

 Metro | Meeting Summary

Powell-Division Transit and Development Project Steering Committee  
Monday, March 17, 2014  
4 to 6 p.m.  
Portland Community College, Southeast Center

*Committee members present*

Shirley Craddick, Co-chair  
Bob Stacey, Co-chair  
Trell Anderson  
John Bildsoe  
Lori Boisen  
Devin Carr  
Matt Clark  
Bill Crawford  
Shemia Fagan  
Jessica Howard  
Nicole Johnson  
Kem Marks  
Neil McFarlane  
Diane McKeel  
Melinda Merrill  
Diane Noriega  
Steve Novick  
Raahi Reddy  
Lori Stegmann  
Jason Tell  
Matt Wand

Metro Council  
Metro Council  
Catholic Charities  
Gresham Coalition of Neighborhood Associations  
Division-Midway Alliance  
Student and transit rider  
Johnson Creek Watershed Council  
Southeast Uplift Neighborhood Coalition  
Oregon State Legislature  
Portland Community College, Southeast  
OPAL Environmental Justice Oregon  
EPNO and EPAP  
TriMet  
Multnomah County  
Fred Meyer  
Mount Hood Community College  
City of Portland  
APANO and University of Oregon  
City of Gresham  
ODOT  
East Metro Economic Alliance

*Committee members excused*

Heidi Guenin

Upstream Public Health

*Metro staff*

Elissa Gertler, Brian Monberg, Dana Lucero, Camille Tisler, Joyce Felton, Jon Williams, Beth Cohen

## **1.0 Welcome and introductions**

Co-chair Shirley Craddick convened the meeting at 4:03 p.m. and welcomed committee members. She described the structure of the committee and introduced Metro staff members supporting the committee.

Co-chair Bob Stacey expressed excitement about the project and the committee's role in delivering transit improvements to communities in the Powell-Division corridor. He noted that the committee is made up of institutional delegates, community-based organization representatives, elected officials and community members. This composition makes the Steering Committee unique and will bring public interest perspectives to the process.

Each committee member then offered their thoughts on his/her vision for the corridor in ten years.

- Safety for pedestrians, cyclists, automobiles, and transit users
- Economic growth and increased job market
- Family friendly environment
- An education corridor connecting Portland State University, Portland Community College, Warner Pacific and Mount Hood Community College, as well as several K-12 schools
- Housing variety and socioeconomic diversity
- Access to natural areas
- Equitable opportunities

## **2.0 Public comment**

Mr. Jim Karlock commented on transit commute times, the lack of light rail safety, job displacement, and overall cost of transit. He expressed concern that high capacity transit will be an expensive, but less efficient alternative.

Mr. Bob Clark expressed hope that the project would not reduce existing car and bus capacity in the corridor. He noted that the residents should have a direct voice in the process, suggesting a vote or polling.

Mr. David Hampsten, representing the Hazelwood Neighborhood Association, charged the Steering Committee with considering the current and upcoming growth in East Portland. He asked that committee members make this a proactive project that will raise the quality of life in East Portland neighborhoods. Mr. Hampstead suggested that special attention be paid to the affordability of the system.

## **3.0 Steering Committee charge and decision making**

Ms. Dana Lucero reviewed the charge of the Steering Committee, as follows. To represent the community by providing information to and from constituents/community members, and represent their perspectives, concerns and priorities. To advance the project through key decision points following decision-making protocols as established by the committee. And to recommend an action plan. The recommended action plan will then go to the local and regional elected bodies for consideration and endorsement. She emphasized the

importance of committee members continued participation within their organizations and within the project's engagement process.

Ms. Lucero then outlined the proposed meeting protocols and decision making process. The decision process proposed was a consensus-based approach, with decisions only moving forward with a high level of committee support. She described a proposed process for reaching resolution when the committee is fundamentally divided and consensus cannot be reached.

Commissioner Steve Novick asked that the committee consider weighted votes as opposed to a simple majority when the committee is fundamentally divided. Mr. Trell Anderson agreed that a simple majority vote may not be the best option, but suggested instead that they require a two-thirds majority. Ms. Diane Noriega proposed that the committee use a first-read, second-read system for decisions, though she acknowledged that the project timeline might render this unfeasible.

Ms. Raahi Reddy inquired about distributing materials further in advance of each meeting, in order to allow committee members to take the information to the groups and communities they represent. Additionally, she suggested that the committee use a method of tabling topics at meetings that they are unprepared to decide on that day. Ms. Lori Boisen inquired about the possibility of extending the timeline if necessary.

Per Representative Shemia Fagan's inquiry, staff explained that a representative can attend in the committee member's place if necessary. Staff also noted that they are willing to work closely with members prior to and following the meetings if they are unable to attend.

Following the discussion, Co-chair Craddick called for a show of support for using a consensus-based approach for decision making, with the caveat that staff will rework some of the details of the procedure. The committee approved this approach with all members showing in full support with green cards.

#### **4.0 Making decisions: Project outcomes and goals**

Co-chair Stacey overviewed the proposed project outcomes and goals. Mr. Brian Monberg explained the proposed outcomes and goals are based in adopted local and regional plans and were discussed with each committee member in interviews prior to today's meeting. The proposed goals reflect on feedback from the community, staff, steering committee members and best practices from other projects. He explained that the goals are measureable so the project can be evaluated based on those measurements.

Ms. Lucero noted that the public engagement report describes the broad support for the project. People believe implementation should improve access to transit and the experience for riders of the 4 (Division) and 9 (Powell) bus lines. Findings also show that the committee should consider different transit types equally and focus on safety. She explained there is a fear of displacement and residents hope instead to improve conditions for the current residents. Additionally, she noted that in interviews, committee members also focused equitable access and benefits.

### *Committee discussion:*

- Committee members discussed fighting displacement, and the need to identify anti as an explicit goal. Members discussed the need for affordability in the corridor, both in housing and transit. Ms. Lucero read a statement from Ms. Guenin, who was not in attendance (attachment to the record).
- Committee members discussed the need for bike and pedestrian improvements to improve both the transportation network and safety.
- Mr. Marks expressed a concern about the level of involvement from the community. He explained that he believes the community voice should directly inform the committee's data and decisions. Ms. Lucero explained that every decision the committee makes will be informed by technical and community input.
- Commissioner Novick expressed an interest in understanding more about the role of the committee in relation to its interaction with the cities, Metro Council and advisory committees.
- Councilor Stegmann noted that the project should be compatible with the current infrastructure so cars are not displaced. Ms. Merrill added that freight has to continue to move through the corridor. Additionally, Mr. Marks pointed out that high capacity transit should not displace or interrupt current transit.
- Per Mr. Tell's inquiry, Mr. Monberg explained that the committee will be discussing ways to measure the goals at the next meeting. This will give specific objectives to the broader goals statements and will begin the screening process for alternatives.
- Mr. Bildsoe and Mr. Anderson asked that more quantitative data, such as projected traffic volumes and transit ridership in the corridor, be made available to the committee in order to better inform their discussions and decisions.
- Mr. McFarlane suggested that travel time for transit riders be identified as a goal so efficiency is tracked.
- Mr. Anderson stressed the importance of striving to reduce toxic emissions and would like to see it incorporated into the evaluation of the well-being goal.

Ms. Lucero summarized the discussion by focusing on proposed areas for refinement within the project outcomes and goals. Revisions to the goals included additions to the transportation goal to emphasize compatibility with other travel modes, including safety within the well-being goal and addressing the concerns about displacement and benefits to current residents within the equity goal. Revisions to the proposed outcomes focused on clarifying the role of the project and committee. The co-chairs called for consensus, directing staff to move forward with revisions to the proposed outcomes and goals for committee consideration and asked for a show of support through the color cards: all were green excepting Mr. Tell, Mr. Anderson, Ms. Boisen, Mr. Crawford, Mr. Bildsoe, Ms. Reddy, Mr. Bildsoe, Mr. Novick and Ms. Johnson, who indicated yellow cards.

### **5.0 Project information and next steps**

Mr. Monberg explained that staff will provide the committee with data to inform their decisions, but staff would like the committee to give input on the type of information needed. He overviewed the high level data included in the "summary document" and noted that as the process moves forward more detailed reports will be available. Mr. Monberg also noted that some information will be distributed between meetings.

## **6.0 Public comment**

Mr. Jim Karlock expressed concern about implementing high capacity transit to solve a problem, he believes, can be solved by local transit increases. He also believes that mass transit is less efficient than small cars.

Mr. Ian Royer noted his satisfaction with the current make up of the committee and its representative nature. He asked that the committee not rely on procedural justice and overlook distributive justice.

Mr. John Mulvey, from Oregon Walks, explained that funds are allocated to this project from Oregon Walks active transportation funds. He felt that the project should return those funds if the project plans to focus on cars in addition to active transportation infrastructure.

Written comments were submitted by: Chris Bentley and Ray Whitford. These comments are included as attachments to the record.

## **7.0 Adjourn**

Co-chair Stacey adjourned the meeting at 6:05 p.m.

Meeting summary respectfully submitted by:

---

Camille Tisler

Attachments to the Record:

Item	Type	Document Date	Description	Document Number
1	Agenda	3/17/14	3/17/14 Steering Committee Agenda	031714pdsc-01
2	Document	3/17/14	Steering Committee Decisions Summary	031714pdsc-02
3	Comment		Heidi Guenin comment	031714pdsc-03
4	Comment		Ray Whitford comment	031714pdsc-04
5	Comment		Chris Bentley comment	031714pdsc-05
6	Document		Meeting protocols	031714pdsc-06