



Powell-Division Transit and Development Project Steering Committee
Monday, September 29, 2014
4 to 6 p.m.
St. Philip Neri, Carvlin Hall, 2408 SE 16th Ave, Portland

Committee members present

Shirley Craddick, Co-chair
Bob Stacey, Co-chair
John Bildsoe
Lori Boisen
Devin Carr
Matt Clark
Bill Crawford
Heidi Guenin
Jessica Howard
Kem Marks

Neil McFarlane
Rick Doughty *for Diane Noriega*
Steve Novick
Raahi Reddy
Vivian Satterfield
Lori Stegmann
Matt Wand
Rian Windsheimer

Committee members excused

Trell Anderson
Shemia Fagan
Diane McKeel
Melinda Merrill

Metro Council
Metro Council
Gresham Coalition of Neighborhood Associations
Division-Midway Alliance
Student and transit rider
Johnson Creek Watershed Council
Southeast Uplift Neighborhood Coalition
Upstream Public Health
Portland Community College, Southeast
East Portland Neighborhood Office and East
Portland Action Plan
TriMet
Mount Hood Community College
City of Portland
Asian Pacific American Network of Oregon and
University of Oregon
OPAL Environmental Justice
City of Gresham
East Metro Economic Alliance
Oregon Department of Transportation

Catholic Charities
Oregon State Legislature
Multnomah County
Fred Meyer

1.0 Welcome, introductions and agenda review

Co-chair Shirley Craddick convened the meeting and welcomed the committee members and public in attendance. Each committee member introduced themselves and noted their jurisdictional or community affiliation.

Co-chair Bob Stacey asked for any amendments to the June 23, 2014 Steering Committee meeting summary. With no amendments, the summary was approved.

2.0 Public comment

Mr. Duncan Hwang, representing the Asian Pacific American Network of Oregon and the Jade District, informed the committee of some of the challenges the Jade District faces, and the excitement created by the prospect of high capacity transit utilizing 82nd Ave as the crossover between Powell and Division. He noted that APANO and the Jade District feel strongly that increased transportation should be a high priority on 82nd Ave. During the night markets this summer, higher than expected attendance brought the street to a standstill; it highlighted the need for better transit options to alleviate congestion for events like the markets. Mr. Hwang also described some of the environmental justice issues the district faces and noted that transit has the ability to address these issues.

Ms. Alison Hart, representing the Gresham Area Chamber of Commerce, explained that the corridor interacts with many facets of her life. She noted the many opportunities for placemaking in the corridor and asked how this investment will affect economic development as well as connect businesses and education centers including Mount Hood Community College. She suggested that connections be viewed through an economic lens. She then expressed the personal feeling that the alignment should run along inner Powell Blvd, cross along 82nd Ave and continue along outer Division St, but could not speak to the chamber's preference on the alignment.

Mr. Jim Karlock informed the committee of his views on light rail. He believes that light rail increases crime, has higher costs than bus and car, and has higher commute times than driving. He expressed the belief that MAX replaces efficient buslines, which cost less to operate. He also noted that even in the densest cities, transit commute times are higher than driving.

3.0 Transit alternatives for further study

Mr. Brian Monberg explained that the meeting's goal was to reach consensus on promising alternatives to study further, including transit vehicle type and general route. In future phases of the project, the project will consider local bus service scenarios, station area planning, and traffic analysis and design. To inform the committee's discussion, he laid out the technical and public engagement findings regarding the project's needs and opportunities, the range of vehicle types, and the potential routes

Mr. Monberg outlined the project's opportunity to create more frequent, reliable transit service for riders of lines 4-Division and 9-Powell and to connect the educational centers and key destinations along the corridor. He explained that ridership in the corridor is already high, and is projected to grow by over 70% on lines 4-Division and 9-Powell by the

year 2035. Due to this increase, capacity issues will need to be addressed by increasing service frequency or by introducing larger capacity vehicles. Additionally inadequate bus stops need safety and shelter improvements including better access in the form of sidewalks and other enhancements.

He stressed the importance of the project taking a system approach, recognizing that roads are important and need improvement, and transit can support those improvements. He also noted that bicycle, pedestrian and freight movement along the corridor must be taken into consideration. Local bus service will also be considered based on route options that are developed.

Mr. Monberg then discussed the range of routes and vehicles that were studied, and noted that public engagement to that point underscored the need to provide quicker more reliable trips and improve access through a balanced system that supports freight, motor vehicles, transit, bicycles and pedestrians. Engagement also showed that the public favored lower cost alternatives that provide benefits to riders. He explained that findings were presented to the public and bus options were preferred. The public also favored inner Powell Blvd transitioning to Division St moving east as the route, which the technical work supported. Mr. Monberg then noted the efforts of the project work groups and explained that these groups will continue to meet as the project progresses.

The local bus service scenarios, station area planning, and traffic analysis and design will all be considerations for the future. He noted that the committee could have other considerations, and asked that members lay out their concerns and questions.

Considerations for today:

- Will light rail be more efficient over the long run?
- Why is light rail a good option for other places in the region? How do we talk about this issue moving forward?
- What is the carbon footprint of light rail versus bus rapid transit?
- Is there an overlap/gray area between dedicated busway and frequent service plus?
- How do we understand how “reasonable” impacts are defined?
- Will there be more focus on equity impacts with regards to the type of transit moving forward?
- Are the public engagement findings and technical findings combined in the presentations and reports?
- How much relocation of businesses and residences would be necessary?
- Can we look at trolley buses?
- How does the choice on mode affect funding sources? How do funding mechanisms support our choice?
- Are there examples of freight sharing transit lanes?
- How will we deal with congested zones in the future?

Considerations for the future:

- Local bus service
- Traffic analysis and concept designs
- Safety and security
- Cost and affordability

- Connections to Mount Hood Community College and Portland Community College, Southeast Campus
- How will a bus perform in mixed traffic?
- Future development: how can we invest in a way that does not preclude future investment?
- How do we understand the tradeoffs needed to run transit on inner Powell?
- Why is 52nd Ave a possible crossover point? How will the bus make the turn?
- How do we maximize the economic development opportunities around 82nd Ave?
- Is a double decker bus a consideration?
- How do we connect historic downtown Gresham effectively?

Following this, the committee participated in a dot exercise that allowed each member to confirm their preferences for route and mode. The majority of dots were placed with bus alternatives and the inner Powell Blvd to outer Division St route alternatives.

At this point Co-chair Craddick called for consensus on the transit mode alternatives for further study. Yellow cards were raised by Ms. Leah Treat and Mr. Bill Crawford.

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

- Ms. Treat expressed concern about the intentionality around the discussion of equity and gentrification. She asked that the process consider these issues moving forward.
- Mr. Crawford noted that he was happy moving forward with the consensus, but explained his concern about the range of bus options. He expressed the opinion that the mode should be dedicated busway and not frequent service plus.

Following the remarks of those that raised yellow cards, Mr. Monberg announced that with the concerns and considerations laid out, the committee had reached consensus on mode. Per Ms. Raahi Reddy's inquiry, Mr. Monberg clarified that with the consensus, rail would no longer be studied any further.

Next Mr. Monberg outlined the four broad route alternatives. Co-chair Stacey called for consensus on the inner Powell Blvd to outer Division St alternative with the questions and considerations that still need to be studied further. Yellow cards were raised by Mr. Rian Windsheimer and Mr. Matt Wand.

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

- Mr. Windsheimer expressed concern about inner Powell Blvd's level of congestion, and suggested that this issue may eventually merit study of alternatives to inner Powell.
- Mr. Wand noted his concern that outer Division, near Gresham, could be an issue. He suggested that the project focus on keeping buses in their own lane, to avoid exacerbating traffic issues.

Following the remarks of those that raised yellow cards, Co-chair Stacey announced that with the concerns and considerations laid out, the committee had reached consensus on a general route.

The committee then discussed concerns about the alignment options still to be considered including the Portland north/south crossover options and the alignment to and around Mount Hood Community College. Committee members strongly expressed support for the alignment serving both Portland Community College Southeast and Mount Hood Community College. Additionally, Ms. Reddy noted the importance of serving the Jade District on 82nd Ave, and several committee members questioned the validity of 52nd as a viable cross over street.

4.0 Land use and station opportunity areas

Ms. Alexandra Howard (City of Portland) and Mr. Brian Martin (City of Gresham) introduced Dr. Lisa Bates, a guest speaker from Portland State University. Ms. Howard outlined the station area planning work done to identify eight opportunity areas. She explained that staff is approaching this planning from a people-oriented, equity perspective, noting many of the riders of lines 4-Division and 9-Powell do not have a car available, cannot drive or do not drive.

Ms. Howard and Mr. Martin reviewed maps that showed income, sidewalks, and access to amenities in Portland and Gresham. They explained that in inner Portland, there is more access to amenities, but housing is more expensive; in outer east Portland, there is less access, but housing is more affordable. Mr. Martin noted that Gresham has a variety of conditions, and while some lower income neighborhoods have access to amenities others do not. Services need to be extended to those that don't have access at this time, and affordable housing needs to be created in areas that have better access.

Mr. Martin then outlined the three opportunity areas identified in Gresham and noted a few of the challenges and opportunities of each area.

- Stark/Hogan (242nd)
- Main/Division/Eastman
- 182nd/Division

Ms. Howard, with Dr. Bates' assistance, outlined the Portland opportunity areas next.

- 162nd/Division
- 122nd/Division
- Jade
- Foster/Powell
- Chavez/Powell

Dr. Bates noted that a difficulty with the eastern part of Division St. is affordability. Housing prices are low, but so are incomes, making housing less affordable. She pointed to the importance of coordinating efforts across the system in an attempt to raise the incomes of the current population and ensure that low income housing is maintained near station areas. Dr. Bates also mentioned that the Jade District is changing fast, and as a diverse, rapidly developing place, new residents could be drawn in and price current residents out.

Regarding Powell/Chavez and Powell/Foster, Dr. Bates suggested that the focus be on maintaining housing affordability and stability. She explained that this area offers diverse housing stock and opportunities for first time buyers, but market pressure will grow in this area.

Commissioner Steve Novick inquired about the examples available for best practices, when Oregon is without inclusionary zoning and rent control. Dr. Bates explained that a thoughtful incentive package could encourage developers to develop in an equitable way. Ms. Howard also noted that staff is working on a report describing successes from around the country and the tools available.

Mr. Rick Doughty impressed on the committee the importance of connecting MHCC. He noted that it is the Head Start center in East Multnomah County and is one of the state leaders in work force development. He also pointed out that MHCC's gym is a destination emergency center. Dr. Jessica Howard then noted that in addition to the educational connections, MHCC and PCC provide connections to vibrant economic nodes.

Mr. Wand suggested that land swaps be considered to maintain a stable housing market. He noted that anything the city of Portland can do to control rent could be helpful.

Per Ms. Heidi Guenin's inquiry, Co-chair Stacey noted that the equity work group will meet again, though a date has not been set.

Ms. Reddy suggested that government agencies coordinate to share their learnings about the Jade District. She noted that many agencies ask frequently ask for information, rather than building on what other agencies have already learned. Ms. Howard explained that staff will consolidate the information.

Mr. Kem Marks informed the committee that market pressures are already present east of I-205, and cautioned the idea that the issue has not reached that far east. He noted that his own rent had risen 7% in one year.

Councilor Lori Stegmann explained that in East Multnomah County there is a large supply of unintended affordable housing. She inquired about how to differentiate between economic recovery and gentrification. She also asked how to differentiate between Gresham and the rest of the urban area.

Mr. John Bildsoe asked when decisions will be made about the makeup of the eight opportunity areas.

5.0 Adjourn

Co-chair Stacey adjourned the meeting at 6:03 p.m.

Meeting summary respectfully submitted by:

Camille Freestone

Attachments to the Record:

Item	Type	Document Date	Description	Document Number
1	Agenda	9/29/14	9/29/14 Steering Committee Agenda	
2	Document	9/29/14	Steering Committee Decisions Summary	
3	Document		Meeting protocols	