



Powell-Division Transit and Development Project Steering Committee  
Monday, June 23, 2014  
4 to 6 p.m. at East Hill Church, Gresham

*Committee members present*

Shirley Craddick, Co-chair  
Bob Stacey, Co-chair  
John Bildsoe  
Lori Boisen  
Devin Carr  
Bill Crawford  
Heidi Guenin  
Kem Marks  
Bernie Bottomly for Neil McFarlane  
Diane McKeel  
Melinda Merrill  
Steve Novick  
Raahi Reddy  
Lori Stegmann  
Jason Tell  
Matt Wand

Metro Council  
Metro Council  
Gresham Coalition of Neighborhood Associations  
Division-Midway Alliance  
Student and transit rider  
Southeast Uplift Neighborhood Coalition  
Upstream Public Health  
EPNO and EPAP  
TriMet  
Multnomah County  
Fred Meyer  
City of Portland  
APANO and University of Oregon  
City of Gresham  
ODOT  
East Metro Economic Alliance

*Committee members excused*

Jessica Howard  
Trell Anderson  
Matt Clark  
Shemia Fagan  
Nicole Johnson  
Diane Noriega

Portland Community College, SE Center  
Catholic Charities  
Johnson Creek Watershed Council  
Oregon State Legislature  
OPAL Environmental Justice Oregon  
Mount Hood Community College

## **1.0 Welcome and introductions**

Co-chair Shirley Craddick convened the meeting at 4:04 p.m. and welcomed committee members. She asked each member to introduce themselves and note their organizational affiliation. Following introductions, Co-chair Craddick introduced Mr. Brian Monberg, Ms. Dana Lucero, and Ms. Deb Meihoff.

Co-chair Bob Stacey asked the committee for a motion to approve the meeting summary from March 17, 2014. Councilor Lori Stegmann moved to approve the summary, Commissioner Diane McKeel seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Co-chair Stacey then reviewed the agenda, and asked for public comment.

## **2.0 Public comment**

Ms. Marlene Byrne, representing her condo association on 181<sup>st</sup> and Powell, voiced concerns about the property taxes declining due to high capacity transit along Powell. She explained that the association is also concerned about increased crime, and requested information regarding high capacity transit's effect on both crime and property taxes. Ms. Byrne also noted that the association wants north/south transit to be a higher priority than it is currently.

Mr. Bob Clark expressed concern about the potential loss of auto capacity on Powell. He noted that many people commute by car to save time, and this project could increase commute times. Additionally, he expressed concerns about the project overwhelming the neighborhood, citing Division as an example.

## **3.0 Project foundation**

Mr. Brian Monberg overviewed the need for the project and its opportunities. He explained that the committee is charged with helping to define the new transit route, mode, and station areas, as well as creating a development strategy for key areas in the corridor. He outlined the project timeline and noted that it is ambitious, but explained that the transit and development investment can fit within a larger context of investments in this area. Mr. Monberg also explained the project history and Powell-Division's emergence from the regional work to prioritize transit lines. He noted the corridor's importance as an emerging educational corridor with potential for economic development at major destinations.

Mr. Monberg then noted the high level of ridership and the diverse communities in the corridor currently. He discussed the high ridership on the 4 (Division) and 9 (Powell) bus lines, which data shows provide good service; it does, however, show areas that could be improved upon. He outlined the public input received regarding desirable transit characteristics. Popular comments included: on-schedule arrivals, the need for buses to come more often and the desire for quicker trips.

The project hopes to improve service by utilizing best practices from around the region and the country.

He focused on implementation next, and iterated the project schedule as well as current capital investments in the corridor.

Mr. Monberg then explained the project process which includes narrowing the range of alternatives, evaluating the options, and recommending an action plan. He noted the technical assessments and public engagement that were already done, as well as the equity discussion the Steering Committee took part in on June 2, 2014.

Following Mr. Monberg's presentation, Mr. Alan Lehto provided an update on the Eastside Service Enhancement Plan. He outlined TriMet's effort to create a shared vision for meeting transit needs not currently met. He showed a snapshot of the system, and explained that the focus was on improving transit and adding lines as they would be needed.

Mr. Lehto noted that, according to the current data, service would need to be doubled in 20 years. He explained that public engagement has shown public focus on improved access to jobs, housing, and appointments, frequent service on existing lines, more new connections, expanded north/south service, more weekend service, and better access to bus stops.

He then provided an overview of the project schedule and described the federal funding programs, New Starts and Small Starts.

The committee then discussed questions and information that will be useful.

### **Questions about project scope and processes**

- How does affordability fit into transit plans such as this?
- What is the preferred method to give feedback to staff on routes and stops?
- Will the new transit bridge count toward the 50% designated transit lane requirement of the Federal Transit Administration's New Starts funding program?
- How do the Federal Transit Administration's Small Starts and New Starts funding requirements compare with the Institute for Transportation and Development Policy's bus rapid transit standards? Do we think we can build a BRT that meets the New Starts requirements?
- What are tour dates this summer?
- What capacity do we have to identify potential/future riders (transit converts)?
- Do different modes and lengths of trips serve different people? If so, can we know how many riders?
- Why didn't the survey have questions about safety?
- What has been done to engage businesses along the route?
- What are traffic counts in the area, along the corridor?

- Are there statistics to draw parallels/connections between property values, safety, and economic development? Do we know what impacts high capacity transit has on crime or property values? Does it differ by mode?
- How can food access be included in our thinking/planning?
- Can we get maps of ridership numbers for lines at each bus stop?
- Are there studies of past local light rail projects that would explain the differing outcomes we see in the region? For example, why are there differences between Kenton and Rockwood?
- How does ridership correlate to auto congestion?
- Are we looking at models of places that have leveraged high capacity transit investment for complete station area build out that includes community facilities and infrastructure?

#### **4.0 Adopt project outcomes and goals**

Ms. Lucero reviewed the consensus method for decision making and outlined the changes that were made to the draft goals and outcomes following the March 17 Steering Committee meeting. The draft presented was the third iteration of the draft goals and outcomes and includes language about safety, access and displacement.

Co-chair Craddick called for consensus on the project outcomes and goals. Yellow cards were raised by Mr. Tell, Mr. Bottomly, and Mr. Bildsoe and a red card was raised by Mr. Wand.

Those that raised yellow cards were asked to voice their questions and/or concerns.

- Mr. Tell expressed concern about reaching the goals and aspirations of the committee. He explained that the project may not ultimately match up with all of the group's aspirations. He noted that the large goals were not negative, but as the process moved forward, they would need to be reconciled with what's possible through one project.
- Mr. Bottomly explained that he was happy with the language, but wanted to acknowledge the large number of trips that do not go the full length of the corridor. TriMet does not wish to inhibit riders from embarking and disembarking as is convenient, but hopes to create more predictable, fast transit. He noted that trade-offs may need to be made between speed and spacing of stops.
- Mr. Bildsoe asked that more data be made available, noting that he was somewhat uncomfortable with the process, and would remain so, until the appropriate data was made accessible.

Those that raised red cards were asked to voice their questions and/or concerns.

- Mr. Wand stated his discomfort with the first outcome, but noted that his real concern was with the language stating that the committee would prevent market driven displacement. He noted that this was an overstatement of the committee's power and could infringe on property owners rights. Additionally,

he hoped that some displacement would occur in order to create a more diverse, economically integrated area that would alleviate pockets of poverty by integrating residents of all economic situations.

Ms. Meihoff suggested that language be found that would assuage Mr. Wand's concerns regarding displacement without creating red card concerns for other committee members. Mr. Wand noted that if the word "involuntary" was placed before "displacement" in the goal, he would move from a red card to a yellow. The language suggested is as follows:

### **Project outcomes**

The Powell-Division Transit and Development Project will result in an actionable plan for key places (future station areas) and improved mobility to address long-standing infrastructure and investment issues along Powell-Division. The action plan will strive to:

- 1) Create a vision and development strategy for key places that promotes community-driven and supported economic development and identifies tools and strategies that mitigate the impacts of market pressures that cause involuntary displacement.
- 2) Identify a preferred near-term high capacity transit solution for the corridor that safely and efficiently serves high ridership demand, improves access to transit, is coordinated with related transportation investments, and recognizes limited capital and operational funding. The solution will include mode, alignment and station locations with supporting transportation improvements.

### **Project goals**

- **Transportation:** People have safe and convenient transportation options – including efficient and frequent high capacity transit service that enhances current local transit service – that get them where they want to go and improves the existing system.
- **Well-being:** Future development and transit improvements create safe, healthy neighborhoods and improve access to social, educational, environmental and economic opportunities.
- **Equity:** Future development and transit improvements reduce existing disparities, benefit current residents and businesses and enhance our diverse neighborhoods. There is a commitment to prevent market-driven involuntary displacement of residents and businesses and to equitably distribute the benefits and burdens of change.
- **Efficiency:** A high capacity transit project is efficiently implemented and operated.

With this addition, Councilor Craddick called for consensus again. Yellow cards were raised by Mr. Wand, Councilor Stegmann, and Mr. Bildsoe.

Those that raised yellow cards were asked to voice their questions and/or concerns.

- Councilor Stegmann asked that the language about preventing displacement be softened, as it could give the impression that economic development would be discouraged. Additionally, she worried that the limited power of the committee would not allow it to truly mitigate displacement, so making it an explicit goal would set the committee up for failure.
- Committee members discussed the language and their concerns with softening it, noting that economic development should not be discouraged but gentrification and displacement should. Mr. Marks suggested the project attempt to put tools in place to allow people to stay in their homes if they so wish, citing examples of cities that were able to mitigate gentrification through public/private partnerships.
- Commissioner Novick suggested that City of Portland staff give a presentation in September on what tools are available at the city level to help mitigate displacement. Mr. Bottomly noted that the Federal Transit Administration offers few tools for mitigating displacement.
- Mr. Bildsoe explained that he would not move to a green card until the data was made available.
- Mr. Wand explained that he still had concerns, but did not wish to block the process.

The project outcomes and goals were adopted.

## **5.0 Information to distinguish promising alternatives**

Mr. Monberg outlined measures proposed to evaluate the project's success in reaching each goal. He asked that the committee discuss information needs for future decision-making. Co-chair Stacey called for questions and specific information needs, and a list was compiled by the group.

- Areas along the corridor have large lots that are undeveloped or underdeveloped
- Current travel time reliability, including for north/south transfers
- Right-of-way that would be required in relation to mode (e.g., bus turn radius)
- More information about all the rights-of-ways under consideration
- Definition of populations of concern
- Gresham Vista Business Park's potential for ridership generation
- Tools available for employers to encourage transit ridership
- Key economic development opportunities planned or underway
- An understanding of what funds we have, and what is competitively available
- Potential choke points for cross traffic under various alternatives
- Opportunities to connect to parks and natural areas
- Capacity/need for bike to transit options - bike racks, storage, etc.
- Extent to which we can convert existing residents into riders
- An understanding of the type of economic development we are supporting
- Positive and negative impacts under equity (i.e., economic development, eminent domain)

- High capacity transit experiences from comparable communities
- Distinction between equitably distributing benefits and impacts and the potential for remedying existing inequities
- Project's effect on affordability and different alternatives access to transit
- Student needs
- Bus rapid transit standards versus frequent bus service
- Operating versus construction costs for different modes

## **6.0 Adjourn**

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

Meeting summary respectfully submitted by:

---

Camille Freestone

Attachments to the Record:

Item	Type	Document Date	Description	Document Number
1	Agenda	6/23/14	6/23/14 Steering Committee Agenda	062314pdsc-01
2	Summary	6/23/14	Steering Committee Summary	062314pdsc-02
3	Meeting Summary	3/17/14	3/17/14 Meeting Summary	062314pdsc-03
4	Document	3/17/14	Meeting protocols and procedures	062314pdsc-04
5	Document	5/9/14	Steering Committee feedback: goals, outcomes, and informational needs	062314pdsc-05
6	Document	6/2/14	Steering Committee discussion	062314pdsc-06
7	Document	6/23/14	Public Engagement Report	062314pdsc-07
8	PPT	6/23/14	Powell-Division Transit and Development	062314pdsc-08