about the allocation of space within the roadway.

**Calista** supported going to Bridgeport. I need more clarity on refinements. Some areas will be terrible if down to one lane, even the Ross Island Bridge backs up Barbur. We should think about the flow of everyone else and travel time – is the new line going to help me get home faster if I had a young child? Scenario 2B is out.





**Calista** asked about the likelihood of getting additional funding.

**Kelly** replied that talks are underway now and we would hope to have more information at the next meeting.

**Eric** asked if we will be able to see a menu of alternate pricing for the entire project to value one thing against another.

**Michael** affirmed that OHSU has been supportive of an elevator and bridge as the Marquam Hill Connector – both time tested technologies. Although we didn't advocate against the funicular, we are on record of wanting a cost-effective solution, and it is unclear whether the funicular meets that test or not. OHSU contributed extensive funding to the tram and feel like it was a good investment because it moves a lot of people over a long distance quickly. An elevator and bridge would cover a relatively short distance and would cost less, hopefully no more than \$20m. It sounds like connecting to OHSU might not be a core value for everyone on this committee. However, I have heard that it is a requirement to receive federal funding. If it really is a federal requirement, I would appreciate seeing that information communicated more clearly, to avoid us debating an issue where there is no flexibility. Everyone lives somewhere, and if there is a connection to Bridgeport, it would be in the community's best interest for them to have the ability to efficiently connect to OHSU and the VA. A staggering number of patients, employees and students travel to OHSU and the VA each day, making it a destination that is as valuable as getting to Bridgeport or downtown.

**Elise** noted that in looking back at the Draft Principles, Goals and Objectives, we want to build robust flexible infrastructure for the future. If we don't build to Bridgeport with all the influx of people moving here, we are not planning for the future. Point two is about equitable access: Our St. Anthony community has to move further and further out for affordable housing. I have members of my community say that it takes them an hour and half by bus to get to work. If they can get there in 30 minutes that would make a huge impact as most are working service and retail jobs. It's one of my driving forces that this whole project needs to serve a greater community outside of SW corridor.

**Deborah** asked if there a way we can borrow the \$400M and pay it off over 20 years out of the transportation package passed several years ago. ODOT is getting more money, too. Has that been explored?

**Kelly** replied that we can look in to this.

**Deborah** asked if there has been discussion about examining original alignment to make changes.

**Scott** replied that after our 74th Ave exploration, we learned the likelihood to do a supplemental draft environmental impact statement would add a year to the project at a cost of around \$100M. We did cost estimates for other branch alignments that were in the range of \$100M, but that alignment skipped downtown Tigard and that was not something the project partners wanted to keep on the list. We had 10 or 15 items that ranged from \$10-15M. We can continue to explore those more with you. In the seven weeks since this group last met, TriMet has been meeting every week with project partners to discuss technically feasible modifications.



**Lindsey** wants to make sure that ridership is on the list of values. Sounds like Scenario 1A is the best one for ridership. If we go this direction and pitch to the public, it must be clear that we had to make these changes to Barbur to get to Bridgeport.

**Brandy** asked the group to each present their final thoughts on what should be carried forward to the Steering Committee. She informed the group that more technical information will be presented and a range of values and viewpoints the Steering Committee should consider will be presented at the next meeting.

**Racheal** – Let's raise \$400M and get to Bridgeport, because I can't support the other scenarios. Let's ask for what we need.

**Calista** – Bridgeport is the end game; to not go there is going to be an issue with voters.

**Lindsey** – Scenarios 1B and 2B looks like we didn't try hard enough.

**Ethan** – Getting to Bridgeport and staying off Barbur to save money is essential.

**Angela** – Get to Bridgeport. Not only does this get me off the road, but the affordability factor is huge. It's imperative to serve as much of the community as we can by going south.

**Julia** – Scenario 1A is the only one – get to Bridgeport. Phases are not going to happen because other projects will take priority – adding two more stops seems like it won't happen.

**Elise** – Get to Bridgeport. Tualatin is a growing economic engine along with the SW Corridor and Wilsonville. As our communities are growing in that direction, we need to provide access to get into Portland without having to drive.

**Eric** – I echo Lindsey: it would be more wasted dollars. Get to Bridgeport or stop in Tigard. Don't make things worse by doing this project; we need room for emergency services.

**Deborah** – I Echo everyone else and highlight that Tualatin has been partner from the beginning. I don't want to us reduce capacity on Barbur.

**Michael** – Making sure we're thinking of impacts to all modes – bikes, peds, bus, cars, and light trail.

**Rebecca** – Having access to major destinations including OHSU addresses equity and economic stability for our PCC students.

Brandy thanked the group for their participation and reminded them that we will be back with more detail at the next meeting.





## Public comment

Three guests addressed the committee.

**Tony Hansen**, *President of Crestwood Neighborhood Association* – Our neighborhood is ground zero for all of this. I would like you to make the pie bigger because I don't like the trade-offs. The stuff in Barbur will affect neighborhood, so we're going to need a lot more information. There was a lot of opposition to removing lanes on Barbur, so if you do that, we're done. I didn't understand the assumptions on the first 60M in cutting right-of-way and removing stormwater. Stormwater doesn't seem like something you can cross off, so more information would be helpful.

**Less Algor**, *Tigard resident, retired Air Force and OSHU* – I have a basic question that occurred to me: I keep seeing the general figure of this project costing \$3B dollars. Do we get to vote on this and if it doesn't pass, what happens next?

**Joe Shwitz**, *retired TriMet* – I worked for TriMet for many years; I did the bus schedules and wrote the MAX schedule. This a great opportunity for transportation, but to stop where they are stopping isn't far enough. But it's a good idea to go to Bridgeport, and then you can split it to go to Wilsonville and Sherwood and cover different areas as things keep growing. It's important to start mapping it ahead of time instead of waiting until everything fills in. If you cut it back, it will cost more somewhere else in the bus system just to fill in. I think that everything needs to be looked at like you are doing, and I respect that. Thank you.