



Meeting minutes

Meeting: Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) and
Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC) Workshop

Date/time: Wednesday, Oct. 3, 2018 | 9:30 a.m. – 12 p.m.

Place: Metro Regional Center, Council chamber

Attending

Tom Kloster, Chair
Glenn Koehrsen
Carol Chesarek
Raymond Eck
Nancy Kraushaar
Eric Hesse
Todd Juhasz
Joanna Valencia
Jon Makler
Marlee Schuld
Dr. Gerry Mildner
Denny Egner
Emily Lai
Colin Cooper
Bev Drottar
Yi-Min Ha
Erika Palmer
Anne Debbaut
James Adkins
Brendon Haggerty
Tom Armstrong
Mary Kyle McCurdy
Katherine Kelly
Tyler Bump
Karen Buehrig
Theresa Cherniak
Paul Grove
Anna Slatinsky
Kelly Betteridge
Jae Douglas
Jeannine Rustad
Dave Unsworth

Affiliate

Metro
TPAC Community Member
Multnomah County
Washington County Representative
Clackamas County, City of Wilsonville
City of Portland
City of Beaverton
Multnomah County
Oregon Department of Transportation
City of Troutdale
Portland State University
City of Milwaukie
TPAC Community Member
MTAC, City of Hillsboro
TPAC Community Member
Kittelson & Associates
MTAC, City of Sherwood
DLCD
Home Builders Association of Metropolitan Portland
Multnomah County Public Health
City of Portland
1000 Friends of Oregon
City of Gresham
City of Portland
Clackamas County
Washington County
Home Builders Association of Metropolitan Portland
City of Beaverton
TriMet
Multnomah County Public Health
Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District
TriMet

Metro Staff

Malu Wilkinson, Investment Areas Manager Chris Ford, Principal Regional Planner
Ted Leybold, Planning Manager Jamie Snook, Principal Transportation Planner
Eliot Rose, Senior Tech & Transportation Planner Marie Miller, TPAC Recorder

1. Call to Order and Introductions

Chair Tom Kloster called the workshop meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. Introductions were made.

2. Comments from the Chair and Committee Members

- **TPAC Community Member Recruitment (Marie Miller)** Ms. Miller announced the open recruitment for TPAC Community members, to be appointed by Metro Council for 2-year terms. There are currently 3 positions open that begin January 2019. Applications are available online and will be accepted until October 23. Asked what qualifications and expertise is most encouraged for applications, Chair Kloster explained what the process entailed for application, interviews and appointments. For more information committee members were encouraged to reach Ms. Miller or Chairman Kloster, and help spread word to their communities.
- Dr. Gerry Mildner commented on materials received from the workshop packet regarding proposed Accessory Development Units (ADUs). More economic costs and implications from these developments may be needed beyond what the current study shows. More information on this was presented during the workshop.
- Raymond Eck commented on the letter from the Audubon Society regarding their concern with the I-5 and Rose Quarter transportation projects listed in the RTP. The clarification for this concerning RTP consideration through policy committees and Metro Council stems from project lists in corridor planning and state funding already allocated to designated projects.

3. Public Communications on Agenda Items – none

4. SW Corridor Light Rail Preferred Alternative (Chris Ford, Metro/Dave Unsworth, TriMet)

Mr. Ford provided an update of the SW Corridor Light Rail Preferred Alternative project. A map was referenced of the Regional High Capacity Transit (HCT) System Plan identified in the RTP and another map indicating where the project fits into the existing HCT network of MAX and WES trains. Mr. Ford reminded the committee this project is intended to help address expected future growth in the region, the concept adopted with HCT plans adopted in 2019, in the 2018 RTP, with priority on corridors for HCT.

Metro growth projects 340,000 residents in the Southwest Corridor by year 2015; an added growth of 70,000 people from today. This expected growth impacts not only commutes within the corridor region, but outside the area for work, housing, education and daily living travel. Prediction of 13-17 hours of congestion daily on I-5 between Portland and Tigard in 2015; it was noted this project will not eliminate congestion but provide travel options to lessen impact.

The study started with land use to connect critical places for context with growth, evaluating over 60 alignment options for consideration. Project partners for the study included TriMet, City of Portland, Metro, Tigard, Sherwood, Tualatin, ODOT, King City and Beaverton. As the project plan unfolded, major decisions included evaluation of tunnels, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) and light rail. However, more than light rail is included in the project:

- New walk and bike connector between Barbur and Marquam Hill (OHSU/Veterans Administration and more major industries)
- 2-mile shared transit-way to allow buses to bypass traffic congestion
- Shuttle between PCC-Sylvania and nearby stations
- Continuous sidewalks and protected bike lanes where light rail transit is in Barbur

The benefits and impacts from an investment like light rail has not always been equitably felt by those in the region. To help address this, Metro has partnered with others on housing grants, strategies and the upcoming housing bond measure. In addition, the SW Equitable Development Strategy, supported by a

grant from FTA, is addressing housing issues, workforce development to help create livable wages, and six pilot programs for housing and workforce opportunities.

Comments from the committee:

- Emily Lai asked what the amount of funding for the pilot project was, and how this was being allocated. Mr. Ford stated the amount for pilot grant funding was \$275,000 to be spent by next summer, 2019. Evaluations were performed on 11 applications received, with six grants awarded. With a question on financial resources toward staffing projects and how displacement of homes/properties with the light rail project was affecting in the long-term range plan, Mr. Ford reported that Metro's housing bond measure had strategies in place addressing these issues. In addition, there is a constitutional amendment under consideration requiring project development for affordable housing, with further options for funding through regional partners.

Dave Unsworth, Director of Project Development & Permitting, TriMet, noted the project would provide 43,000 riders on average weekdays in 2035. This equates to 1 in 5 commuters southbound I-5 during rush hour from downtown Portland to Tigard and Tualatin.

The project is undergoing Environmental Review to become eligible for federal funds. The public review period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement received over 1,000 comments. This led to the recommendation by the SW Corridor Steering committee on a preferred alternative chosen based on purpose and need, public and agency input, and FTA rating criteria. The alignment of the line was discussed. Considerations given included Barbur Blvd., Marquam Hill connections, and Tigard/Tualatin connections.

Comments from the committee:

- Denny Egner asked why the line stopped at Bridgeport and not finish in Tualatin. Mr. Ford explained cost considerations and environmental impacts with crossing the river detracted from this idea.
- Nancy Kraushaar commented on unsafe bike lanes between Tualatin and Bridgeport. Were other bike/ped lanes planned for improvements? Mr. Ford reported that station access improvements with Tualatin were considered, but would need other funding sources yet to be determined. A separate bridge was considered too costly when considered. Mr. Unsworth added that partnerships were possible on other bike/ped lanes outside this project.
- Carol Chesarek commented on the lack of Park & Ride space at the Sunset transit station. What plans are being made for adequate parking with this line? Mr. Unsworth listed the Park & Ride locations under consideration with the plan, but acknowledged that not enough space would permanently fill needs. Considerations planning for the future included mobility huts, Automated Vehicles (AVs), and shuttles. Currently it costs \$50,000 per single Park & Ride space, with decisions to be made balancing costs and future space needed.
- Theresa Chernaik asked if elevations with transit structures was considered to address congestion. Mr. Unsworth reported that for now structures were not being planned for changes, but some removal of stations to increase speed between downtown Portland south was planned. Consideration of replacing the Steel Bridge or placing a tunnel below has been given. There are also environmental concerns with grades to lanes leading to the committee preferring the project going further south.
- Collin Cooper asked for the reasoning with the Barbur Transit Station placements. Mr. Unsworth reported this was based on the study of the Barbur concept plan. Considerations that lead to this being the preferred transit stations in the plan were travel time, liability, affordable housing, accessibility,

reliability/speed, and development/housing. Asked what the relationship between ridership on different lines in the region, this varies on if light rail plays a mix for service and the challenge predicting reliability of time on I-5. More study will be done on the concept of the west as its own corridor. Light rail replacements help on time, with connections between light rail and buses serving Tigard for current needs.

- Emily Lai asked how other states are able to fund projects like this with future sustainability. Mr. Unsworth reported that state sales taxes provided revenue that Oregon does not, requiring us to utilize our resources carefully and work with communities on strategies. Asked how we addressed vacant housing along transit corridors for equitable development, Metro Council and regulations apply to prevent acquisition for these purposes.
- Dr. Gerry Mildner asked if the bridge over Highway 217 was being designed for multi-modal traffic. Mr. Unsworth stated this was not in the budget for the project, but could possibly be developed with a bike-ped lane with Tigard planning.
- Collin Cooper commented on the goal of having 20-minute neighborhood commutes, but with TriMet such a complex system, this wasn't the reality. Choices for equitable transit travel with reliability is challenging. Agreement on this from the committee, noting that federal funding 50% partnership on transit projects with less resources, working from aging systems, limitations of single tracks, and commitment to ongoing and proposed projects makes it challenging.
- Emily Lai commented on utilizing further efforts to create designs and strategies outside bonds proposed by Metro, and working with others early on to think outside the box.

Mr. Ford concluded the presentation with the project schedule. In Nov. 2018 Metro Council will consider adding the final preferred route to the RTP, weighing input from local jurisdictions. In 2019, TriMet takes the lead with a new steering committee and advancing designs, and will work with Metro to complete environmental review and identify funding strategies. Following a proposed regional funding measure in 2020, the project would work to acquire federal matching funds in 2022, with the light rail opening in 2027.

5. Portland Housing Strategy (Tom Armstrong/Tyler Bump, City of Portland)

Tom Armstrong and Tyler Bump with the City of Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability provided an overview of housing issues and residential zoning projects in process. Homes sales by affordability shown from 2000 to 2017 displays the high degree in loss of affordable homes to average households in Portland. Dynamics driving this trend includes increase in educated households, 25% increase in jobs, which has resulted in Portland having the 10th highest median household income in the country, ahead of New York and Los Angeles.

Housing development in Portland has increased from 4,000 units per year in 2015 to 7,000 units in 2017. A graph of housing types shows the majority of units are multi-family, with single-family units relatively flat as greenfield sites in Portland are scarce. Since 2011, Portland has seen an increase in Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU). Asked if the change in county tax assessments on ADUs have had, there is no indication that is has had an impact on permit for ADUs.

Mr. Bump provided an overview of the Inclusionary Housing program, designed to help meet the need for a minimum of 23,000 additional housing units to serve low and moderate income households, working to preserve economically diverse neighborhoods and housing affordability. Inclusionary Housing requires that all new residential buildings with 20 or more units provide a percentage of the new units at rents affordable to households at 80% of the median family income (MFI). The City of

Portland has defined additional regulatory options under the umbrella of this requirement. Permit applications must include one of the options to provide affordable housing in their proposal, or applicants can opt to pay a fee-in lieu at permit issuance.

Regulatory Options

Option 1 80% AMI In buildings with 20 or more units, 15% of the units must be affordable at 80% AMI , except within the Central City and Gateway Plan Districts, where 20% of the units must be affordable.	Option 2 60% AMI Applicants can elect to make 10% of units affordable at 60% AMI in buildings within the Central City and Gateway Plan Districts, or 8% of units for buildings in all other areas.
INCENTIVES	INCENTIVES
Central City Plan District & Gateway Plan District—20% of Units <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 10-year property tax exemption on affordable units (for properties with a 5:1 FAR or greater, this exemption applies to all residential units) – Construction Excise Tax exemption on affordable units – Buildings will be exempt from parking requirements as detailed in Title 33 – Density/FAR bonus (varies by zoning code and plan district; see Maximum Base and Bonus Density/FAR table) 	Central City Plan District & Gateway Plan District—10% of Units <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 10-year property tax exemption on affordable units (for properties with a 5:1 FAR or greater, this exemption applies to all residential units) – Construction Excise Tax exemption on affordable units – SDC exemptions on affordable units – Buildings will be exempt from parking requirements as detailed in Title 33 – Density/FAR bonus (varies by zoning code and plan district; see Maximum Base and Bonus Density/FAR table)
All Other Areas*—15% of Units <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 10-year property tax exemption on affordable units – Construction Excise Tax exemption on affordable units – Buildings will be exempt from parking requirements as detailed in Title 33 – Density/FAR bonus (varies by zoning code and plan district; see Maximum Base and Bonus Density/FAR table) 	All Other Areas*—8% of Units <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 10-year property tax exemption on affordable units – Construction Excise Tax exemption on affordable units – SDC exemptions on affordable units – Buildings will be exempt from parking requirements as detailed in Title 33 – Density/FAR bonus (varies by zoning code and plan district; see Maximum Base and Bonus Density/FAR table)
KEY REQUIREMENTS	KEY REQUIREMENTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – At least 5 percent of the number of affordable units must be built to be Type A as defined in the Oregon Structural Specialty Code. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – At least 5 percent of the number of affordable units must be built to be Type A as defined in the Oregon Structural Specialty Code.

Maximum Monthly Rent Considered Affordable

Bedroom	30% MFI	60% MFI	80% MFI
0	\$392	\$855	\$1,140
1	\$458	\$916	\$1,222
2	\$549	\$1,099	\$1,466
3	\$635	\$1,270	\$1,694
4	\$708	\$1,417	\$1,890
5	\$781	\$1,563	\$2,085

The above table provided by HUD, updated annually, adjusted per region.

Theresa Cherniak asked how long was the rate required to maintain affordability. The Portland Housing Bureau requires 99 years of affordability to comply with the program. To ensure this requirement, they have a compliance team that reports and monitors the program and permits. From March 2016 to Feb. 1, 2017, development applications for 19,000 units were placed in the pipeline before the Inclusionary Housing program took effect. There are now 8,600 still in the pipeline, which will take 4-5 years before

these applications are all considered. Affordability housing in Portland will be a rolling issue, as will comparisons to other parts in the region for years to come.

Comments from the committee:

- Theresa Cherniak asked how Inclusionary Housing are distributed, and how both renters and landlords know if a tenant is qualified. What type of marketing is done for this program? The City of Portland's Housing Bureau provides the outreach and engagement for the program. Property managements, landlords, and developers are required to report on income with renters to qualify and track this program.
- Emily Lai asked how the allocation of these units could be provided to the more vulnerable low-income for rent. Mr. Bump explained this was one component of the city's affordable housing programs. Resources are being leveraged directly for mixed use development with residential housing, among which are affordable rent. Property tax, CET and exemption waivers help offset costs to developers for these units. Lost revenues to these have not been calculated as yet.
- Nancy Kraushaar asked if the SDC waivers are popular, was there a concern of shortage on this development and losing capital investments. It was explained that SDC in the agreements are only on affordable units, meant to provide a balance with development.
- Following graphics of pre-IH Vested Projects and Units, and Post-IH Permit Activity, Dr. Gerry Mildner asked how soon in the process were the 8,000 applicants as of July 2018, moving to post-permit activity. Mr. Armstrong reported that they'd continue to monitor, with several variables to watch for, among them interest rates, construction costs, the timeline in the permit schedules and land use applications for consideration.
- Paul Grove asked that there seemed to be a great deal of attention to the central city areas with the projects, but a different dynamic on development across the region could show a different projection and result for development. Mr. Bump agreed that relooks at growth projections and incentives across the city will be reviewed for housing mix in the future.

A spectrum of residential zones have been designed for Portland that include the Residential Infill Project for single dwelling zones, and the Better Housing by Design project for multi-dwelling zones. The Residential Infill Project takes a fresh look at the rules governing the types of housing allowed in our neighborhoods. This proposal would allow more housing units to be built in residential neighborhoods but only if they follow new limits on the size of new buildings. Single dwelling makes up 40% of land area, with the challenge to better utilize this efficiently.

To address the issue of new houses that are out of character with existing houses, Portland proposes to limit the size of houses with a floor to area ratio standard. The floor to area ratios will vary depending on what the housing types, which will be expanded from single-houses and duplexes to include additional ADUs, triplexes and (maybe) four-plexes. Portland is also exploring a visitability requirement, when there are three units or more, at least one unit is required to be "Visitable":

- No-step entry
- Bathroom and halls with wider doors
- Area to socialize

The additional housing options overlay zone will apply to most residential areas, shown on a map to the committee. Some areas where it would not apply are the Johnson Creek planning district with environmental issues, and displacement risk areas. At the end of this year the decision is expected to proceed for review of the draft proposal, with the recommended draft at City Council in early spring 2019.

Comments from the committee:

- Paul Grove asked if there would be a reworked/revised economic analysis recently reported by Jerry Johnson. This was expected in the next month or so.
- Carol Chesarek asked why areas prone to landslides and steep slopes allowed consideration with these new building zones. The decision was made after much discussion to look at a mix of housing not limited for choice. Ms. Chesarek noted it will be hard to reach some houses in these areas after disasters.
- Dr. Gerry Mildner asked if the analysis by Jerry Johnson came before the study now being discussed. It was agreed that a higher output in the housing units would increase from the updated analysis. Redevelopment proposed did not factor in additional units.

With a 2040 grant, the Better Housing by Design project is revising development and design standards in Portland's multi-dwelling residential zones outside the Central City. These middle-and higher density zones provide opportunities for new housing to meet the needs of current and future residents. Elements include diverse housing options and affordability, outdoor spaces and green elements, building design and scale to pedestrian friendly streets, and east Portland standards and street connections.

The new framework for the multi-dwelling zones include four zones that are based on existing zones, but are more responsive to different types of places. The Bonus FAR is provided for projects with affordable housing or FAR transfers from sites where historic buildings, existing affordable housing or trees are being preserved. Mr. Armstrong noted that at this time next year, up-zoned residential development in the city will have taken place.

Comments from the committee:

- Nancy Kraushaar asked if this applies to redeveloping existing buildings. That was confirmed, 50-60% of Portland's multi-family zoning has existing single family houses that are expected to be redeveloped to multi-family housing.
- Carol Chesarek asked if incentives to preserve trees was new. The incentives for preserving existing affordable housing and trees comes through transfers of development rights. They are looking to expand this areas.
- Anna Slatinsky asked if it was possible to layer bonuses on top of the Inclusionary Housing bonus. No, since the calculated base and bonus is near the maximum building space (lot coverage and building height) allowed.
- Theresa Cherniak commented on the different approach based on floor to area ratios, which could be duplicated in other areas of the region. Mr. Armstrong agreed, adding that this was a form-based code approach rather than counts of units. We can't control the number of people in units, but focus on sizes of buildings. With a question on transit structure and parking, Mr. Armstrong reported they focused on the distance to transit as the key to regulating the minimum number of parking spaces.
- Dr. Gerry Mildner recommended adding a footnote to the statement that up-zoning all residential areas of the city will produce more housing. Some neighborhoods may not absorb this zoning or have the economic capacity. ADUs have a lower value with smaller size area. Mr. Armstrong said it might be debatable. Opportunities for providing creativity in development, future demographics in the region and population needs, and market demand will affect housing choices.

- Paul Grove asked if garages were counted in the plan. There are allowances for accessory structures. Narrow lots were at one time taken out of consideration in the proposal, but are back in. Mr. Grove commented on the 3-year process with the project, and recommended that with the RFA established and project planned, it would be beneficial to have a review and look back with updates at a later time.

6. Metro Emerging Technology Strategy PILOT Program (Eliot Rose, Metro)

Eliot Rose provided an overview of the Emerging Technology Strategy Partnerships and Innovative Learning Opportunities in Transportation (PILOT) program. A handout on the program was noted in the packet. Mr. Rose explained that the PILOT program was a near-term implementation action identified in the Emerging Technology Strategy designed to provide information and develop partnerships to help Metro and its partners guide innovation toward advancing equity and improving travel options. Technology pilots can be a more cost-effective way to learn about Emerging Technologies than research or planning studies, and they are an important tool to understand how emerging technologies impact equity. The goals of the PILOT program are: Goal 1: Test; Goal 2: Collect information; Goal 3: Develop partnerships.

Following preliminary conversations with over 50 organizations potentially interested in launching a pilot, and research on pilot projects and funding programs in other U.S. communities, Metro defined successful PILOT projects as those that:

- Address a well-understood, clearly-defined challenge
- Test an innovative solution that supports regional goals
- Conduct outreach and education to help community members make the most of this solution
- Create new partnerships across sections
- Develop and share information on successes and challenges
- Leverage additional resources

Total funding available for the PILOT program is \$150,000. The amount applicants are allowed to request: \$25,000 – \$150,000. Teams consisting of public agencies, non-profits, and/or private companies are eligible to apply. The grant period is for two years, from July 2019 through June 2021.

Following an overview of the selection process, Mr. Rose highlighted two key upcoming dates:

- October 5, 3-6 p.m. Kickoff event at the Lucky Lab in NW Portland, where people can share interest in project ideas and network with potential partners.
- Sept. 28 – Oct. 26 Call for Letters of Interest. Encouragement is given to submit a brief letter describing your project idea. Metro staff will offer feedback and potentially technical assistance with the application process based on letters of interest.

Comments from the committee:

- Glenn Koehrsen asked if consideration has been given to scalability, with projects applicable to larger and different areas of the region. Mr. Rose commented that they would be looking into this idea as part of developing the program. Considerations would be given to resources available, the scope of the project, and interest from others in developing the program. Letters of interest will help Metro form more detailed thoughts on this subject.
- Carol Chesarek asked if noise and space limitations at the Lucky Lab Kickoff event might prevent attendance, and options to find this information. Mr. Rose reported that information would be available on the website, and updated following the kickoff event. Plans for the event include presentations, structured network time with a national presenter on the PILOT programs, A

networking activity facilitated by Metro staff, and an open networking social time toward the end. A debrief from the event will follow via email.

7. Adjourn

There being no further business, workshop meeting was adjourned by Chair Kloster at 12 p.m.
Meeting minutes submitted by,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Marie Miller".

Marie Miller
TPAC Recorder

Attachments to the Public Record, TPAC and MTAC Workshop meeting, Oct. 3, 2018

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT NO.
1	Agenda	10/3/2018	October 3, 2018 TPAC/MTAC Workshop Agenda	100318T-01
2	Work Program	9/26/2018	2018 Combined TPAC/MTAC Workshop Work Program	100318T-02
3	Meeting Minutes	8/29/2018	Meeting minutes from August 29, 2018 TPAC/MTAC Workshop meeting	100318T-03
4	Memo	Sept. 24, 2018	To: TPAC/MTAC and interested parties From: Marie Miller, TPAC recorder RE: TPAC community member recruitment and appointments for new terms on committee	100318T-04
5	Handout	N/A	Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project; Steering Committee Preferred Alternative Report	100318T-05
6	Newsletter	Fall 2018	SW Corridor Light Rail Project: What's next for light rail?	100318T-06
7	Handout	April 2018	Residential Infill Project Summary: Proposed Draft	100318T-07
8	Handout	May 2018	Better Housing by Design – Proposed Draft Summary	100318T-08
9	Handout	N/A	Metro Partnerships & Innovative Learning Opportunities in Transportation (PILOT) Program	100318T-09
10	Handout	June 2017	Inclusionary Housing	100318T-10
11	Presentation	10/3/2018	SW Corridor Light Rail Preferred Alternative	100318T-11
12	Presentation	10/3/2018	City of Portland Housing Issues	100318T-12
13	Presentation	10/3/2018	PILOT program overview	100318T-13