

Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

Tuesday, March 10, 2015

12:30 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

Commissioners Present: Andre' Baugh, Karen Gray, Don Hanson, Mike Houck, Gary Oxman, Michelle Rudd, Katherine Schultz, Howard Shapiro (arrived 2:06 p.m.), Chris Smith, Teresa St Martin, Maggie Tallmadge

City Staff Presenting: Susan Anderson, Joe Zehnder, Eric Engstrom, Deborah Stein, Nan Stark, Marty Stockton, Peter Hurley (PBOT), Art Pearce (PBOT), Mark Lear (PBOT), Traci Manning (PHB), Javier Mena (PHB), Dawn Uchiyama (BES)

TriMet Presenters: Alan Lehto, Vanessa Vissar, Kate Lyman, Tom Mills

Chair Baugh called the meeting to order at 12:34 p.m. and gave an overview of the agenda.

Items of Interest from Commissioners

- *Commissioner Smith* attended the Pembina risk assessment work shop this morning. An interesting idea that the PSC will have to evaluate is the idea of maximum tolerable risk. The UK government has this already.
- *Chair Baugh* also attended the session. When you look at the information, it is very fact-driven. It is essentially a bunch of engineers looking at quantifying risk and what the tolerance level may be. We'll have to look at that; it's not an emotional issue from the consultants' perspectives. In terms of maximum tolerable risk, they've also compared accidents to things such as earthquakes, tsunamis, etc. At the March 17 briefing, we will hear from Pembina and community groups and will have the information from Pembina next Monday.
- *Commissioner Gray:* Yesterday met with the City, Port and Pembina to discuss the roles and duties of a community advisory committee. We also were able to do a review of Pembina's outreach in the community over the last few months. Meetings for the advisory committee will begin in June. Also, the EPAP housing group had a four-hour work shop on Saturday and came up with an 8-point strategy for anti-displacement that they would like to share with the PSC.
- *Chair Baugh* met with the EPAP housing group to hear their concerns last week and will send the notes to PSC members.

Director's Report

Susan Anderson

- *Commissioner Tallmadge* was offered a position with the Coalition of Communities of Color as their environmental justice manager.
- The West Quad Plan made it through Council last week after many proposed amendments. The SE Quad Plan will come to the PSC this spring, and after all 3 plans have been adopted by resolution at Council, we'll begin working on the code aspects in 2016. Council appreciated the many hours the PSC and advisory groups put into the project.
- The Climate Action Plan is out for public review. This was a hugely collaborative effort between City and County staff. Public comments are being accepted through April 10,

and we're hosting 2 open house events. More information is on our website at www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/climate.

- On March 12, BPS is receiving a STAR award from LCDC for our Comp Plan public involvement efforts over the past year. The committee found that with the Map App and our people-to-people engagement we adapted quickly and listened well.
- Next Tuesday at 3 p.m. we'll have the briefing with two panels of invited testimony only (Pembina and neighborhood reps). Testimony is continued through April 7 when we'll have the hearing on the project. The safety reports will be available next Monday, and we'll post them when we receive them.

Consent Agenda

- Consideration of Minutes from 2/24/15 PSC meeting

Chair Baugh asked for any comments for the consent agenda.

Commissioner Smith moved to approve the Consent Agenda. *Commissioner St Martin* seconded.

The Consent Agenda was approved with an aye vote.

(Y9 – Baugh, Gray, Hanson, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

Comprehensive Plan Update

Work Session: Eric Engstrom, Joe Zehnder, Deborah Stein,

Documents:

- [Residential Densities Staff Report](#)
- [Housing Staff Report](#)
- [Testimony Memo](#)

Presentations:

- [Housing](#)
- [Residential Densities](#)
- [Transportation](#)
- [Service Enhancement Plans](#)

Eric reminded the group about the process for the Comp Plan and where we are at the PSC. A draft recommended draft will come in April, and the final PSC vote will be based on that. After the last work session, we realized we have a number of outstanding items, so we've shifted the schedule so that the final PSC recommendation will likely be on May 26.

Housing

Eric provided context about housing in the city of Portland.

The proposed Comprehensive Plan Map is based on a 30-50-20 residential growth strategy:

- 30% allocated to the Central City
- 50% to other Centers and Corridors
- 20% to other residential neighborhoods outside of the Centers and Corridors

When we talk about housing, we start from 8 household type groupings, which have a range of characteristics. We use this to forecast the need for different types of housing. We cross-walk these groupings with the kind of housing that is available. ADUs are a footnote but analogous to

several of the housing types that could substitute for a few of them.

Slide 6 shows the growth allocation (number of new units) based on the proposed Comp Plan. Some of the larger numbers are in the R5 zone, and there is lots of apartment capacity in corridors and in the Central City.

Overall we have enough housing types to meet expected demand except for the lowest income groups.

In terms of the single-dwelling zones (RF - R2.5), we are forecasting about 25,000 new dwellings in those zones. The largest concentration of growth in this will be in the R5 zone. There is about 3600 acres of vacant residentially-zoned land in single-family neighborhoods. Farm forest sites are primarily on Skyline Blvd. The vacant land can accommodate about 11,000 homes. So we have a slight supply-demand squeeze for small-lot or high-density single family homes expected to exceed demand.

Housing Targets

Proposal: Add an explicit policy with a numerical target of approximately 1,000 affordable units per year.

Currently in Policy 5.22, we identify the need for affordable housing and we want to provide for the extent possible to meet this need. Since then, we've adopted the Portland Plan, West Quadrant Plan and URA amendments that call for 30% of new housing to be affordable, which we're thinking about bringing into the Comp Plan more specifically. Joe walked through the implications of this. We've produced about 480 units of this type of housing per year in the past decade; we'd have to increase this to about 1,000 units per year to meet the 30% goal.

Commissioner Hanson noted this is aspirational, but he supports it. Most of the housing will be accomplished by non-profits and government entities.

- 15% was the number included in the Portland Plan, so a number of partners know this and have provided input.

We know this is a stretch goal, and the need is still beyond it.

Commissioner Smith supports this proposal, but it is both an income inequality as well as a housing issue. We need to be aggressively looking at ways to lower the cost of housing production (e.g. Eli Spevak's work). We have policies that support exploring this type of housing production. But I have a concern that our revenue source in the past has largely been dependent on TIF. We know that is decreasing, so the revenue source is a question.

- In thinking through how much production is necessary to balance affordable with other housing, this is a major infrastructure investment.
- One of the things we do with Council is an asset management report to show what we need over the next years. We don't do this for housing because we don't (yet) think of this as infrastructure. Internally we've been talking about if we had the numbers, we need to identify the revenue we'd need to look at housing as a component of civic infrastructure.

Commissioner Tallmadge: If we set the goal at 15%, and we know that there will be about double that need, I'm not sure I'm comfortable supporting this.

Commissioner Rudd: I assume as a practical matter that a lot of those units would be SRO units to hit this number, but that doesn't really get at kids in poverty, for example.

- The target number is regulated and subsidized, so it doesn't necessarily include things that are being privately built. There is some supply that is not included in this target.

Commissioner St Martin is supportive of the policy, but we should also think about improved ways to provide the needed housing, in addition to adding more money to the programs.

- Some things will raise the cost of development; others will help drive this down.

Commissioner Hanson noted that lots of times, cost per square foot doesn't go down because it's affordable. For example, looking at reducing the SDCs, if you're a non-profit doing affordable housing, you don't need to pay for parks. This is an issue for me knowing that it's simplistic and doesn't help build the infrastructure households need, especially in East County.

Chair Baugh is supportive but also wants to look at regulatory issues (how we do bonuses, for example). How does this play into the discussion? What about rent control? Or a preservation strategy for the current units we have to stabilize the neighborhoods and keep the housing there?

- *Commissioner Hanson* added that much of the affordable housing demand will be for families on the perimeter, so lots of small units likely won't fit the need, particularly in that geography.

Commissioner Oxman asked about the \$290M investment figure and what's included.

- *Javier*: Studios to family-sized units, throughout the city. Many of the resources were TIF-generated and in URAs. A smaller percentage is federal resources, which we can invest throughout the city. The \$290M is for 10 years includes just a small portion for health and human services, and some operational services.

Commissioner Oxman is supportive of a policy that sets targets. I'm concerned about labeling any measurement as being aspirational, so I'd rather see a more realistic target that we actually can get to.

Commissioner Schultz asked about how and why the percentages were chosen. I'm supportive, but I'm not sure where these numbers come from or why we'd need to settle on these numbers.

- We may not be there in terms of being able to do this. It's something that the City is interested in learning about, but we may not know the answer about the absolute feasible spot and a stretch goal right now. So the question is what we do about this.

Chair Baugh: We know where affordability is ranked with other cities today. When we look at "x%", can we estimate where our housing affordability will be in 2035 relative to other cities? We don't want Portland to be becoming less affordable compared to other similar locations.

- Staff will think about this. We don't know how the 15% goal compares to other cities, so we can do some research into this.

Susan: The PEGs came up with the 15% as aspirational, even though we need to do better. This isn't just out of the blue, and we still don't know how we're going to get there yet. We need to look at what we need and then go back to figure out how we get there.

Commissioner Schultz would like to see the logic from the Portland Plan and how we came to this 15% affordable housing target. [Staff can provide this.](#)

[Commissioners confirmed that around 15% is a place to start for the affordable housing goal.](#) We need to define what the range of this 15% includes (% MFI).

Gentrification and Displacement

We defined gentrification in the Portland Plan with objectives and policies. Gentrification was defined as displacement of residents from their neighborhood because of price. We also hear the baseline concern that Portland is getting too and more expensive. So independent of how it affects various populations, prices are going up.

A piece of this is that Portland is a very popular place to live; there is a high demand to live here. At the end of 2013, we only had about a 2% vacancy rate, which drives new housing production as well as the cost of housing. Housing production rates have not kept up with supply, but it is also part of the business cycle. Part of our path to be a more affordable city as we grow is to build housing.

We are still a fairly low-cost market compared to other West Coast cities.

The Portland Plan goals were to balance neighborhood revitalization with the ability of residents to stay in place to enjoy the benefits of that revitalization... prevent or mitigate displacement that results from public actions and investments.

Slide 18 shows the anti-displacement strategies in the Comp Plan, which are also detailed in the staff report. We have policies and programs in place, but they are mostly smaller pilot programs. We also have a policy to work on land use regulations to support the policies (e.g. bonuses, inclusionary zoning – if/when restriction is removed by state, etc).

Have we captured what the PSC has requested in these components? Yes.

In addition, we have received the anti-displacement policies from a coalition of groups at the last PSC hearing. There is lots of interest in this topic. The policy suggestions we received at the last hearing (slide 19) are things we'll come back to the PSC on April 14 so we can get more background to have discussion with the PSC then.

Joe reminded the PSC that the Comp Plan gives direction and offers how we get there; it doesn't specifically create a tool. He also reminded the PSC that anything in the Comp Plan is appealable by land use law, so we want to be careful about what we include directly in the plan. All the good things we want to do also can make things more expensive, so this is a big dilemma to balance.

Commissioner Rudd asked about “capture windfall profits”. To whom? How is this defined? The more recent environmental impact reports may have looked at this, so what do we think about the quality of these analyses?

- We need to look at this and parse it. But the principle is that there is some value that we could get part of out of a development deal to spend on public benefit.
- Neighborhood affordability is something we're looking into more so in transit projects.

Commissioner Gray noted there is an opportunity to be bold in this area. This is extremely important to lots of people in the city. There is equity verbiage, and then there is true equity. What about broadening home ownership, rent stabilization/control? Crosswalk your work with the reports from EPAP and Living Cully and see which ones really have legs.

- Traci: PHB is working with BPS and OEHR on impact assessments and reviewing the work from the other groups. The bold and optimistic part is that so many people are working on these issues.

Commissioner St Martin noted that one area we should pay attention to is keeping existing homeowners in their homes and pair that with density increase. An example, not for inclusion in the comp plan specifically, but an implementation tool that would allow homes in areas at risk for gentrification to build ADUs on their property via a grant program. Then they can rent the ADU to create more income, and deed restrictions (similar to some of the down payment grant programs) can maintain the affordable housing status for a designated period of time. This increases density while keeping single-family character of a neighborhood.

Commissioner Tallmadge: The plan should be striving for equity, not just mitigating affects but addressing and reversing past injustices. This does need to be supported by investment to

prove we're supporting equitable outcomes.

- The Comp Plan is a plan about growth and physical development of the city. So there are aspects of many conversations that are good ideas and policies, but where they live in the land use plan versus other City strategies or policies is something we need to work through. We can put barriers in front of ourselves if we put too much into the land use law realm.
- Part of this is we want to have clear metrics and goals. The land use plan should set clear policy direction, but everything in the Comp Plan is appealable to LUBA. We want to have lever on the policy side but not too prescriptive that we tie our hands in the future. Look at the items in the staff report, many of which are not land use actions, but there could be components of some of these that should include.

Commissioner Smith noted that he'd support forwarding the plan in 2 pieces to Council; one under the jurisdiction of LCDC and another piece that could be adopted by not in the Comp Plan directly.

Chair Baugh: OEHR ought to be involved in some manner, but I haven't heard or seen their comments. I just want to know if this is an issue of concern for them.

- We can ask OEHR Director Dante James to join the PSC at an upcoming meeting.

Chair Baugh also asked about no net loss and policies for how we get there.

Be bold. We can do it differently in Portland. But also remember that the tools we're talking about, while useful, are not at all sufficient as we saw in the 15% discussion. We can work these individual tools, but the bold move is bigger than that.

Commissioner Oxman asked about the definition of public action. Adopting plans set a number of things in motion.

- We have to sharpen this for ourselves and figure out the rules. Things that affect the marketplace. Looking at past decisions and repercussions.

Compatibility

What is the relative emphasis in policy in existing single-family neighborhoods, particularly outside of centers and corridors? This is addressed primarily in policies 4.12 and 4.13.

We did get lots of testimony of the relative balance between these two policies. Both are important: we want to emphasize stability of form and scale while we continue to allow adaptive reuse and creation of additional housing types to meet affordability and changing household needs.

4.12 is about adaptability. 4.13 is about maintaining scale, form and pattern. We are specifically not saying every house has to match the existing houses. How are we doing in the balance for these policies?

Commissioner Smith thinks these are complimentary policies. 4.12 is about more incremental things (e.g. adding an ADU) that probably don't influence form as much.

Commissioner Shapiro supports both policies, and they do work well together. At any given time, I hear about the City having surplus properties – could we make this available to neighborhoods?

Commissioner Rudd noted there is some tension in the development community and BDS about what compatibility means. This may not be the place to do it but I'd want to think in the future about whether design guidelines make sense to give people some comfort.

- A statement that is not in this pair of policies as explicitly as it could be is if we talk about scale and patterns is if we're talking about the planned scale or the existing. This is especially a tension in the R2.5 zone.

Commissioner Hanson noted that what is planned is what this should refer to, not necessarily what's built currently. I think these policies complement each other. And how would we do design guidelines for single-family homes?

Commissioner Oxman asked about the suggestion around existing entitlements.

- Staff is suggesting to delete this component since it's not clear to most people (including staff).

Commissioner St Martin likes the policies in the context of how we do things today (e.g. historic districts). But how do we create other guidelines in area outside of historic or conservation districts?

- The Zoning Code has requirements about setbacks and heights and open area and other standards that are intended to set the patterns.

Chair Baugh is supportive of the policies but asked about quality in different neighborhoods. We need to preserve the quality and not have low quality units/construction in low-income neighborhoods, for example.

Commissioner Tallmadge noted these policies are a lot about private ownership. The quality will vary from neighborhood to neighborhood.

- Any kind of design-based regulations have to be clear enough so they do impose cost burdens.

Commissioners Schultz wants to define scale (at the plan level? Existing environment?). I would support plan scale. We also should define quality.

Commissioner Houck: We have a broader issue than just the loss of house and form. What about loss of tree canopy for example? I wouldn't change the policy, but this is a large item to think about for the city.

- In 4.13, does "natural landscape features" capture this?

Commissioners are supportive of these two policies and find they are overall complimentary.

Residential Densities

Deborah, Marty, Nan

Staff is looking at what the appropriate residential density should be in each area of the city. This is what we reflect in the proposed Comp Plan Map.

We have identified 6 groupings of down-designations (slide 3). The staff report summarizes each of the groups, and today we're looking at 3 of the 6 items.

Lack of connectivity, school district capacity and/or other public services

These proposals are for down-designating:

- R1 → R2.5
- R2 → R5
- R2.5 → R5

This relates to the David Douglas School District conversation we had at the last PSC meeting. They currently don't have a remedy for keeping up with the population growth they've seen. Areas of Woodstock and Reed have similar characteristics.

Densities in these areas aren't supported by connectivity, parks, basic services and amenities and/or school district capacity.

In DDS, we have a 2-pronged approach:

1. Decrease housing potential where infrastructure, connectivity and school capacity won't support currently allowed residential densities through 2035.
2. Decrease zoning potential but retain Comprehensive Plan designations. Tie zone map amendments to "service adequacy" letters from David Douglas School District.

We are signaling that within the plan period, these issues won't be able to be addressed.

Commissioner Gray asked about up-zoning areas nearby these down-designated areas to help with capacity.

- Yes, absolutely. We want the density in places that are most appropriate. Today we're focusing on the down-designations, but we'll come back with this second part next meeting.

Commissioner Oxman and *Commissioner St Martin* asked about if down-designating in areas institutionalizes the lack of amenities there.

- We certainly don't want this to happen, so it's a careful balance. We want services to catch up with the development that is already there without stepping away fully. In the staff report we note that with some of the lower designations there is an assumption of land division versus multi-family, so improvements could be more effectively triggered through the land division process.

Commissioner Houck was also concerned about institutionalizing inequities. I like the approach, but at our last conversation about down-zoning, we want to be able to look at what has evolved and do some up-zoning where applicable.

- Yes, and we can do some refinement plans in the interim if necessary.

Commissioner Schultz is more in favor of decreasing zoning potential instead of decreasing housing potential in the DDS example.

- We need to look at all the services. We have been incrementally scaling down the map/proposal to get more to this option so we don't provide an excuse not to provide services.

With the local improvement district (LID) question in mind, if an area is already being assessed, we should revisit our proposal. This is new information we just are getting from PBOT today that we can share at the next work session.

Commissioner Rudd: We talked in an earlier session and I want to be sure we maintain the policy to periodically to see how our zoning processes are working on the ground and to periodically do rezoning packet as a city. Applying to rezone property is expensive and we don't want to unnecessarily add that to the cost of housing. We've talked about the need the balance zoning and school capacity (DDS) and not adversely impacting things by downzoning. I'd like to make sure when we are looking at down-zoning in other areas that, given the demographic profile, we expect to maintain required child populations for schools in our established neighborhoods.

Historic character in a Conservation District (of Eliot Neighborhood)

Staff has endorsed the neighborhood proposal to alleviate pressure to redevelop properties that have existing single-family homes to multi-unit structures. Eliot has some of the oldest homes in Portland, and there has been pressure to redevelop. This proposal is intended to be more of a preservation approach for these older homes.

R2 → R2.5 is the proposal, so just a slight density change. But it would allow for duplexes and triplexes on a 5,000 square foot lot where they are currently not allowed. There is an opportunity to provide density where we have amenities such as transit.

This is intended to reuse houses that are already there and get more value out of the home

that already exists. But you could also end up with houses that don't match the neighborhood character. Eliot does have a d-overlay since it is in a conservation district.

This doesn't guarantee nothing would be redeveloped, but we added a proposal to amend the a-overlay in the future to allow extra density if you keep the existing structure.

Commissioner Tallmadge asked about if it would be cheaper to convert the existing structure.

- It would depend on the current structure.

Chair Baugh noted that MLK Blvd is in a proposed streetcar corridor.

- Intensity along the corridor is where we want the density, so we don't anticipate this would lower the density all that much. The number of fewer units is probably not enough to make that difference.

Allowable density where anticipated LRT station likely won't be built

This is a portion of northern Westmoreland where a light rail station had been planned but TriMet has confirmed there isn't a plan to have a station here in the plan period. There is a mix of development in the area.

The proposed changes include:

- RH → R2.5
- RH → R1
- R1 → R5

This proposal was greatly informed by neighborhood input and community conversations.

Commissioner Rudd: How far away is the RH site from an existing station or one being built? What do the studies say about how far people are willing to walk to a station?

- 17th and Holgate is the closest station, about a quarter- to half-mile away and outside that distance of willingness to walk.

This area has a high concentration of homes that were built in the late 1800s, early 1900s. It's not a historic or conservation district, it could be.

Commissioners are supportive of these policies. We need to look at the implications of down-designations on future investment in infrastructure in these areas, which could be looking more at the zoning and keeping the Comp Plan designation.

Commissioner St Martin: What's the net effect of the proposals added together?

- In rough numbers: reduction of 780 units in the first grouping; reduction of about 100 units in Eliot; and about 400 units in the Harold area. We would balance these by up-zoning in other areas.

Commissioner Hanson also is supportive but notes we should look at the LID details that PBOT has recently provided.

Transportation

Art Pearce, Peter Hurley

Art provided context about the TSP. This is a 20-year plan, based on a series of financial assumptions. Much is based on the new revenue – as well as how we can increase these funds.

Peter highlighted the smaller (typically each under \$500,000) proposed projects in the Citywide programs bundle. Slide 4 highlights a number of projects within four of the programs. PBOT will be posting the full list of the small projects, by program, online in the next few days. These

are not part of the land use decision as the major projects are. This list will be updated on a more regular basis than will the major project list.

Commissioner Schultz asked if the proposed Green Loop would be a small or a large project.

- Large. It's not in the TSP now, but it could be added after the Central City Plan goes through Council and recommended to be added to the TSP. There is not a big bucket of funding for projects that are not yet on the plan, so we have to adjust and recalibrate as we go along.

Commissioner Smith supports the concept of combining small programs. In the TEG process, there was a desire to bring in new projects in this cycle of the plan. Conditions and policies have changed, so we aren't totally sure the old project list is not necessarily the best way to get new ideas, but I am actually more comfortable with the list now that I've seen it. In the testimony we received, some people wanted to include all of the Bicycle Master Plan items.

- Everything in the Bicycle Master Plan is at least on the reference list. We're removing the projects that have already been completed. But all the projects that haven't been completed or funded will be on the reference list. It doesn't mean they'll be built in the next 20 years though.

North Portland Greenway and Sullivan's Gulch are two major projects. What portion of these projects get advanced on the constrained list?

- There are significant components of each that are on the constrained list. *Staff will provide details to the PSC.*

Chair Baugh noted that as we down-zone some areas we don't affect transportation elements or priority of getting built in those areas (e.g. in East Portland).

- The way we've scored the projects includes the Comp Plan proposals.

Small projects get on a reference list in a few different ways:

- Modal plan
- Area plan
- Program manager

Citywide Transportation and Major Programs

We are looking at breaking/phasing the very large project to be able to construct portions in the first phase.

How much are we investing in high-growth, high-need centers? \$218M (17% of total) is on the constrained list, and this includes about a quarter of the projects on the list.

The Albina Community Plan does not include a list of projects, but we have completed 4 projects in the area, 3 are funded and 3 are on the draft recommended constrained list.

Analysis

Slide 10 is the shared of projected spending on the constrained list by geography and the share of projected 2035 households and jobs by geography. Slide 11 shows, by geography, the constrained list spending per person.

Art walked through the various maps in slides 13-17 that highlight how project scores are influenced by a variety of components including equity, health, safety, freight mobility and cost effectiveness.

Then slides 18-25 are the projects based on their being on the constrained list, unconstrained list or if they are funded TSP projects overlaid on various areas.

Many projects in East Portland scored well and are on the constrained or funded list.

Commissioner Smith asked if the ranking components should be weighted equally (as they were) or differently (e.g. giving double priority to equity). Would this be feasible and would it be useful?

- We can do this, but because we want to see how we score on multiple criteria, it would likely be more productive to focus on specific projects.

Chair Baugh asked about spending by year and priorities there.

- The list currently has a 1-10 and an 11-20 year funding horizon. The majority of the East Portland projects are on the constrained list, but we don't have a map today that shows in which year grouping. *Staff can produce this map/report.*

Commissioner Rudd asked to see freight corridors in a similar map.

Commissioner St Martin asked about the safety map and the little "bubbles" that appear to on the map, how does the level of safety in these areas as compare to other similar cities? I am looking for a rough gauge on how good or bad our human safety is with the current street configurations.

- These represent areas where there have been traffic fatalities in the last 10 years. We have identified safety improvements that also don't show up on the map (this map shows major projects) for example Safe Routes to School.

Commissioners Schultz asked about project area.

- Gateway street improvements are a good example: numerous small improvements that were bundled into a major project.

If commissioners have further questions or want additional analysis, staff can provide answers at the March 24 work session.

Service Enhancement Plans

TriMet staff: Alan Lehto, Vanessa Vissar, Kate Lyman, Tom Mills

Alan provided an introduction to the service enhancement plan work. TriMet has reached an agreement with its represented employees and now is financially stable for the long-term with this new agreement. We can now keep up with our current requirements and increase our work over time.

By the end of this year we will have restored service hours back to pre-recession levels, which means less waiting and less crowding on board buses and trains.

We are restoring our Frequent Service on bus and MAX lines to serve key corridors, with weekday service across our Frequent Service network restored in 2014 and weekends being restored in 2015. The Orange Line and bus service connecting neighborhoods along this corridor will be running later this year as well.

We are able to make investments in capacity and reliability now too.

The Service Enhancement Plan (SEP; "the future of transit") is a collaborative process about what the full service network looks like. Incremental improvements have already started on the Westside, with each of the other areas being completed by the end of this year. This is consistent at the broad level with the Comp Plan and TSP update.

TriMet staff walked through outreach they have completed and learnings from each of the different areas of the SEP.

The SEPs are creating a shared long-term vision for the future of transit in the city and throughout the region. As resources allow, each year's budget includes one or multiple of three objectives:

- Maintain
- Optimize and restore
- Increase

To implement the full vision for the Future of Transit over the long term, however, additional resources will be necessary to provide the increased service envisioned.

Beyond operating resources, we also need to develop an even stronger partnership with the City to ensure that those investments in service are supported by safe and convenient access to the service and that the operating environment supports efficient and reliable service.

Strengthening the Partnership for High Quality Transit
Art, Eric and Alan presented.

We are building a land use proposal that is very dependent on a good and improving transit system; the land use plans don't work without this. Traditionally in the TSP it doesn't always cover service provision and operations that TriMet leads. We need to make sure we're tying ourselves to those commitments as well.

There is now a [draft letter of intent](#) with responsibilities for each agency (TriMet, PBOT, BPS). The growth strategy needs to be complimented by access and the right level of service. This is a first attempt to put together the pieces. A TGM grant, Growing Transit Communities, will be starting this summer and will help refine how we work and deliver packages together.

One way this relates to periodic review is that through the review, there is a formal way to establish agreements with service providers. They are typically uninspired, so we're trying to be more specific where we are mutually making commitments to each other.

Commissioner Smith noted the Streetcar Master Agreement example. This took about 10 years to form that partnership. How can this evolve to something that substantial?

- We have a collaborative relationship. We are likely to talk about co-investment in some smaller corridors; a broader declaration of intent with very specific investment strategies.

Our objective is stability and permanence through economic downturns.

Commissioner Hanson is happy the letter states intent in an overarching manner at this point.

Commissioner Oxman thanked TriMet for showing the budget variance over time. How much of a percentage of TriMet's budget does this represent?

- In the far out years, it was up to about 25%. But now we're at about a steady state with the recent agreement with staff. We have to keep a 2.5 month reserve in case we're down a bit one year we are still ok.

When they closed the Thurman Street Bridge, we got the TriMet van option. Are there other ways we can do transit, particularly for neighborhoods that are on the edge of town or in difficult places in terms of location?

- The SEPs include "community connectors" – areas that need some sort of connection but due to constraints, a traditional fixed-route bus doesn't make sense. But we can look at right-sizing the vehicle or working with partners.

Commissioner Shapiro is happy to see the letter of intent.

Chair Baugh is also pleased to see the letter of intent. But we need to have commitment on

both sides. I want to be sure we have a long-term commitment to ensure the transit service doesn't disappear. If the City makes investments, what's TriMet's commitment to these corridors or other areas of town? We need to figure out how to preserve a partnership. I'm also interested in solving the student transit problem, particularly in East Portland (school districts that are not PPS).

- We understand the thinking behind the commitment to specific corridors. The more we drill down to details, we can make real commitments, but we don't know what that looks like just yet. In terms of access to schools, we need to improve service enough it is worth students taking transit.

Commissioner Tallmadge noted the analysis that is being done. Are you also doing displacement analysis?

- The focus of our displacement study work is on the Powell-Division BRT project. We are largely approaching this with the City's lead to understand what that pressures physical capital investments make.

Commissioner St Martin commented on the TSP project list and asked if people have been providing feedback.

- The MapApp is being used readily. Now we're preparing the scoring and program reference lists, and those will be populated on the website in the next week.

Susan noted that usually we start with a letter of intent, and then we often get to an IGA, which is a legal contract. If we can show we are going to provide demand and TriMet is the supply, that could work, but we need to think about the flip side as well. The private sector, institutions, schools, etc can also benefit from an agreement like this, which we'd have to think about in the future of how to get these people involved.

Commissioner Smith noted an executive level management structure in the Streetcar Management Plan that keeps it at the forefront.

Coordination with BES

Mark Lear (PBOT), Dawn Uchiyama (BES)

Dawn introduced the [charter](#) that BES and PBOT signed last September about right-of-way work and coordination.

Commissioner Houck asked about PP&R and coordination with that bureau as well.

- At the next PSC meeting, PP&R will be here for the conversation. BES has the intention to put a similar charter together with PP&R too. The history of the past few years had made us become more strategic in our efforts.

Next Steps

Eric reiterated the topics from today:

- For housing, we will bring back some follow-up on the displacement conversation.
- PSC members like the compatibility policies and the concept of housing targets (with more details to come).
- Housing topics that we'll return to include homelessness, opportunity mapping areas, status report on demolition issue and single-family development standards.
- Residential density discussions received a general nod from the PSC with extra caution that we are not precluding additional infrastructure.
- Remaining residential topics include prevalent lot patterns; proposed down-designations in natural hazard areas; Lombard in a portion of North Portland; and proposed up-zoned areas.
- For transportation, we heard an endorsement of the approach for an agreement with TriMet. There will be more time to discuss project-specific questions.

- We also will review the Chapter 9 (Transportation) policies at a future work session.

Commissioners should send project-list-specific questions to staff.

Written testimony on the Comp Plan for the PSC is open through this Friday at 5 p.m. This includes the MapApp being able to accept comments.

Susan thanked the PSC members for their continued diligence and hard work. Our next meeting is next Tuesday at 3 p.m. to be briefed on the T6/Pembina project.

Adjourn

Chair Baugh adjourned the meeting 5:16 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken