



Transportation System Plan Expert Group
A Component of the Portland Comprehensive Plan Update

MEETING SUMMARY NOTES

Meeting Date: September 25, 2014

Time: 2:00 – 6:00 p.m.

Location: Hawthorne Room, Portland Building; Portland, OR

Special Meeting

TEG Members Attending: Don Baack, Corky Collier, Marianne Fitzgerald, Sam Gollah, Eric Hesse, Phil Healy, Arlene Kimura, Keith Liden, John Mermin, Linda Nettekoven, Lidwein Rahman, Phil Selinger, Pia Welch, Garlynn Woodsong

Staff Attending: PBOT: Judith Gray, Courtney Duke, Peter Hurley, Bob Hillier, Scott Boardman, Sara Schooley, Clay Veka, Zef Wagner; BPS: Eric Engstrom; Facilitator: Jim Owens

Other Attendees: David Hampsten, Roger Averbeck

Regular Meeting

TEG Members Attending: (in addition to above) Tim Kurtz, Chris Smith, Peter Stark

Staff Attending: (in addition to above) PBOT: Eddie Hill, Scott Boardman, Mauricio Leclerc, Grant Moorehead

TEG Members Absent: Matt Davis, Justin Douglas, Maryhelen Kincaid, Gerik Kransky, Allan Schmidt, Joe VanderVeer

Key Points and Outcomes

In conjunction with the TEG's regular monthly meeting, a special meeting was conducted to continue a hands-on exercise to evaluate sample transportation projects, using the most recent evaluation criteria and scoring methodology developed by PBOT. The TEG had a number of questions and offered a variety of comments on application of the criteria to the three projects selected for evaluation. In commenting on the exercise generally, the group noted that the projects were all pedestrian/access oriented and may not be representative of how other types of projects would be scored. It was recommended that to better test the criteria, three very different but high priority projects should be scored.

The TEG's regular meeting was devoted to a review of policy changes from the 1980 Comprehensive Plan to the Proposed Draft 2035 Comprehensive Plan, and to an introduction to a Citywide Parking Strategy. The TEG had a number of questions about the BPS's process for soliciting and responding to input. The conversation about substantive issues focused on the Proposed Draft Plan's approach to addressing conflicts among policies and among other plans. The TEG also received a presentation from bureau staff on the process to develop the Citywide Parking Strategy. Key elements for which TEG review will be sought at future meetings include parking principles and policy language.

SPECIAL MEETING

Welcome and Explanation of Meeting Approach: (2:00 pm)

Description: Following introductions, Jim Owens, Facilitator, explained the approach to a two-part meeting, with the first part being devoted to a project evaluation exercise and the second being a regular TEG business meeting.

Introduction to Exercise: (2:05 pm)

Presenters: Peter Hurley, PBOT

Description: Peter explained that the focus of the exercise was on prioritization of three projects in NE Portland (Gateway area), rather than on refining evaluation criteria. He explained that the projects would be evaluated for their response to questions on eight factors, with three of those looking at differing types of economic benefits. He then explained that the three projects were to be scored relative to each other, rather than to the magnitude of the problem. Zef Wagner, PBOT, then illustrated the projects using MapApp features. TEG member questions and comments included:

- Project descriptions are very thin. A: Project descriptions vary among the projects; many of the details are not relevant to this scoring exercise. Some projects will have detailed descriptions, others will not, depending on the source of the project.
- How can cost effectiveness be evaluated without cost details? A: Including cost information tends to prejudice the scoring so it is not applied until later.
- Does the cost-benefit factor include stormwater costs/benefits? A: It could.
- How are alternative approaches to implementing a project considered? A: PBOT has instituted a new email to use in submitting ideas for new or alternative projects.
- Under Neighborhood access, is there a conflict in emphasis between the scoring question and the scoring guidance -- neighborhood destinations versus high-density corridors?
- The Jobs Access criterion does not consider regional benefits. If the project improves access to employment elsewhere either within or outside of the City, is it scored higher? A: No, the scoring is focused on access to jobs within the project's vicinity. Employment data from outside the city is difficult to obtain; not sure how relevant it is to scoring these projects.
- A definition is needed of cost-burdened households.
- Has BPS data on revitalization potential been incorporated into the Revitalization criterion? It would be useful to show urban renewal boundaries. Metro has methodology for calculating infill potential.

Peter advised that the project evaluation exercise needed to remain at the planning versus funding level as funds may not yet be available to implement the projects.

Project Evaluation Exercise: (2:30 pm)

Five small table groups, with designated leads, then scored the three projects. Comments about the exercise included that the exercise moved fairly quickly. Comments about challenges/needed improvements included:

- The criteria will necessarily be applied differently on major versus minor projects.
- Clarity is needed on how proximity to centers and corridors is to be rated.
- Access to destinations that are separate from population centers needs to be considered.
- For Safety, it is difficult to assess how projects impact safety, which has numerous aspects to it.
- For Economic Benefits: Revitalization, how projects connect where people are living to where they are working is a critical consideration.

- Revitalization should be renamed to gentrification.
- For Economic Development: Household Prosperity, the criteria seem to repeat those for other factors.

In commenting on the exercise generally, the group noted that the projects were all pedestrian/access oriented and may not be representative of how other types of projects would be scored. It was recommended that to better test the criteria, three very different but high priority projects should be scored.

REGULAR MEETING

Introductions and Housekeeping Items: (4:30 pm)

Presenters: Jim Owens, Facilitator; Courtney Duke, PBOT

Description: Following introductions, Jim Owens reviewed the agenda for the meeting. Other than edits offered by Roger Averbeck, there were no comments on the August 28 meeting summary.

Jim and Courtney Duke reviewed the schedule for upcoming TEG meetings and public involvement activities. Courtney announced that the three open houses on the Proposed Comprehensive Plan had been sparsely attended. PBOT staff will be meeting with the modal committees over the next several months; there will be a presentation to the Portland Business alliance in October and 4-5 meetings with agency partners, e.g. TriMet.

Related Materials:

- August 28 meeting summary

Comprehensive Plan Update (4:25 pm)

Presenters: Eric Engstrom, BPS; Courtney Duke, PBOT

Eric noted that copies of the Proposed Draft Comprehensive Plan and Feedback from the Networks PEG on the Working Draft, Part 1 (June 2013) had been provided at the August meeting. Also at the August meeting, Eric had identified the key elements of the Proposed Draft as Policies, Project list, Capital Systems Plan (CSP), and Plan Map. He noted that at Planning & Sustainability Commission (PSC) hearings to date there have been only three transportation-related comments. The November 4 hearing will focus on policies.

Eric's PowerPoint presentation, 2035 Comprehensive Plan: TEG Policy Discussion, included identification of proposed policy changes from the 1980 Comprehensive Plan and transportation policy changes from the Working Draft to the Proposed Draft.

The TEG's initial discussion related to the public involvement process; comments included:

- How will the TEG be appraised on public input on transportation-related aspects? A: Courtney and Eric will provide reports as the review process proceeds.
- How will staff respond to TEG comments? A: Generally, comments will be treated the same irrespective of the source or their format; there is no intent to respond to individual comments. Internally, staff will check that all comments are addressed; most comments will be grouped around key issues.
- There is a clear disparity geographically in the source of comments, with the bulk to date coming from inner neighborhoods.

- Many comments relate to permitting, suggesting the need for basic education on transportation planning.
- How are implications to adjoining jurisdictions being addressed? A: There is ongoing coordination with counties and cities in the region.
- Joint meetings of the modal committee are supported.
- Are comments weighted equally? A: It depends.
- How is BPS responding to the requests for delay in PSC action? A: The requests are being taken seriously; it will be up to the PSC. BPS desires to obtain input on goals and policies before initiating code writing.

The discussion then shifted to the substantive content of the Proposed Draft Plan:

- Parking policies need to be flushed out better.
- Is existing code overridden by the new Comprehensive Plan? A: No, the Plan directs how the code is to be written.
- Will existing plan districts be affected by the Plan? A: There will be a process to review/update plan district provisions.
- Issue #11(Policy Changes): This is a policy shift. The SE Quadrant Plan is not being coordinated with this policy. How will this policy be applied in the central core?
- When will we have an opportunity to address the transportation hierarchy? A: At the October meeting.
- How will conflicts among various plans be resolved? A: They are being addressed through the transportation hierarchy, street classifications, and project lists.
- How are projects not in the former TSP or the RTP being addressed in the new TSP project list?

This agenda item will be continued at the October meeting; TEG members were requested to come prepared with specific comments.

Related Materials:

- PowerPoint presentation -- 2035 Comprehensive Plan: TEG Policy Discussion
- PowerPoint presentation -- Transportation System Plan Presentation: Planning & Sustainability Commission Briefing
- Feedback from Networks PEG on Comprehensive Plan Working Draft, Part 1 (June 2013)

Citywide Parking Strategy (5:10 pm)

Presenters: Mauricio Leclerc and Grant Moorehead, PBOT

Mauricio led a PowerPoint presentation on the process to develop a Citywide Parking Strategy. He noted that the Bureau intends that the TEG function as the citywide review committee for the Strategy. Key elements for which review will be sought at future meetings: parking principles and policy language.

Comments included:

- There is a disconnect between on-street and off-street parking management.
- If plan districts are exempted, then, by default, there is no parking minimum in those areas.
- Hide-and-ride parking is an issue that needs to be addressed.
- There are a number of safety issues associated with parking.

Related Materials:

- PowerPoint presentation

Public Comment (5:55 p.m.)

There was no additional public comment.

Adjourn (6:00 p.m.)

For more information, please contact either Courtney Duke, PBOT at 503-823-7265 or Courtney.duke@portlandoregon.gov or Jim Owens, Facilitator at 503-278-3452 or jim.owens@coganowens.com. The City of Portland will make reasonable accommodation for people with disabilities. Please notify us no fewer than five (5) business days prior to the event by phone 503-823-7700, by the City's TTY at 503-823-6868, or by the Oregon Relay Service at 1-800-735-2900.

DRAFT