

## **Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission**

**Tuesday, October 26, 2010**

**6:00-8:00pm**

### **Meeting Minutes**

**Commissioners Present:** Andre' Baugh, Don Hanson, Mike Houck, Gary Oxman, Michelle Rudd, Howard Shapiro, Jill Sherman (arrived 6:08pm), Chris Smith, Irma Valdez

**Commissioners Absent:** Karen Gray, Lai-Lani Ovalles

**BPS Staff Present:** Sandra Wood, Planning Manager; Eric Engstrom, Principal Planner; Joe Zehnder, Chief Planner; Julie Ocken, PSC Coordinator

**Other City Staff Present:** Lance Lindahl, PBOT; Patrick Sweeney, PBOT; Doug Morgan, BDS

*Chair Hanson* called the meeting to order at 6:00pm and provided an overview of the agenda.

### **Street Vacation R/W #7200, Proposed vacation of SE 94<sup>th</sup> Ave north of SE Henry St**

Action: Consent

Documents Distributed

- o Staff Report & Recommendations to the PSC
- o Map of area surrounding the proposed vacation before and after Green Line MAX construction

*Chair Hanson* noted that the proposal was reviewed at the Officers' briefing on October 14<sup>th</sup>. He explained that is a remnant segment of road after the construction of the green line MAX and proposed the request be kept on consent.

The recommendation was approved of the Consent item with a unanimous aye vote (Y7 – Baugh, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Shapiro, Smith, Valdez)

### **FEMA Flood Map Update**

Action: Hearing / Recommendation

Sandra Wood, BPS, and Doug Morgan, BDS, presented

Documents Distributed

- o Proposed Draft Ordinance
- o FEMA Flood Map Update Project Proposed Draft
- o Staff memo to PSC with amendments to Proposed Draft and ordinance

Map posted in room

- o Portland Special Flood Hazard Areas as of November 26, 2010

Sandra Wood provided the background about the project. FEMA maintains maps for areas that are prone to flooding and updates them periodically. November 26, 2010 is the current update date, and staff will take the project to City Council on November 10, 2010 to ensure they are ahead of the deadline. 26 panels on the FEMA map cover the city of Portland, and nine of those panels have amendments in this update; areas include the Columbia River and slough, drainage districts, and the north reach of the Willamette. The request to adopt FEMA's updated maps is necessary to maintain Portland's eligibility in FEMA's National Flood Insurance Program.

In addition to the map changes, staff also proposed changes to City Titles 24 (Building Regulations) and 33 (Planning and Zoning). These are not substantive changes, but they are to update the codes to refer to the FEMA maps with the update date and to change terminology in the codes to be consistent with FEMA.

Terence Thatcher, natural resources Deputy City Attorney with the City of Portland, gave an overview and status of litigation that Portland Audubon is engaged in w/FEMA. He described the case but confirmed it does not have any effect on the PSC's action today.

Similar litigation occurred in Puget Sound, where the National Wildlife Foundation sued FEMA in district court over FEMA's actions in their mapping. The courts found that little or no attention has been paid to the affects of the map updates on wildlife, specifically salmon and steelhead in the Pacific Northwest. In Seattle, FEMA had failed to comply with the Endangered Specifics Act . FEMA is now engaged in discussions with local governments in the Puget Sound area to create a model ordinance to improve FEMA regulations to better satisfy the needs of the local area – similar to what may occur in Portland.

Going forward, FEMA says they will consult about wildlife in areas before making map amendments. FEMA will also do a biological assessment of its mapping and programs in Western Oregon, and will consult with the National Marine Fisheries Service about how they will update work in this area in the future.

- *Commissioner Houck* commented that it sounds like there is potential, as Portland goes forward with implementing Metro's Title 13, that we may be changing some of our own regulations to respond. Terry Thatcher confirmed that yes, FEMA may come up with new regulations for Portland about how we manage areas in flood plain, but that will be a future project.

### **Public Testimony**

**Tom Boullion**, Port of Portland, noted the Port identified seven locations on its property (identified as sections 1-7) that have been added in the updated maps that the Port believes are in error based on the Army Corp of Engineers mapping the Port property in 2009. His request is that City do a better job in publicizing FEMA's 90-day comment period when they publish the Preliminary Maps and that for future updates that there is collaborative work between the City, Port, and FEMA.

### **Comments and Questions from Commissioners:**

*Commissioner Hanson*: Is there an established process with FEMA if there is a minor difference? Tom responded that he is not sure which process would be most appropriate, but it would need city and local concurrence that the proposed changes are reasonable.

*Commissioner Shapiro* asked about what the concern is about the area along the river by the airport (Section 5).

Tom: There are areas of that section that are not susceptible to flooding. We just want the most accurate map we can have.

*Commissioner Rudd*: Are you and FEMA looking at the same LiDAR [mapping] data?

Tom: It's not clear to me: our information is more recent than FEMA's from 2005.

*Commissioner Houck* commented that we need to ensure everyone has input in the process.

*Commissioner Sherman* asked why we didn't get input in the 90 day comment period that was in January 2010?

Joe Zehnder clarified that FEMA didn't notify appropriate City staff when it sent map but that the City has been in contact with FEMA to send future updates to the correct bureau in the City; we now have it straightened out.

*Commissioner Oxman*: There is a difference in technologies, but I imagine land hasn't changed very much. The Port's contention is that there are areas actually higher than what FEMA has identified.

Tom: Based on LiDAR we have, we would have to compare different information sets. With more time, we could create more detail to show what differences are, but for now, we just wanted to flag areas that are different from published FEMA report.

*Commissioner Oxman:* What is the operational implication of the flood plain expansion?

Tom: It's hard to anticipate, but 1) flood plains are a regulated feature for hazards, so if we want to develop in the mapped areas, building requirements are more complicated; and 2) as designated in the natural resource inventory, flood plain ends up being a feature that adds to ecological value and can be regulated as a natural resource – which also has implications for future development restrictions.

*Commissioner Hanson:* Can you clarify the concerns with section 7?

Tom: A portion of that area is low, but as you go further upland, it should be out of the flood plain, and our data supports that.

*Commissioner Houck:* There are implications for natural resources if there are changes. We need to make sure we bring in other parties if maps change that may affect them.

**Bob Salinger**, Conservation Director, Portland Audubon, confirmed that the City Attorney gave a good explanation of the litigation and handed out the proposed settlement document. The short-term implications of the lawsuit in Portland are expected to be like the outcome in the Seattle area, and ultimately FEMA will have to go through the same process to create a model to prevent or mitigate for salmon impacts when updating maps in the Portland area. The four options would include:

1. no development in flood plains;
2. make sure salmon well-being is accounted for;
3. adopt model ordinance; or
4. property owners can work with NOAA fisheries

Bob noted that as River programs come before the PSC that the Commission should think about these implications. Projects from the City should work proactively to develop programs to ensure that development thinks about these impacts in advance.

#### **Additional Written Testimony**

- Tom Bouillion, AICP – Port of Portland

#### **Further Comments and Questions from Commissioners:**

*Commissioner Baugh:* I don't see West Hayden Island (WHI) on these maps. I realize it's not annexed to the city yet, but listening to Bob, how is that project factored into this consideration?

Joe Zehnder: Any regulations put on WHI will still be subject to flood plain regulations. The development feasibility work will have to take this into consideration to see if the proposed potential location and arrangement is accomplishable. This includes the 300 acres for a marine terminal and 500 acres of open space.

*Commissioners Hanson:* If and/or when WHI is annexed, will there be a flood plain analysis?

Joe Zehnder: City Council told BPS to find a plan that best arranges the designed 300 and 500 acres and test its feasibility. Looking at arrangement of development areas, we have to factor in federal regulations. We're not going to make a regulatory call about if you can develop there, but mitigation figures into land planning to see if we have a functional piece of land.

*Commissioner Houck:* I'm happy to see staff include Metro's Title 13 into its findings because Portland has yet to comply with it. But there is no mention of the Climate Action Plan (CAP) or work related to adaptation in final draft. Flood plains will likely expand in the future – so the City of Portland should think beyond the FEMA mapping, be proactive in looking into future to apply adaptation strategies noted in CAP. I see this as an opportunity to be more proactive.

*Commissioner Oxman:* Does PSC approving this have any negative short-term impacts?

*Commissioner Houck:* No, but this is an opportunity to highlight the other future issues.

*Commissioners Hanson* called for any last comments and closed testimony.

*Commissioners Hanson* asked staff what happens now.

Sandra Wood: We are publishing the recommended draft on October 27 and will take the proposal to City Council on November 10. Those who testified today should have received notice. The Council session is also a public hearing, so people can testify then.

*Commissioner Shapiro* moved to amend the *FEMA Flood Map Update Project: Proposed Draft* as shown in the “Amendments” memo dated October 25, 2010.

*Commissioner Baugh* seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.  
(Y8 – Baugh, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Shapiro, Sherman, Smith, Valdez)

*Commissioner Shapiro* moved to substitute the amended proposed ordinance that is part of the “Amendments” memo dated October 25, 2010 and moved to recommend that City Council 1) adopt the Proposed Ordinance, as amended and 2) adopt the *FEMA Flood Map Update Project: Proposed Draft*, as amended.

*Commissioner Houck* seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.  
(Y8 – Baugh, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Shapiro, Sherman, Smith, Valdez)

## **Portland Plan Strategies**

Action: Briefing

Eric Engstrom, BPS, presented

Documents Distributed – PPT slides handout

- PowerPoint –

The PSC commissioners had an overview of the Portland Plan (PP) at its retreat, but Eric noted that his slide presentation always highlights the variety of partners on the plan; it’s not just a City of Portland plan, but includes all partners that operate within city. His presentation provided an outline of the structure of the elements of the PP. It is a strategic plan and guideline for the comprehensive plan, which includes goals statements in a comprehensive way and also outlines specific strategic actions.

The plan is organized by nine action areas, and we are developing a set of specific measurable targets for each. We are developing 3-4 integrated strategies. Each of the strategies will describe a specific set of high priority actions. We will track progress through a report card, including indicators for overall city performance, business/corporate performance, and measures that individual households can strive for, if they choose.

The plan will also give direction to the further development of the Comprehensive Plan, which will include long term policies, investments, and urban development plan.

There will be a total of four phases of public involvement, and we are beginning the strategy building phase – this will be inclusive of both Portlanders’ input and evidence-based work.

The phrase “driver of change” is being used to define a set of specific actions that move us toward more than one target, working with more than one partner agency, that have big impacts the on future of the city and will define how we are accomplishing what we set out in our goals.

Upcoming events for the for PP work include the Inspiring Communities Speaker Series and the start of Phase III public outreach.

Eric described the strategy development:

- 4 Principles: equity; safety & opportunity; health; and resiliency – which are the operating principles that permeate across all the plan’s actions. They are the “rules” of how we do

- the planning and are rooted in values statements from VisionPDX and early phases of PP work.
- 6 Drivers of Change (potential outline of strategies): economic opportunity; investment in students; 20-minute neighborhoods; City Green; future technology & practices; and equitable Decision-making
  - 9 Policy Areas (ultimately the structure of the comprehensive plan): prosperity & business success; education & skill development; sustainability & the natural environment; human health, food & public safety; transportation, technology & access; equity, civic engagement & quality of life; design, planning & public spaces; neighborhoods & housing; and arts, culture & innovation.

*Commissioner Smith:* How did we arrive at 6 Drivers of Change as the right number? Is 6 too many?

Eric: We don't know yet. But so far we have not been able to boil the key pieces down further.

Eric highlighted City Green as an example of one of the integrated strategies. It includes building a green network to tie habitat (green infrastructure system), greenways and people connecting infrastructure. In this plan, big streets are included as civic spaces, where investment would be added to tie together the network and future growth strategies.

The 20-minute neighborhood concept encompasses a variety of opportunities including small business development, neighborhood economic development, food access, education, transportation, and housing access. There are 90+ neighborhoods in Portland, but not a "one size fits all" mentality for the 20-minute neighborhood concept. The map showed the cells of neighborhoods, which Joe clarified as including 100% of the city's population. Each cell includes a population of approximately 20,000 to 40,000, which feels like a right scale.

Joe highlighted that the 20-minute concept is more than just retail – it is about walkability, features of each neighborhood, and all assets. Much of the past good results have come from local initiatives at a grassroots level, and this is what we want to have with the PP. There are implications for the City "micromanaging", and there is a limitation to the planning that can feasibly done, so we want to create a set of rules and concepts for neighborhoods to use as fitting for their area.

#### **Comments and Questions from Commissioners:**

*Commissioner Smith* noted the plan should include tools we can give to each area/neighborhood for communities to work from the "bottom up" from a grassroots level. Previous examples of work done by smaller groups within Portland include the East Portland Action Plan and Mississippi Street.

*Commissioner Baugh:* For the areas that are not there – I'm concerned that we need tools areas that are not on the map as well. Joe Zehnder confirmed that every area within the city limits is in a circle, even though the graphic might not look so. There are centers noted inside the circles that could be economic centers.

*Commissioner Baugh:* Outside of the economic centers, there may be another Mississippi that could grow and take off on its own.

Joe mentioned there is a dilemma: Metro's designation shows the City of Portland has 150 miles of main streets and corridors, which is lots of road to cover. What we are trying to communicate is the current viable economic centers; we're trying to make these core ones thrive, and as an area grows, others will arise.

*Commissioner Baugh:* Where we make the investments are not necessarily the economic centers. There are equity and educational opportunities question to address too.

Eric concluded the presentation with information about indicators and that they are specific measurables. The final timeline is to have a draft plan in July 2011 (after the Phase III input from early 2011) with public hearings July-Dec 2011.

**Further Comments and Questions from Commissioners:**

*Commissioner Houck* commented on the concept of City Green being under “health” – and that this includes ecosystem health. We should make this link of ecosystem and human health clear. Does the city have a separate process for developing indicators other than the Regional Indicators that Metro is developing?

Eric: We are a bit ahead of Metro process, but we hope it is iterative with the Metro process.

*Commissioner Houck* noted that if we can combine resources with Metro, PSU, and the City to collect finer detailed information, that would be great. He also noted that sustainability and prosperity are not polar opposites – with the City Green approach, we start doing a better integration of grey and green, especially for maintenance. He used the example of the \$1.4B spent on the Big Pipe project – if we don’t do the “green stuff”, that pipe will fill up, and we don’t want to (or won’t be able to) simply enlarge the pipe.

*Commissioner Shapiro*: Eric shared the report with the CIC. He expanded on *Commissioner Baugh’s* comments about leaving tools for all neighborhoods, but the City needs to get creative around what those tools may be to provide equitable resources and support to all areas.

*Commissioner Hanson* noted that 20 minutes is not uniformly 20 minutes around the city – the time needs to fit the geography of each area.

Joe: Part of what we are getting at is this is not one size fits all. In some areas, it will be maintenance and continued attention. Others are a bigger lift, will take more time and will need more effort. It’s not a formula. It’s defined by the place, and it’s about the place.

Eric: The goal is not to replicate plans identically but to create what is [for example] a “Lents Version” or an “East Portland” version. Some past example are fraught with gentrification issues, so we don’t want to replicate that.

*Commissioner Valdez* commented on the PP’s subtitle, “Making Portland prosperous, healthy, and rich in opportunity” – this is right on.

*Commissioner Baugh*: Ultimately what is more important than the length (time/size) of the neighborhood is the success of a neighborhood.

*Commissioner Hanson*: I hope we can go out farther (e.g. the east side). We would have a larger increment of improvement if we are successful farther out. How often do report cards come out?

Eric: The report cards will likely be linked to budgeting process, part of an annual cycle. But this is still to be determined.

*Commissioner Smith* commented on the color scheme on the map and that each represents the different types of neighborhoods.

Eric: Based on a 20-minute walkable distance, there is a catchment. Some catchments for various neighborhoods may be outside city boundaries (for example, an area in the far west part of the city may have its major service centers in Beaverton).

*Commissioner Smith*: In the City Green plan, to what extent do the bioswales, street trees, etc contribute to urban habitat?

*Commissioner Houck*: Think about what you hear when you walk down the Park Blocks... birds. This is their real habitat. Trees attract birds. Bioswales also infiltrate water to keep it out of storm system. Bioswales provide value for invertebrates, not just the sewer system.

*Commissioner Rudd:* On the area map, I would be curious to see where the schools are located.  
*Eric:* We have more analysis of each area which show public facilities, parks, schools, and other amenities.

*Commissioner Baugh:* The strategic partners will have to participate to have the strategies implemented. What is process to bring them along so they are at the same place as BPS staff?

*Eric:* We meet with partners on a quarterly rotation. We also have the Portland Plan Advisory Group's participation. Education is weighed heavy on the partnership actions.

*Joe:* Our partner organizations at both a staff and leadership level have been tracking our participating all along. Now it is getting more concrete, so we need a different level of work with each. We have a 5-year first cut at the plan that partners have helped develop. To identify more specific actions and alignments, the work will be refined to focus on partnership work and their commitment. Solidification of partnerships is what we are doing now.

*Commissioner Shapiro* raised a concern about IGAs. Are you exploring those?

*Joe:* Yes, IGA with schools are being developed. With PPS, we are working on grade changes as you know from the schools project that came to the Planning Commission some months back. After we complete the PP, we will work on IGA with other school districts too.

*Commissioner Oxman:* What drives a bottom-up action is the ability of communities to come together to get things done. Is there a vision for how skill development will be carried out at the neighborhood level?

*Eric:* For ensuring bottom-up work, enabling people is the approach – this is part of what the 20-minute strategy is trying to do.

*Joe:* The question of a bottom-up approach is a longer discussion. We are building equity into each strategy, so the Equity Driver of Change could be one that “falls off” because it clearly infiltrates into the other areas.

*Eric:* The Portland Plan team will next be at the November 25, 2010 PSC meeting for a hearing about the Factual Basis & Buildable Lands Analysis. Staff will present an update on the Housing and Employment Land supply Analysis and will welcome comments on changes to the Historic Resources, Natural Resources Inventory and Watershed Health background reports.

## **Lake Oswego to Portland Transit Project**

Action: Briefing

Patrick Sweeney, PBOT, and Jaime Snook, Metro, presented

Documents Distributed

- Project newsletter (Winter 2009)
- Project factsheet (Spring 2010)
- PowerPoint –

*Commissioner Baugh* has recused himself from this project.

Tonight's presentation was for informational purposes; the project team will return in January for a recommendation from the PSC.

Jamie presented information about the project's timeline. It actually started in the mid-1980s, but the key items for now is that the DEIS will be published in November, and then they will develop a locally preferred alternative. Once published, the DEIS will be open for a 45-day public comment period through early January. There will also be open houses, a public hearing with the project Steering Committee, and a public comment report. The 45 day comment period will be followed by a steering committee recommendation.

*Commissioner Smith* asked for a verification of the dates.

Jamie: It depends on when we publish. If we publish the DEIS on November 19, then the comment period will run through January 7, 2011 (a bit longer than 45 days due to holidays). Then steering committee makes its recommendation and the project team comes back to the PSC to ask for its recommendation to Portland City Council in January.

*Commissioner Smith* mentioned he was an alternate on steering committee and raised a concern: for the PSC's impactfulness on recommendations for the project, he suggested having the project team return to the PSC before the steering committee's meeting so that the PSC recommendation can inform the steering committee's decision.

Jamie noted that the steering committee will have a public hearing in the middle of the comment period [mid-December], which could be a good forum to raise concerns.

Further discussion about PSC input and timelines was held until the end of the presentation.

Staff continued with details about the rationale and need for the project: it addresses building livable, walkable communities to sustain economic competitiveness and prosperity while providing safe and reliable transportation choices with shared burdens and benefits of growth in the region. The project will optimize the regional transit system by improving transit within the corridor while supporting land use goals.

Due to increasing population in the area, traffic congestion has gone up, constraining Highway 43, thus creating a less reliable bus system. The employment forecast points to an increase in the corridor as well.

Previously, the project considered a variety of transit alternatives:

- River transit
- Reversible lane
- Highway 43 widening
- No-build
- Bus rapid transit
- Streetcar

Of these alternatives, a No-Build, an enhanced bus alternative (fewer stops and more frequent service – but this would increase the number of busses on corridor instead of reducing traffic) and streetcar have moved forward to be studied in the Lake Oswego to Portland Transit DEIS.

Staff provided details about the projected average weekday ridership between Lake Oswego to South Waterfront from 2010 to 2035. In a no-build scenario, over 1600 riders would not be accounted for, making it unviable based on future growth.

With the streetcar option, there are currently two options:

- South portal phasing option – which would tie into the Moody/Bond couplet extension project. The Moody/Bond couplet extension project would extend the street grid and streetcar would locate in the roadway similar to the existing South Waterfront configuration. This would facilitate redevelopment, and form a more cohesive business district. The project costs could be leveraged as a local match.
- Macadam in-street options – would improve Landing Dr as a public street and would bring the streetcar to the front door of Johns Landing businesses. The streetcar line would be designed either in-street or via an additional lane, if not constructed in the Willamette Shore Line right of way.

*Commissioner Hanson* asked for clarification: can we move forward with both options on table?

Patrick noted that the preference from neighborhood residents would be to have a specific alignment. There are concerns with the streetcar in the condo area since the



current right-of-way goes in-between condos, so the neighborhood is leaning toward having the rail on-street.

Staff described the funding options for the streetcar options as well as the enhanced bus option. The streetcar high option had the most needed funding (\$458M) but would leverage the 60% Federal funding (for any option) with the Willamette Shore Line value and other local, regional and state funds.

*Commissioner Smith* noted we have been hearing about equity issues between buses versus rail... but we should think about the places served, not the technology. If you go with the enhanced bus, there are fewer funds to spend in the region on busses, so the streetcar option actually leaves you with more to spend elsewhere on transportation. Patrick confirmed this and noted they also consider life of vehicle – streetcars have longevity over busses. And the streetcars would be locally made.

Staff reiterated the next steps for the project: the DEIS draft will be available in mid-November; there will be open houses during the 90-day comment period as well as the steering committee's public hearing; and a locally preferred alternative will be drafted. The steering committee's recommendation will consider its citizen advisory committee and project management group input, as well as the public comments.

#### **Comments and Questions from Commissioners:**

*Commissioner Houck:* Some people see a feature of the corridor as a trail possibility. Is that dead with this project?

Jamie: During the alternatives analysis, this was originally a transit and trail study. The projects have separated, refined, and worked parallel to each other. There is an agreement with the steering committee that the streetcar portion will coordinate with the trail project. Recently, JPACT authorized funds to spend on an engineering study for the trail project and especially how to get a trail through the most constrained part of corridor. An RTP is being amended to include trail in it.

*Commissioner Sherman:* What do the costs you've listed include?

Jamie: The costs only include the streetcar; the trail would have to get own funding, but the streetcar project certainly does not preclude the trail.

*Commissioner Oxman:* In terms of capital financing, what is the value of the Willamette shoreline?

Jamie: The benefit is that we already own the right-of-way in the corridor, so we can leverage more funding from the Federal government. The value of the right-of-way has been added to the capital costs. The right-of-way is the rail corridor between Bancroft to the foothills area of Lake Oswego. But if we go with the enhanced bus, we could do something else with corridor. The comparison is based on the idea that we would use the shoreline.

*Commissioner Oxman:* With capital funding and operations management, what is the long-term funding look like? Capital costs are high, so how much are we gaining with the streetcar over the bus? Is it worth the monetary difference?

Jamie: We haven't done an assessment for capital financing, but we did for operations and maintenance costs... I can get you those numbers.

*Commissioner Smith:* In terms of congestion, the bus strategy is a "frontal assault" to add capacity and keep headways up by removing transit stops. The streetcar is a flanking strategy to go around the congestion. The enhanced bus does not include queue jump lanes – it's more just an express bus. For portions where congestion is worse (one is Johns Landing), does that coincide with one of the congestion zones – and how do we deal with that?

Patrick: There is only one short piece of Macadam (.5 miles) being considered for the streetcar alignment. In this stretch of Macadam is a string of existing consecutive [timed] streetlights. The traffic signalization creates flow – and the streetcar would go with traffic flow during peak hours.

*Commissioner Smith:* The question of in-lane versus a separate lane is something the PSC should focus on.

Patrick: the issue we are hearing from residents of the condos on the east side of Macadam is that currently the trees provide a buffer from street traffic. Also from residents is a desire to have a better pedestrian environ along Macadam with more crossings, wider sidewalks, lower speed limit. Residents are in tune with making Macadam into more of a main street and are not interested in adding additional lanes.

*Commissioner Hanson:* If we put streetcar in outside lanes, do we create a congestion problem? If there is a streetcar on Macadam, do the busses go away?

Patrick: The existing bus service in this stretch of Macadam stops curbside, so the pattern of transit service would be similar. With a streetcar, we reduce the total number of transit stops on Highway 43 since much of service will be on Willamette shoreline. Our streetcar studies showed streetcar in mixed traffic on Macadam did not negatively impact traffic for the .5 miles of shared roadway. We would only have streetcar service if that is the chosen option [no busses on this stretch].

The Commission discussed the process questions about when to add their input to make it most effective for the project:

*Commissioner Smith* noted that the PSC should take the Mayor's challenge for the Commission to be as impactful as possible – so earlier [before the steering committee's recommendation] the better.

Patrick: we can come back to the PSC in December with the DEIS report and any other updates.

The commission debated if the next PSC session with the project would be a hearing or work session, and they concluded it would be a work session. The public will have opportunity to weigh in on the project via the open houses and the project hearings outside of the PSC. The question of a subcommittee as a working group came up but was decided not to be used for this project given the tight timeline – but a subcommittee process may be a way for future PSC work to be impactful and timely on working through details with project staff before a final presentation to the full PSC.

The Lake Oswego to Portland Transit Project will return to the PSC at the December 14 meeting as a work session for Commission members. Staff will summarize the DEIS draft and the PSC will discuss its perspective to share as a recommendation to the Mayor who will vote on the project as a member of the steering committee in late January 2011.

### **Items of Interest from the Commission**

*Commissioner Hanson* will meet with the leadership from the Landmarks and the Design commissions on October 27, 2010. This will be a general discussion to identify where decisions each commission makes may be in conflict with each other. The leadership will meet quarterly and will report back to their commissions at their respective commissions following the leadership meetings.

*Commissioner Houck* asked if a similar relationship could be made with chair of the Park Board – and that he would be happy to be part of those meetings.

Commissioners thought this could be another good relationship and will look into it.

### **Director's Report**

Provided by Joe Zehnder

- Reminder to Commissioners about openings on three committees that are reserved for PSC members: Portland Plan CIC, Airport Community Advisory Committee, and the BPS Budget Advisory Committee
- River Plan / North Reach update: Council unanimously adopted the River Plan in April 15<sup>th</sup> and then three industrial entities appealed that decision to LUBA. The briefs were finally filed a few weeks ago and the City is in the process of preparing its response. The bulk of the arguments center around compliance with State Goal 9 (economy). The City's response is due on November 2<sup>nd</sup>.

Meanwhile, the River Plan is scheduled to go into effect in January 2011 and in order to do so the City needs to establish the in lieu fees that provide flexibility for property owners. So, on November 17th we will bring the in lieu fee report to City Council for discussion. That report will describe the process that will be followed to calculate the in lieu fees. The actual in lieu fees will be adopted by administrative rule. It is important to remember that the in lieu fees are optional.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:37pm.