



Meeting minutes

Meeting: High Capacity Transit Strategy Update Working Group #3.75
Date/time: Thursday, November 17, 2022
Place: Zoom – Virtual meeting
Purpose: Share input from committees on vision, obtain feedback on Refined Network Vision Story Map, solicit responses on what future modeling assumptions will be used for HCT lines, hear further suggestions on criteria to use for evaluating HCT corridors.

Vision Input

- Northernmost section of CTC is missing, up to Columbia
 - Response: revise to reflect correct terminus
- Economic opportunity not fully reflected in policy and objectives.

Refined Network Vision Input

- Line 73 on 122nd has lower equity access and ridership scores than expected yet scores high for equity (100th percentile for EFA tracts); consider adding to Refined Network Vision
 - Response: consultant team will review this further
- Lack of new lines on Refined Network Vision between Hillsboro and Wilsonville
- Desire for more streamlined way to reach Hillsboro from Wilsonville
- More connections to Lents to reinforce Portland’s expected growth corridors and Civic Corridor
- Measuring difference in current transit travel time vs. future transit time with HCT investment
- Clarify what assumption is being used for BRT on 82nd
 - Response: modeling will be reviewed further at WG #4. Modeling will not contribute to the L2/Readiness screen

Corridor Evaluation Criteria Input

- How are HCT corridors defined? Will the corridors be coded as dedicated for at least 50% of the ROW dedicated to HCT?
 - Response: modeling will be reviewed further at WG #4. Modeling will not contribute to the L2/Readiness screen
- Should we include the distance for a HCT line from other HCT lines as criteria?
 - Response: consider for inclusion in policy framework
- Adding more vehicles to improve frequency can help address current needs

Actions agreed upon

- Iterate and clarify tolling coordination and modeling; have meeting to review tolling modeling run results
- Identify why Line 73 was not considered in Refined Network Vision; consider Line 73 for inclusion in Refined Network Vision
- Work with Thaya to code candidate lines in December or following months.
- Clean up glossary to remove outdated “ETC” language and shift to “Better Bus” language
- Review modeling approach further with WG

Next meeting

November 23, 2022 9:00-11:00 am

Zoom



Meeting minutes

Meeting: High Capacity Transit Strategy Update Working Group #4
Date/time: Wednesday, November 23, 2022
Place: Zoom – Virtual meeting
Purpose: Share revisions on Policy Framework, obtain feedback on Network Vision, identify corridors with highest level of readiness, refine what lens to analyze corridors with and what criteria to use in ranking corridors, forecast funding and revenue assumptions.

Policy Framework Input

- Include streetcar in HCT definition
- Revisions seem to be going in the right direction

Network Vision Input

- Would prefer to see a less specific alignment for Corridor 8 than the current I-205 alignment to reflect it as a visioning corridor
- The future vision needs to have a north-south line serving East Portland (122nd).
 - Response: team re-examined this route, not recommendation for inclusion do to previous scoring, lack of connection to regional/town centers. Corridor is identified ETC corridor.
- Spacing aspect (fuzzification) is seen as a good addition
- City of Portland prioritizes analysis of Broadway / Weidler couplet over Sandy for Corridor 11
 - Response: team will adjust routing in network vision map
- What is the horizon year?
 - Response: approximately 2070.

Readiness Assessment Input

- Reiterate importance of looking at potential time savings for corridors with HCT treatments; desire to understand how Metro would measure the travel time benefits and how it relates to modeling
 - Response: Ridership modeling is not part of the Level 2/Readiness screen. Travel time savings incorporated into analysis through metric that examines the ratio of transit to car travel time in a given corridor.
- Constrained locations could provide opportunity to implement HCT, as opposed to walking away from HCT
- Interested in duplication of Level 2 analysis with Big Moves and Level 1 screening
 - Response: Level 2/Readiness evaluation intended to provide a greater level of detail and alignment with CIG funding criteria
- Desire for Working Group to review assumptions on model before model is run
 - Response: modeling will not contribute to the Level 1/Readiness screen. Modeling assumptions will be discussed with WG at a later meeting
- Due to difficulty of achieving exclusive guideway, any results with assumption of exclusive guideway need to clarify this difficulty

Corridor Ranking / Tiering Input

- Incorporate improvements to access for car-dependent areas of the region as criteria



Meeting minutes

- Seeking clarification on what happens when some corridors do not move forward; question about low-scoring HCT corridors still being considered for other improvements in light of fact that some potentially low-scoring HCT corridors have just started bus service
- What are each jurisdiction's priorities and what can they put funding towards?
 - Readiness evaluation will consider jurisdictional readiness and political/funding support
- Adding a second bullet to the tiering matrix to look at additional actions to advance a corridor and time frames

Funding / Revenue Assumptions Input

- Team reviewed initial funding assumptions, subject to further refinement
- Funding important lens to apply to Readiness evaluation
- Will there be a funding bucket for Better Bus?
 - Response: Better Bus is not part of the HCT vision per se, but is a separate program applicable to multiple transit corridors in the region

Actions agreed upon

- Consider going back to policy framework and making it more aligned with growth concept and strengthen the network
- Add Line 76 to Network Vision map
- Fuzzify and share back the Story Map before WG #5
- Consider both new connections and strengthening existing connections as part of the corridor ranking assessment

The tables below provide more detail on how comments from WG 3.75 were addressed.

Feedback	Considerations/Team Recommendations
There are four clear HCT priorities: IBR, SW Corridor, 82 nd , TV Highway	These are Tier 1 corridors (will discuss further later in presentation)
Longer-term corridors should address gaps, focusing on land use, cost, ridership	Reflected in Level 2 and readiness criteria
Need for bike/ped improvements to support corridors	Reflected in readiness criteria
Consider SW 257 th	This was a 2009 corridor and was included
Consider Halsey	This corridor emerged from Big Moves analysis and was included
181 st corridor – recommend extension northward	The southern portion of this corridor was already included; extended connection northward
Consider corridors east of 257 th in Multnomah County	This area of east county did not rise to the top in technical analysis (major unserved O/D, land use)



Meeting minutes

Feedback	Considerations/Team Recommendations
Consider Hwy 212 from I-205 to Happy Valley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did not perform highly w/r/t Level 1 criteria (equity, ridership) • Identified ETC corridor • CTC to Happy Valley connection included
Minor routing adjustments for corridors in Clackamas County	Made changes; no fundamental change to corridors
Consider more direct connections between Hillsboro/Clackamas County/Wilsonville	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upgraded HCT connection between Beaverton TC/Tualatin and vicinity is included. Connects to TV Hwy, Hillsboro • Oregon City/Tualatin/Wash Sq/Beaverton TC connection included • Connection to Wilsonville added per prior feedback, connecting policy framework (land use)
Employment areas north of Hillsboro	Consider how to better connect these areas to the existing HCT system
Powell (US 26) corridor – Division already improved	Desire for Powell to remain under consideration based on prior partner agreements
Consider “new northern arterial” corridor connecting Wash. Co. to St Johns	No existing corridor; new connection not adopted in plans. Recommend for further discussion as new transit corridor as part of separate process (Westside Multimodal Study)
Line 73 corridor (122 nd)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scored in the middle quantile on Level 1 criteria • Identified ETC corridor • Big Moves analysis indicated high need, but for short connection between Midway/Gateway (not conducive to HCT)
Line 12 corridor (Sandy Blvd)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identified ETC corridor • Sandy streetcar to Hollywood (town center) added • East of Hollywood – no connection to centers
Line 14 (Hawthorne)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identified ETC corridor • Moderate in Big Moves • Policy framework (corridor density)
Line 6 (MLK)	This corridor is included, will be evaluated

Next meeting

December 20, 2022 11:00 am-1:00 pm
 Zoom